

Topology of the Other: Boundaries as a Means of Space Cosmisation

Marina Kolinko¹

Ph.D., Associated Professor, Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University (Vinnytsia, Ukraine)

E-mail: mkolinko09@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1043-2742>

The article presents a philosophical reflection of the Other within the context of space "cosmisation". The topological methodology suggests the analysis of semantic structures in spatial relation of subjects and their environment. It also assigns the cartography of differentiation relationships inside the humankind and in humankind's search of its own place in the space universe. There have been found algorithms for the topology of relations with the Other in anthropological and cultural aspects. The authors have highlighted the importance of searching for algorithms of communicative and diplomatic protocols of the interaction of the humankind with the principally Other (animal, artificial, space worlds). An analytical instrument for distinguishing the specific forms of interaction became an abstract Alien by Georg Simmel. The Other articulates the relations of distance: it does not go ahead, but it does not fully overpower the freedom of coming and going. The paper proves the necessity of marginality of the Other for activating and renewing the relationships inside the homeworld and relationships between different worlds.

Keywords: topology, space, universe, cosmology, alien, other, homeworld, distance

Received: June 2, 2019; accepted: August 1, 2019

Philosophy and Cosmology, Volume 24, 2020: 99-112.

<https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/24/10>

Introduction

In the stock of new forms of subjectivity, the Other reveals new aspects of interpreting the difference. The process of perception and understanding of the Other and the Alien is of immediate interest of polyphilosophical studies. It is related to the general methodology of research into the cultural variety. The classic philosophical tradition does not practically investigate the idea of the Other. The "Alien" provides more historical and analytical material than the "Other". The Alien is present in the ideas of everyday consciousness and theoretical thought of various cultural epochs. Zeno reflected on the universalistic perspective of living not in separate communities, with different administration and laws, but on the perspective of common living of "fellow countrymen" under common rules. This subject was considered in the Ancient philosophy as a problem of "barbarians". In addition, it was viewed by the medieval theologians in terms of "alien" religions. The Christian worldview suggests a society

with no aliens and excluded ones, where all are sons of God (those christened by Jesus Christ). In Modern philosophy, this subject was brought up to date in terms of discussing the moral attitude to people of alien world outlooks, religions, cultures and nations. The philosophy of today needs not only theory that allows to adequately and relevantly describe social and cultural processes and a subject's role in them. It needs a theory that allows interpreting the place of the human civilisation in the space universe and its responsibility which goes beyond the terrestrial space solely and shapes the cosmological thinking.

Purpose and objectives

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the levels of topology of the Other — anthropological, cultural and cosmic, as well as to prove the efficiency of the Alien in further civilisation development. The article objectives consist in conceptualising the Other, analysing the basic features, displays, boundaries, the topological role of the Other in the environment and the parameters of his impact on the development of systemic continuity.

Methodology and literature review

Since the Enlightenment, the Alien has been an example necessary for self-identification, a so-called mirror to look at if you want to understand yourself. The concept of the Alien is intensively used by modern philosophers and sociologists: Georg Simmel (Simmel, 2008), Bernhard Valdenfels (Valdenfels, 2019), Jeffrey Alexander (Alexander, 2004), Vince Marotta (Marotta, 2012). Their ideas have influenced the formation of our scientific position. There are different interpretations and applications of this concept. A considerable resource of overcoming the postmodern loss of the subject is in “the explications of the Alien as intra-subjective strangeness... or extra-territorial atopic Alien as a liminal form of identity” (Kozachynska, 2017: 14).

On the basis that “the planet Earth and its organisation is merely an episode of cosmic history in the world existence” (Bazaluk & Kharchenko, 2018), it is to the point to raise the problem to the level of strategy of cosmic thinking that determines metaphysical boundaries. The search of algorithms of understanding the Other that does not belong to the humankind (cosmically Alien, artificial Mind, other in the biological world of the planet) demonstrates an epistemological challenge and hope to meet an unknown intelligent world, which is, however, probably close, similar, understandable and such that perceives us. This angle widens the horizon of the philosophical problem of the Other in gnoseological, anthropological, social and cosmological aspects.

Spatial basis of topology

The spread of spatial discourse caused the sciences to divide the space among them in such a way that it appeared to be fragmented, in accordance with methodological postulates, into geographical, historical, political, economic and cosmic spaces. The theme of interaction space is becoming vitally important for social sciences. But it is the task of philosophy to generalise and unite the problematic points of spatial topics into a single methodological resource which brings interest to topological methodology in the analysis of multidimensional structures of existence and human thinking.

In their origin, most of the spatial surveys are geographical, and this is reflected in the range of concepts and categories, the style of thinking and construction of research models. Space is a general determination of place, area, landscape and territory. No doubt, it has

social meaning within the context of location. In the most abstract way, space is interpreted as an order of location and interaction of things, places and positions. It is the phenomenological experience of space, but not only natural science spatial discourse that is of immediate interest in the field of our research. Space is performative, it is impossible to be investigated out of touch with those who render it habitable, get to know, represent, in isolation from the existing one.

The category of *space* has a long history. It is the Ancient philosophy that articulated the basic interpretations of space. The substantial interpretation presents space as a reservoir, while the attributive interpretation characterises space as an order of things. At first view, space precedes objects and determines the conditions of their possibility. This is how space starts to be viewed as a reservoir of things and processes, as a “container” with bodies and material things that exist inside. Geographically, such an idea makes sense. Moreover, even here, symbolisation turns the concept of geographic space into one of the variants of spatial construction of the world in human consciousness.

In his work “Other Spaces” Michel Foucault (Foucault, 2006) presents a reflection of space in pre-modern, modern and postmodern periods. According to Michel Foucault, the Middle Ages built space of a hierarchical plurality of places: “sacred and profane places, protected and, vice versa, unprotected ones, urban and rural places (related to real human life). In cosmogonic theory, there were super-celestial places, contrasted with celestial ones. In its turn, a celestial place was opposed to a terrestrial place. There were places with things forced to be “replaced” and, vice versa, there existed places where things got their natural location and rest. All this hierarchy, this opposition, this intersection of places compiled what could be roughly called a “localisation space” (Foucault, 2006: 192). The discovery of infinite space and its certain desacralisation by the Renaissance scientists decomposed the localisation of place, having replaced it with *extension*: “now a thing’s place was no more than a point in its motion, absolutely in the same way as a thing’s rest was no more than its motion that was slowed down infinitely” (Foucault, 2006: 192).

In the New time discourse, the Cartesian coordinate system with its geometric definiteness sets a perspective possibility of understanding various dimensions of space. It is still used as a metaphor for describing vertical and horizontal parameters of the social medium, culture and communication. Let us also highlight the importance of Newton-Leibniz understanding of space as a basic one in interpreting the variety of social space. Unlike Isaac Newton’s substantial space, the relative model by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz combines space and time. It also suggests a principle of “universal differences” that acknowledges the existence of a great number of monads as substantial units. According to this principle, space is the order of co-existing things that opens up possibilities of the universe. Non-Euclidean geometry develops an idea of space features being dependent on general properties of the matter, and the theory of relativity demonstrates the dependence of space-time properties on the type of motion and interaction of material systems. This has changed the priorities of the scientific community in favour of the relational space-time theory.

Basing on Immanuel Kant’s anthropological study, we understand that in terms of the topological research into the levels of the Other, we should consider not the “space as a whole”, but a specifically meaningful space, a human space filled with senses. In addition, its meaning cannot be narrowed down to a complex of objective determinants, such as territory size, climate or landscape characteristic features. The goal of phenomenological studies is working with not only space but also spatiality. Spatiality became a key conception in modern philosophical and cultural studies, being critically oriented at a “spatial turn” — a

new approach to the philosophical analysis of society, culture, time and history. Within this context, of special interest is the conception of personal space, social distance and social boundaries by Georg Simmel (Simmel, 2008). He is the inventor of a word combination “the sociology of space”. Georg Simmel investigated space as such mastered by man. He also studied the space forms in their social context and correlation with corresponding physical spaces. Our research is based on Georg Simmel’s interpretation of space of the Other.

Topology as methodology of spatial thinking

Spatial relations and forms of spatiality are the subject of research in topology. The topological analysis method enables to take a new look at configurations of any interactions and relations, at their differences and similarities. The method does not bring into the foreground static structures, but production, changeability and plurality of practices.

The term *topology* is rather polysemantic. And this hinders giving its clear definition and application as a philosophical category. Moreover, such polysemantism makes it difficult to develop and use a related methodological strategy. In a broad sense, topology investigates properties of various type spaces. As a part of geometry, topology studies the continuity phenomenon, where the fundamental properties of figures are cohesion and possibility of continuous external figural deformation. Mathematical topology considers invariable properties of spatial objects and their ability to transform within the context of their spatial environment. We view *topology* as a special philosophical category aimed at mental “mapping” of certain semantic structures, their bonds, relations, displays and development vectors. Topology outlines a new reality status, and this makes it possible to build the general theory of space organisation. Topology reveals the principle of constructing the identifications, differentiations and interactions. This principle is presented as *subjects and environment* and it is fundamental in investigating the communication relations. The topoi of a subject and an environment outline their *places* in communication. Besides, they have specific characteristics of closeness / remoteness and direction of communication (way, orientation). Therefore, for example, a topological scheme of communication with the Other is concentrated on the spaces “between” and “around”, what characterises the cultural *transition strategy*. However, the transition process is only possible with outlined and interpreted boundaries of a cultural world that are to be outstepped.

The concept of *culture* is endowed with a power that regulates the world. It is used in the context of regulated general space (cosmos, universe). It as well renders a sense of order created by human actions, a habitable and cultivated human space. It is realised in the metaphor of an oecumene, a native, home, one’s own world that is familiar and limited. This limitedness leads to interpreting the essential bond of culture and the boundary: when emerging in conditions of differentiation and territorial localisation, culture continues, transforms and progresses only in the modus of outstepping its boundaries and expanding its space. Mapping of the homeworld assumes its obligatory structuring, ordering and thus its limitation. Boundaries become a method of homeworld “cosmisation” that articulate certain rules, forms of existence and configuration of relations of subjects of the same cultural system. The toposphere of the traditional lifeworld was depicted in the lines of circles that radiate from the close world to the remote world: from one’s own and familiar to the unknown and alien, from “significant others” to “generalised others”. Various meanings are inscribed in such a scheme: perception starts with reflection of the “self”, then it outsteps its boundaries into the open horizon of the “other”. The toposphere of the modern lifeworld is principally built at joints and boundaries of cultural spaces.

A research into various aspects of the Other requires applying a wide range of methodological developments in this subject. It also needs involving not only topological but also hermeneutic, phenomenological and post-structuralist studies. In order not to become a general place, the concept of the Other is to reveal currently important epistemological motion.

Topological variants of the Other

The contemporary discourse of civilisation topics goes through the topoi of the Alien and the Other as the components of the cultural transition strategy. The philosophical postmodern metaphor of “a subject’s death” is a pattern of the transition strategy. In this sense it is a model concept for grounding the problematic character of transgression, marginality, incomplete plunging into a certain space. Postmodernism is open for narrative variants and this removes raising the issue of the so called correct reading. Stating the crisis of identification that characterises modern forms of subjectivity, after-postmodernism forms a program of subject’s resurrection, reconstruction and repatriation. A Ukrainian scientist Vadym Palaguta highlights the current importance of a new theory of subjectivity which “demonstrates a shift of research emphasis from considering an active, self-sufficient and energetic subject to studying the conditions and generating mechanisms as an initial, basic beginning which precedes the subjective activity itself and its social actualisation” (Palaguta, 2010: 16). It is the mechanisms of subject’s introduction, “through self-identification, into certain symbolic social and spatial formations that determine the conditions and result of “production” of subjectivity. And every time the result changes when a subject “gets into” a certain social and spatial structure” (Palaguta, 2010: 118).

Our research of the Other and the Alien is aimed at developing a strategy of interaction. This is why it has less concern about the conception of transcendental Other as God (for example, according to Emmanuel Levinas). However, it should be noted that “Emmanuel Levinas wrote very deeply about the understanding of the Other as the goal of meaning” (Polishchuk et al., 2018: 122). In her philosophical and anthropological work “Subjectivity: extending heterogeneous spaces (philosophical and anthropological dimension)”, Viktoriya Kozachynska has thoroughly investigated the specific features of modern concepts of identity, selfhood and subjectivity which “radically overpower the metaphysical model of the closed Self as monadic immanence <...> and thus — the idea of subjectivity as a manifestation of the transcendent in the immanent” (Kozachynska, 2016: 179).

We agree with Svetlana Bankovskaya, who explains defining of the Otherness “with a need to affiliate inter-subjectivity as a single reason for objective social reality” (Bankovskaya, 2007: 76). The researcher demonstrates the levels of perception of the Other from a logic category (generalized Other) to a social type, and then to an individual Other (Bankovskaya, 2007: 77). Within the context of contemporary cosmological studies, of current interest is to add a conventional extra-terrestrial Other as well. Such inclusion of a speculative Other outlines the perspective of perception and understanding of species that are biologically and cosmologically different from the human being.

Alienation and incorporation of the Other into the homeworld

According to the scheme of general cultural space, otherness, strangeness can belong to a homeworld, or it can exist beyond its boundaries. The Other presents a way of presence of various people in the world. It outlines a problem of social order and horizonness. If subjects

and objects of a homeworld are perceived with their individual features, then the space of the Other has generalised and typed properties. Marking of the Other and marking off from it — “close, near, far, strange or historically preceding” (Nikolko & Gritsay, 2008: 49) is the first stage in formulating an integral I/WE construct. A marginal form of the alien is an enemy. The rules valid for the other and the alien in everyday life of a democratic society fail with respect to the enemy. The other is not wanted, nobody wants to let him in his own space because he is strange. That is why the problem of social inclusion/exclusion and marginalisation of certain subjects has become so urgent in the contemporary philosophical discourse. Gender studies view this problem in the context of gender-based discrimination, with “attempts to define woman risk excluding or marginalizing some women” (Jenkins, 2016: 394). The problems of racial and ethnic affiliation are also a source of developing the principles of recognition of the Other (Mogensen, 2019; Gordana & Smeriga, 2019).

The problem of understanding starts with acquaintance and getting knowledge of an unknown subject. This approach “is in tune with a general trend in epistemology, where there has been a lot of interest in how understanding relates to knowledge” (Sliwa, 2017: 521). Out of the whole flow of information on the other, we can single out the knowledge necessary for understanding (Wilkenfeld, 2018). One can get acquainted and communicate with representatives of another culture by means of layer-by-layer “removing” of specific signals and codes of a foreign culture. At the time of these actions, a subject reveals in himself similar “layers”. It is the topological method of comparison of “similar to similar” and usage of general cultural topoi that allows a subject to see in a “strange” or “unknown” personality features similar to himself, features that bind and draw individuals together. Marking the domestic and foreign cultural spaces allows to understand the principles and develop the rules of their situational and lasting interactions.

Homeworld is an embodiment of traditional ideas of space. It gives protection, reliability and stability. Contemporary knowledge of the changeable world does not give confidence in the future, it disturbs and makes search for new algorithms of relationships with this world. A human being loses peace and home comfort, he is destined for search and expectation, being not always ready for this. Then, there can be produced nostalgic imaginations on traditional society, established order and rejection of changes. An undesirable meeting with the Other makes a personality or the whole society build and protect the boundaries of the homeworld, defending its integrity and inviolability. This traditional social practice is widely spread and appears normal if boundaries are the means of ordering and “cosmising” of space. Due to the boundaries, a cosmos fences off and protects itself against chaos. However, denial of knowledge, fear of the new and unknown can cause a situation that is called in physics falling behind the horizon of events. The notion of *horizon of events* shows that close to the black hole, nothing can leave its gravitation field. No information is obtained beyond the horizon of events. Crossing the horizon, an object becomes isolated from its Universe and stops existing. Rather, its existence still continues in the black hole space, but for any observer from this Universe this existence is over. The cosmological physicist Stephen Hawking (Hawking et al., 2016) assumed that the black hole does not absorb but only keeps off, “grinds” into radiation the matter and energy. Then the black hole lets them back and transforms in such a way that their original nature is impossible to recreate. This cosmological term can be used in the context of threat of falling behind the horizon of events, after which we shall never be the same. We shall exist, walk, eat, and think. However, in the system of value coordinates of the cultural world we can stop existing. Surface sliding and lack of self-reflection mask the boundaries of the cultural. In addition, it is difficult to perceive the moment of crossing the

horizon. One needs a lot of time to build new bonds and relations that conform to the criteria of the postmodern society.

To avoid falling behind the horizon of events, the humankind needs to learn how to perceive the Other, how to live under unknown circumstances, think over the role of boundaries in contacts and relations and to implement the mechanisms of trust (D’Cruz, 2019). In these conditions, an Alien is not only a stranger; his cultural role gets more complicated. In Georg Simmel’s analytical essay “The sociological significance of the stranger”, which is a starting point in our reflections of the Alien, the author links the social type of the Alien and the social distance (Simmel, 2008). The German sociologist opposes an alien to a “domestic” person who does not leave the group. However, he differentiates the alien from a “traveller” who comes today and leaves tomorrow. The alien comes today and stays tomorrow. He lives in the group, takes part in its tasks, but still he remains far from the others — “domestic” members of the group. Georg Simmel shows strangeness as an “absolutely positive attitude, as a special form of interaction” (Simmel, 2008: 9). The Alien’s location is defined in two sets of coordinates — social and spatial. Each of them changes along the distant axis: social and spatial remoteness, social and spatial closeness. The Alien is perceived as a stranger to the group: though he is in permanent relations with other group members, his “remoteness” is emphasized more than his “closeness”. He stays within a group but he does not originate from it. That is why the Alien imports cultural features that are not peculiar of the group initially.

Georg Simmel limits the range of Alien’s roles: his mobile and unstable position and groundlessness explain the impossibility of his becoming a landowner (a symbol of rootedness). It is common for him to be a seller, a moneylender, a judge, an arbiter, an interpreter. The German philosopher believed the Alien’s role in the group to be very important: as a subject who is not closely connected with the group, being deprived of its bias and prejudice, the Alien fulfils a specific function of a mediator of interaction with the others. Due to a stranger’s closeness and at the same time remoteness from others, he is often valued for objectivity, for his ability to look at events and relations at a distance and without prejudice. A stranger can be a man whom we address as a close and trusted person, no matter how paradoxically it may sound, because the social distance between us prevents him from judging us too strictly. Such a conclusion is explained with the fact that the Alien is free from emotional and moral bonding to the traditions and rules of a recipient culture. However, Georg Simmel exaggerates the role of a stranger as an impartial and objective arbiter. In fact, lack of pressure on his judgements and actions, relations with history, habits, tastes as well as his ability to examine the existing relations from outside favour the evaluation that “corresponds to more general and objective ideals” (Simmel, 2008: 11). A closeness and remoteness ratio grants a stranger with a tone of higher objectivity than that existing within the cultural boundaries only. However, this is not a scientific criterion. Moreover, a stranger, as a carrier of certain cultural features and social attitudes, comes under their influence on his perception.

Following Edmund Husserl, Bernhard Valdenfels (Valdenfels, 2019) compares the ethnology of “home” and “foreign” worlds. The world is given to us as an unlocked open horizon that is not limited with a domestic circle. Horizonness is the most important feature of consciousness. As this concept of Husserl is presented in Bernhard Valdenfels’s topography, the homeworld functions both as a centre surrounded with further horizons and as a ground the higher levels are built upon. Edmund Husserl depicts toposphere inside the homeworld as circles of various shades of the knowledge sphere, “where I have a more or less good

understanding and where I can get on well with my “fellow countrymen” (Valdenfels, 2019). The sphere of one’s own and familiar is the basis for understanding the new and unknown. The process of mastering the alien is a process of familiarising with his worldview, understanding and domestication (Kolinko, 2018). “We can ask ourselves whether the concentric model of the Native world, as if a trunk of a tree growing the strangeness circles, and separation of internal and external strangeness, conform, even distantly, to our multicultural society. Do not the spheres of Self-Strangeness continuously penetrate into one another in a cultural blend?” (Valdenfels, 2019). The concept of the Alien appears when “our habitable, understandable and accessible world is interfered with new forms of living together which go beyond the boundaries of our knowledgeability, understandability and thus are classified as strange” (Chernyak, 2013:71). Inside a home world, it is always possible to predict the other’s actions related to us and his respond to our actions. In a homeworld, the other, even being strange, is perceived as part of a common history. He is related to common plans, life projects and the future of this cultural whole. He stops being Alien and remains different when he shares with others the task of strengthening and developing a common social world. So, “individuals with different psychological profiles, different interests, and different positions within the national community react to anxiety about the status of the state with they identify” (Ward, 2019: 211).

The experience of the Other and the Alien shows beyond its own boundaries, being in the horizon of certain world experience. Identification of the cultural Self stipulates the presence of the Other, his “invisible presence as a place or field of realisation of the subject discourse” (Palaguta, 2010: 156). Presenting an Alien as a social type leads to a conclusion on necessary marginalisation — a stimulus to develop the social form of life. When a group comes across with an alien, “its members also come across with strangeness among themselves” (Heinke, 2019). While group members are similar in the set of values, their behavioural reactions are individual. This fact of uniqueness of every person, with his own experience and worldview, makes the German researcher Jörg Heinke draw an anthropological conclusion about a stranger, an alien inside each of us” (Heinke, 2019).

Identity is formed in the process of differentiation between oneself and everything that is not oneself, which is beyond. The Other gets into our domestic system of senses and relations due to certain legitimation stages: “identification, communication experience, a habit of communication with the Other (habitus development), reflection of experience of communicating with the Other in consciousness and naturalisation of the Other, its embedding in a comfortable world view” (Nikolko & Gritsay, 2008: 49–50). The Other actualises a personal or a collective Self (in an identical cultural group). Therefore, addressing him, listening to the Other is an important stage of formation of identity, either cultural or national.

The discussion around the “Alien” by Georg Simmel presented in the works Jeffrey Alexander (Alexander, 2004), Vince Marotta (Marotta, 2012), Jörg Heinke (Heinke, 2019) is concentrated around whether this concept can take part in discussing the modern challenges: the state of ethnic groups in western countries, marginality and poverty. The Alien is exposed to analytical procedures mostly from the view of a recipient group. Jeffrey Alexander states that in Georg Simmel’s conception, a stranger cannot be related to those in the exceptional condition (for example, newly arrived poor immigrants). This is due to the fact that Simmel’s category is strongly different from the modern economically disadvantaged or exploited class (Alexander, 2004: 88). We agree with his idea in a sense that, getting into new social conditions and theoretical contexts, the image of an Alien transforms. Representative systems used by the main social and cultural group to build interpretation schemes in relation to

newcomers, cannot be understandable to a stranger. Unfortunately, today an Alien does not represent freedom and liberation that Georg Simmel insisted on. A stranger becomes a rule of a swift-flowing world and often illustrates a behaviour of human indifference to each other. Can we draw a conclusion on disappearance of Simmel's alien as some contemporary authors do (Alexander, 2004; Marotta, 2012)? Though the primary functionalist interpretation of the Alien as an element of a group that defines its boundaries does not reflect modern contexts of his interpretation, such a conclusion seems premature. However, this is the objective and subjective status of the Other that "we and they" polarisation is built on, what stimulates the group to re-examine the canons of its existence. Conceptualisation of strangeness means perceiving a difference in the space of commonness. The level of people's intercultural competence and society's readiness to admit this difference influences the fact how potentially marginal groups are accepted: whether they are dangerous because they are unknown or a possible danger is not caused by their otherness but by their desire to be included in a new social and cultural environment and by their desire of law obedience. In a global and mobile world strangeness gets so widely spread and otherness gets so common (travellers, migrants, nomad workers) that it becomes a norm. However, as local and global conflicts show, it is early to write off this concept, since it will long be much-needed within the context of intercultural relations.

Within the framework of theoretical insights of Martin Heidegger and Bernhard Valdenfels, the basic nature of the Alien is viewed as an intentional failure, when the cultural world is not recognised in his strangeness, resists explanation and rejects interpretation. Commenting on this position, Andriy Artemenko, the author of the conception of identity topology, states that such creation of One's Own image "is based on the procedure of differentiation between something which is known, understandable, interpreted and the rest of the world. Differentiation assumes the exclusion procedure — everything, which is different from One's Own, is excluded from the well-organised view of the world. This is not a boundary or a border, this is indifference that ruins the possible world of the other. This is the methodological plane linearity that does not want to perceive the dimensional environment and considers itself within the surface" (Artemenko, 2013: 42). Treatment of the intentional failure in interaction with the Other is one of the accepted strategies of its perception. This strategy provides for mutual reaction and influence of the cultural context: "They mutually respond to and transmit a wide range of social cues, which get interpreted in a context-sensitive fashion" (Schönherr & Westra, 2019: 29). Also possible are such variants of cultural reaction to the Other as a strategy of domestication which means familiarisation and acceptance. Then the Other is a cultural possibility.

The place of the Alien as a sovereign subject is defined as atopy and gets into the "topos of cultural comparison" only by force (Valdenfels, 2019). Responsive phenomenology suggests a response event, "boundary attention and the most important here is a desire to admit the right of another culture, another people, another person for otherness, strangeness, difference" (Chernyak, 2013: 73). The relation of One's Own and Alien is not presented vertically. It is shown as an intersection of certain independent spaces. The intersection point will be a place of their contact, a space of "boundaries". Bernhard Valdenfels marks external strangeness as alien, which is different from internal strangeness. As to internal strangeness, the general language mechanisms work out. Bernhard Valdenfels's responsive phenomenology suggests a concept of "common territory", identification of both one's own and alien in the response field. Dialogism as a strategy in the "Between" space in relations with the other is of lively interest with contemporary scientists (Bankovskaya, 2007; Khmil & Korkh, 2017; Polishchuk

et al., 2018). A communication problem appears exactly at the moment when a person wants to express himself in relation to others. The process of “Self” identification is opposed to others. Strangeness is not only a social problem of a newcomer in the group or somebody who received new experience and thus a difference. This is also a problem of expectations in relation to other subjects. “Strangeness occurs when the expectations are not met by others” (Heinke, 2019). Jorg Heinke draws attention to a danger of stereotype thinking and superstitions. An Alien constantly brings changes what is perceived by the group as a threat to their homeworld. If a group has weakened resistance mechanisms to Alien’s confrontation or does not have them at all, it becomes highly probable that the group will depart from the traditional inflexible standards, with perspective renewal of its life activity. Communication with the Alien needs self-reflection and tolerance. Contemporary social and cultural realities dictate a new reading of the tolerance principle in cultural, anthropological and other contexts (Callan, 2015; Godfrey-Smith & Kerr, 2019). If group members do not have objective information on the processes inside their world and the external environment, if they do not develop an ability to think critically and work through the new, a difference is perceived as a threat to their world. A corresponding response will be aggression, non-acceptance, and displacement. “If people are sure enough of themselves and their identity and have sufficient possibilities and the ability to handle and interpret information, they are the ones who can win from experiences with the unknown” (Heinke, 2019).

Important in this context is a theme of readiness to accept not only one’s own homeworld, but also unknown and possibly odd worlds. The matter is to find a topological place of earthly organisation in the Universe system. A discussion about the meeting with the extra-terrestrial Alien is held in the field of arguing a possibility of understanding and non-understanding. In his research into the nature of communication, the British scientist John Elliott from Leeds Metropolitan University has developed a method of determining unknown language structures and their decoding. Having analysed more than 60 human languages, dolphin communication and robot communication, he drew a conclusion on a link between the understanding of human analytical abilities and the development of strategies of identification and understanding of extra-terrestrial messages. “We still have many scripts from our own antiquity that remain undeciphered, despite many serious attempts, over hundreds of years. So, given this, an algorithmic rationale, based on previous research into signal decipherment techniques, is presented. This phased approach will then provide an initial methodology for us attempting to unlock the content of an extra-terrestrial signal, whilst facilitating the dissemination of timely and accurate information to an expectant world” (Elliott, 2011: 441).

The American astronomer Frank Drake proposed a well-known Drake’s equation where he considered the factors important in development of civilisations of our Galaxy. In modern cosmology it is used for evaluation of a possible number other planet civilisations. Stephane Dumas and Yvan Dutil have created a system of message coding that can be used in communication with the extra-terrestrial Alien (Dutil, 2011). Paul Fitzpatrick studies possible communication with conventional extra-terrestrial intelligence, develops algorithms and systems of possible contacts, a communication and diplomatic protocol, assuming friendly, unfriendly or neutral contacts. As early as the end of the 20th century, Marvin Minsky (Minsky, 1985) was convinced that “communication with Alien Intelligence” is possible. To the question “Will we be able to communicate with alien intelligence?”, he gave an answer: “Yes, we will — provided they are motivated to cooperate — because we’ll both think similar ways” (Minsky, 1985: 117). He believes that understanding is based on a search of general algorithms of intelligence functioning. Unlike Marvin Minsky, William Herkewitz articulates

an opposite opinion: “if you follow the logic of the renowned Polish philosopher and science fiction writer Stanisław Lem, after a lot of hubbub and frustration: absolutely nothing. According to Lem’s logic, our species may never be able to read or understand a message from extraterrestrials” (Herkewitz, 2019). Besides, in conformity with the conception of axiological absolutism (Seth & Chad, 2019), if a system faces a danger from outside, it is forced to prefer protection of internal space to perspectives of new levels of identification of the Other. In the opinion of Lazar Seth and Lee-Stronach Chad, the humankind will have to make a choice in keeping with “higher moral consideration” (Seth & Chad, 2019: 98). However, many scientists are still optimistic and they do not give up searching for a universal language of communication in the cosmic space. For instance, LINCOS (Lingua Cosmica) “drafts a detailed scenario for communicating with aliens. He begins with elementary mathematics and shows how many other ideas, including social ideas, might be based on that foundation” (Minsky, 1985: 132). The British philosopher Alistair Isaac draws attention to the hidden effects of information semantics and conventional symbols. Studying them will allow to create “an adequate theory of information content” (Isaac, 2019: 103) that will open new possibilities of mutual understanding.

With a certain degree of fantasy of the research into the space of cosmic communication, their heuristic possibilities and cultural perspectives appear socially significant in a cosmological aspect to understand a clash with the Other and human communication with other communication systems.

Conclusions

1. This paper considers space as a quality characteristic of unfolding the cosmic universum and a platform for subject interaction. Spatial analysis of interaction of various culture subjects proves the transition of philosophical studies from the plane and linear vision of social systems to a principally new topological methodology of considering various spaces in their interrelation with surrounding social landscapes. In terms of topology, invariance and internal change (which is thought as deformation) are not incompatible: most probably, they are closely interrelated. Topology is creation of various order spaces in a way providing for a deformation or a change as transformation continuity.
2. There has been proved the essential role of boundaries in human space cosmisation. Topology ontologises the boundary problem. Boundaries outline the rules and senses of the home world and articulate the exit point to other cultural worlds. Their sense does not reject relations, continuity and nomadism of the contemporary world. However, it emphasises another side of cultural development taking into account the processes of division, filtration and separation.
3. Social experience of the Other and with the Other in the space of cultural intersection has been explicated in the article. It is related to strategic orientation of subject’s resurrection, revealing in the discourse practices of topological relation of a subject and his environment. There has been proved that the concept of the Other is systematically important in investigating inter-civilisation relations. The authors have systematised the range of images of the Other as a social type: historically other, personal or collective, close, alien and enemy. The plurality of ethnological aspects allows to understand that the Other and the Alien can be viewed not only in the sense of “such that can not be understood so far”, but also as sovereign subjects able to assert themselves.

4. The topology of relations of the Alien with the group is connected with his specific functions in the recipient group: a marker of rules relevance, an expert and a motivator for changes. The authors have used Georg Simmel's distance interpretation of the Alien as a synthesis of closeness and remoteness, presence but not integration into the group. It has been summed up that interrelations with the Alien transform from non-acceptance and rejection, escape and indifference to interpretation and recognition. One of the strategies of meeting a cultural stranger (individual or group) is in the desire to familiarise, to render habitable and domesticate.

Gradual understanding of culture as a means of organization of human existence gives depth and scale to the philosophical topological research strategy. The theoretical discourse of "communication between" goes beyond the human culture only into a space of cosmological generalisations. In terms of cosmology, the general order is to integrate every separate phenomenon and every structure with its own limiting order. Topology problematises the place of the Other in the cosmic universe and searches for general algorithms of reaching the mutual understanding with him.

References

- Alexander, Jeffrey. (2004) Rethinking strangeness: From structures in space to discourses in civil society. *Thesis Eleven*. Issue 79 (1), 87-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513604046959>
- Artemenko, Andriy. (2013) The topology of identity in the network structures of society. Kharkiv: First digital Publishing house.
- Bankovskaya, Svetlana. (2007) The Other as an elementary notion of the social ontology. *Sociological review*. Moscow. Volume 6. Issue 1, 75-87.
- Bankovskaya, Svetlana. (2019) The Aliens and boundaries: the question on social marginality. Available at: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2002/6/chuzhaki-i-granicy-kponyatiyu-socialnoy-marginalnosti>. Last accessed: 10. 03. 2019
- Bazaluk, Oleg, and Larysa Kharchenko. (2018) The Philosophy of the Cosmos as the New Universal Philosophical Teaching about Being. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 21, 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/21/1>
- Callan, Eamonn K. (2015) Debate: Liberal Virtues and Civic Education. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*. Volume 23. Issue 4, 2015: 491-500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12050>
- Chernyak, Natalya. (2013) About the boundaries and possibilities of responsive phenomenology. *Omsk scientific bulletin. Philosophy*. Issue 1 (115), 71-74.
- D'Cruz, Jason. (2019) Humble trust. *Philosophical Studies*. Volume 176. Issue 4, 933-953. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-018-1220-6>
- Dutil, Yvan. (2019) *Social choice and equity theories: seeking the common good as a common ground*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37750-1_17
- Elliott, John. (2011) A post-detection decipherment strategy. *Acta Astronautica*. Issue 68 (3), 441-444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2010.01.003>
- Foucault, Michel. (2006) The other spaces. Intelligence and power: Selected political papers, reports and interview. Translated from French by B. M. Skuratova, Edited V. P. Bolshakova. Moscow: Praxis, 2006: 191-204.
- Godfrey-Smith, Peter and Benjamin Kerr. (2019) Tolerance: A Hierarchical Analysis. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12178>

- Gordana, Iličić and Peter Smeriga. (2019) The Influence of Institutional Design on the Democratisation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Političke vedy*, Volume 22, Number 2, 115-136. <http://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2019.22.2.115-136>
- Hawking, Stephen, Malcolm Perry, and Andrew Strominger. (2016) Soft Hair on Black Holes. *Physical Review Letters*. Volume 116. Issue 23, 231-301. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.231301>
- Heinke, Jorg. (2019) George Simmel, Strangeness, and the Stranger. Available at: <http://www.postcolonialweb.org/australia/malouf/jh2.html>. Last accessed: 17. 03. 2019.
- Herkewitz, William. (2019) If Aliens Contact Us, We Won't Understand. *Astronomy Magazine*. Available at: <http://astronomy.com/bonus/alien-contact>. Last accessed: 14. 03. 2019.
- Isaac, Alistair M C. (2019) The Semantics Latent in Shannon Information. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*. Volume 70. Issue 1, 103-125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axx029>
- Jenkins, Katharine. (2016) Amelioration and Inclusion: Gender Identity and the Concept of Woman. *Ethics*. Volume 126. Issue 2, 394–421. <https://doi.org/10.1086/683535>
- Khmil, Volodymyr and Olexandr Korkh. (2017) The Concept of Self-determination in the Philosophy of the Enlightenment. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. Volume 11, 127-134.
- Kolinko, Maryna. (2018) Metodolohichnyy potentsial kontseptsiiy domestykatsiyy. *Skhid. Analitychno-informatsiynny zhurnal*. Issue 5 (157), 47–51. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2018.5\(157\).148996](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2018.5(157).148996)
- Kozachynska, Viktoriya. (2017) Subjectivity: the disjunction of heterogenous views (philosophical and anthropological dimension). Dissertation abstract on specility 09.00.04. Kharkiv.
- Kozachynska, Viktoriya. (2016) Subjectivity: the disjunction of heterogenous views (philosophical and anthropological dimension). Kyiv: NPU named after M. P. Drahomanov Publishing centre, 2016.
- Marotta, Vince. (2012) Georg Simmel, the Stranger and the Sociology of Knowledge. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. Volume 33, 675–689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2012.739136>
- Minsky, Marvin. (1985) Communication with Alien Intelligence. *Extraterrestrials: Science and Alien Intelligence* (Edward Regis, Ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 117–132.
- Mogensen, Andreas. (2019) Racial Profiling And Cumulative Injustice. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Volume 98. Issue 2, 452–477. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12451>
- Nikolko, Milana and Yelena Gritsay. (2008) The Other marking: Ukrainian in the Independence period. The Crossroads. *Journal for East European boundary research*. Vilnius:European Humanitarian University. Issue 2-4, 48-56.
- Palaguta, Vadim. (2010) Self-Identity of the social subject in the discourse practices: monograph. Dnepropetrovsk: “Innovatsiya”.
- Polishchuk, Oleksandr, Galyna Buchkivska, and Liudmyla Pavlishena. (2018) The Metaphor of Dialogue: Philosophical Conceptualization and Implementation to Social and Learning Practice. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 20, 2018: 120-127. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/20/11>

- Schönherr, Julius, and Evan Westra. (2019) Beyond 'Interaction': How to Understand Social Effects on Social Cognition. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*. Volume 70. Issue 1, 27-52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axx041>
- Seth, Lazar, and Lee-Stronach Chad. (2019) Axiological Absolutism and Risk. *Nous*. Volume 53, Issue 1, 97-113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12210>
- Sliwa, Paulina. (2017) Moral Understanding as Knowing Right from Wrong. *Ethics*. Volume 127. Issue 3, 521-552. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690011>
- Valdenfels, Bernhard. (2019) The own and foreign culture. The paradox of Alien science. Available at: <http://anthropology.rinet.ru/old/6/wald.htm>. Last accessed: 16. 03. 2019.
- Ward, Steven. (2019) Logics of stratified identity management in world politics. *International Theory*. Volume 11. Issue 2, 211-238. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175297191800026X>
- Wilkenfeld, Daniel A. (2018) Understanding as compression. *Philosophical Studies*. 2018: 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-018-1152-1>.
- Simmel, Georg. (2008) The survey on the Other. *Sociological theory: history, modernity, perspectives*. Sociological review journal Almanac. Sankt-Peterburg, 9-14.