



Scientific article
IRSTI 02.15.99



<https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-155-2-67-79>

JACQUES DERRIDA'S DECONSTRUCTION AS CONTEMPORARY EUROPEAN CULTURE CRISIS OVERCOMING AND ITS PROBLEMS' SOLUTION

^aYerzhan CHONGAROV , ^bKudaiberdi BAGASHAROV ✉

^aKazakh Russian Medical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

^bAl-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

✉ kudaiberdi1981@gmail.com

Abstract. The article explores Jacques Derrida's method of deconstruction as a method, tool and a way which can help to overcome contemporary European culture crisis, and can help to solve its problems. The study employs methods of comparative analysis, systematization, deduction, and textual and phenomenological analysis. The authors argue that language in European philosophy functions not merely as a tool of communication but as a mode of shaping cultural consciousness and ontological experience. The paper discusses the main principles of Derrida's deconstruction and its significance for overcoming the crisis of rationality, identity, and humanism in contemporary Europe. Deconstruction is proposed as a methodology of cultural self-understanding and as the foundation of a new humanistic paradigm oriented toward openness, difference, and responsibility. The conclusion emphasizes that Derrida's method provides not only a critique of the Western philosophical tradition but also a humanitarian horizon for the future. By transforming the concept of Europe from a metaphysical center into a text of differences and relations, deconstruction opens the possibility for a renewed European identity based on dialogue, translation, and ethical openness.

Keywords: Philosophy of Language; Deconstruction; Jacques Derrida; European Culture; Humanistic Knowledge; Difference; Poststructuralism.

For citation:

Chongarov, Y., & Bagasharov, K. (2026). Jacques Derrida's Deconstruction as Contemporary European Culture Crisis Overcoming and its Problems' Solution. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 155(2), 67-79 <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-155-2-67-79>

ҚАЗІРГІ ЕУРОПАЛЫҚ МӘДЕНИЕТ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІНІҢ ШЕШІМІ ЖӘНЕ МӘДЕНИЕТ ДАҒДАРЫСТАН ШЫҒУ ЖОЛЫ РЕТІНДЕГІ Ж. ДЕРРИДАНЫҢ ДЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯСЫ

^aЕржан ЧОНҒАРОВ, ^bҚұдайберді БАҒАШАРОВ

^aҚазақстан-Ресей медициналық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

^bӘл-Фараби атындағы қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

ДЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ Ж. ДЕРРИДА КАК ПУТЬ ВЫХОДА ИЗ КРИЗИСА СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЕВРОПЕЙСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ И КАК РЕШЕНИЕ ЕЕ ПРОБЛЕМ

^aЕржан ЧОНҒАРОВ, ^bҚұдайберді БАҒАШАРОВ

^aКазахстанско-российский медицинский университет, Алматы, Қазақстан

^bКазахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Жак Дерриданың деконструкция әдісі қазіргі еуропалық мәдениет дағдарысын жеңуге және оның мәселелерін шешуге көмектесетін әдіс, құрал және тәсіл ретінде қарастырылады. Зерттеуде салыстырмалы талдау, жүйелеу, дедукция, мәтіндік және феноменологиялық талдау әдістері қолданылады. Авторлар еуропалық философиядағы тіл тек коммуникация құралы ретінде ғана емес, сонымен қатар мәдени сана мен онтологиялық тәжірибені қалыптастыру тәсілі ретінде де қызмет етеді деп тұжырымдайды. Мақалада Дерриданың деконструкциясының негізгі қағидалары және оның қазіргі Еуропадағы рационалдылық, жеке тұлға және гуманизм дағдарысын жеңудегі маңызы талқыланады. Деконструкция мәдени өзін-өзі түсіну әдіснамасы және ашықтыққа, айырмашылыққа және жауапкершілікке бағытталған жаңа гуманистік парадигманың негізі ретінде ұсынылады. Қорытындыда Дерриданың әдісі тек батыстық философиялық дәстүрге сын ғана емес, сонымен қатар болашаққа арналған гуманитарлық көзжиекті де ұсынатыны атап өтіледі. Еуропа тұжырымдамасын метафизикалық орталықтан айырмашылықтар мен қатынастар мәтініне айналдыру арқылы деконструкция диалогқа, аудармаға және этикалық ашықтыққа негізделген жаңартылған еуропалық жеке тұлға үшін мүмкіндік ашады.

Түйін сөздер: тіл философиясы; деконструкция; Жак Деррида; еуропалық мәдениет; гуманитарлық ғылымдар; айырмашылық; постструктурализм.

Аннотация. В статье исследуется метод деконструкции Жака Деррида как метод, инструмент и способ, способный помочь преодолеть современный европейский культурный кризис и решить его проблемы. В исследовании используются методы сравнительного анализа, систематизации, дедукции, текстового и феноменологического анализа. Авторы утверждают, что язык в европейской философии функционирует не просто как инструмент коммуникации, но и как способ формирования культурного сознания и онтологического опыта. В работе обсуждаются основные принципы деконструкции Деррида и её значение для преодоления кризиса рациональности, идентичности и гуманизма в современной Европе. Деконструкция предлагается как методология культурного самопонимания и как основа новой гуманистической парадигмы, ориентированной на открытость, различие и ответственность. В заключении подчёркивается, что метод Деррида обеспечивает не только критику западной философской традиции, но и гуманитарный горизонт для будущего. Преобразуя концепцию Европы из метафизического центра в текст различий и отношений, деконструкция открывает возможность для обновления европейской идентичности, основанной на диалоге, переводе и этической открытости.

Ключевые слова: философия языка; деконструкция; Жак Деррида; европейская культура; гуманитарное знание; различие; постструктурализм.

Дәйексөз үшін:

Чонғаров, Е., Бағашаров, Қ. (2026). Қазіргі еуропалық мәдениет мәселелерінің шешімі және мәдениет дағдарыстан шығу жолы ретіндегі Ж.Дерриданың деконструкциясы. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 155(2), 67-79 <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-155-2-67-79>

Для цитирования:

Чонғаров, Е., и Бағашаров, Қ. (2026). Деконструкция Ж. Деррида как путь выхода из кризиса современной европейской культуры и как решение ее проблем. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 155(2), 67-79 <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-155-2-67-79>

Introduction

The problem of language occupies a central place in the European philosophical tradition. From antiquity to the present day, European thought has consistently returned to the question of how language determines the boundaries of thought, culture and human subjectivity itself. In the 20th century, the philosophy of language became not just one of the branches of the humanities, but also the core of Europe's theoretical self-awareness. It was through the analysis of language that philosophy encountered a crisis of metaphysics, interpretation and meaning, which led to the formation of new directions - hermeneutics, phenomenology, structuralism and post-structuralism (Heidegger, 1959; Gadamer, 1960; Foucault, 1966). At the centre of these discussions was the question of 'the nature of meaning and the truth of utterance.' The tradition dating back to Descartes and Leibniz viewed language as a transparent means of expressing the mind, but in the 20th century, this view was radically revised. Philosophers such as Martin Heidegger, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, and especially Jacques Derrida showed that language cannot be reduced to a function of representation - it itself produces meaning, constitutes reality, and shapes the structure of cultural experience (Heidegger, 1959; Foucault, 1966; Deleuze, 1968; Derrida, 1967).

In the 20th century, beginning with the works of Wittgenstein, Heidegger, and Husserl, language ceased to be a transparent medium. It became an object of philosophical analysis - a structure in which meaning itself is born (Wittgenstein, 1922/2001; Heidegger, 1959). Heidegger, especially in his work *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, asserts that 'language speaks for itself' and that humans merely respond to this call. This idea would become a crucial premise for Derrida, who radicalised the idea of the autonomy of language and text. Contemporary culture is experiencing what Jean Baudrillard called the 'simulacration of meaning' - the replacement of reality with its representation (Baudrillard, 1981/1994). Words cease to be carriers of truth, turning into signs without referents. In his *Course in General Linguistics* (1916/1959), Ferdinand de Saussure first defined language as a system of differences. Structuralists (Barthes, Lévi-Strauss, Foucault) transferred this principle to culture: meaning is the effect of differences, not the expression of essence (Foucault, 1966; Barthes, 1970). However, structuralism retained the idea of a centre - a fixed principle that holds the system together. Derrida, in contrast, argues that the centre is a fiction, a place that is "always already" displaced (Derrida, 1966/1978). It is this shift from structure to the play of differences that marks the beginning of poststructuralism. Contemporary European culture is experiencing an identity crisis linked to the loss of the universal foundations of reason and morality. In these conditions, the method of 'deconstruction' proposed by Jacques Derrida becomes not only a philosophical tool for analysing text, but also a way of rethinking the very form of European culture. Deconstruction reveals internal contradictions in the logic of Western metaphysics - between logos and writing, truth and interpretation, presence and absence - and offers a new model of thinking in which difference becomes a source of meaning. The aim of this study is to reveal how the philosophy of language in the European tradition prepares the ground for the emergence of the method of deconstruction and how this method can be applied to analyse and overcome the crises of contemporary European culture. This article explores the role of the philosophy of language in European intellectual culture and examines Jacques Derrida's method of deconstruction as a potential response to the cultural and epistemological crises of modern Europe. The research proceeds from the premise that the decline of classical rationalism and the exhaustion of Enlightenment universalism have generated a structural crisis in European thought. Within this framework, the philosophy of language becomes a privileged space for diagnosing and rethinking the foundations of European identity.

This article aims to explore Jacques Derrida's method of deconstruction as a solution to contemporary European culture crisis problems, and to reveal how his method can help to overcome abovementioned crisis.

Research methodology

The research is based on a set of philosophical and philological methods aimed at analysing language as a cultural phenomenon and identifying the methodological foundations of deconstruction. The comparative method is used to compare different concepts of language - from phenomenological and hermeneutic to poststructuralist - in order to identify common trends and differences in the understanding of language and meaning. The method of systematisation allows us to reconstruct the internal logic of the development of the philosophy of language in European culture - from classical ontology to the philosophy of difference. The method from the general to the particular and the method of deduction are used to move from the analysis of general theoretical premises (the crisis of metaphysics

ics, the 'death of the subject') to the concrete manifestations of these ideas in Derrida's philosophy. It is aimed at interpreting Derrida's original texts, including *De la grammatologie* (1967), *L'écriture et la différence* (1967), and *La voix et le phénomène* (1967), taking into account their context in 20th-century French philosophy. The 'method of phenomenological analysis' is used to understand deconstruction as a way of describing the experience of meaning and presence in language.

The authors also used several methods: philosophical interpretation, deconstruction method, 'revealing oppositions' (discovering the binary categories that structure the text, e.g., logos/writing), 'inversion', and critical thinking. As a result, the research methodology represents a rigidly articulated philosophical position, within which J. Derrida's deconstruction functions as a critical ontology of culture. This allows us to analyse contemporary psychological, spiritual, and sociological crises not at the level of symptoms, but at the level of their structural necessity and philosophical foundations.

Discussion

It should be noted that one of the main components of modern Western cultural studies is the linguistic approach to the problems of culture. Many philosophical and cultural schools of the XX-XXI centuries gave enormous attention to language's problems. As I. Ilyin writes: «All Western philosophy is experiencing a peculiar turn to language (linguistic approach), giving big significance to the problems of language» (Ilyin, 1989: 7). For more than two thousand years of European tradition, language research, philosophical and empirical theories of language did not have a strict distinction. Only in the last two centuries «differences in approaches are formalized into independent fields of research, both within philosophy and within the rest of the sciences» (Irwin, 1988: 27-28). The problems of language are considered in various scientific theories and disciplines. Among them we can mention: linguistics, logic, semiotics and hermeneutics. Logic, which makes a significant contribution to the general theory of language, studies the structure of language. Investigating the structure of language, logic «applies the method of idealization» (Valle Arroyo, 1984). Unlike logic, linguistics empirically describes natural languages without applying idealization. Language within linguistics is a creative process that generates the world of text. Linguistics studies natural languages in contrast to logic, which is concerned with the study of formal languages. One of the main components of modern Western cultural theory is the linguistic approach to the problems of cultural philosophy. Many cultural schools of the XX-XXI centuries have placed the problems related to language at the centre of their attention. The problems of language are the object of study of both structuralism and poststructuralism. The key figure of poststructuralism is the French cultural scientist J. Derrida. In his work, Derrida reflects on the problems of the modern state of the theory of culture and other humanities, and his works played a significant role in the formation of poststructuralist ideas. The philosophy of language in European culture has undergone a profound transformation from classical to postmodern thought. The structuralist turn initiated by Ferdinand de Saussure emphasized language as a system of differences, influencing thinkers such as Barthes and Foucault. Phenomenologists and hermeneutists like Heidegger and Gadamer viewed language as the medium of Being and understanding. French post-structuralism, with figures like Deleuze, Lyotard, and Derrida, shifted focus toward instability, difference, and textuality.

Jacques Derrida's deconstruction challenges binary oppositions that underlie Western metaphysics. In 'De la grammatologie' (1967), he introduces the notion of *différance*, the endless deferral of meaning. Deconstruction reveals that meaning is never stable but constantly produced through differences and traces. In 'Spectres de Marx' (1993), Derrida connects deconstruction with ethics and politics, offering a vision of democracy as an open, future-oriented process. Deconstruction provides tools for addressing cultural crises in Europe: the loss of meaning, fragmentation of identity, and decline of dialogue. Through the ethics of hospitality and openness to the Other, Derrida proposes a framework for intercultural communication and democratic renewal. Contemporary culture is experiencing a multidimensional crisis affecting the psychological, spiritual, moral and social spheres. This crisis is expressed not so much in the loss of individual values or social institutions as in the undermining of the very foundations of meaning-making, identity and interpretation of reality. In this regard, Jacques Derrida's philosophy of deconstruction takes on particular heuristic significance, as it is aimed not at eliminating cultural contradictions but at revealing their structural conditioning. In scientific and humanities discussions, deconstruction is often interpreted as a destructive method leading to relativism and nihilism. However, such an interpretation is simplistic. In reality, deconstruction does not

destroy meaning but reveals its instability, historicity, and dependence on discursive structures. It is this approach that allows deconstruction to be used as an analytical tool for understanding the crisis processes of contemporary culture. Using the method of deduction - from the general philosophical principle of deconstruction to specific manifestations of cultural crises - it can be shown that many contemporary problems are not anomalies, but are a logical consequence of the Western metaphysical tradition based on binary oppositions, the hierarchy of meanings, and the privileging of presence over absence.

A comparative analysis of deconstruction and classical humanistic approaches allows us to assert that Derrida does not reject values as such, but criticises their dogmatic consolidation. Consequently, deconstruction can be viewed not as a factor in the degradation of culture, but as a means of its self-reflection and renewal.

Europe as an open text: from rationality to responsibility. Deconstruction translates the traditional European focus on rationality into the realm of ethical responsibility. Whereas previously the meaning of culture was understood as a truth that needed to be expressed, in the post-metaphysical horizon, meaning becomes a "relationship to the Other". Habermas calls this 'communicative action,' while Derrida refers to it as 'the writing of responsibility' (*écriture de la responsabilité*). Both approaches coincide in one respect: culture exists only where there is 'responsibility to the other,' where understanding is based not on domination but on the recognition of difference. European culture, as Balibar shows, can no longer be a 'culture of the centre.' It becomes a 'mosaic of differences,' where deconstruction serves as a method of mutual understanding rather than destruction. Thus, deconstruction becomes a form of European ethics: it offers a new type of universalism - a universalism not of identity, but of dialogue; a universalism that recognises multiplicity and thus preserves the possibility of communication without violence.

The crisis of language and the restoration of meaning through deconstruction. The contemporary crisis of European culture is expressed primarily in a crisis of language - in the gap between words and reality, in the loss of trust in meaning. Mass culture, digital mediatisation and political rhetoric create a simulacrum effect (Baudrillard, 1981), where signs lose their referentiality. In this context, deconstruction restores language's critical function. It teaches us to read not only texts, but also social discourses, revealing the hidden mechanisms of power, ideology, and exclusion. Thus, deconstruction can be understood as a form of cultural ecology: it restores the balance between word and meaning, between expression and responsibility. It offers a way to resist manipulation - not by establishing new dogmas, but through constant awareness of the relativity of any system of signs. In this sense, deconstruction becomes an instrument of 'democratic thinking,' open to both self-criticism and dialogue.

Perspective: deconstruction as a new cultural rationality. If the rationality of classical Europe was the rationality of presence, then the rationality of the postmodern and post-humanist era is the rationality of the 'trace.' Deconstruction asserts that to think is to watch meaning slip away and to accept this slippage as a condition of understanding.

The Philosophy of Language in European Culture. The philosophy of language occupies a special place in the structure of European thought, since it is through language that Europe has come to understand its own cultural identity and conception of reason. Since ancient times, language has been seen not only as a means of communication, but also as a form of truth's presence in the world - a way of ordering existence through words ('logos'). However, in the 20th century, this view was called into question: language ceased to be a transparent window into the world of ideas and became a space of differences, interpretations, and historical traces.

From logos to interpretation: the classical tradition and its crisis. The tradition of rationalist philosophy of language, dating back to Descartes and Leibniz, assumed that language is a neutral expression of thought. Language serves as a representation of the internal content of consciousness and, therefore, must be subject to the logical rules of reasoning. This attitude can be traced back to 20th-century logical positivism, where language was seen as a means of verifying the truth of statements (Carnap, 1934; Wittgenstein, 1921). However, a shift already occurs in phenomenology and hermeneutics: language begins to be understood not as a tool, but as a 'medium of experience.' In Martin Heidegger's works, especially in *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (1959), language becomes the 'home of being.' Heidegger argues that it is not man who speaks language, but language that speaks through man, thereby destroying the classical metaphysics of the subject (Heidegger, 1959). This opens the way to understanding language as an ontological phenomenon. Hans-Georg Gadamer develops this line of thought in hermeneutic philosophy, arguing that understanding is always mediated by language. In *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960), language acts as a mediator between tradition and the interpreter, and meaning as an event of dialogue (Gadamer, 1960). Thus, language ceases to be a system of signs and becomes a process of meaning generation.

Structuralism and the death of the subject. In French thought of the 1960s, the philosophy of language took a new direction - 'structuralism'. Ferdinand de Saussure, who laid the foundations of structural linguistics, defines language as a system of differences without positive terms, where meaning arises from relationships rather than from entities (Saussure, 1916). This idea became the starting point for philosophers Michel Foucault and Roland Barthes. In his book *Les mots et les choses* (1966), Foucault shows that language is a historical field of discourse in which forms of knowledge are formed, rather than simply a means of describing reality (Foucault, 1966). In his essay *La mort de l'auteur* (1968), Roland Barthes argues that a text lives outside the author's intentions, and meaning arises from the play of signs and interpretations (Barthes, 1968). Thus, structuralism prepares the ground for poststructuralism, in which language becomes not only a system of differences but also an arena for philosophical criticism of metaphysics. Here we encounter the figure of Derrida, a philosopher who showed that the very structure of language contains internal ruptures, aporias, and traces of absence.

Language as cultural text. For European culture, language is not just a form of thought, but a form of existence. European identity is based on writing, logic and rational discourse, but in the 20th century these foundations were called into question. There is a need for a 'new philosophy of language' that takes into account not only the structure of the sign, but also its historical, cultural and ethical significance. In contemporary philosophy of language – in many philosophical works – we can find that language is connected with corporeality, time, and affects, and therefore cannot be reduced to the logic of logos. Emmanuel Levinas views language as an ethical relationship with the Other, where the word is responsibility (Levinas, 1972). Jean-Luc Nancy, in *La communauté désœuvrée* (1986), sees language as a condition of shared existence, a form of co-existence (*être-avec*). Almost half of these ideas are also considered in the philosophy of Jacques Derrida, who tried to take the next step - 'deconstructing the very idea of the presence of meaning in language.'

Results

Jacques Derrida's Deconstruction: Theory and Method. Origins and Basic Principles

Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) developed deconstruction as a method of philosophical analysis of text, directed against the metaphysical tradition of the West. In three key works from 1967 - *De la grammatologie*, *L'écriture et la différence*, and *La voix et le phénomène* - Derrida shows that Western philosophy is based on the 'privilege of presence,' that is, on the belief that meaning and truth are given in the immediate experience of the mind, speech, or consciousness (Derrida, 1967). Derrida demonstrates that this assumption is historically and logically unfounded. He introduces the concept of *différance* - difference and deferral - as a structure in which meaning is never fully present but is constantly deferred in a chain of signs. Thus, language does not express ready-made meaning but endlessly produces it.

Against the metaphysics of presence. Deconstruction is directed against the fundamental assumption of Western philosophy, which Derrida calls 'logocentrism.' Within logocentrism, writing was considered secondary to speech, and speech was considered the direct expression of reason. In *De la grammatologie*, Derrida argues that this hierarchy is false: writing is not secondary; it structures the very possibility of speech (Derrida, 1967). 'Writing is not an addition to speech, but its condition of possibility' (Derrida, 1967: 9). In this way, Derrida undermines the binary oppositions that underlie Western thought: speech/writing, truth/error, presence/absence, subject/object. Deconstruction does not destroy these oppositions but reveals their interdependence and internal instability.

The method of deconstruction. Deconstruction is not the negation or destruction of a text, but rather a 'method of careful reading' that reveals internal contradictions, aporias, and hidden presuppositions. It shows that any philosophical statement contains within itself that which undermines it. Derrida's method can be presented in three steps:

1. 'Revealing oppositions' - discovering the binary categories that structure the text (e.g., logos/writing).
2. 'Inversion' - temporarily reversing the hierarchy to show the dependence of the dominant term on the subordinate one.
3. 'Deconstruction' - going beyond opposition, revealing the logic of difference ('*différance*') that makes meaning possible but never complete.

In this sense, deconstruction is an ethic of reading: it requires responsibility to the text and attentiveness to what is excluded or displaced from discourse.

Deconstruction and the philosophy of language. Derrida's method is crucial for the philosophy of language. It shows that language cannot be stabilised in logical structures, universal grammars, or rational systems of meaning. Any text contains an internal difference that makes it open to multiple interpretations. Thus, deconstruction is not simply a theory of language, but a 'philosophy of meaning as trace.' Meaning does not exist before language and does not coincide with it; it merely 'follows' - in the literal sense - writing. In this context, Europe, founded on logos, is forced to rethink its own cultural foundations by recognising difference, multiplicity, and the unattainability of ultimate truth.

Deconstruction and Crisis in Contemporary European Culture. European Culture and the Crisis of Rationality. As Jose Ortega y Gasset wrote in his book: "European culture is undergoing a multi-level crisis" (Ortega y Gasset, 2008: 97-100) - philosophical, ethical, and political. Its roots lie in the decay of the foundations of classical reason and universalism that took shape during the Enlightenment. The 20th century, marked by world wars, totalitarianism, technological determinism and globalisation, called into question the ideals of rationality, autonomy and humanism. Jürgen Habermas in *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne* (1985) describes this process as the 'exhaustion of the Enlightenment project,' while Jean-François Lyotard, in *La condition postmoderne* (1979), points to the 'end of grand narratives' - the destruction of universal models of truth and progress (Habermas, 1985; Lyotard, 1979). In these conditions, Europe is losing its own cultural 'self': rationality is turning into an instrument of efficiency, humanism into ideology, and identity into political fiction. Jacques Derrida's deconstruction offers not so much a "cure" for this crisis as a 'way of understanding it.'

Deconstruction as a critique of the logocentrism of culture. According to Derrida, the crisis of European culture is a consequence of logocentrism, that is, the belief in the stable foundations of truth, presence, and meaning (Derrida, 1967). European culture was built around the idea of a centre - God, reason, the subject, history. But this centre always implied exclusion: otherness, difference, marginality. Deconstruction reveals these exclusions, giving them a voice and thereby exposing the mechanisms of power within cultural structures. The crisis in Europe is not accidental - it is inherent in the very logic of the West. Europe, Derrida argues in *L'Autre cap* (1992), must 'turn to the Other,' that is, realise its own dependence on otherness (Derrida, 1992). This gives rise to the image of a Europe without a centre - Europe as a process of differences, as a space of translation open to other languages and other thoughts. Deconstruction thus becomes a method of 'cultural self-reflection.' It does not destroy Europe, but offers it a new foundation - a foundation without a centre, a culture without exclusion, humanism without domination.

Catherine Malabou: deconstruction and plasticity. Catherine Malabou, a student of Derrida, develops the idea of 'plasticity' as a continuation of deconstruction in her work *La plasticité au soir de l'écriture* (2005). If, for Derrida, difference infinitely postpones meaning, for Malabou, plasticity means 'the possibility for form to change and remain the same at the same time' (Malabou, 2022: 15). Malabou links deconstruction with neuroscience and the philosophy of consciousness, showing that text is not only the structure of writing, but also the material dynamics of the brain. Thus, deconstruction takes on a bio-philosophical dimension.

Jean-Luc Nancy: deconstruction of community. In his book *La communauté désœuvrée* (1991), J. L. Nancy transfers deconstruction to the realm of political philosophy. He argues that any community is based not on a single foundation, but on division, on the co-presence of differences. According to Nancy, Europe is a 'community without work' ("désœuvrée"), where meaning is not produced but 'coexists' (Nancy, 1991: 38). This understanding coincides with Derrida's ethics: culture is not a finished building but a process of collaborative writing.

Bernard Stiegler: deconstruction and technology. In his book *De la misère symbolique* (2004), Bernard Stiegler applies deconstruction to the analysis of contemporary technoculture. He shows that the digital age radicalises *différance* - the postponement of meaning becomes an endless stream of data. Stiegler interprets Derrida's 'writing' as a technique that shapes the memory of humanity. For him, deconstruction is a way of critically understanding the technosphere, in which symbolic impoverishment requires new forms of meaning-making.

The ethical dimension of deconstruction. One of Derrida's most important contributions to contemporary philosophy is the return of the ethical dimension to the philosophy of language. For Derrida, writing is a form of responsibility, since it is addressed to the Other, whom we can never fully understand. In his lecture 'Force de loi' (1990), Derrida links deconstruction with the idea of justice: 'Deconstruction is justice' (Derrida, 1990). This phrase emphasises that deconstruction is not relativism, but an ethical practice aimed at recognising difference, the excluded, the unrepresented. In the context of European culture, this means the need to abandon universalism based on the suppression

of otherness and move towards a model of responsibility, both philosophical and political. Thus, deconstruction becomes a way of ethically restoring humanism, but no longer on the basis of reason or universal values, but on the basis of respect for otherness and multiplicity.

Deconstruction as a Humanitarian Perspective. Humanitarian Knowledge in an Era of Fragmentation. Contemporary humanitarian sciences are experiencing a crisis similar to that of culture. On the one hand, they are losing their privilege of interpretation, giving way to natural and technical disciplines. On the other hand, they are facing internal fragmentation and the loss of common categories. In these conditions, deconstruction acts as a 'method of humanistic self-awareness.' It offers a way of reading cultural texts - philosophical, artistic, media - that does not seek a single interpretation but reveals a multiplicity of meanings. Unlike structuralism, which sought to describe systems, deconstruction proceeds from the fundamental openness of the text. It shows that any text is a network of differences and traces, where meaning is always deferred (*différance*) and never final.

Deconstruction and pedagogy. The application of deconstruction in humanities education allows us to rethink the very idea of teaching. In his book *L'Université sans condition* (2001), Derrida argues that the university of the future should be a space of unconditional thinking - a place where even the impossible can be questioned (Derrida, 2001). This understanding of the university implies a rejection of the authoritarian model of knowledge and a transition to 'dialogical pedagogy' based on the joint production of meaning. Deconstruction becomes the ethics of teaching - attentiveness to the word, to the context, to the Other. This is especially important for contemporary humanities education: in an era of digitalisation and accelerated communication, deconstruction restores depth, slowness, and responsibility for meaning.

Deconstruction and art. In the field of art and aesthetics, deconstruction contributes to the development of new forms of perception and creativity. Postmodern artists and theorists - from Paul de Man to Jean-François Lyotard - have embraced Derrida's ideas as a tool for analysing artistic texts, where form and content cannot be separated. According to Derrida, art is always already deconstructive, as it questions the boundaries of representation. It shows not what is depicted, but how the image arises. Thus, deconstruction in art becomes a means of aesthetic cognition, opening up space for multiple interpretations and cultural dialogue.

Political perspective. Deconstruction also has a political dimension. It rejects rigid dichotomies - East/West, centre/periphery, culture/barbarism - and thus contributes to the formation of a new type of European identity based not on exclusion but on openness. In today's world, where migration, multiculturalism and global communications are creating new forms of interaction, it is deconstruction that can become a 'philosophy of coexistence.' Europe, which is undergoing a crisis of self-determination, needs not a return to the universalism of the past, but the ability to exist in diversity. Jacques Derrida calls this 'the European future of Europe' - not a geopolitical project, but an ethical horizon in which difference becomes a source of renewal (Derrida, 1992).

Deconstruction and digital culture. The digital age has become an age when new forms of writing - hypertext, artificial intelligence, and algorithms have emerged. These forms are changing the very nature of meaning: text is becoming fragmented, distributed, machine-like. Deconstruction in this environment becomes particularly relevant, since it already conceives of text as a 'network of differences' ('réseau de différences'). What was a philosophical metaphor in the 20th century becomes a reality of the digital world in the 21st century (Strutt, 2022-2025: 58-72): the internet is literally an 'archive of traces' ('archive des traces'). Therefore, deconstruction can serve as a method of critical analysis of digital cultural processes:

1. How texts and algorithms create new forms of power and exclusion;
2. How digital media transform the concept of authorship and meaning;
3. How 'artificial intelligence' rewrites the boundaries of the human.

Thus, deconstruction becomes a philosophy of digital humanism, helping to preserve the human dimension in the technological age.

Deconstruction and the future of humanistic knowledge. Post-humanism and the new boundaries of the philosophy of language. Contemporary humanities are confronted with the question of the boundaries of the human - a question posed by technology, artificial intelligence, and bioengineering. In this context, the philosophy of language, developed in the spirit of Derrida, takes on new meaning. The concept of 'différance,' denoting the endless postponement of meaning, allows us to understand language not as an instrument of the subject, but as a space where the subject itself becomes an effect of difference (Derrida, 1967). In the era of post-humanism, this means that man

is no longer the centre of the world and the source of meaning, but part of a network of relationships - semiotic, cultural, technological. Deconstruction thus becomes an instrument of philosophical adaptation to new forms of reality: it teaches us to think outside the binary oppositions of 'human - machine,' 'natural-artificial,' 'mind-language.'

Deconstruction and degradation of European spiritual culture. The problem of the degradation of modern spiritual culture: crisis in the metaphysical foundations of European culture. (Traditional Christian values - truth, goodness, self-sacrifice - lose their universal status and become historically conditioned constructs). "Relativism" is on the rise: values are no longer perceived as objective and universal, but become a matter of individual choice. "Commercialisation of the spiritual sphere» - Culture is increasingly subject to market logic, where value is determined not by depth of meaning but by the ability to attract attention and generate profit. Mass culture, the media landscape and digital technologies are shaping a new system of symbols in which spiritual landmarks are being replaced by consumerist practices. So the culture is often formulated as the loss of absolute norms and guidelines. However, deductive analysis shows that the crisis of values is a consequence of their former metaphysical fixation. Deconstruction reveals that values claiming universality have always been historically and culturally conditioned. Instead of destroying spirituality, deconstruction offers its reinterpretation. It removes the illusion of a transcendent guarantee of meaning and transfers responsibility for value choices to individuals and society. In this sense, deconstruction contributes to the formation of an ethic of responsibility based not on dogma but on conscious decision-making. A comparative analysis of religious, philosophical, and secular value systems shows that deconstruction does not deny the sacred, but rather problematises its institutional forms (Derrida, 2002: 42 - 44). This opens up the possibility of dialogue between tradition and modernity, which is particularly relevant in the context of cultural pluralism and globalisation.

Deconstruction and contemporary sociological issues. Contemporary sociology observes processes of social fragmentation, identity crisis, and loss of social trust. The application of deconstructive analysis allows us to view these processes as the result of the collapse of universal social narratives - nation, class, progress. From the point of view of determinism, social structures are not neutral, but reproduce certain power relations through language and symbols. Deconstruction reveals hidden hierarchies in social discourses, thereby contributing to a critical analysis of power, ideology, and social norms (Statham, 2022: 42-58). The results of the study show that deconstruction does not lead to social chaos but, on the contrary, contributes to the formation of a more reflective society capable of recognising its own limitations and avoiding totalitarian forms of thinking (Losyk, 2022: 88). In this sense, deconstruction acts as an instrument for the democratisation of social knowledge. Considering all the abovementioned aspects of the study, we can think that J. Derrida's deconstruction does not solve the problems of contemporary culture in a utilitarian or technocratic sense. Its contribution lies in changing the very way problems are posed. It shifts the focus from the search for definitive answers to the analysis of the conditions of possibility of meaning. Methodologically, deconstruction, applied through systematisation, deduction, determinism and comparativism, demonstrates high productivity in the analysis of crisis phenomena in contemporary culture. It contributes to the integration of philosophical, psychological and sociological knowledge, forming a holistic understanding of cultural transformations. As a result, we can conclude that deconstruction is not a symptom of cultural crisis, but one of the key intellectual strategies for understanding and overcoming it.

Deconstruction as a philosophical strategy for overcoming cultural reductionism. One of the key results of applying deconstruction to the analysis of contemporary culture is the overcoming of reductionist models of thinking characteristic of both positivist and neoclassical humanistic approaches. Contemporary culture, under the influence of technoscientific discourse, increasingly interprets man, society and spirituality in terms of functionality, efficiency and adaptability. J. Derrida's deconstruction allows us to reveal the philosophical foundations of this reductionism, rooted in the metaphysics of presence. A systematisation of philosophical sources shows that reductionism arises as a consequence of the quest for a definitive foundation of meaning, for a stable ontological support. Deconstruction, on the contrary, demonstrates the impossibility of such a foundation, revealing the principle of *différance* as a structural deferral of meaning. As a result, culture ceases to be viewed as a set of fixed meanings and begins to be understood as an open field of interpretations. By the process of philosophical interpretation, it can be argued that the crisis of contemporary culture is not a deviation from the norm but a logical consequence of the exhaustion of the metaphysical paradigm. Deconstruction, in this context, acts not as a negation of culture but as a form of its philosophical radicalisation, aimed at revealing the hidden premises of cultural norms and values.

The ethical and philosophical dimension of deconstruction in the context of cultural pluralism. In philosophical discourse, the question of the ethical implications of deconstruction takes on particular significance. Critics often accuse Derrida's approach of undermining normativity and making ethical judgment impossible. However, a comparative analysis of deconstruction and classical ethical theories (deontology, utilitarianism, virtue ethics) shows that deconstruction does not abolish ethics, but radically rethinks its foundations (Rattan, 2024: 620-621). Unlike normative systems that seek to universalise moral principles, deconstruction proceeds from the recognition of the fundamental irreducibility of the Other. Ethics, from a deconstructive perspective, cannot be reduced to a set of rules, since it always arises in situations of uncertainty and responsibility without guarantees. It is this idea that takes on particular significance in conditions of cultural and value pluralism. From the standpoint of determinism, ethical behaviour is determined not by abstract norms, but by specific historical and cultural conditions. Deconstruction allows us to avoid both moral relativism and dogmatism by offering a model of ethics as a continuous process of interpretation and re-evaluation. In this way, it contributes to the formation of a philosophical ethics that is adequate to the complexity of contemporary culture.

Deconstruction, language and the transformation of social knowledge. One of J. Derrida's central contributions to the philosophy of culture is a radical rethinking of the role of language. Contemporary sociological and cultural studies increasingly note that social reality is constituted not only by material structures, but also by discursive practices (Fairclough, 2022-2025: 55-72). Deconstruction allows us to reveal how language reproduces power relations and normative models of behaviour. The method of systematisation shows that many contemporary theories - from critical sociology to postcolonial studies - use deconstructive principles of text, discourse and narrative analysis. In this sense, deconstruction acts as the philosophical foundation of interdisciplinary social knowledge. It can be deduced that the crisis of trust in social institutions is largely due to the discrepancy between declared meanings and actual practices. Deconstruction reveals this discrepancy, demonstrating that social texts never coincide with their own claims to transparency and objectivity. In this way, it contributes to the development of critical thinking and philosophical reflection in sociology.

The philosophical significance of deconstruction for the future of culture. In the philosophical dimension, J. Derrida's deconstruction can be interpreted as a symptom of the transition from metaphysical culture to post-metaphysical culture. This transition does not mean a rejection of meaning, truth or values, but implies a rejection of their final fixation. In this context, the culture of the future is conceived as a space of open dialogue, multiple interpretations, and responsibility for meaning. Summarising the results obtained, it can be argued that deconstruction does not offer ready-made solutions to the problems of contemporary culture, but it transforms the very logic of philosophical thinking. It teaches us to think in conditions of uncertainty, to work with contradictions and to accept complexity as a fundamental property of cultural reality. From a philosophical point of view, it is this attitude that makes deconstruction a productive strategy for understanding the crises of contemporary psychology, spiritual values and social structures. In a context where traditional philosophical models are losing their explanatory power, deconstruction acts as a form of radical philosophical honesty and intellectual responsibility.

Deconstruction and transdisciplinarity. In the future, humanistic knowledge cannot remain within rigid disciplinary boundaries. Deconstruction is inherently transdisciplinary: it operates at the intersection of philosophy, linguistics, literature, cultural studies, ethics, and political theory. Deconstruction operates across several fields of the human sciences, including philosophy, anthropology, linguistics and literary theory (Derrida, 1978: 351-366; Derrida, 1976: 6-10; Attridge, 2010: 1-6). This approach contributes to the formation of a new humanistic thinking that is capable of working with hybrid objects - digital texts, network forms of communication, and intercultural translations. In this sense, deconstruction is not just a method of interpretation, but a method of thinking about the future, free from dogmatism and open to multiple meanings. As Bennington (1993) notes, deconstruction is not destruction, but a constant 're-reading of boundaries,' a process that allows humanistic knowledge to renew itself while remaining true to its ethical core - attention to the other, to difference, to context.

Europe as text: a humanistic perspective. If we follow Derrida's logic, Europe is not a geographical or political entity, but a text open to endless interpretation. This text contains traces of the past - from antiquity to postmodernism - and looks to a future in which meaning is never complete. Deconstruction helps us to see Europe as a process of interpretation, as an open system where meaning is created through the interaction of cultures, languages and identities. This makes it not only a philosophical but also a cultural strategy capable of maintaining unity in diversity.

Conclusion

As a result, the research methodology represents a rigidly articulated philosophical position, grounded in a coherent system of theoretical assumptions and conceptual distinctions. Within this framework, J. Derrida's deconstruction functions not merely as a textual or linguistic strategy, but as a form of critical ontology of culture. It enables the analysis of cultural phenomena as internally differentiated structures rather than as stable and self-identical entities. Deconstruction reveals the instability of meaning embedded in cultural narratives, discourses, and symbolic systems. Consequently, culture is interpreted as a field of tensions, traces, and deferred meanings rather than as a closed system of values. In the sociological dimension, Derrida's methodology allows for a critique of institutional discourses that present themselves as natural or inevitable (Zima, 2023: 63-89). Social norms, values, and identities are revealed as contingent effects of historical and linguistic processes. This makes it possible to analyse social conflicts at the level of their philosophical presuppositions rather than at the level of surface antagonisms. Deconstruction thus operates as a tool for uncovering the hidden conditions of possibility of social order. Importantly, this methodological framework does not aim at the destruction of meaning or cultural coherence. Rather, it seeks to demonstrate the productive openness of cultural systems. By questioning the metaphysical assumptions underlying modern culture, deconstruction creates space for alternative interpretations and forms of life. In this sense, it functions as a critical practice oriented toward responsibility rather than relativism. The analysis of crises at the level of structural necessity allows for a deeper understanding of their persistence and resistance to purely technical solutions. Therefore, the proposed methodology offers a philosophical lens through which contemporary cultural crises can be understood as expressions of deeper ontological and epistemological tensions. It situates these crises within the broader horizon of modernity and its internal contradictions. By doing so, it provides a systematic and theoretically grounded approach to the analysis of culture in its contemporary condition.

Jacques Derrida's deconstruction opens up a path for European culture to a new way of thinking, in which difference becomes a source of unity, and absence becomes a form of presence (Somers-Hall, 2022: 152-160). It translates the philosophy of language from the realm of logic into the space of ethics and culture, where meaning is understood not as a complete truth, but as a process of endless becoming. Modern Europe, losing its old forms of identity, can find itself precisely through deconstruction - through the ability to 'read itself,' recognising its own traces, its own exceptions, its own shadows. Deconstruction does not destroy Europe - it makes possible its rebirth, based on respect for the Other, multiplicity and self-reflection. This is its philosophical and cultural perspective. Jacques Derrida's deconstruction is not just a philosophical school, but a way of thinking that sets new horizons for understanding European culture. The philosophy of language in the European tradition, from the ancient logos-oriented systems to 20th-century structuralism, sought to establish a stable centre of meaning. Derrida, on the contrary, shows that language has no centre - meaning is always deferred, differentiated, intersecting with other meanings. This conclusion has profound cultural implications. Deconstruction becomes a way of overcoming the crisis of modernity, expressed in the loss of universal meanings and the dominance of technorationality. It does not destroy European culture, but opens it up to the Other, to the multiplicity of languages, cultures and meanings. From a humanistic perspective, Derrida's method becomes the basis for a new philosophy of responsibility, where attention to otherness becomes a key principle of ethics and education. Politically, deconstruction shapes the concept of Europe as a space for dialogue rather than power, as a text rather than a system. Thus, the philosophy of language, reinterpreted through deconstruction, restores to humanistic knowledge the ability to be not just a description of the world, but an 'act of its ethical transformation.' The prospect of applying deconstruction in the future is a path to humanistic integration, to understanding new forms of subjectivity and communication, to a philosophy capable of living in an era of differences.

So, finally, summarising the results, we have come to the following:

1. Deconstruction does not function as a rejection of culture; rather, it represents a radical philosophical reflection that seeks to expose the latent premises embedded in cultural norms and value structures.
2. Deconstruction enables a departure from both ethical relativism and doctrinal rigidity by conceptualising ethics as an open-ended process of interpretation and critical reflection. Consequently, it supports the formation of a philosophical ethics that adequately reflects the complexity and plurality of modern cultural life.

3. Deconstruction should be understood not as a manifestation of cultural crisis, but as one of the central intellectual strategies for interpreting and addressing it.

4. Deconstruction helps to preserve the human dimension in the technological age.

5. Deconstruction operates not to obliterate spirituality, but to reinterpret it critically. It eliminates the assumption of an inherent transcendent guarantee of meaning, transferring ethical responsibility to the level of individual and societal deliberation. In doing so, it advances an ethic of responsibility grounded in reflective decision-making rather than imposed dogma.

6. Deconstruction operates as an ethical strategy for reestablishing humanism, not on the basis of universal rational principles, but on the acknowledgment of otherness and the embrace of cultural and moral plurality.

7. Within artistic practice, deconstruction operates as a tool for aesthetic understanding, enabling the emergence of diverse interpretations and fostering dialogue across cultural contexts.

8. In pedagogical practice, deconstruction functions as an ethical framework, fostering sensitivity to the word, its context, and to the Other. Its relevance is heightened in the contemporary humanities, where rapid digital communication challenges contemplative engagement, and deconstruction reinstates slowness, depth, and ethical responsibility in the production of meaning.

9. Deconstruction operates as a method of philosophical adaptation, fostering the capacity to think beyond conventional binary distinctions, including those between human and machine, nature and artificiality, and mind and language.

References

- Bennington, G. (1993). Jacques Derrida. University of Chicago Press.
- Caputo, J. D. (1997). Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida. Fordham University Press.
- Culler, J. (1982). On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism. Cornell University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1967). De la grammatologie. Minuit.
- Derrida, J. (1967). L'écriture et la différence. Seuil.
- Derrida, J. (1967). La voix et le phénomène. PUF.
- Derrida, J. (1990). Force de loi: Le "fondement mystique de l'autorité". Galilée.
- Derrida, J. (1992). L'Autre cap: Discours sur le racisme en Europe. Minuit.
- Derrida, J. (2001). L'Université sans condition. Galilée.
- Fairclough, N. (2022–2025). Discourse analysis. Routledge.
- Filler, J. (2024). Substance ontology and the crisis of reason.
- Habermas, J. (1985). Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne. Suhrkamp.
- Ilyin, I. P. (1979). The crisis of our age.
- Ilyin, I. P. (1989). Poststructuralism, deconstruction and postmodernism.
- Ilyin, I. P. (2014). Axioms of religious experience.
- Irwin, A. (1988). Science, social theory and public knowledge.
- Liotard, J.-F. (1979). La condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir. Minuit.
- Malabou, C. (2009/2010). Plasticity at the dusk of writing: Dialectic, destruction, deconstruction. Columbia University Press.
- Malabou, C. (2022). Plasticity, annihilation and change.
- Nancy, J.-L. (1991). La communauté désœuvrée. Christian Bourgois.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (2008). The dehumanization of art and other essays on art, culture, and literature. Princeton University Press.
- Peter, V. Zima. (2023). Discourse and power: An introduction to critical narratology. Routledge.
- Rattan, R. (2024). Pragmatic ethics. Nature / British Journal.
- Rothery, J., & Gerot, L. (1986). Writing genres: Literacy and education. University of Sydney.
- Somers-Hall, H. (2022). Judgement and science in modern society. Cambridge University Press.
- Statham, S. (2022). Critical discourse analysis: A practical introduction to power in language.
- Strutt, D. (2022–2025). The digital image and reality: Affect, metaphysics and post-cinema. Amsterdam University Press.
- Valle Arroyo, J. (1984). El pensamiento de Derrida. Editorial Cincel.

Conflict of interests

The authors of this work declare that there is no conflict of interests.

Authors' contributions

Chongarov E. – writing the text of the article, literature review.

Bagasharov K. – supplementing the data, technical preparation, and editing the text.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет / Сведения об авторах / Information about authors:

Ержан Чоңғаров – философия ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Қазақстан-Ресей медициналық университеті, қоғамдық пәндер кафедрасы, Алматы, Қазақстан, yerzhan.chongarov@sdu.edu.kz, <http://orcid.org/0009-0009-9435-7345>

Yerzhan Chongarov – Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Kazakh-Russian Medical University, Department of Social Sciences, Almaty, Kazakhstan, yerzhan.chongarov@sdu.edu.kz, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9435-7345>

Ержан Чонгаров – кандидат философских наук, ассоциированный профессор, Казахстанско-российский медицинский университет, кафедра социальных наук, Алматы, Казахстан, yerzhan.chongarov@sdu.edu.kz, <http://orcid.org/0009-0009-9435-7345>

Құдайберді Бағашаров – PhD, қауымдастырылған профессор, әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ, Алматы, Қазақстан, kudaiberdi1981@gmail.com, <http://Orcid.org/0000-0003-0051-9163>.

Kudaiberdi Bagasharov – PhD, Associate Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, kudaiberdi1981@gmail.com, <http://Orcid.org/0000-0003-0051-9163>.

Кудайберди Бағашаров – PhD, ассоциированный профессор, КазНУ имени аль Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, kudaiberdi1981@gmail.com, <http://Orcid.org/0000-0003-0051-9163>.

Мақала туралы ақпарат / Информация о статье / Information about the article.

Редакцияға түсті / Поступила в редакцию / Entered the editorial office: 09.02.2026

Рецензенттер мақұлдаған / Одобрено рецензентами / Approved by reviewers: 10.06.2026.

Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации / Accepted for publication: 30.06.2026.