Symbolic Violence and the Other in Cross-Cultural Field

Some Remarks on R. Girard's and J. Baudrillard's Theories

Philipp Tagirov
Department of Social Philosophy
Peoples Friendship University of Russia
Miklukho-Maklay str., 10/2, Moscow, Russia, 117198
E-mail: tagirov_fv@pfur.ru

Abstract—**The following article explores the problem of symbolic violence as a cultural phenomenon. The education, meaning "leading from", can lead us in various directions; some of them presuppose a dialogical communication between people identifying themselves and others through different symbolical matrixes. Meanwhile, other directions could bring us to the edge of conflict and misunderstanding. Alongside real physical violence, there was always symbolism that preceded real violence that facilitated it, escalated it, or prevented it. Studying Rene Girard's analyses of sacred violence, we come to the conclusion that the Monstrous Other, the arbitrary object of sacrificial violence, retains his consolidating function in contemporary cultures. Contemporarily speaking, terrorism is the principle of evil and, as Jean Baudrillard points out, our culture claims to be positive or "sterile white" in certain ways forms a demand for terror and violence turning the Other into the Evil Other. The solution for overcoming breaks in symbolic communication is proposed by both secular and religious symbolic matrixes. However, the object of our desire must be lifted up high enough to consolidate instead of separating by mimetic competition.**

Keywords—culture; communication; education; the other; symbolic violence; terrorism; tolerance

I. INTRODUCTION

The contemporary multicultural world requires specific cross-cultural communication. Looking around, we face a highly interactive coexistence of religious and secular cultures and ways of argumentation. Generally, we use a concept of post-secularity speaking about particular society and not about the world in general. Post-secular culture presents a complex system that includes both religious and secular elements and subsystems (like our contemporary world), but, historically, it follows religious and secular types of society and possesses the experience and wisdom of both types so it could try to teach its people the principles of a dialog with the Other. If we wonder whether the world has already been secular so it can be called post-secular now. The answer is definitely "no", but some major political dispositions used to be formed on secular basement (like NATO – Warsaw Pact). Nowadays, as Samuel Huntington predicted in 1993 [7], political and economic differences are complimented (and complicated) by mismatches in postulated fundamental (metaphysical) worldview principles. In the 21st century international arena will our cross-cultural communication be supported by wisdom of coexistence with the Other?

Education – from ē- ("from, out of") and dūcō ("I conduct, I lead ") – etymologically points not only (and not primarily) at the direction "where to" but also at a place (or condition) "where from", meaning the state of "untrained", "unconducted", in some way amorphous.

The "untrained" can be trained in various ways. The "unconducted" can be led into different directions (for instance, secular, religious and post-secular), but being conducted to the secular principles of world viewing form quite a different symbolic matrix than the one formed by religious conduction. While the communication and interaction between individual or group subjects belonged to these different matrixes are still possible, they tend to be surficial, formal for the deeper we go into the system of symbolic meanings the less common ground for our mutual understanding we find. Yet, there may be at least one existential field that demands our cooperation on more than just a formal level. There is the necessity of our co-existence and care for it to be safe and perspective. This co-existential necessity requires not just formal cooperation with us thinking of each other in the conceptual grid of our own. Thus, one must take the other one as merely an object and deprive him of his symbolic subjectness. How could we conduct those being educated so they arrive not only to the communication of the bearers of different symbolic matrixes but also to the ability of cross-matrix communication? Is this communication achievable if not by the constant reworking on our own matrixes, reconstructing and reshaping them to face new challenges including the challenges of symbolic subjectness of the other? In other words, shouldn't this be an education taking us from any particular "where" and lead us to some place under perpetual reconstruction however providing us with tools and skills for it?

Wherever there are breaches in symbolic communication, it results in possible turning of the Other into Stranger, the Evil Other or the Monstrous Other and escalation of symbolic or even real physical violence. The following

article presents an analysis of the problem of symbolic violence in cross-cultural field. Two works by R. Girard ("Violence and the Sacred", 1972) and J. Baudrillard ("The Transparency of Evil", 1990) are studied and rethought alongside some other texts. While these two philosophical giants seem to be not much alike, their theories of symbolic violence could comply each other in a rather fruitful way.

II. VIOLENCE AND SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE

During the history of humanity, violence manifested itself in different forms, but it could be found in any period of time and in any culture. These days when most cultural, political and economic processes tend to overpass any local territorialization violence also becomes global for the first time in the history of mankind. Even if it is originally local, mass-media helps it to reach maximum coverage.

When we study the animal world, we learn that it doesn't have violence we know. There's only an aggression as a part of strife for survival, and there are cases of rabies which, being a disease, could be understood as a fluctuation from a normal state of affairs. By inventing symbolic language, building culture and developing social institutions, man ceases to be an animal and discovers a new world – sadly, this world includes human violence which goes in its forms to brutal inhuman atrocities.

As a social phenomenon, violence has two sides — real and symbolic. While real violence is horrible, symbolic violence can be aesthetically shape-shifted by high moral ideas, sanctified. But it is twice as horrible for culture to let man exceed exclusively biological existence which was bound to his corporality and it is his corporality a real physical violence can be referred to. The genuine human dimension that makes our culture possible and that is also maintained by the culture is a symbolic dimension [4]. Real violence can at the worst result in death while symbolic violence can compel us to reshape our life according to the symbols of a stranger's symbolic matrix. Could death sometimes occur a better ending than life that isn't your life anymore?

Horror of symbolic violence terrorizes. Terrorism seems to be the most prominent example of symbolic violence in the contemporary world.

However, multiple forms of symbolic violence have existed from the ancient times. Magic formulas and rites performed to scare away the enemies, destruction of names of the old gods by the order of pharaoh Akhenaten and – later – anathemising of the reformer pharaoh's name, are the ancient examples of symbolic violence. The principal distinction between those forms and nowadays violence is not in some new symbols but in the fact that any act of violence can be symbolically reconstructed for millions of people. Do mass-media only follow the tracks of violence or do they precede or even provoke it in some way as Jean Baudrillard believes speaking about their precession to violent acts [2]?

Terrorism today challenges the very symbolic system of the western world. To fight it back it needs to transgress some certain principles and ideals of its own. On the other hand, it's obvious that terrorism can serve as an excuse for transgressing these principles. But terrorism is in no way a unique and even a dominant form of symbolical violence today. Repression often revealed itself in relations between sexes, generations, and representatives of different ethnical or status groups. The source of this repressiveness lurks in the cracks in symbolic systems; the cracks that divide the initiator of violence and his victim. Certain hierarchies are necessary for the existence of the society becomes a temptation to see a subject of different position (in society or in discussion) as a Stranger.

Violence (as well as dialogue) needs the Other. Presuming that this Other is not just "the same as me but the other", the Other is a totally Stranger (unlike in dialog), he is a Monster.

In ancient rituals of sacrifice the victim of consolidated violence of the society (a "scapegoat" in Rene Girard's theory [6]) obtained the status of abomination or of the sacred (see also George Bataille's "Theory of Religion" [3]. Similar to this during the war the homicidal violence (prohibited at the ordinary state of events) is justified by being addressed to non-human, not-yet-human, non-orthodoxial, uncivilized – in other words, to the Stranger.

III. THE SYMBOLIC SACRIFICE AND ITS ROLE IN CULTURE. CONSOLIDATING VIOLENCE

Conflict hides below the surface of any society. If it hasn't proclaimed itself out loud, it still exists in latent forms strained like a spring, and, like any strained spring, it's dangerously explosive. Being strained and ever-ready to explode has a symbolic power that sometimes occurs to be even greater than it has already opened itself. It contaminates people with its own tension and its readiness to release this tension. A bullet in a gun is much more deadly than in a corpse and even in a brief moment of its illusory freedom. A gun can kill without losing its power, remaining in a barrel.

Whether we understand conflict as a moving cause for social development or as a sword of Damocles for humankind, according to Rene Girard [6], there is at least one cure to ease the conflict's heat and prevent it from actualization. This cure is known to the most societies as sacrifice.

The phenomenon of sacrifice was found in the center of ethnographic, culturological, psychological, sociological or philosophical studies more than once or twice. Sometimes sacrifice was placed at the origin of human culture. Sigmund Freud in "Totem and Taboo" underlines the essential connection of religion with sacrificial practice. The widespread understanding of sacrifice being an attempt to calm down the divine anger or to show god our loyalty is, for Freud, a later explanation since originally it served transgression of god's otherness in celebration of the unity of the faithful with their god [5]. Serge Moscovici shares Georg Simmel's idea about sacrifice lying in the basement of any economic exchange, barter as well as monetary, in the basement of exchange itself [9].

However, the function of sacrifice goes beyond merely economic reasons. It unifies not only with market interests

but also with violence and not only with our concern about life matters but death matters as well. Besides any other exchange the sacrificial practice always includes exchange of violence.

Myths of different cultures often speak of violent act as an act of cosmological meaning. The first man Pangu separates Yang from Yin with a help of his axe and so originates the world of distinguishable things from undistinguished chaos. Norse Ymir or Vedic Purusha are being sacrificed by gods in order to create main components of the reality – including people. These myths could tell us about original importance of violence but also about the world starting to exist with a differentiating act performed in a violent way and elimination indifference. Through the sacrifice of Purusha, the gods establish order in the natural and human world. Later when man recalls this act through ritual repetition, he once again actualizes the lines of differentiation between upper and lower, between right and wrong. Thus, he preserves and revives this order.

Egyptian Ra every night travels by underworld river and fights the serpent Apophis who represents chaos. This victory is necessary for a new dawn to come, in other words – to prevent order and harmony from destruction. Violence guarantees the beginning of every day. Babylonian Tiamat belongs to the world of gods as well as Marduk but to the elder generation, the one of chaos and indifference. When Marduk cuts her body in two halves, he thus makes the first difference. The act of Uranus castration by Kronos also separates the sky (Uranus) from the Earth (Gaia). Violence doesn't always mean killing, banishing can be another act of violence. The expel from Eden is a punishing violence for the fallen man, but at the same time, the very fall of Adam can be understood as a sacrifice – a sacrifice of Eden, heaven idyll, indifference in bliss, life without knowing sorrows and death for the sake of knowledge, for an apple from the Tree of Differentiation, for the sake of freedom of choice and truly human existence.

Culture is mimetic. On one hand, cultural mimesis molds a man of certain identity and desires from an amorphic piece of biologic clay. On the other hand, this mimesis builds an arena of infinite strife, guaranteed foundation for endless tensions pushing society forward but also powerful enough to ruin it. Essential mimetism of culture is well studied in R. Girard's work "Violence and the Sacred" [6]. The desire of the same object gives birth to rivalry. However, there's a level that is deeper than some particular project of possessing economic resources, political resources, or some other resources. It is a desire for a real existence in all its totality. Real tension is about our desire for a real existence, as well. Real conflict arises from a lack of it.

The other is necessary for the emergence of our mimetic desire, the one who would serve as an example. However, for its realization, the other should be eliminated; he must be made alike myself for the core of a conflict works by infecting myself with desires of the other and projecting my motives onto him. The other is being deprived of his otherness. The differences blur and become erased. The social organism is attacked by the tumor of the

undistinguishable chaos. All cells become the same, losing their special functions and from this moment their predominant will is to contend. They are driven by a wish for total expansion, even at the cost of health or the very life of an organism. The unfulfilled mimetic desire results in growing violence, actual or latent (like that bullet ready to shoot but remaining in a gun for now).

To prevent actualization of mimetic desire from jeopardizing social order, we need to channel and organize this desire, making it neutral or beneficial for the society. First, mimetic desires seem to be pre-cultural, but culture develops by calling its children for mimesis. It encourages this wish for in return it provides cultural progress, and it is culture's duty to channel both actualization of mimetic desire and tension of unfulfilled desires frustration.

When chaotic, uncontrollable violence threatens to spread throughout the society, we need controllable violence which that involves most of its members. Rene Girard claims that sacrificial violence was the most typical example of such controllable violence in archaic cultures. The meaning of sacrificial violence (in society as well as in myth) is in defeating monster who's supposed to have caused the spread of violence, the dispersing of a hierarchy, and line of differentiation. In other words, it is the monster who symbolizes chaos and primordial indifference. People seek among themselves for the personification of a mythical sacrifice – the only one who would suffer for the sins of all so the rest would live in peace and order again. The arbitrary scapegoat becomes the savior whose death (real or symbolic) brings reconciliation to society.

We remember the sacrifices of Purusha and Ymir, Ra repeatedly beating Apophis, Marduk killing Tiamat, Apollo slaying Python, St. George defeating the Dragon and try to follow their example to overcome chaos through symbolic repetition of their deeds. The sacred power of these deeds is proved by practical effects achieved by our rituals. Chaos retreats. Rival brothers recognizes their brotherhood prior to conflict brought by their mimetic desires. The father regains respect of his sons and patriarch – of his patrials. The old world died in violent convulsions dissolved in chaos. The sacrificial knife divided the body of indifference into a new heaven and a new earth. Violence that emerged from erasure of differences was counteracted with the violence rebuilding differentiation. The sacrifice, which R. Girard calls "founding violence" releases the accumulated tension and not chaotically but cosmically.

Through sanctification, violence gets channeled into certain cultural forms that provide the maintaining of social integrity. The consolidation it brings is even more important for us than just a relief from growing tension. The ritual of sacrificial violence involves almost all members of society, one way or another. The elimination of the enemy as a manifestation of all evil and an origin of all miseries that are troubling our society becomes the only foundation for the unity of the rivals that are antagonists in everything but admitting the actual crisis and the necessity of stopping it. Whatever the real cause of these miseries may be is transferred to the scapegoat. It's transcended, alienating the

arbitrary victim and making it different from anyone, the Stranger, the Evil Other, the Monstrous Other that can be, for an instance, the witches of a nearby tribe, pagans, unfaithful ones, world imperialism, mason conspirators, communist agents or agents of globalization, westernization, Americanization, etc. – or terrorists. If a scapegoat is taken from our own ranks, he also becomes alien to the community because by his very status is the servant of Evil, the agent of inhumanity or the fallen one par excellence who has fallen so deep in his vices that he could be differentiated from the others again. The unanimity against the scapegoat consolidates antagonists and becomes the ground for establishing a new order.

Differences can be lost not only because the subjects are turned into some homogenous bio- or socio-mass, not only by totalitarian unification but also because of amplifying dynamics of differentiation when differences are multiplied getting smaller and more and more temporary. Changing fast, individual differences belong to no one in particular. They belong to everyone distinguishing no one. They mingle and give birth to a monster. This monster will unite them against it when their original desire of total existence nearly brings them to the edge of non-existence. R. Girard attributes his model of sacrificial crisis primarily to archaic societies, but it seems to be useful when we study breaks in symbolic communication between subjects of different ethnic, cultural, age, confessional and gender identities in our contemporary world.

IV. PRINCIPLE OF EVIL IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE: TERRORISM, MASS-MEDIA AND THE LIMITS OF TOLERANCE

How can we make a Monstrous Other out of the Other? Generally, we don't see the Other as a physical body but through the matrix of meanings and symbols referring to them. That's why all we need to do is to distort symbolic communication ("symbolic exchange" in Baudrillard's way [1]). The substitution of symbols and their meanings becomes possible due to low transitivity between different symbolic matrixes. The lack of the common symbolic field appears as a precondition for manipulating symbols and meanings.

In the beginning of the 21st century, we are regularly shown our own incarnations of the Evil Other. Even the path to God often requires the Monstrous Other so that divine halo shines brighter. Humanism, western lifestyle or tradition sometimes requires it too. By having the Monstrous Other, we find certain means for proving our loyalty to our highest ideals and add a personal existential intensity to social consolidation (while our seeking for this intensity among the ordinary objects of desire, as we have seen, would weaken our consolidation making us rivals for the first place). Does the Enemy always precede our searching for him? Does our Monstrous Other preexist our necessity to fight him or to consolidate against him? Don't we need a new myth being created each time we look for a basis to simulate non-existing difference (or escalate some minor difference) between Us and Them?

Jean Baudrillard in "The Transparency of Evil" formulated an uncomfortable and provoking question whether terrorism exists to serve a kind of violent release from social tension. In contemporary society, where the borders of the political are uncertain, where politics become "trans-political" and exist in everything else, where the Evil is found in the mirror, terrorism aims not at a narrow, relatively marked political field but attacks all transpolitical reality. That's why Baudrillard calls terrorism a transpolitical mirror of evil [2].

A bomb thrown at the Russian Emperor Alexander II in 1881 was supposed to hit a concrete man and particular regime. A bomb detonated in Brussels Airport in 2016 wasn't aimed at this particular airport or at particular people who were unlucky to be there on that sorrowful day waiting for their flights. Both bombs attacked a symbolic reality which is centered on a certain important personality in the first case and almost equally distributed among all airports and other public places in Europe (and probably not only in it). Moreover, each of us sees our self in the "mirror of terrorism" also because… we look at this mirror. Nowadays, mass-media gives us an almost instant opportunity to observe distant events and be involved into them. They give a terrorist an ability to reach every one of us and send terror right through our monitors or TV screens.

Julius Caesar's assassination wasn't a terrorist act; neither was the assassination of Henry IV of France. There was murder, there was blood, and there were political consequences, but there was not terror spreading its wings over this blood. On one hand, as Baudrillard notes, a screen endows a terrorist the unprecedented power over the spectator, but on the other hand, it becomes a source of previously unknown and perverse pleasure giving a terrorist to a spectator. Baudrillard states the precession of mass-media to terrorist violence and also the "collective demand" for terrorism.

A screen attracts terrorism as well as violence, disease, and evil. It's provided with the fact that with its other side it attracts us, the civilization of voyeurism. "Good news doesn't sell", – they say. Why? Who's to blame? Is it because of our vicious human nature, or is it raised and educated? Is it some sort of virus infecting contemporary culture? The path to God is not merely but often requires a Monster; on our screens, the Monster definitely dominates over God. Baudrillard suspects the source of this disease in a "sterility" of contemporary western civilization. He believes it follows the path of "prevention and extinguishing" of its natural relations, aestheticizing what is frightening, and seeks for a precise regulation and discussions about the Good [2]. In the "sterile white" world like this where evil seems to be expelled the symbols of something infernal, jeopardizing our regulated routine and terrifying us, become magnetic.

At the same time, traditions of the Enlightenment, ideals of humanism, egalitarianism, freedom of self-determination (for an individual and for people), principle of tolerance that shine like jewels during the periods of prosperity could turn into golden chains when stable. The comforting and dominant role of this civilization is threatened. How could our humanism and tolerance handle us pointing at the Other and labeling him not a victim of social injustice, wrong

education or misguidance but the Evil Other, the Monster, Absolute Stranger? When this storm comes, western civilization will face an unpleasant dilemma: choosing between the loss and hypocrisy. The tragic fate of humanism, pluralism and tolerance is to betray their own principles when defending themselves against those who are non-humanist, un-pluralistic and intolerant. This dilemma is a harsh one, and we often choose hypocrisy – at least for the sake of that these principles remaining among our own people. That means these principles fail to be universal, and we distinguish between Us and Them on the symbolic level that would presuppose different people deserve different treatment. The West raises its originally secular values at almost sacred height and wages its own holy war in their name.

How can we disenchant a Monstrous Other turning him back to "the same as me" or – in order to underline his uniqueness and individuality – to "the same as me but the Other"? We need to learn how to see in the being of the other as much reality and authenticity as we generally see in our own. That's what culture of tolerance is about. Tolerance today means seeking what is common on different fields, in different symbolical dimensions. Such sort of tolerance requires titanic efforts and rare courage to deconstruct one's own symbolic dimension or it would risk to remain formal because there would be possibly not enough common subspaces between different dimensions.

As an alternative we could propose another sort of tolerance which would mean seeking and respecting what is different in the borders of a common field, common symbolic dimension.

Our contemporary world, becoming more and more pluralistic and multicultural, gradually turns from a systemized order into a very complexly organized system with a lots of chaotic elements (a sort of synergetic system). However, we could suppose that even a complexly organized system might have a limit for its complexity. If so, possibly unlimited plurality of being might someday lead to the impossibility of being at all and chaos as a system would be displaced by primordial chaos that according to some ancient believes preexisted cosmos.

Along with the growing pluralism on the level of phenomena, the contemporary world also seeks for a unified common ground for the pluralism flourish upon. It hopes to find what could be a single foundation for the being of plural. Now, this search is being conducted in the field of education as well economy, politics, science, religion and philosophy.

V. TRANSCENDENCY AND SANCTIFICATION OF THE MUNDANE

All contemporary symbolic systems that claim to be or to become universal can be roughly divided into two groups — secular and religious.

The scenario of a secular symbolic universe unfolds through the process of globalization where secular western societies try to play a leading role. They endeavor to conduct other cultures to principles of human rights, individualism, liberalism and democracy.

World religions attempt to actualize the second scenario. They construct a unified, symbolic matrix centered on the idea of the highest metaphysical principle. They believe in the most real, absolute being achievable through the means proposed by particular religion and (as a rule) the postulation of the equality of all believers who belong to this confession.

The practices of both scenarios are claimed to be devoted to the postulated principles. However, we could face their distortion when they are being used to veil certain economic or political interests.

Aldous Huxley points out that contemporary world offers its sacrifices, including human sacrifices, to its own gods who are no longer personifications of nature but of human-made political ideals [8]. These ideals refer to facts (real or imaginary) of the mundane plane. Distinguishing between events which meanings symbolically belong to "the mundane" and those belonging to "the sacred", he also divides all thinkers into "philosophers of time" and "philosophers of eternity". What's important whether a thinker claims to support some "tradition of eternity" or not, he becomes a philosopher of time whenever he finds the highest purpose of his being in the world of becoming. The highest purpose is higher in its value than anyone following it, and anyone rejecting it. And even ideal of tolerance allows being intolerant to some people and the ideal of humanism sometimes permits human sacrifices for its sake. That's one of possible destinies for a philosopher of time and when we speak of the violence in the name of sacred we see the banner made by their hands.

According to Baudrillard, our own existence is founded on the symbolic presence of the Other and also on his symbolic death [2]. Generally the opponent is not being killed but he must be pushed to the point when he seeks his symbolic death himself. As we can suppose the ancient archetype "the Hero and the Monster" is being displaced today by the model "Beauty and the Beast" where the Monster is not fought but seduced instead. But the Beast we seduce remains a Monster that is on object of violence in the name of what is "sacred" for us.

Sacred violence in its highest archetypical kind belongs to the world of eternity. Violence in the name of the Sacred is wholly performed in the plane of historical time. Violence in the name of the sacred as well as sacred violence can refer to a model action that took place in mythological time and remaining in eternity however when sacred violence demands a repetition. First, it requires a symbolic repetition of violence and not a repetition of symbolic violence which is what we seek in case of violence in the name of the sacred. For sacred violence wants its repetition not as an excuse for a momentary cause but for the eternal return of some defining and so differentiating principle. In accordance to the logic of sacred violence, it's not violence itself that unites but the transcendent; sacrifice is not just a founding violence but also an establishing of an over existence that provides the overcoming of existence that seems deficient.

The purpose of a cultural project can hit a man below the belly, can rise up to the level of his stomach, or become a banner over his head, or shine among the stars higher than

any clouds. The tenser is the string between us and our final purpose the more intense our existence could become. Meanwhile the height of a purpose directly influences its consolidating ability:

The more transcendent is our purpose the more it unites; the closer it's to the ground the more it divides being included in the model of cultural mimesis as a finite and limited object of desire.

Any culture channelizes violence. By lowering the transcendent and sanctifying secular meanings, contemporary culture ties people with a simulated competition. It provides more and more mimetic models and seems capable of neutralizing elements of crisis that could have been a result of such rivalry. This multiplied competition becomes founding instead of undermining for the contemporary civilization. However, this foundation fails to pretend to be essential as a cornerstone, it constantly flickers, changes borderlines, endlessly seeks for new models to mimic, plays with meanings and produces new symbols – sometimes without any reliable correspondence with other symbols in the symbolic matrix possibly making it more transitional for meanings from other matrixes but thinner and less lasting, less durable and risking to dissipate as a whole.

VI. CONCLUSION

While the study of symbolic violence in cross-cultural field will proceed and the present world continuously demonstrates the escalation of violent conflict (symbolic and physical ones, growing about breaches between our symbolic matrixes) that urges us to go on, we need to make some interim conclusions for now.

When a mundane value is declared as a unifying principle this value, even if it is raised to the sacred height, it risks turning from an apple of Hesperides into an apple of discord. Conflicts of interests would continuously result in new violence. Even transcendent names for a mundane value (and being mundane means being limited, exhaustible) cannot save from the competitive strife among those who share the desire for this value.

Most likely, only transcending and teaching transcendent ideals can lead us to a value what is equally shared by anyone in all its totality. If a transcendent value is evaluated for the sake of itself and not as a mask for any mundane claim than it could become the unifying principle for a common symbolic matrix.

Perhaps none of the traditional attempts to formulate certain transcendental principles for the unified symbolic field succeeds in getting universal, at least without essential transformation. The reason of this failure originates from inevitable abruption when it comes to its inoculation to the soil of other traditions. The only possible solution demands the spirit of religious tradition go beyond its letter.

Whatever the way mankind will choose (or may be some third one) it would seem to have a chance of overcoming the growing symbolic violence only in case when there was an opportunity of symbolic communication without distortion. The general logic could be the following:

- discover a common symbolic universe instead of variety non-transitional symbolic systems and teach it to others;

- find the Other against this common background;

- find ourselves against the background of his otherness.

REFERENCES

[1] Jean Baudrillard, Symbolic Exchange and Death. Sage Publications Ltd, 1993.

[2] Jean Baudrillard, The Transparency of Evil : Essays on Extreme Phenomena. London: Verso Books, 1993. Chapters "The Mirror of Terrorism", "Whatever Happened to Evil?"

[3] George Bataille, Theory of Religion. New York: Zone books, 1989.

[4] Ernst Cassirer, An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture. Yale University Press, 1972.

[5] Sigmund Freud, Totem and Taboo. Resemblances between the psychic lives of savages and neurotics. London: George Routledge & Sons, Limited, 1919.

[6] Rene Girard, Violence and the Sacred. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

[7] Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" in Foreign Affairs, vol. 72, №3 (Summer, 1993), pp. 22–49.

[8] Aldous Huxley, The Perennial Philosophy. London: Chatto And Windus, 1947.

[9] Serge Moscovici, La Machine à faire les dieux, Fayard, 1988 / The invention of society: psychological explanations for social phenomena, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1993. Chapter 8.