

УДК 323.1

Social and Anthropological Background for Addressing Xenophobia

Boris V. Markov*

*St. Petersburg State University
7/9 University Embankment, St. Petersburg,
199034, Russia*

Received 11.12.2017, received in revised form 31.01.2018, accepted 12.02.2018

Contemporary humanity is facing a new form of exclusion. If earlier protest caused total power and economic exploitation, today in place violent ways of assembling individuals in the collective body came new media technology. Globalization turns the new totalitarianism of planetary scale. The question arises, what does it mean to “be together”? Is the totality of the citizens, every four years, taking part in the elections, or something more-for example, people, nation or just fellow, existing according to the formula: live and not bother others live. It would be good to connect on a spiritual basis, as suggested by Russian philosophers of unity, but until the time is not ripe, should create more realistic projects. Today human Association are not built on spiritual unity, and at the organizational basis and fewer rely on solidarity. Your problem is the recognition of the other, which is not a romantic fiction, and lives and works near to us in the context of a modern multi-ethnic society. It cannot be an absolute skeptic, of course, if it is not being driven into a corner, such as paring down his social rights, wages, and forces other think, drink, eat and dress, as do representatives of a big nation. The involvement of another is not only in the plane of the rational negotiation and political treaties, but also at the level of everyday communication, which is the best form of hospitality.

Keywords: ethnicity, nation, people, society, State, identity, our, alien, friend, enemy, xenophobia, hospitality.

DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0221.

Research area: philosophy.

Conservative thinkers think that man is evil by nature, and only power can prevent the society from starting a war against everyone. On the opposite, socialists believe that man is kind, and suggest abolishing the state as such. Liberals consider man to be reasonable, able to compromise and live in peace. For this reason, Russophobia, Judaeophobia and other forms of xenophobia are subject to elimination. But

humanism, morals, and human rights are regarded as measures of standardization and are taken with suspect. People tend to see “microfascism” in everything. But as we know, excessive expansion of any term causes inflation. That means, that instead of the spook stories intended to create and use the guilt complex for the “horrible past” even in consequent generations, it is necessary to set a question how memory connects to imagination in

construction of the past, and analyse the modern time on the basis of the analysis result.

The image of an enemy is a complicated psychopolitical construct. It is usually intensified not only in the face of a real threat, but also as a method of concealing inner problems of a society. Instead of changing a policy, it is said to be correct, but held back by an enemy postponing the promised future indefinitely. The enemies are often presented as the representatives of marginal groups. The suggested solution of the alien problem is different from these common misconceptions. It states the necessity to look for deeper reasons than hostility of the aliens. The reasons can be external, such as emergency situations in the places where aliens come from, and disorders inside the society they come from. Hatred for the alien is majorly determined by a crisis inside the society and fear of disorder, which makes everyone fear each other. This is why the left-wing intellectuals associate xenophobia with globalization, i.e. with the expansion of capitalism and market relations that destroy friendly interpersonal relations. This position should be also critically reviewed. Some functional, professional dependences may connect people even tighter than friendship. They may serve as a basis for establishing families, small ethnic and spiritual communities united by affection. But they cannot support large superhuman systems, such as modern society. For this reason, the ways to address hostility and distrust should be sought for in the way of improving social spaces, where individuals can make their dreams of unity come true.

As xenophobia cannot be overcome with the strategy of multiculturalism and tolerance, escalation of humanism and ethics seems to be a way out. But it raises the question, why besides the Categorical Imperative, the moral philosophy

of Kant also finds a place for universal evil? One should not look for a connection with Gnosticism, since Christianity does not address the substantiality of evil. Human right to sin may be regarded as a doubt in the perfection of the creator. It is not coincidence that Luther once said that “no one gets saved”.

In Christianity, the indefiniteness of power opposite to good created the figure of the devil. It was necessary to explain why the promises have not come true yet. This opposition to good was first introduced by Paul the Apostle. Demonization of the evil was caused by the need to imagine something that holds happiness back. Obviously, the obstacles on the road of good cause the need for the scapegoat, i.e. the victim. According to G. Blumenberg, is it more than just rhetoric. He supposes that in crisis situations there appear micromyths and microreligions to justify the protest of the consciousness against the evil made by the authorities (Blumenberg, Schmitt, 2007: 167). The image of the alien remains a sort of a stigma, a code of an enemy being a threat.

Initially, the term of evil used to describe human nature means that all moral standards are reactive. History is driven by evil and powerful people; for this reason, with violence we cannot but cope. However, it does not mean that all forms of cruelty can be excused. On the opposite, the comparison of the present and the past demonstrates humanization of various forms of upbringing, normalization and control, which leads to overcoming the hostility of the alien.

The study of identification mechanisms reveals that the insider is detected only against the background or on the borderline with the outsider. The outsider is primarily perceived as something ontologically alien; it is a source of threat, bringing the “insiders” to unite and consolidate, to forget their domestic problems. This old way of strengthening the national, cultural, or any other identity needs special research. Europe that

recognized itself, first of all, as the fort of culture, civilization, and Christianity, had to attack and defend itself, to explore and colonize. It suffered from such self-identification, too. Besides the outsiders that could be assimilated, Europeans had to face the outsiders unwilling to do any economic or cultural exchange; they were called barbarians, non-Christians, and the Holy War was declared against them. There is no surprise that the conquerors, adventurers, colonizers and other pioneers of Europe left only sad memory behind.

Fyodor Dostoyevsky remarked the “cultural imperialism” of European writers: “The greatest European poets could never express the genius of the alien, or, maybe, the neighbour nation, its spirit, the unrevealed depth of this spirit and the despondence of its fate with such a power as Pushkin could. On the opposite, turning to other nations, European poets normally converted them into their own nationality to understand them in their own way” (Dostoyevsky, 1972–1990: 145). In his speech of Pushkin, Dostoyevsky said that Western people had lost the genuine Christian faith and do not know Christ, while Russian people have retained the Holy Face and true Christian religiousness which may serve as a foundation for the future universal brotherhood. The superiority of Russian nation is explained by the “universal responsiveness”, that helps understand and, to the necessary extent, accept any national world outlook, to see the synthesis opportunity; this opens the way to brotherhood and the universal union of all people (Dostoyevsky, 1972–1990: 148). Let us remember that, like any other, Russian community formed such human qualities as love for labour, tolerance, patience, responsibility, solidarity, fairness, patriotism, being the producer of what is now referred to as social capital. In the Soviet Union, migrants were not just tolerated; their national identity and culture was deliberately developed. It brought the

controversial result of the Soviet national policy. On one hand, it is being reproached of providing national autonomy inclining to division. On the other hand, it seems that if the Soviet Union had lived for several decades more, it would have definitely melted all the nations into the “one and single Soviet People”.

There are different concepts of explaining xenophobia outbreaks. What is normally seen as a simple increase in the number of migrants, what is often experienced through fear and hostility by the locals, outbreaking in the forms of protests, conflicts or even bashing, is reconstructed by liberal theorists as a result of political propaganda, creating the enemy image in the order of the ruling elite. Conservative anthropologists, on the opposite, believe the enemy image development to be a preparation for a sacrificial offering, consolidating the society infected with violence. According to R. Girard, our ancestors saw the way out from a crisis situation in a sacrificial offering. Of course, today we cannot accept such a savage way of bringing the society together. We need efforts for development of economy and democratization of society. It should be admitted, however, that these measures do not heal the consciousness of people, living the post-stress with a strong feeling of revenge, feeding collective violence, right away. When fear and suspicion hold away, there will always be the people willing to use these sentiments for their benefit. This is why psycho-historical studies are an up-to-date task of social science. Philosophic anthropology, accumulating such knowledge of the humankind as traditions, regulations, rituals, preventing traditional communities from falling apart, opens up an arsenal of traditional techniques for overcoming the fear of the alien and preserving one’s own identity. An important contribution of the philosophic anthropology into understanding of man is the indication of his “energetic” potential. A man is more than just

an accumulation of some social relations; he is also an “accumulator of wishes”. Getting ecstatic, excited, an individual infects others, making a group declare itself a nation and to distinguish between friends and foes. “Ecstasiticity”, or, as Dostoyevsky put it, the “excessiveness” of man, expressed not only in a game, but also in violence, causes outrages. Instead of the instincts holding animals back from aggressive behaviour, people are guided by ethics and law. From the point of view of liberal political science, the society we know today emerged from hostility against everything estates nations referred to as the “motherland”. An example to farewell to the symbols of the motherland and the mother tongue is the birth of American nation. British, French and other roots were forgotten and replaced. Even though the word “people” remained in the Constitution, the concept was replaced with sovereignty of nation. However, as we know, the new national integrity was accompanied with the elimination of “alien languages”, the orgy of violence and the deadly civil war.

Cultural virology

According to the political virology principle, every people, just like every individual, has its own viruses dangerous for others. This is why immunity against aliens is compulsory. If aliens do not comply with the regulations and codes of the accepting country in their places of migration, they cause disorder. In fact, health of a culture is determined by its immunity against aliens, with simultaneous capacity to perceive useful external influences. The biological virology model may be applied to culturology with certain precautions and supplemented with some immunology principles. The discovery made by Mechnikov is interesting for the postulate that antibodies may also play a defensive role. Safety of an organism depends both of the impenetrability of its borders and inner resistance. Any organisms,

including cultural ones, are open systems; the alien, the external presents a threat for them, on the other hand being useful for their inner development. For example, staying behind the iron curtain reminds of a clinic ward, sterile of alien viruses. Its residents lose immunity and turn defenceless when the borders are broken. To perform the defensive function, the state develops suspiciousness and real methods of monitoring and supervising the aliens. An example of that is the evolution of customs, intelligence, political police. The customs differentiate between dangerous and safe things; the police, detects the dissidents. But in fact, any foreigner smuggles some ideas in his head; it is the luggage of ideas and outlook developed since his childhood. Similarly, the discontent with the regime may spawn inside the society or be stimulated from outside. The absence of inner immunity reveals itself in the people looking at themselves through the eyes of an alien.

American political thinker F. Yockey insisted that there was another history, made parallelly to the political and economical events of the 19th-20th centuries. It was the process of developing a cultural parasite, causing distortion in Western politics and economics. By cultural distortion, he meant the conditions when “outer life-forms are warping the Culture from its true Life-path”. This is what happened to the West in the early 20th century, and it has to recognize that suffers from cultural distortion (Ulick Varange, Francis Parker Yockey, 2017: 381).

Yockey painted an impressive picture of a degrading American society. However, he remarked, America was not intended to be an empire. Geographically isolated, it was not tempered in fights, and, basically, it has never had any real enemies. Reviewing American history, Yockey arrived at the following conclusion: their first and main mistake was to write the Declaration and the Constitution on the basis

of the French template, containing the basic principles of bourgeois society. The second fatal mistake was the victory of the democratic North over the aristocratic South. And the third life-changing mistake was Jewish capitalism. This caused such shocks as the racist war between the blacks and the whites, the class war of the trade unions against the employers; financial war of the money dictators; and, finally, the life or death combat between the culture-destroying minority and the American nation.

The destructive consequence of financial capitalism, the exodus of the blacks into the cities, the fear of extinction made the thinker join the conservative side. Yockey quoted the letter of Baruch Levi to Marx published in 1928, where he writes that the Jewish nation would attain world dominion by the dissolution of other races, by the abolition of frontiers, the annihilation of monarchy, and by the establishment of a world republic in which the Jews will everywhere exercise the privilege of citizenship. In fact, one can find such assertions in other cultures and literatures. They should be treated with healthy sense of humour. Every nation may consider itself to be the Messiah, and they should not be feared. Once, Max Scheler was seriously frightened by the words of V.S. Solovyev that Russia will unite all nations in some religious international. He was not soothed by the words that it intends not to dominate, but to be friends. Having surrendered to resentment, he remarked: if others refuse, Russians may hit them with a rock (Scheler, 1963: 220).

Politics should not be immoral. But if the morals are used cynically, they pervert the war and the politics itself, driving them to the level of brutality. It's another matter that morals and values can be different. Let those be Russians, Jews or Arabs, all of them are guided with the values of their own. For this reason, politics and war mean a combat for both economic and symbolic values.

Yockey predicted an era of cultural politics, when an ultimate war between Europe and anti-Europe begins; it would be the war not for economy, democracy and human rights; it will be the fight for the world domination. It is very similar to the picture of the "civilizations way" painted by the modern American political scientists. Russian scientists were much more moderate about this (Trubetskoy, 1995: 309).

Attributing strategy and tactics of the world revolution to Zionists, Yockey simply exaggerated. After all, the Jewish people is not the only one who dreams of supremacy. The thing that matters is to achieve this aim by peaceful means. Powerlessly watching aliens suppressing the successors of the first European pioneers, Yockey called for some decisive counteraction. Indeed, you should not watch the indigenous population degrading, but the task of a philosopher is to wake its ambitions and facilitate the upbringing of the national elite, instead of calling for an outrage. Hatred to the alien that still does not disappear completely is an open wound for humanists. They suffer of guilt, believing penance to be the best remedy of hatred. The guilt complex facilitates the development of tolerance but weakens the society overloaded with aliens. At first, they prefer to stick to their own rules, then they insist on autonomy, and, finally, come to dominate.

Contemplating on the facts and without surrendering to xenophobia, one should admit that an empire is different from an isolated nation state because it attracts representative of its conjoined provinces. As for Jews, they have been loyal servants of Austria and Germany. In the times of Rathenau, those were the Jewish financiers who ensured industrial growth. In Russia and beyond, not all the Jews used to be shylocks. The majority of them knew their business and had always been good specialists. Against this background, antisemitism outbreaks look absolutely strange. Reluctantly, one has to admit that a society still

turns to sacrificial offerings when the sacrificed is a marginal member of the community.

Yockey described the development of culture in biological terms. Using the antibody metaphor, he arrived at the distortion theory, according to which aliens destroy the culture they intrude into. When their number exceeds a certain critical value, the vector of culture development changes from rise to degradation. Yockey referred to this final stage as to retardation, or a backwards reverse move. According to him, the external aliens who have launched retardation of Europe, are the Slavic people and Russians in particular. To describe aliens, Yockey turned to microbiological terms, but his perception is obviously one-sided: the emphasis is made on maliciousness, virality. However, in fact antibodies are not just enemies, many microorganisms also play a defensive role. For example, Northern nations believed frequent bathing to cause diseases. Our skin is a membrane protecting us from hazards of the outer world and absorbing useful substances. Those who have read books by H. Plessner carefully, have a more flexible idea of the borders between insiders and outsiders. The organism lives in an environment; from outside, it gets food to process and digest. It has special canals for this purpose. Similarly, it may contact with other organisms, not only in a fight, but also in a cooperation. In fact, there are predators and parasites, and the most hazardous ones are the microorganisms that cannot be filtered by the skin membranes and penetrate into the body. It is well-known fact that once large Cherokee tribe died of measles. Europe was attacked by dangerous microbes that arrived with oriental goods, and from time to time we still face epidemic outbreaks.

Similarly to the antibodies, Yockey associated cancer cells with migrants, representatives of alien cultures, that do not assimilate, do not dissolve, but crystallize and freeze in their initial state. Like the Molokans, they remain loyal

to their mother culture, while their historical motherland continues developing. As a result, they find themselves to be outsider for both the previous and the new culture. For example, Yockey demonstrated that defining America as a melting pot of ethnicities and nations is one-sided. Some ethnicities melt, and children of the migrants become Americans, while others, such as Chinese, form enclaves and create a society within a society, sometimes criminal like Sicilian or any other mafia. But the most dangerous ones are those who can assimilate into the accepting culture and use it for his own purposes. According to Yockey, Russians barbarize culture, and Jews develop it.

On the other hand, Nietzsche claimed that nationalism was a disease, which, like moralism, was the reason for the decadence of Europe. “This most anti-cultural sickness and unreason there is, nationalism, this *nevrose nationale* with which Europe is sick, this perpetuation of European particularism, of *petty* politics: they have deprived Europe itself of meaning, of its reason – they have driven it into a dead-end street” (Nietzsche, 1990: 759). Besides making other nations suffer, nationalism is dangerous for Europe itself, for it stands for legitimization of imperialism and colonialism. European kings believed that Christianization was their main task, while colonialists excused themselves with bringing civilization to the lagging peoples. Both ideas are based on the model of Europe as a sacred or cultural Empire.

Nietzsche described the migration processes in a way unusual for his time. He satirized the petty talks of Jewish invasion and Russian threat, criticized the British for their mercantilism and paid a tribute to the aristocracy of the French. Nietzsche provoked anti-Semites, proving that due to their history the Jews have greatly developed their spiritual power, that they are not inclined to resentment and now “that they unavoidably

intermarry more and more, from year to year, with the noblest blood of Europe, they will soon have a good heritage of the manners of soul and body so that in a hundred years already they will appear noble enough so that as lords... Therefore a settlement of their case is still premature... but also ... at some time Europe may fall like a perfectly ripe fruit into their hand, which only casually reaches out... They will be called the inventors and guides of the Europeans...” (Nietzsche, 1997: 503). Mocking at xenophobia, Nietzsche suggested that those are anti-Semites, not Jews, who need to be driven out of Europe, and encouraged mixed marriages.

Alien as a victim and a scapegoat

As a form of indifference, equality is more dangerous than beneficial. According to R. Girard, the crisis of society emerges as differences are erased. Relying on a Greek tragedy analysis, he demonstrated that it lies on a conflict emerging from destruction of differences: those are patricide and incest. In the opinion of Girard, this fear conceals the genuine reasons of miseries. “Patricide and incest provide the community with exactly what it needs to represent and exorcise the effects of the sacrificial crisis” (Girard, 2010: 114). That is the expansion of the vicious circle of violence and revenge infecting the society like plague. “To escape from the circle it is first necessary to remove from the scene all those forms of violence that tend to become self-propagating and to spawn new, imitative forms” (Girard, 2010: 111). For this purpose, a scapegoat is found. Offering it as a sacrifice, people purify themselves, simultaneously getting rid of the collective guilt of the growing violence.

This pattern is also applicable to understanding the psychohistory of modern societies. The growing fear of decadence initiates the search for a scapegoat. After the offering has been done, it becomes good, since it facilitated the

escape from the crisis. We cannot but admit that violence still exists and that the victim archetype still serves its purpose. Religious thinking is not inclined to moralism; it is more concerned about disarming the anger of gods. The subject matter is collective thinking. Before becoming a sacrifice, the disturber seemed to be filth itself, but having gone through the violence he becomes valuable as the saviour of order. Having killed their victim, people believe to have got rid of filth. Today the scapegoat is an anachronism. However, sacrifice offerings still exist in Christianity, and even in a tolerant society there are some outlaws. Girard makes a reference to a double bond: a prohibition creates a desire to break it. This is why he claims the totality of violence, when one violence causes another; he believes that there is no better way of conflict settling than a sacrificial offering. Various regulations and prohibitions focus the desire on some common examples, settling the arising conflicts. However, the violation of rituals breaks the established order and increases violence, which can be only terminated with the offering of a scapegoat.

If sacrifice can stop restructuration of an old community, it may serve as the beginning of a new one. This violence of foundation opens a new circle of sacrificial rituals that will never come to an end. Legends of different nations tell the story of one mythical creature killing another to establish a new cultural order. There is no surprise that a society always has a someone to sacrifice, a *pharmakos*. It was normally taken around the place to absorb all the filth, and then driven away or slaughtered. The offering was preceded by games or even fights imitating the crisis of order caused by mutual violence. The slaughter cannot be avoided. As the victim is expected to save the community from violence, hostility is replaced with glorification. A sacrificial offering is collective and bears a preventive character. Rituals are not manifestation of violence; they

are not ways of letting steam off. It is a way to prevent a worse violence. It can be referred to a sort of a waste recycling factory.

But still, playing with the archaic, one has to be careful. The sacrificial offering rituals existed in the early history of any nation. The differences between the clean and filthy were concentrated in the aliens who were believed to be evil. There is a belief in evil spirits even in common Christianity. There is no surprise that dictators turn to cleaning the country of the inner enemies. Goebbels said Jews were lice, condemning them to death in gas chambers. Besides the “purity issue” another way of strengthening the society was detection of disruptors. So, political virology relies on the metaphor of purity, which is the base used in various spheres. If there are any filthy ones, there should be places for isolation and purification. The most radical facilities were modelled by Catholic theology. That is hell and limbo. Strictly speaking, the camps of the 20th century were based on the same infernal principle.

The friend and foe heterogony

Hostility is a political term, while friendliness belongs to anthropology. It is determined by our present conditions. Friendship is not established by human nature. Psychologists claim that aggression is more specific to it. Kant wrote of evil and distrustful attitude of people to each other and explained it by their selfishness. Often the political term relies on violence. On the opposite, the ethical and anthropological contemplations are based on friendliness. In Christian heaven, there is no place for politics; but the Manichaeic idea of substantial evil is represented in all religions in this or that way. This is why the saint and the warrior happen to be complementary figures.

As for the thesis of inherent violence and our ancestors' inclination to violence, based on the number of broken skulls found around

archaeological sites, it is contradicted by the ethnic data of the surprising friendliness of the so-called savages. Therefore, in the post-heaven world, a meeting in a neutral territory is not that risky any more. The tribe fellows recognize each other by appearance and language. The aliens, as a rule, resided in remote territories and had a strange, undifferentiated habitus. Their presence on the border of an occupied territory was a sign of danger. The aliens turned into enemies only when they caused any damage. If it didn't happen, the affect of hostility did not arise.

According to Russo, friendliness, being an original ethos of the humankind, was superseded by practical attitude to the aliens who were the war game, subject to slaughter or slavery. Hegel explained neutralization of hostility on the basis of hospitality with the underdeveloped legal awareness. It is not friendship, but fair exchange that puts human relations into order and develops the notion of “humanity”. And for real, the popular law, still retaining hospitality, is gradually replaced with the law of state that formulates the code of aliens. The generosity being the base of hospitality gives its place to economic exchange. The newcomers must join this or that group and perform some certain functions. According to one old hospitability rule, a traveller was welcomed regardless of what land he came from. But gradually, the stranger turned into a citizen of another state, a foreigner, whose rights consisted of a mix of right and rightlessness. A foreigner was seen as an alien if he did not know the laws of his country of residence. At the same time the alien is the person no one knows. He teeters between being rightless and enjoying the right of being a guest. If an invited guest does not make any psychological pressure, since any person may once be someone's guest, an alien is not a guest of anyone, and, therefore, he looks suspicious and may become a source of fantasies. This is why Bahr H.-D. in his *Sprache des Gastes* analysed

the history of an alien's rights and concluded that they do not and cannot exist (Bahr H.-D., 1994: 241).

In Medieval Europe the right of guest was first determined by trade interests. In the Modern time, the popular right that accepted a guest's immunity broke into private and social law. It replaced the ancient law, established by the ruling groups to justify the snatch of prisoners. An alien is rightless unless he belongs to a society the rights of which are recognized. Right was monopolized by the state with a serious condition: an individual cannot be eligible for hospitality if he is a foreigner, i.e. does not belong to the said legal community. And even though human rights assume equality to the law, *de facto* the rights of an alien are limited to the asylum right. Despite that, during the war the aliens were frequently interned.

Since the 16th century, a guest obtains the status of a foreigner. Gradually, a number of recommendations and instructions on the precautionary measures to be taken against travelling strangers are formulated. In foreigner registrars, their name and origin, gender and age, profession and nationality are recorded. The first identity of civilians were recommendation letters. For the military people, there were assignments, stating their mission besides the name and rank. In Prussia, there was a passport-like document for migrants. In the early 19th century, Austria introduced the first common passport. It contained some anthropometric features, such as height, eye colour etc., all in all around 30 parameters. In the 20th century, an individual passport is compulsory; it indicates the citizenship that does not always coincide with the place of residence. The police keep a register of law breakers. If previously, only delinquents were to be registered, today the national data base keeps extensive information on each person, including their incomes and expenditures, job

promotion, biometric parameters and even the generic code.

According to the Enlightenment project, individuals may agree on rational basis and coexist in peace. The critics question the applicability of the human right concept established in the Western culture of Enlightenment to other historical periods and cultures. Are the universal human rights the mere Christian rights? The idea of human rights should be understood as the integrity of the certain and universal. It limits pluralism and non-conformism by recognizing the common efforts making up the general notion of humanity.

Two hundred years after the "eternal peace" programme declared by Kant, there appeared some international organizations of peaceful conflict settlement. The "peace-making interventions" of different sort doubt the justice of sanctions applied by international organizations. Kant denied the possibility of eternal peace controlled by a superpower. In "The Metaphysics of Morals" he distinguished between the community of friends and the community of profiteers. The latter is extraterritorial. For this reason, the right to trade in any territory does not mean the recognition of an alien's rights. As an alternative to imperialism, Kant came up with the right of guest (Kant, 1965: 279). Sociability is inherent to a person from the beginning as an anthropological constant. People have to cope with their neighbours; it gives us the reason to speak of a universal hospitality right. The idea of global citizenship relies on rationality that manifests itself in public conflict settling.

It seems like globalization has opened up some new opportunities of intercultural communication. In fact, globalization process erases cultural differences. It can be easily seen in international tourism industry, stamping hotels, beaches, markets and services on the basis of one and the same pattern. As a result, such trips make people more stupid, since they do not

learn something foreign, but forget their own. As an encounter with the foreign never happens, the world is still ruled by misrecognition. The fear of foreign does not disappear, and racism blossoms even more than before, especially in metropolises that have been considered to be the melting pots of nationalities, no matter how strange it may seem. The migrants form enclaves to stick to their rules. They see each other like enemies to defend from. As for the “indigenous population”, it cannot but turn into the victims of aggression that overcomes any permitted right to defence.

Conclusion

Right before the World War I, Russian philosopher N. Fedorov came up with the strongest concept of Pacifism ever made. He declared the beginning of universal brotherhood and end to orphanhood: let “everything be like your own, not someone else’s”. Unfortunately, the associations of people are based on organization basis, not on the affinity of souls, and rely on solidarity less and less every day. Are there any “organic” forms of unity today, haven’t they passed into oblivion together with the “old order”, replaced by more liberal associations referred to as “civil society” and “democracy”? Nation and the state are not natural entities, growing organically like trees on the ground. They are product of sophisticated

cultural technologies making up a system of defence, a shell in which an individual may feel secure and not fear the alien. The main thing is not to create an image of an enemy and not to fall into resentment. As an opposite to the common talks of Jewish invasion and Russian threat, we may suggest that the “kind Europeans” address their xenophobia. A real positive consequence of Asian migration could be the transfer of such traditional values as industriousness to Europe. Unfortunately, normally it causes only exploitation of cheap labour resources from the third world countries instead of healthy and cultural potential of the people not infected with European resentment and nihilism. For this reason, the problem can be solved by recognizing such an Alien, that lives and works by our side in a modern multinational society. He cannot be absolutely strange, unless backed in a corner by cutting off his social rights or forcing him to think, eat, drink and dress as the “state-forming nation” representatives do. The foreigner gets included into the culture not only through rational negotiations and political treaties, but also on the level of daily communication, best manifested in hospitality. We need to create such social spaces where people feel as a nation, an audience, a civil society, and not a mass as in a supermarket or public transport.

References

- Dostoyevsky, F.M. (1972–1990). *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy v tridsati tomakh [Full Collected Works in 30 Volumes]*. Leningrad: Nauka. Vol. 26. 518 p.
- Girard, R. (2010). *Nasilie i Sviaschennoe [The Violence and the Sacred]*. Moscow: NLO. 448 p.
- Kant, I. (1965). *Metafizika нравов. Sochineniia v 6-ti t. [The Metaphysics of Morals. Collected Works in 6 Volumes]*. Vol. 4, Part 2. Moscow: Mysl’, 107-438 p.
- MacIntyre, A.Ch. (2000). *Posle dobrodeteli: Issledovanie teorii morali [After Virtue: a Study in Moral Theory]*. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt; Yekaterinburg: Delovaia kniga, 384 p.
- Nietzsche, F. (1990). *Ecce Homo. Sochineniia v 2-kh t. [Ecce Homo. Collected Works in 2 Volumes]*. Moscow: Mysl’, Vol. 2. 693-769 p.
- Nietzsche, F. (1997). *Utrenniaia zaria, ili mysl’ o moral’nykh predrassudkakh [Daybreak: Thoughts on the Prejudice of Morality]*, *In O pol’ze i vrede istorii dlia zhizni; Sumerki kumirov; Utrenniaia*

zaria: *Sbornik [On the Use and Abuse of History for Life; Twilight of the Idols; Daybreak: Collected Works]*. Minsk: Poppuri, 385-508.

Said, E. (2016). *Orientalizm. Zapadnye kontseptsii Vostoka [Orientalism: Western Concepts of the Orient]*. Saint Petersburg: Russky mir, 636 p.

Ulick Varange (Francis Parker Yockey) (2017). *Imperium. Filosofia istorii I politiki [Imperium: The Philosophy of History and Politics]*. Saint Petersburg: Russkiy Mir, 543 p.

Trubetskoy, E.N. (1995). *Staryy i novyy natsional'nyy messianizm. Izbrannoe [Old and New National Messianism. Selected Works]*. Moscow: Kanon, 480 p.

Schitt, C. (2016). *Poniatie politicheskogo [The Concept of the Political]*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 568 p.

Blumenberg H., Schmitt C. (2007). Briefwechsel (1971–1978). Fr. am Mein. 485 p.

Bahr H.-D. (1994). *Sprache des Gastes*. Leipzig, 387 p.

Scheler M. (1963). Nation und Weltanschauung. In *Gesammelte Werke*. Bern. 6. 115-221.

Социально-антропологические предпосылки преодоления ксенофобии

Б.В. Марков

Санкт-Петербургский государственный
университет
Россия, 199034, Санкт-Петербург,
Университетская набережная, 7/9

Современное человечество сталкивается с новой формой отчуждения. Если раньше протест вызывала тотальная власть и экономическая эксплуатация, то сегодня на место насильственных способов сборки индивидов в коллективное тело пришли новые медийные технологии. Глобализация оборачивается новым тоталитаризмом планетарного масштаба.

Возникает вопрос, что же это значит «быть вместе»? Является общество совокупностью граждан, раз в четыре года принимающих участие в выборах, или нечто большее – например, народ, нация или просто соотечественники, существующие по формуле: живи сам и не мешай жить другим. Хорошо бы соединиться на духовной основе, как это предлагали русские философы всеединства, но пока время для этого не пришло, следует создавать более реалистичные проекты. Сегодня человеческие объединения строятся не на душевном единстве, а на организационной основе и все меньше полагаются на солидарность. Решение проблемы состоит в признании такого Другого, который не является романтической выдумкой, а живет и работает рядом с нами в рамках современного многонационального общества. Он не может стать абсолютным скептиком, если, конечно, его не загонять в угол, например, урезая его социальные права, зарплату и заставляя думать, пить, есть и одеваться так, как это делают представители «государствообразующей нации». Включенность другого осуществляется не только в плоскости рациональных переговоров и политических договоров, но и на уровне повседневной коммуникации, лучшей формой которой является гостеприимство.

Ключевые слова: этнос, нация, народ, общество, государство, индивидуальность, свое, чужое, друг, враг, ксенофобия, гостеприимство.

Научная специальность: 09.00.00 – философские науки.
