

20. Shleykher A., *Basnya, sostavlenneya A. Shleykherom na indoevropeyskom prayazyke*, A. Shleykher, Zvegintsev V.A. *Istoriya yazykoznaniya XIX, XX vv. v ocherkah i izvlecheniyah*, M., Prosveshchenie, 1965, 1, 122 (in Russ).

21. Kondrashov N.A., *Istoriya lingvisticheskikh ucheniy, ucheb. posobie dlya stud. intov*, N.A. Kondrashov, M., Prosveshchenie, 1979, 224 (in Russ).

22. Zhuravlev V.K., *Nauka o praslavyanskom yazyke: evolyutsiya idey, ponyatiy i metodov*, Birnmaum Kh. *Praslavyanskiy yazyk, Dostizheniya i problemy v ego rekonstruktsii*, Obshch. red. V.A. Dybo i V.K. Zhuravleva, M., Progress, 1987, 453-493 (in Russ).

23. Vostokov A.Kh., *Rassuzhdeniya o slavyanskom yazyke. Izvlecheniya*, A.Kh. Vostokov, Zvegintsev V.A. *Istoriya yazykoznaniya XIX, XX vv. v ocherkah i izvlecheniyah*, M., Prosveshchenie, 1965, 1, 52-55 (in Russ).

24. Brandt R.F., *Lektsii po istoricheskoy grammatike russkogo yazyka. Fonetika*, R.F. Brandt, M., Universitetskaya tipografiya, 1892, 146 (in Russ).

25. Sreznevskiy I.I., *Mysli ob istorii russkogo yazyka*, I.I. Sreznevskiy, M., Uchpedgiz, 1959, 16-81 (in Russ).

UDC [130.2:572]:316.613.434

V. SLYUSAR

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Ukraine

INSTRUMENTS OF TRANSITION OF THE FORMS OF SOCIAL VIOLENCE

The article explores three forms of social violence: «mythical», «divine», and «rational». Such tools for the transition of these forms are analyzed in the article: provocation (when moving from «rational» violence to «mythical»), of the victim (from «mythical» to «divine») and legitimation (from «divine» to «rational»).

Keywords: violence, social violence, provocation, social stigmatization, legitimization.

ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ЗОРЛЫҚ-ЗОМБЫЛЫҚ ҚҰРАЛДАРЫНЫҢ АУЫСУ ФОРМАЛАРЫ

Мақалада әлеуметтік зорлық-зомбылықтың 3 формасы қарастырылады: «мифтік», «құдайлық» және «рационалдық». Форма деректеріне көшу үшін осындай құралдар талданады: итермелеу (рационалдық зорлық-зомбылықтан мифке көшу), құрбандарды стигматизациялау (мифтіктен құдайлыққа) және заңдастыру (құдайлықтан рационалдыққа).

Түйін сөздер: зорлық-зомбылық, әлеуметтік зорлық-зомбылық, итермелеу, әлеуметтік стигматизациялау, заңдастыру.

ИНСТРУМЕНТЫ СМЕНЫ ФОРМ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО НАСИЛИЯ

В статье исследуются три формы социального насилия: «мифическое», «божественное» и «рациональное». Анализируются такие инструменты перехода данных форм: провокация (при переходе от «рационального» насилия к «мифическому»), стигматизация жертвы (от «мифического» к «божественному») и легитимизация (от «боже-

ственного» к «рациональному»).

Ключевые слова: насилие, социальное насилие, провокация, социальная стигматизация, легитимизация.

In our previous studies we have analyzed the forms of social violence by proposing classification based on dominance of relevant philosophical elements in explaining the need for the usage of certain types of violence. There have been highlighted the «mythical» «divine» and «rational» forms of violence. «Mythical» violence is based on aggression, on monosyllables worldview mythologeme of a better alternative and simplified explanation of the current situation; «divine» - on the faith, here happens the sacralization of violence; «rational» – understanding by the objects of necessity and inevitability of violence [1: 2: 3]. According to social transformation processes «mythical» violence is directed at objection of specific social norms and rules, «divine» – at the integration of society based on the categorical perception of newly installed rules and regulations, and «rational» - at support of their legitimate means. In social transformations mutual transition of these forms is linear. These transitions are carried out in the form of jump and predict availability of appropriate tools of influence. We believe that these instruments are: a provocation during the transition from “rational” to “mythical”, stigmatization of victims – from “mythical” to “divine” and legitimacy - from “divine” to “rational” violence.

Provocation as a social action during actualization of the requirements for objection of certain social norms or rules, regardless of the subjects of violence – whether they are active members of certain social groups and communities or authorities, causing using methods of pressure, that carry a direct threat to life and health. In the philosophical sciences we can distinguish two approaches to the definition of the term. In the rationalistic philosophy provocation is understood as an action aimed at weakening of the control of mind over emotions, which leads to transition from social order to the chaos, and irrational - instrument of a breakthrough from the world of uniformity and regulations to the real existence and bright feelings [4, p. 11-12]. The aim of the provocation is to block or significantly limit the controlling authorities through calls to specific individuals through ridicule, insults, humiliation, ignoring of existing rules, as a result strong emotions appear at them. Provocation is a violation of social norms, which is intentional and is intended to involve the object into open conflict, at the same time it causes a reaction that discredits it in the eyes of third parties. At the individual level provocation encourages individual to the behavior (as to act so to inactivity), which is not peculiar to it in established by him system of social relations. At the social level it comes to objection of connections and relationships, it means that it is directed against the dominance of “rational” violence, against the existing social norms and rules, which subject of provocation is not able to change by itself. Actions of provoked object legitimize the use of tools of “mythical” violence

by this subject. If the subject acts as authority, provoked organizations appear in the mass consciousness as a threat to social stability, that allows to use methods of force to impact agents of change. If the government acts as the object of provocations, its actions may lead to loss of legitimacy.

Functionally provocation as a tool for transition from “rational” violence to the “mythical” is aimed to increase community of angry due to the inclusion of persons attached to the protests. G. Arendt defines the key reason for this, it is inclusion of hypocrisy, he actualizes the desire to “disrupt the hypocritical mask from the face of the enemy, to expose him and those devious machinations and manipulations, that allow him to rule without the use of violent means, that is to provoke actions of the authorities even under the threat that these actions will destroy you in order the truth came out “[5, p. 76]. Structural and systemic violence, that are inherent in “rational” violence, thanks to this desire, are concede to (as a result of provocation) direct forms, “true” image of power is formed in the public consciousness, that is the image of the institution, called to protect existing norms and rules, but which (hypocritically) takes a very different function. Firstly, provocation arises as a set of actions aimed at disclosing of the real functions performed by power, and, secondly, as the articulation of the need to change power, norms, rules even using violent methods. But provocation is not a part of “mythical” violence, but it is rather a an instrument of transition from “rational” to “mythical” because it has a short-term effect, while the mythmaking – long-term process. It explains the inefficiency of provocative actions under conditions of immaturity of “rational” violence, that is, under conditions of failure fixation of appropriate new attitudes in the legal system.

Provocation deprives the authorities of monopoly on the use of force, legitimizing this right by subjects of “mythical” violence. Thus, if an attack on law enforcement agents according the domination of “rational” violence is classified as a crime, as a result of provocation with the approval of “mythical”, such action in the public consciousness are classified as “necessary crime”, method of counteraction to “criminal authorities” and so on, later are justified as caused revolutionary expediency. On the other hand, the deliberate implementation of provocation by authority can be aimed at legalizing of the activities of relevant public organizations (patriotic, paramilitary, sport, specializing in martial arts, youth) and criminality. Typically, their main task is declared policing, assistance to security services to identify criminals and prevent crime, but unofficially their activities are aimed at intimidating of the protesters, creating a situation of dominance of fear and panic, leading to relegitimization of power.

To address the problem of stigmatization of the victims as an instrument of transition from “mythical” violence to “divine”, let us consider the definition of the role of violence in the mimetic crisis and sacred sacrifice to overcome it in the philosophical

heritage of R. Girard. He understands violence as a result of imitating structure of human desires. According to his theory of “sacrificial crisis” in the transition to a qualitatively new cultural and social system always comes social crisis. Its cause is “the loss of distinction between the unclean and purifying violence” [6, p. 68]. In the context of social transformations we can “sacrificial” crisis interpret as a period of transformation of “mythical” violence as an instrument of destruction of social norms and rules to which it is directed, to the violence for violence, to mutual violence. And although the “mythical” violence based on mythical thinking, which includes rational constructs, in this period, primarily, the impact on the emotional and volitional sphere is actualized. Such violence is characterized by intense mimetism that denies any possibility of its conversion into other forms without the intervention of external factors. The crisis is overcome through “sacrifice”. First aggravation of social processes leads to a “mimetic crisis”, the essence of which is the desire of all members of society to possess the same object. But during the sacrificial crisis the desire is focused on one object – on violence. It happens because in addition to the interaction between the subject and object of desire there is a third element – a rival, that is the subject, which is aware of another subject whose action is also directed to this place. Society moves to a state of universal competition, social relationships are formed on the principles of mutual violence that is overcome only in one way – by a unanimous sacrifice. Strengthening of mimetic desire and rivalries causes a mimetic crisis in which violence “all-against-all” as a threat to destroy the society spontaneously turns into violence “all-against-one”, thereby the unity of the community is recovering. The choice of victim is irrational, but it is always done with a particular set of alternatives that are fixed in the cultural code of society. So in historical perspective certain social groups are regularly the subject of persecution. Ritual practice of sacrifice received social expression, it fixes in elementary forms of recognition of ontological content of violence. And therefore, mankind has developed a strategy to prevent violence that occurs between the two subjects – focus on the third item. The unanimous violence against the victim requires significant unification, it means that social community members get a number of common features, a sense of identity. Then the process of sacralization of sacrifice occurs, violence separates from its carrier – people, and permeating all of their existence, becomes “divine”. The final act of approval of “divine” violence victim is recognition of his guilt, which focuses on itself all suspicions, tension and reprisals. Thus, during social transformations need to overcome the violence arises, which occurs in the approval of new laws, also search for relevant procedures occurs. The specificity of producing the image of responsible for the social crisis in the myths is providing to the victim the functions as object of violence, and transformation processes of the subject, ie, it restores, symbolizes and embodies the order.

One of the instruments of transition to implementation of “divine” violence is

a social stigmatization of victim, who receives public consciousness label “subject that carries out violence,” respectively, its activities also are stigmatized as violent, even if it is not so in the existing currently norms of the legal system of society. The main marker of stigmatization is “guilty”, at the same time mass consciousness is characterized by a lack of critical approach to establish the truth of proclaimed fact. Regardless of whether guilt is real or invented, it is made a significant exaggeration of it.

Drawing an analogy with sacrifice, it is possible to isolate specific feature of social stigmatization - misrecognition of role of violence in this process. If in the ritual sacrifice for the faithful act of violence against the victim is understood as a requirement of God or gods as the need to appease its / their anger, in the process of social stigmatization through produced in public consciousness installations, stereotypes, violence conviction (regardless of its form – physical, structural or systemic) in relation to certain social groups and communities is identified only as a force.

The point of transition from “divine” to “rational” violence is the legalization and legitimization of new rules and regulations, approval of new structures or relationships. As in the previous points, transition is conducted in the form of jump and affects the adoption of new legal acts which qualitatively change the system of social relationships. It can be adoption of the Constitution or amendments thereto, declaration, a memorandum of social solidarity or reconciliation and so on. Actually, the implementing of legislation is part of the process of approval of the authorities, the further implementation of which is possible only through violence, even as J. Bodin pointed out that sovereignty is formed by force and violence as major factors establishing of absolute power (*plenitudo potestatis*). But violence appears in a qualitatively different form – with mainstay of the conviction, addiction, coordination with existing rules in order to preserve status quo. Z. Freud, analyzing the relationship between law and power, replaces the term “authority” by “violence” and proves that, despite the law and violence are opposed, one evolved from the other [7, p. 275]. This is due to the necessity of combining many weak individuals against violence of one strong, right appears as authority of the community that keeps violent content in relation to any individual, but due to the nature it is implemented as the force of community.

Of course, legislation has a instantaneous nature, the procedure of entry into force of adopted new laws usually is clear, consistent and short. While acquiring legitimacy involves achieving social consensus perception of approved rules by large part of the population. G. Sholem, analyzing the work of F. Kafka “Process”, describes a stage of transition from legalization to legitimization of new social norms and rules as the stage on which the law “establishes itself, due to the fact that is valid (gilt), but does not means (bedeutet) “[8, p. 163]. In other words the law at this point is valid, but

devoid of meaning. The law may acquire social value, acquire legitimacy, confirming “rational” violence and lose it, giving to “mythical”. In the case of deprivation of legitimacy authority has to prove its own credibility by using physical force, that is quite resource intensive and causes increase in its resistance and self-organization. The history of the Soviet Union demonstrates attempts of legitimization of credibility of the Communist Party and the legalization of a new system of social relations. Thus, adoption of the Constitution in the USSR in 1936 involved the proclamation of the new socio-economic relations (socialistic) and the leading role of the Communist Party as governing core of state and public organizations. Of course, a large number of its provisions had democratic ideas, it recognized the equality of citizens in rights, but as practice of political life has shown, they had a declarative character. But the rejection by part of the population of the new content of social relations caused appropriate reaction of authorities – terror against the population. Prolonged use of physical force is not only wasteful, but also directed against the authorities [9, p. 58]. Therefore, the use of physical force in case of failure to reach goal (acquiring of legitimacy of the new rules) yields indirect forms of violence, the search for new social, legal and / or cultural patterns is occurred, then there is another act of legitimization. Thus, violence becomes an instrument of optimizing the social system: on the one hand, the threat of authorities to use physical violence finds no alternative in implemented changes, on the other – probable resistance actualizes the necessity for estimate a great cost of changes. This leads to finding a model that will be implemented and legitimized by least cost resources. Therefore, it should be noted that the adoption of the constitution described above was preceded by approved XV Congress of the CPSU (b) in 1927 The first five-year plan, adopted by the CPSU (b) Central Committee resolution about the increasing the pace of collectivization and dispossession from 5 January 1930, the content and conceptual principles of which formed part of its foundation.

Legalization and legitimization of new rules and regulations can be determined by one ways of preventing terrorism. But usually, these processes occur only after a certain stigmatization of social community, group as a common enemy, and therefore a new legal system, or rather amendments to existing include prohibitive regulations against “enemies”. So legalization and legitimization serve as not only the mechanism of combating terrorism, but as redirection of massive aggression from physical destruction of opponent to social coercion to exist in the system of new rules, where the last are deprived of a number of benefits, privileges and even rights and freedoms. But the operation of this mechanism reveals a direct correlation of the legal system from the main tasks, set before it by new ruling elite. As it was noted, one of the conditions of transition to a state of “war of all against one” and overcoming mimetic crisis is recognition of stigmatized “victim” of a new social role. In the case of its non-recognition, a new legal system performs the opposite function, fixing not how to prevent terrorism, but rather the total physical destruction of “enemies”. Particularly, exactly on terror as a punitive legal system functions Lenin emphasized during the

discussion of RSFSR Criminal Code “openly exhibit the fundamental and politically true (not only narrow legal) provision, which motivates the essence and the justification of terror, its necessity, its limits. The Court must not eliminate terror ... and to justify and legitimize it in principle, clearly, without hypocrisy and decorations” [10, p. 190].

In the history of mankind there are known facts, it concerns primarily the twentieth century, long dominance of “divine” violence and the transition to “rational” without legitimization the new legal system. This is primarily linked to political and social movements that received in the humanities collective name “fascism”. The violence of fascism, said J. Ortega y Gasset is not used for the establishment and imposition of law, but simply fills the cavity, replaces the lack of any legitimacy [11, p. 201]. On the one hand, in societies which established the ideology of fascism, violence and force substitute law, but on the other – fascism is not seeking to consolidate itself within the law because it is based not only on its own strength, but on weakness of other ideological movements. Thus, one could argue that this factor reveals the impermanence of fascist regimes, but we can see a significant duration of their existence, that social transformation actualizes necessity for strengthening the legal system, strengthening in society of “rational” violence, but inability of fascist regimes to suggest consolidating solutions for this leads to returning to the dominance of “mythical” violence and the search for alternative social and political movements. An important component of the legalization of new rules and regulations are theatrical publicity and their implementation. Let us agree with J. Ortega y Gasset, who, declaring that society is divided into those people who commands and who obey, stressed that “this obedience can be normal and prolonged only if someone from humble transfers inner piety right to rule” [12, p. 181]. Exactly pathetically organized adoption of legal acts, such as, for example, the Declaration of Independence, Constitution and / or amendments thereto, covenants, changes to laws, created in the public mind the illusion of participation and consensus.

Conclusions. Provocation directed against the dominance of “rational” violence to deny existing social norms and rules, which subject of provocation is not able to change by itself. But it through short-term effect is not part of “mythical” violence, but it is instrument of transition from “rational” to “mythical.” The most provocative event - a quick mean of destruction of values, that form the core of society, it is aimed at value confusion of individuals. Provocation aims to reveal the actual executable functions of government and articulate the need to change the last, as well as relevant rules and regulations with using violent methods Actions of provoked object legitimize the use of tools of “mythical” violence by subject. Provocation as a tool of transition from “rational” violence to the “mythical” which is aimed to increase community of angry by inclusion of attached to the protests persons . Provocation actually legitimizes the actions of agents of change, that the legal system can define as criminal.

“Mythical” violence is characterized by intensive mimetism, that firstly causes “mimetic crisis” (aspiration of all society members to possess by the same object,

the state of universal competition, social relationships are formed on the principles of violence to each other). And, secondly, any possibility of its conversion into other forms without the intervention of external factors is denied. The crisis is overcome by stigmatization of victims in the public consciousness, that leads to change of the dominant of violence from “all-against-all” to the violence “all-against-one”. It appears as prerequisite for further sacralisation of sacrificial, separation of violence from its carriers, recognition by the victim of its guilt, which focuses on itself all suspicions, tension and reprisal, and the establishment of “divine” violence. Transition from the “mythical” violence to “divine” is carried out by transforming the dominant social utopian myth, the myth of the cleansing sacrifice – the myth of the scapegoat. At the same time, social group or community which is stigmatized as a victim receives in the public mind the label “subject that carries out violence”, even if its activities are not classified according to the existing regulations at the appropriate time by regulations of the legal system and society as a violent criminal. Choice of the stigmata of victims depends on the availability of victim signs (signs that show a tendency to become a victim of crime in the future) in social groups and communities. Community with the following features in the mass consciousness does not appear as “other”, but as “anomalous”, as a threat to the established social order and stability, as “the enemy.”

REFERENCES

1. Slyusar V.M., «Mifichne» nasy`llya yak forma social`nogo nasy`llya u procesi social`ny`x transformacij. *Gileya*, **2017**, 118, 278-282 (in Ukr).
2. Slyusar V.M., “Racional`ne» nasy`llya v suspil`ny`x transformacijax Aktual`ni problemy` filosofiyi ta sociologiyi, **2016**, 13, 73-76 (in Ukr).
3. Slyusar V.M., «Bozhestvenne» nasy`llya yak skladova social`nogo nasy`llya. *Grani*, **2017**, 2, 97-102. (in Ukr).
4. Dmitriev A.V., *Ponjatje provokacii. Provokacija: sfery komunikativnogo projavlenija: sbornik statej, koll. avtorov. M.*, **2016**, 7-17 (in Russ).
5. Arendt H. *O nasilii; per. s angl. G.M. Dashevskogo. M.*, **2014**, 148.
6. Zhirar R., *Nasilie i svjashhenoe; per. s fr. G. Dashevskogo; izd. 2-e, ispr. M.*, **2010**, 448 (in Russ).
7. Frejd Z., *Pochemu vojna? Sobranie sochinenij v 10-ti tomah. T. 9 Voprosy obshhestva. Proishozhdenie religii. M.*, **2008**, 271-286 (in Russ).
8. Benjamin W., *Briefwechsel von Walter Benjamin und Gershom Scholem (1933-1940). Frankfurt am Main*, **1988**, 318 (in Germ).
9. Berg`er P., *Vlada, Peter L. Berg`er, Bridzhy`t Berg`er. Chasopy`s „Yi“*, **2005**, 37, 54-59 (in Ukr).
10. Lenin V.I., *Dopolnenija k proektu Vvodnogo zakona k Ugolovnomu kodeksu RSFSR i pis`ma D.I. Kurskomu. Polnoe sobranie sochinenij. M.*, **1970**, 189-191 (in Russ).
11. Ortega-i-Gaset X., *Do py`tannya pro fashy`zm. Vy`brani tvory`*; per. V. Burggarda, V. Saxna, O. Tovstenko, K., **1994**, 196-204 (in Ukr).
12. Ortega-i-Gaset X., *Bezxrabetna Ispaniya. Deyaki istory`chni zauvagy`. Vy`brani tvory`*; per. V. Burggarda, V. Saxna, O. Tovstenko, K., **1994**, 140-195. (in Ukr).