Birgit Menzel
AAASS Salt Lake City, November 5, 2005

Aesthetics and Violence in Contemporary Russian Literature

Introductory remark:

The topic of this panel is not about ideologies or dynamics of violence in Russian society, or strategies of resistence against violence in contemporary Russia and their historical pattern or examples – all these are no doubt topics of vital importance and related to culture. Neither is our topic the various forms and manifestations of violence in contemporary Russian culture, (related f.i. to rock music, mafia, drugs, crime, terrorism, underground, alcohol etc.). Especially after 9/11, October 02 and Sept. 04 (North-West Theatre in Moscow; Beslan). It is too big and complicated to be addressed within one and a half hour here.
My idea in organising this panel was to focus on one aspect: the "*representations* of violence in (contemporary) Russian *literature*". Yet, in this topic, everything is connected and no discussion is possible without being emotionally involved![1]

The representation of violence seems inevitable in art and literature for two reasons:
- It is a reflection of violence in reality and a seismograph of the suppressed traumas of society. The amount of violence in literature, art and culture, particularly in popular culture,[2] has been described as directly proportionate to the amount of collective nightmares and anxieties in society.
- (Secondly) The attraction to evil is an anthropological fact, and therefore the artistic imagination of evil and violence is an essential human driving force.

This fact is a scandalous provocation until today, in East and West alike. It has been rejected and denied in philosophical, sociological and political discourse; only by few individual artists, writers and philosophers, this scandal has been accepted and explored.[3]

The explicit, sometimes excessive representation of violence has been noted as one of the predominant characteristics of Post- Soviet culture; it is a connecting link of all cultural manifestations, which are quite heterogeneous in everything else.
Mark Lipovetskii has described this overabundance of violence as "*crossing the gap/split between the once official Soviet rhetoric of violence and the alternative culture",* which he considers to be a major task of Post-Soviet culture.[4] Lipovetskii has discussed violence in Soviet literature with the philosophical

(theoretical) approach of mythological versus divine violence, developed by Walter Benjamin, and later discussed by Jacques Derrida and Mikhail Ryklin.[5]

I want to focus on the connection of "aesthetics and violence" in Post-Soviet "literature, that is: language in aesthetic function" and try to answer the following questions:

How has the literary representation of violence changed in Post-Soviet literature compared to the past?
How can violence in literature be evaluated? How is the question of aesthetic and moral responsibility reflected in Post-Soviet literature, in the texts, by the authors? How can it be evaluated by us academic scholars?
Which role does literature offer in dealing with the Soviet past, in tempering the prevailing stream of violence?
(or more generally: *Which literary uses of violence can "do" what for which end?)*

To explain the criteria of my description and evaluation, I will first make some more general remarks on the relationship between language, aesthetics and violence.

It has been discovered by cognitive and emotive linguistic studies[6], that language itself plays an active role in creating the subject and reality, language can be a means to create and exert violence.
Modern literature has explored this power of language to create violence. 20th century Russian literature, from the Avant-garde to Postmodernism, has experimented with language as a weapon. The "poetics of monstrosity", used by writers like Vladimir Sorokin, Iurii Mamleev, Viktor Erofeev and others demonstrate the effect of violent language.

So literature c a n collaborate with Evil.[7]

But there are different stages and different motivations to be involved with violence, considering the basic ambivalent fascination, which I mentioned above. There is the rhetoric of evil, rich and ancient. Since modern times, evil can be seen as beauty, as a negative act of freedom,[8] which still refers to the ideal, even if its perverted. (see for instance Marquis de Sade)
One step further is the imagination of evil, i.e. producing images of evil and violence by collaborating with this dark force (for instance E.A. Poe, Baudelaire); this means to get involved more deeply than making use of the rhetoric of evil.
And there is finally the semantic-artistic organization of this imagination of evil.
In its most radical expression, there can be a rejection of finding any sense of evil: no moral judgement, no intention to even warn. This means, that no

connection to anything sacred or transcendent is possible in such texts. When it comes to making any sense of evil, the texts keep totally silent.

But the literary representation can also express the opposite of aesthetic detachment and moral impassibilté: a sacracizing affirmation of evil as a means to use total destruction as one final blow to wipe out all evil and with it everything ambiguous. The German philosopher Klaus Laermann has used the paradox term "mysticism of violence" for this, Jacques Derrida spoke of a "yearning for 'hyper-essentiality'". This literary representation expresses a mystical transgression to what others see as Divine, by using and incorporating the force of total destruction as a means to change a totally godless world.

In asking now, how to evaluate the literary representation of violence, it should be asked:[9] *How can this intriguing ambivalence be artistically addressed and expressed, without confirming and mythologizing violence or simply state moral rejection of it? How can a difference be made between the artistic fascination with violence as a humanising strategy,[10] AND mystifying, promoting violence by its affirmative reproduction?*
And how can this difference be identified?

In Post-Soviet literature there is a great variety of both rhetoric, imagination and semantic organization of violence. In trying to describe this variety along the criteria explained above, I suggest, that basically three different ways of representation can be distinguished. I will then bring several examples:

1) Literature can examine violence, by exploring cause and effect, the underlying psychology and the reality of the Horrible and Evil from a position of distance. This strategy aims at conquering violence by intellectualising it (examples are Bertold Brecht, Jean-Luc Godard, Alexander Kluge).[11]

2) Literature can portray violence, by trying to document it as objectively as possible, by showing/illustrating it figuratively, aesthetically or realistically. It can mean to get involved with its seductive force, but nevertheless keep the narrow ridge of ambivalence between attraction and vicarious delight and the analysis followed by moral rejection, or

3) Literature can exploit violence, by creating violence with verbal and non-verbal means in order to either deconstruct it or on the opposite mystify and promote it as a destructive force of evil (examples are Céline, Ernst Juenger, and again E.A. Poe, Rimbaud, Baudelaire).

In applying this general classification to Post-Soviet literature (by which I mean texts, written after 1990), I curiously find almost no examples for the first type,

much more for the second and the greatest variety in the third type. Therefore I begin with examples for type 2 and 3 and return to 1 later.

2) Svetlana Aleksievich (*1948),[12] a Belorussian-Ukrainian author, living in Minsk, writes documentary prose, always based on personal interviews, about people, who have been exposed to some of the most violent atrocities and disasters of 20th century. Her books on the nuclear fallout of Chernobyl, on the returning soldiers of Afghanistan, on women's experiences as fighters and soldiers in World War II., and on people who survived suicide-attempts in Post-Soviet Russia, have made a deep impact and caused strong emotional responses by a wide international readership. They have been translated into several languages and gained more than fourteen awards in Russia, Germany and France.
In "Chernobyl'skaia molitva /A Prayer of Chernobyl': chronicles from the Future", she describes the deserted ghost-land of the nuclear fallout as a "rehearsal for the apocalypse".[13] In "U voiny ne zhenskoe litso/The War has no female face", she presents stories of former women soldiers and partisans. Most of them broke their silence and talked about experiences, which had never been verbally expressed before, neither in private nor in public.[14]

Aleskievich's writing is example for **portraying violence** as a topic (not a device!). A radical pacifist herself, she writes from a position of moral rejection. By illustrating the impact of man-made violent acts, she hopes that her books raise insight and help temper the stream of violence, she hopes for a humanising, cathartic role of literature. "I am describing the truth, which is reality as it is." "I am a woman, who shines (radiates?) thanks to reflecting light."[15]

- Another author **portraying violence**, is **Liudmila Petrushevskaia,** for example in her novel **"Vremia – noch'/Time of the Night"** (1990**)**.
In these "Notes from the edge of the table" the narrator Anna, a tough Soviet woman in her fifties, tells the story of her monstrous family: how she pampers her adult son, who is uncapable to work and frequently arrested for alcoholism. Once he jumped out of his window to flee from the beating fury of his wife. Anna raises her little grandson with a monstrous, devouring love that makes him choke. Her daughter left the kid with her, while being driven from one chauvinist lover to another. She, too, flees from her all-devouring mother – "I hate you! O God, how I hate you!" – and later punishes her by ignoring the old woman until her death-bed.
This is a Post-Soviet portrait of a Late Soviet family: psycho-terror, hysterical fits, cold hatred and self-destruction, coated by hypocrisy to the neighbours and outside world.

There is psychological more than structural and physical violence portrayed here, rhetorically more implicit than explicit. As to the rhetorics, there is no

excessive violence, no 'blood and gore' in Petrushevskaia's stories and plays, neither is it spilling over to destroy language and narrative itself. Both physical and psychological violence is always individually motivated, each action has a subject and an object, no matter how helplessly entangled everybody is in the spidernet of damage done by individuals to each other and by the system, the anonymous society. But – different from Aleksievich –, there is no transparent position, comment or the slightest hint to moral rejection in Petruchevskaia's dramas; here the author is totally silent.

My next example is **Vladimir Sorokin's** story "**Mesiats v Dachau**" (1992).[16] It is set in a fictitious Post-totalitarian Europe of 1990, in which Stalin and Hitler both conquered and coexist. A Russian intellectual voluntarily internalises himself for one month of vacation in the German concentration camp Dachau. There he is tortured by two German SS-women (the blond Germanic Faust-Gretchen type and the black Margarethe), physically as well as psychologically, by being forced to lecture about classical and Soviet Russian literature. The gradually increasing torture culminates in a cannibalistic orgy of violence, the process of debasement and deterioration affects both the personas, the story, and the fascistic language itself, so that the text dissolves into an uninterrupted stream of unstructured hate-disgust-blasphemist-sexual word-fragments.
The German-Russian relationship is represented here as a sado-masochist mutual obsession, in which the male Russian subjugates himself at first to the female German, until all coherence is being dissolved in the metaphor of cannibalistic devouring each other.
In Sorokin's text violence is both a topic, and a device. As a topic it includes Russian and Soviet classical literature, seen as a force of violence. The story is an example for language creating violence, **exploiting violence** with a rich rhetoric using stereotyped words and images as well as an individual style.

"Ne nado protivit'sia gnoino-bezumnomu razlagaiushchemusia sochashchemusia krovavoi spermoi nasiliia chuiu totalitarizma, a nado umet' otdavat'sia emu naslazhdeniem I s pol'zoi dlia obshchego dela." (p. 9)

This story does not, however, mystify evil, but it aims at demonstrating the pathology of fascism, the unconscious connection between German and Russian totalitarism and at deconstructing the Soviet structural, physical and psychological violence (the philosopher Mikhail Ryklin called Sorokin the "idealiser of collective traumas"[17])

Other writers who experiment with **exploiting violence**, are **Iurii Mamleev Viktor Erofeev, Iuliia Kisina** (the story "*Margot Winter*", **Eduard Limonov** and **Aleksandr Prokhanov.**

Erofeev: rhetoric of evil as beauty, perverted ideal. (*Zhizn s idiotom*)

Mamleev: metaphysical intention to transgress evil into the sublime. However debatable, whether this is mystifying evil. **(***Shatuny/The Sky Above Hell***),** [18]

Limonov: mystifying evil and violence! In aesthetic terms more talented than Aleksandr Prokhanov, but basically the same type of representing violence. (Russkoe psikho)[19]

Aleksandr Prokhanov. In his novel "*Gospodin Geksogen*"[20] is an example for a text, exploiting violence in an affirmative, mystifying way, though much less talented as Limonov, demagogic, racist and trivial in its literary devices.

Similar: many novels of the formula-detective genre boevik, f.i. **Daniil Koretskii's** novel "*Antikiller"*.

Let me turn to the question, *how the literary representation of violence changed in Post-Soviet literature compared to the past?*

There was, indeed, a deep gap between violence in Soviet literature and in Soviet reality, which Mark Lipovetskii considers crucial. Let's recall some master-conventions of topics and rhetoric:

- Explicit violence – both literary and visual one – was possible only within the clear pattern of enemy-behaviour, such as war and civil war;
- Violence was also worth representing as sacrifice, especially self-sacrifice (from the revolutionary raznochintsy of 19th century (Chernyshevskii) to the terrorists of narodnaia volia (Trifonov) and the pilot- and partisan-martyrs of war and peace (Pavlik Morozov, the pilot Meres'ev, Fadeevs Molodaia gvardiia etc.);
- However, violence always had to be explained, rationalised, it always had to be identified with an intruder from outside, "disclosed" in Marxist terminology, even if he came from inside (the Trotskyite spy or nature's disasters: the Tungus meteorite as a nuclear attack)
- The topics and rhetoric changed in inofficial literature after the thaw (Mamleev's "Shatuny", Sokolov's "Shkola durakov", the Moscow conceptualists.) Varlaam Shalamov portrayed violence and inhumanity in the GULAGs, both explicitly and new in that no clear distinction between "own" and "other"/"inside" and "outside" could be made any more. In Shalamov's "Tales of Kolyma", the dark hole of potential uncontrollable violence in every human being appeared for the first time and shocked samizdat readers by undermining the ideal of socialist humanism. These were powerful literary imaginations of evil, but their semantic representation nevertheless still referred, if only from afar, to a humanist ideas – violence appeared as a perversion of humanity.

Its here, in Marxist literature above all, in didactic, socialist realist literature, where we find examples for **examinig violence.** Most of this literature is didactic, and I could not think of any examples in the Post-Soviet present! (May be you come up with some?)

The Post-Soviet texts and authors which I mentioned here, cover all topics of violence formerly taboed,[21] such as

- the wars – Second World War, Afghanistan, Chechnia, seen by women, Chernobyl', suicide,
- psychological and physical violence against women and children, within the family – friend and family can be no longer distinguished.
- in Sorokin's texts, violence occurs without any motivation and is impossible to rationalise; it appears as an abstract force contaminating each and everyone, being all-present. May be the most irritating aspect is the sado-masochist pathology, the lack of any distinction between perpetrator and victim.[22]

The examples have shown, that of the three types of literary representation of violence – examination, exploitation and portrayal – only two are explored in Russian literature today. The most radical and therefore most irritating imagination of evil is probably displayed in Sorokin's texts, where we are confronted with both the utter debasement of human beings and the lustful phantasies of perversion; while Svetlana Aleksievich's texts confronts us with the authentic atrocities and hardly bearable pain of victims of war, totalitarism, nuclear fallout, despair, atheism.
The 'mysticism of violence', as I have tried to explain, is cynical and as a reflection of the author's attitude morally and aesthetically irresponsible. Sorokin's texts expose the reader from the utmost aesthic distance most radically to the uncontrollable dark forces of evil without offering any sense, while Svetlana Aleksievich's equally irritating texts offer catharsis by insight in the better human soul, in confronting us with the unbearable evil.

There is a remarkable difference between literature by male and female authors.[23] The rhetoric of violence is much more explicit and excessive in texts by male authors (from Sorokin to the boevik, Marinina vs. Koretskii) than by female authors. In Sorokin's texts there is an abstract hostility to life, which merges with the elitist distance of the author (his Gnostic worldview?), whereas the aesthetically much less intriguing, if not simplistic texts by Svetlana Aleksievich, which equally face and expose the reader to the horrors of violence and evil, nevertheless express warmth and a vital love of life.

Reality changes,[24] the cultural context changes, but **definitions of violence and even the evaluation of violence historically change, too.**

It has been stated by sociologists, psychologists and philosophers, that there is a growing acceptance of violence in Eastern and Western societies. It is has also been stated as a fact, that we live in a historical period of inflationary images of violence. [25]
In Russia, as a recent linguistic study has identified, certain aggressive and violent verbal acts which traditionally always had a negative connotation, have been reevaluated and received a positive meaning during the past ten years, especially in certain areas, such as business and sports.[26]

There are more questions for me in this topic than answers.
So instead of a conclusion I tell an episode:

One day in the 60's, Salvador Dali, sitting in a Paris café with Evgenii Evtusenko, said: In my opinion, Adolf Hitler was the greatest artist of Surrealism. Evtusenko fuming with anger and replied: How can you say s.th. like that. You don't know the horrors of war and totalitarianism, but we know. I can't sit with you at the same table! An American art historian who was with them, jumped on his feet in defense of Evtusenko. 'As a sign of solidarity with Mr. Evtusenko', he said, 'I spit in your coffee, Mister Dali' – and spat. Dali raised the cup and said: I already had to drink my coffee with cream, cognac and liqueur, but now for the first time I drink it with the spit of a famous art historian – and he drank with pleasure.

Vladimir Papernyi comments this episode in his book "Kul'tura Dva":[27]

"Nowhere in Russian culture do we find an aesthetisation of destruction. The war and all experiences connected with it take a great space in Russia, but these experiences are almost always tragic. The aesthetisation of evil/destruction is only possible in a culture in which the artistic representation is totally removed from life, and the magic connection between them has been totally broken."

This is a thesis, which I would like to discuss with you.

Thank you for your attention.

---

[1] Being related to the more general question of "possibilities and boundaries/limits of dealing with violence in art".
[2] Popular commercial literature generally contains an overabundance of violence. But this does not necessarily mean, that all commercial popular literature mythologises violence and all high artistic literature works towards the humanizing rejection of violence. As John Fiske has stated, "consumers consume differently than producers intend"; there are a lot of hidden uses of popular literature.
[3] Karl-Heinz Bohrer, Das Böse – eine ästhetische Kategorie? *Merkur* 6 (June 1985), pp. 459-473.
[4] Mark Lipoveckij, *The Imprints of Terror: Rhetorics of Violence in Soviet Culture.* Paper given at the Harriman Institute, Columbia University, March, 2005.
[5] Other theories of violence and culture could be applied to the Russian situation, like René Girards *La violence et le sacre* (1979), George Sorel, *On violence* (on myth and violence in revolution); Hannah Arendt, *On violence* (1970).

But like Benjamin, all of them approach the problem from a philosophical, religious-philosophical or sociological point of view and do not include the specific aspect of aesthetics. Walter Benjamin, Zur Kritik der Gewalt, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed by R. Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser, vol. II.1, Frankfurt, 1977, pp. 179-203; Jacques Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978; Idem, *Gesetzeskraft. Der mystische Grund der Autorität*, Frankfurt, 1991; Mikhail Ryklin, *Terrorologiki,* Tartu-Moscow, 1992; English, Bodies of Terror: Theses Toward a Logic of Violence, transl. By Molly Williams Wesling and Donald Wesling, *New Literary History*, 24, 1, Culture and Everyday Life (Winter 1993), pp. 51-74.

[6] These recent cognitive and so-called emotive linguistic studies have been done both in Western and – even more – in Russian linguistics. See Shakhovskoi (1983/1988); Zhel'vis (1990, 2001), Kalzhanova (2002); english: Fadeeva (2000). For Law-Linguistics: Golev/Lebedeva (2000), Tret'iakova (2000); engl. Issers (1999). Conference Graduiertenkolleg "Violence and Aggression in Language", Berlin, November 2005.
As well as by modern theories of performativity (the subject is created by language).

[7] Karl-Heinz Bohrer, Das Böse – eine ästhetische Kategorie? *Merkur* 6 (June 1985), pp. 459-473; Idem, Die Ästhetik des Schreckens. Die pessimistische Romantik und Ernst Jüngers Frühwerk, Frankfurt/Berlin/Wien, 1983; Jürgen Wertheimer (ed.), *Ästhetik der Gewalt und ihre Darstellung in Kunst und Literatur*, Frankfurt/Main, 1986.

[8] Marquis de Sade; Viktor Yerofeyev.

[9] See Roger Fayet (ed.), *Gewaltbilder. Zur Ästhetik der Gewalt*, Wien: Museum Bellerive, May 2002; Peter Gorsen, Alpha und Omega der Schreckenslitanei, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7.8.2002; *Die Gewalt ist der Rand aller Dinge/Violence is at the Margin of all Things*, Wien: Generali Foundation, 2002.

[10] *i.e. writing against/offering to overcome violence by showing the mirror, banning it by virtualizing, aesthetisizing it*

[11] Brecht's theory of estrangement: showing what there is from a distance, in order to enlighten; to ban evil by reason.

[12] Only two books have been translated into English so far: Svetlana Aleksievich, *Voices from Chernobyl: Chronicles from the Future* (tr. Antonina W. Bouis), London: Aurum, 1999; *Zinky boys: Soviet voices from a forgotten war* (tr. Julia/Robert Whitly), London: Chatto&Windus, 1992; *Der Krieg hat kein weibliches Gesicht*, 2004 (*U voiny ne zhenskoe litso*, Minsk, 1985, Moscow, 1988); *Poslednie svideteli. Kniga nedetskikh rasskazov*. (German, *Die letzten Zeugen. Ein Buch unkindlicher Erinnerungen.* Dokumentarische Prosa, ???), Moscow, 1985; *Tsinkovye mal'chiki*, Moscow, 1991, 1996, 2001 (*Zinkjungen*, Frankfurt: Fischer, 1992); *Zacharovannye smert'iu*, Moscow, 1994 (German, *Im Banne des Todes. Geschichten russischer Selbstmörder*, Frankfurt: Fischer, 1994, and *Seht mal, wie Ihr lebt. Russische Schicksale nach dem Umbruch*, Berlin: Aufbau, 1999; *Chernobyl'skaia molitva. Khronika budushchego,* Moscow, 1997 (German, *Tschernobyl. Eine Chronik der Zukunft*, Berlin: Berlin-Verlag, 1997); *Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh*, Moscow, 1998; *Gespräche mit Lebenden und Toten.* Audiobook, München, 2000. Herrlicher Hirsch, gejagt. Katastrophe und Glück – Bekenntnisse zur Liebe in Russland, *Lettre International* 61/2 (Berlin, 2003), pp. 32-37; *Mascha und Nina und Katjuscha*, Berlin: Links, 2002; S. Aleksievich/Paul Virilio, Radioaktives Feuer. Die Erfahrung von Tschernobyl, *Lettre International* 60/1, (Berlin, 2003), pp. 11-15.

[13] "You sink into a totally different time. And suddenly I realized that we have somehow rehearsed the end of the world. And it really happened! When I went there with a camaraman, we walked for hours and hours without meeting one human. And suddenly a herd of porkipies jumped out of what once was a home for people. There are many wild animals there now. It looks, as if nature forgets man fairly fast (..). Suddenly you see, that nature gets along better without humans. And all of a sudden, I understood, that we Belorussians are the first humans, who have one unique experience. We do not need to rehearse this any more – what they call Apocalypse." Interview S.A. with Karla Hielscher in Deutschlandfunk Radio, 23.9.1997 (Translation B.M.)

[14] "I learned, that women see a different war, (…) which men hide from us and don't explain. They don't see this. A woman has a different perspective. For her, war is always murder. And in spite of all ideas, she sees, how horrible it is to kill and she asks herself, why men kill each other." Karla Hielscher, Review of "U voiny ne zhenskoe litso" and Interview with S.A., Deutschlandfunk-Radio, 28.10.2004.

Even in the 1990s, some of the episodes did not pass the censor. Thus sexuality, rape and cruelties on the side of Russians had to be cut out in spite of the author's protest, for example the episode of young female soldiers spilling their legs with blood of menstruation after marching days in the heat in boots, far too big for them, in male underwear, no napkins whatsoever. When the batallion reached a river, the young women threw themselves into the water, risking to be shot, while their male compattants hid in the bushes. One girl got shot to death in this. The shame and urge to wash themselves was stronger than the need to protect themselves. - The censor yelled at S.A.: "Where have you read such nonsense, in Remarque's novels, I bet? A Soviet woman is not an animal!" After the book was published, the author received not only enthusiastic responses, but had to face harsh criticism and massive protests – up to threats to murder her! -, which – most painful for her - included protests by women, who had been soldiers themselves in World War II. They reproached her for debasing, insulting and dehumanising women in war and the image of woman in general.
But there was also deliberate self-censorship: so S.A. left an episode out, in which a girl watches her brother, a partisan, who brutally beats an innocent neighbour to death with an iron stick, the eldest of their village, which was occupied by the Germans.

[15] Svetlana Aleksievich, Ich bin eine Frau, die dank reflektierendem Licht leuchtet. A Documentary Tale (tr. Rosemarie Tietze), Jutta Sauer/Peter Wortmann/Literaturbüro Westniedersachsen (ed.), *Erich Maria Remarque. Friedenspreis der Stadt Osnabrück für historische Aufklärung, Menschenrechte und soziale Fürsorge 2001*, Ostnabrück, 2002, pp. 51-62.

[16] Vladimir Sorokin, Mesiats v Dakhau (1992), *Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh*, tom 2, A Month in Dachau, *Grand Street*, 12,4 („Oblivion" 48), 233-253. (More Sorokin in English, *The Queue*. Transl. by Sally Leird, New York-London, 1985. Four Stout Hearts (An Excerpt from the Novel (transl. by Jamey Gambrell), *Glas,* 2 (1991), pp. 15-48.
Mikhail Ryklin, Borshch posle ustrits. Arkheologiia viny in „Hochzeitsreise", Dagmar Burkhart (ed.), *Poetik der Metadiskursivität. Zum postmodernen Prosa-, Film- und Dramenwerk Sorokins*, Munich 1999, pp. 179-186.

[17] Ryklin in Burkhart…

[18] Iurii Mamleyev, Shatuny (1978). On violence in Mamleyev Deutschmann (2004), Schmid (?), Weller (2004), (Menzel (2005).

[19] Eduard Limonov, Russkoe psikho, Moscow, 2003. Olga Matich, *Eduard Limonov: Making War and Love*, Paper given at the Conference: Post-Communist Condition, Berlin, 2004.

[20] Aleksandr Prokhanov, *Gospodin Geksogen*, Moscow: Ad marginem, 2002; Wolfgang Eismann: Repressive Toleranz im Kulturleben. Prochanov, ein Literaturpreis und das binäre russische Kulturmodell, *OSTEUROPA,* 6 (2003): 821-838; and Birgit Menzel (ed.), *Kulturelle Konstanten im Wandel. Zur russischen Kultur heute*, Bochum (2004).

[21] Even formula literary genres like Science Fiction did not have a subgenre "horror-novel" which was highly developed in Anglo-American SF, for instance.

[22] Limonov's favorite film is *The Nightporter* (see Matich), in which the German Nazi-torturer falls in love with his victim, a young beautiful Jewish woman, whose body he once used for medical experiments in concentration camp, and who is equally falling for him, when they meet by chance in their bourgeois Post-War life in Vienna.

[23] See the controversy about Ernst Juenger on the occasion of awarding him with the Goethe-Prize in 1983. Feminist critics' response: Renate Wiggershaus, Einige Überlegungen zur Ernst Jünger-Diskussion, *Grüne Hessenzeitung* 12/83, Dezember 1983/Januar 1984, pp. 33-35.

[24] Although the question whether there is more violence today in Russia or whether only the perception changed with the changing representation of violence in media, art and literature, is hard to answer.

[25] Since WWII, the "glocalizing" of wars (euphemisms like "purges", "ethnic cleansing"; Ruanda, Jugoslavia, Iraq, Chechnia etc.) and the electronic revolution (technology producing more efficient weapons than ever before and computer games training generations to be thrilled in the precision and vast number of kills, to see "the enemy" in the most abstract, non-human terms. A literal effect of this can be seen in the fact, that more than 90% soldiers in wars of the 1990s shoot to kill, while only 55% of them fired to kill in wars of the mid-20th century. Advanced technology is only the material aspect of it. See Chris Floyd, *Christianity Today,* December 28, 2004.

"According to a startling historical study by military psychologist Lt. Colonel Dave Grossman, 80 to 85 percent of the "greatest generation" refused to fire their weapons at an exposed enemy in combat. In the Korean War 55 percent of soldiers fired to kill. Today, in what the Pentagon sees as a triumph, 95 percent of America's young soldiers are ready to kill another human being." On the consequences of the growing acceptance of violence see Giorgio Agamben, *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*, Stanford, 1998 (German: *Ausnahmezustand. Homo sacer*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2002/2003/2004.

[26] Galina Takigawa-Nikiporets, New Technology as a toll for philological research. Some tools for a semantic analysis of the language of the mass media. Компьютерные технологии для семантического анализа ЯСМИ. Unpublished paper given at the ICCEES in Berlin, July 2005.

[27] Vladimir Papernyi, *Kul'tura Dva*, Ann Arbor 1985, p. 249; M 1996, p. ???.