

# ФИЛОСОФИЯ КУЛЬТУРЫ

---

И.В. Гибелев (I.V. Gibelev)

## САКРАЛЬНОЕ И ТЕХНИЧЕСКОЕ: ОБРАЗ ГРАНИЦЫ КУЛЬТУРНЫХ МНОЖЕСТВ (SACRAL AND TECHNICAL: BOUNDARY IMAGE OF THE CULTURAL SETS)

---

**Аннотация.** В культурфилософии и философской антропологии положительное обсуждение культурных множеств вызывает затруднения, поскольку онтологический статус множественности ускользает от объясняющего и понимающего рассмотрения. Доступной в таком случае остаётся критика. Положительная интерпретация будет состоятельной, если сосредоточится на границах культурных множеств. Экспликация феномена границы в пространстве культурных множеств связана с пониманием соотношения сакральных и технических пространств. Они подлежат рассмотрению в пост-историческом горизонте, что изменяет онтологический статус их границы в сравнении с классической культурой. Два фундаментальных значения понятия границы, данные ещё Аристотелем, граница как различение-синтез и граница-предел, преобразуют связь техники и сакрального в гибридное единство.

Методом исследования является тематизация культурных множеств, которая разворачивается как поиск в множественности пространств, коррелирующих с универсалистской интенцией культурфилософии.

Новизна исследования состоит в попытке позитивного рассмотрения культурных множеств, образуемых пересечением сакрального и технического пространств в современной культуре. Такие оригинальные пространства требуют определения специфичного масштаба их анализа. В качестве масштаба и одновременно инструмента анализа используется концепт границы. Дано описание ряда феноменологических признаков границы сакрального и технического.

**Ключевые слова:** пост-история, техническое, сакральное, культурная множественность, множественность, машина и аппарат, онтологический статус границы, феноменология границы, граница, пост-апокалипсис.

**Abstract.** The discussion of cultural pluralities causes difficulties in cultural philosophy, as well as philosophical anthropology, because the ontological status of plurality eludes the explaining and understanding examination. In such case, the criticism remains comprehensible. The positive interpretation will be considered accomplished, if concentrate on the boundaries of cultural pluralities. Explication of the phenomenon of boundary in the space of cultural pluralities is associated with understanding of interrelation between the sacral and technical spaces. They are subject to examination in the post-historical horizon, which change the ontological status of their boundary if compared to the classical culture. The two given by Aristotle fundamental definitions of boundary (boundary as differentiation-synthesis and boundary-limit) transform the connection between the technique and sacral into the hybrid unity. The scientific novelty consists in the attempt of a positive review of the cultural pluralities, formed by the intersection of sacral and technical spaces within modern culture. Such original spaces require the determination of a specific scale of their analysis. As the scale and simultaneously mechanism of the analysis, the author uses the concept of boundary. The work provides the description of a number of phenomenological signs of the boundary between the sacral and technical.

**Key words:** Post-apocalypse, Post-history, Technical, Sacral, Cultural plurality, Plurality, Machine and apparatus, Ontological status of the boundary, Phenomenology of the boundary, Boundary.

Efficiency of the cultural and philosophical discourse nowadays could be found not only in the conceptualization of the classic cultural spirits but also in the research of the various set borders. They run through the culture and could be found in the transition effect between human and non-

anthropomorphic creations (like animals or technical devices), constant and virtual reality, different kinds of social practices and spaces. According to Anthony Steinbock, «borders, edges or beyond, even they belong to the physical or mental world, often are examined as the most saturated spaces, as far as exactly here

are found complexity, richness and diversity, nowhere else implemented. Besides it there is found highest number of challenges both for the physical and mental worlds» [1, p. 192].

What are the borders for the sets they distinguish, what could form their «own» and what they could be as the part of the set – all these questions open the research horizon of the phenomenology of the border cultural image in the modernity. Obviously, these questions require as culturological as philosophical interpretation. What even high (and sometimes right) was the criticism of philosophy in modern science, the logic of development of scientific knowledge requires a generalization, the implementation of which is the direct philosophical and scientific aim.

The issue of the border as the ontological phenomenon and, following from this, researching the boundaries of culture have long been familiar for philosophical and cultural thought. Already Aristotle had interpreted the nature of the border in connection with such appellations as thing, essence, time, space, and attitude. Defining the boundaries given by Aristotle in «Metaphysics» still retains its productivity without any significant changes. The definition at the same time distinguishes and connects, is a limit of thing for which there is nothing that would apply to itself [2, pp. 67, 119, 139].

Cultural definitions of the boundaries are diversified and contradictory (especially against the background of rare philosophical definitions). It means striving to understand representation of the boundaries in the variety of cultural spaces. Obviously, literary look over the border will differ from the point of political geography, and social community borders are depicted by a different way than in the worlds researched by topology. Theme of a new research synthesis, that is so fashionable nowadays, revives philosophical interpretation of the border. That is why it ceases to be a fashion and becomes a new scientific horizon.

If we assume that the Aristotelian understanding has the essential meaning in the study of the border phenomenon, it will be as same essential to make clear ontological status for a variety of cultural boundaries. In this case, of course, ontology does not imply the return of classical metaphysics, because of bicultural situation of modernity, located in the horizon of post-historical existence. Therefore, the issue is about ontology sets [3, p. 58-106].

According to A. Gehlen, post-historicity is associated with the end of the history of ideas and the collapse of faith in human and progress [4]. This leads to a number of consequences. Firstly, does not come an eschatological adjudication with the end of the history. Secondly, there is taking place the collapse of cultural unity, substitute by cultural diversity. Moreover, thirdly,

the multiplicity of elements compose the world of everyday life, turning into the main structure of the living world.

These changes point out the reality of the historical and post-historical existence border. It should be determined how extremely far they lag and is there any place for succession in the inside stretch of the border. For this aim, it is necessary to find out conditions for the possibility of distinguishing between multiplicity and universality, which is done in a distance of history and post-history. The formula that determining the conditions for 'possibility' reveals the reflexive position of research as clarifying the relation of the world and opening the world human being. In other words, the issue is about ontology and phenomenology of the border that defines the space of the human and extra-human, and the research of cultural spaces becomes a reflection on the border and the diversity of borders.

Research of multiple boundaries in a field that opens after post-structuralism, suggests the need to focus the theoretical vision of objectivity borders. Since the optics of the proposed consideration is made with the disposition of the historical and post-historical existence, insomuch the boundary of the sacred and the technical spaces serves here as generalized form of cultural diversity, and landscape of the illuminated sets appears in a post-apocalyptic form. In this case, the concept of the sacred expresses the transcendent foundation principle, which is an origin for the diversity of the world. The concept of technical, in turn, is intended to show the limiting immanent substantiation of nature and culture based on themselves. The choice of these two concepts to describe the phenomenological features of cultural boundaries is dictated by hybridization of dominated sacred forms of social practices and technologies of the classical culture, which compose nowadays the body of non-classical and modern culture. The concept of hybridity is intended to reflect the uncertainty of ethos of sacral and technical boundaries; it's mixed, spatialized state.

The concept of post-history contains the meaning of two similar concepts – eschatology and the apocalypse. Eschatology is the doctrine about the end of the age, and the apocalypse – the revelation about new time after the end of the temporal history. The term of a post-apocalypse now is used primarily to refer to the existence of the world after any global catastrophe: nuclear war, economic crisis, the final people degeneration, etc.

If the «eschatology» and «post-history» have philosophical and cultural interpretation, then the term of a post-apocalypse still requires complex research. However, by now it is possible to find such a significant meaning as the non-occurrence of the Promised

Land after the end of the age, ideas, stories, human. According to Apostle Paul, man and nature have already been saved and time of prosperity and salvation come, all the new has come. In this regard, Rudolf Bultmann says that the gift of the Spirit is given individually, in the form of pawn, revealing the real historicity of a man whose lifetime is the time of decisions and choices [5, p. 54-57]. Thus, nevertheless the history of the world has come to an end, finally she was saved. The presence of the Spirit in the history certifies that its salvation comes out of transcendence that turned in immanence and embodied in it. According to V. Bibikhin the experience of transcendence, available for human in the immanent is the experience of the border, which in this case does not take place in space and must not to be understood figural [6, p. 150-151]. However, following this logic, achieved by making a step over the earth and heaven boundaries the transcendence is not the valid transcendence. The border in the proper sense there is inordinate nothing of transcendent transcendence and its metaphysical measurement.

The secularization of history that is accompanied by the movement of the border through in the immanence, leads to transgression of the transcendental boundaries and its reliance in the cultural activity of man, where he is the only author bears the whole responsibility. According to Giorgio Agamben, the personify repository of this event nowadays is equipment and technology [7, p. 91-94]. Christian Kassung insist that it will be wrong to call «loom» the modern non-mechanical, electronic equipment [8, p. 164-172]. In contrast to the loom, modern technology, called by different investigators machine or device, is not a way to conceal the existence or to exposure openness of subtle.

The situation is exactly vice versa: machines and devices erase the boundary between open and hidden. Technology magic unspell the transcendence of the sacred and the natural world that turns to spelling immanent meanings of history. Possibilities of anthropological construction and historical aims of human chosen by himself, according to Agamben, have reached its limit. The boundary that separates and connects the various forms of existence, the spatial and temporal dimensions dissipated. If we can now talk about the reality of borders of cultural differences and the synthesis, than it is only in meaning of citations and reminiscences. The reality of cultural boundaries is preserved only in the sense of a limit – a situation when openness and concealment annihilate and produce output in undefined form – multiple hybrids, that arise in the fields of trans-policy, trans-economy, transsexuality, transhumanism. Agamben calls this transgression as «self-demonstrate beyond the being» and J.L. Nancy

gives the name of «ecotechnics» to a world condition, which consists war and peace, sovereignty and slavery everywhere and nowhere. Conception of this situation is extremely difficult, not only in relation to the ontological status of the transcendent border, but also because of the phenomenology of the border, describing phenomena of the border. The process of research here leads to «...the edge of availability in the phenomenological comprehension of the experience» as A. Steinbock says, points out that «the border phenomena ... are given as something impossible to be given at all». That could include a wide range of phenomenon: «non-conscious, dreaming, birth and death, temporality, another personality, other worlds, animal and plant life, the Earth, God and so on» [1, p. 192].

It turns out that the transgression as «overcoming of the limits» (M. Blanchot) and the theme about crossing over the border of impossible are as though closed in the limit, in retractable distance between overcome and unmastered [9]. In this context are getting actual philosophical and culturological ideas about the invincibility of insuperable borders of immanent and the transcendent neither in ecstatic of thought, no in religious and sexual ecstasy. Ideas of reality, that are developing nowadays about the new sensitive, resistance of «own» in things to any designing, expresses intuition border-limit that could not be overcome.

The weakening and even the disappearance of synthesizing and discriminative function of border in a world of technology exposes the absence of metaphysical essence with the apparent presence of something different. The different, first, is a limit of a distance (of conceivable and inconceivable, experienced and unexperienced) lying beyond the horizon of the transcendence, and, secondly, it does not necessarily have a sacred nature. As an example for this could serve a virtual reality, where technical capabilities increasingly match the desires and needs of the user. One of the major trends in communications, for example, of a human and a computer, is development of invasive and non-invasive interfaces. They demonstrate the fundamental difference between virtual technologies and mechanical machines, intended to cancel the mediation, to create the hybrid one from human and computer. Enlightenment program of full coverage and control of nature reaches almost fantastic sound in modern technology and science.

Especially clearly, that this is expressed in fantasies of mass culture. Therefore, in the film «Time» – a mysterious elusive and unstoppable time, suddenly, without any explainable reason merges with the human body – the flesh of time itself is now in symbiosis with the human body. For philosophical thought, of course, there is nothing unusual and new; Heidegger

had been directly determined that the time is the being, and with it has been spoken, that the danger is growing next to saving. The technology of self-explication of time in the human body is mysterious. How time manages to become a machine?

Agamben believes that Heidegger was the last philosopher who thought that the historic decision of being fate is as possible as a positive role of technology in this solution. Nevertheless, in post-apocalyptic horizons of a technical representation of time as the deepest intimacy and as something dangerous and determinative the saving one do not grow. Technique appears as the phenomenon, beyond whose self-realization endlessly lies its own nature. It could be said that this is one of the new qualities of the technical devices.

Another quality is associated with the opening of a horizon of other by technology, what could be considered in two modalities. Firstly, the «computer autism» (Baudrillard) and an obsession of modern technical facilities by themselves means a border-limit, beyond which the self-enclosurement of modern technics has no place. This place is vacant. Technique or history could not take it because of their subordinate to the logic of self-identity, that consists the idea of creating a perfect technical device, a perfect society or continuous economic growth. Their borders express a limit of self-identity beyond which there is nothing that would apply to the technics and historicity. The only thing that could be found beyond their own borders – it is externality, radical otherness from history and technology. It can present as a blind spot, which is known as an idea about, but not identified or stigmatized as nothing, placed outside the moral and ontological order (for example, a natural disaster). This blind spot is sacred space, «produced» by technique.

Another way of appearing of the sacred in the world of closed the hardware devices comes from the mystery that arises inside of the technical device – rolled inside immanence. The mythology of spontaneous generation of sacral could be represented as the sacred mythology of new machines, which contain the internal identification of a horizon, interpreted in analogy with the positivist notion of appearance of non-material factors in the complexity process of natural phenomena. However, neither individual nor social community could not be understood in analogy with the device, says Bataille; even if they appear as a kind of device, it is «collected» in the mystical experience [10, p. 15-23].

It seems that exactly in the paradoxical mechanics of «self-assembly» of a mystical experience beyond aura of divinity lies the understanding of crossing borders excess that distinguishes Bataille's point of view. Habermas interprets Bataille's diaphora of radically

material world and the heterogeneous origin of sovereignty as historically fissile event [11, p. 239-246]. If the sovereignty dies under morality and religion, it is a material thing produced by the totality of work-in-itself, and it is just a thing – beyond any affective connotations. This step, according to Bataille, was introduced in the Soviet industrialism. Things have no choice, than to become a material carrier self-fulfilled by sense (it seems that Derrida's idea of materiality of a sign as the carrier of sense and Baudrillard's theory about domination of material things now become more understandable). If originally item is associated with primitive energy of expenditure, by peeling off from the radical otherness of heterogeneous elements, paradoxically, it is starting the cause of itself, outlining the crisis of modernity as a rationally non-thematic attribution of the mind to the primitive power of the sacred. Nevertheless, the crisis, according to Bataille, is manifested as lack of explosive power of heterogeneity and must be invoked. However, there cannot be any ecstatic rise above itself in a totally material thing. It is assumed, that some ecstatic residue could be inverted inward the thing, that show us a Sartre's image of the thing-in-itself as a monolithic identity, quiet domestic bliss of the indifference.

In modern culture, the sacred presence is significant, it manifests itself both in theoretical constructions, ideologies, social structures as a concept, and in the things themselves, practices and spaces. It may be divine or non-divine sacred. It should be seen in the last as a missing boundary region in understanding of the technical world. Border of immanent and transcendent in the relation between the sacred and the technical space, as Bataille presents, is successfully described by S. Zenkin. He writes: «In nature, animal world, the living creation cannot distinguish itself from the environment, it is not separated by distant relation of the subject-object; animal condition is characterized by continuity and in the expressive Bataille's metaphor: "every animal is in the world, like water is in water". This state of "intimate" intimacy is also called immanent, not containing anything else, anything the transcendent. Transcendence appears in the world with the beginning of human industrial activity, with the beginning of the thing-production that is separated from the natural world due to which it is focused, projective character» [12, p. 136].

In the long view, the consideration of the border phenomenology is possible at three angles – metaphysical, genealogical and production concepts. There is only one border – between the earthly and heavenly, in a metaphysical sense, and it has a transcendental essence. The boundary of the transcendent and immanent in genealogical project presents in the world or

nature in a natural way. In both cases, both the horizon of other, and sacred spaces in culture are given as a natural inhabitation of man.

Production strategy submits other out of horizon of transcendence: standoff distance, distance, mediation are becoming weaker, they come to be replaced by non-interpreted and unrepresentative ways of the relationship between a man and the world. Of course, we cannot say, that the transcendent other is completely removed from the field of contemporary culture; it may compose any vital senses of human world and provide meaningful for art and science. However, other is divested of the author's voice and presents as one of life strategies among the cultural diversity. A similar situation can be seen in the post-historic continuation of history: produced hybrids seem to be scheduling the way to new possible worlds, but their originality is problematized by mixing of something previously existed.

Dreams about the technical perfection of mind and body, up to reaching immortality and incorruptibility, arouse the desire to get rid of the radical limb of man instead of the situation of divine salvation. E. fon Samsonov puts it this way: «A man saw himself as a divine machine, which, for its part, makes machines. Today we would probably drop the adjective "divine" and remaining is still significant» [13, p. 152].

The condition of production and rescue vehicles in this case, is the placement of the border in immanence. However, moving the transcendental location of the boundaries of sacred and technical in the immanence of cultural diversity has led to its dissipation. No matter that, technique is presenting its power similar to the power of the sacred; the most meaningful here is the accommodation of the border. The combination of technical and sacred spaces expresses the resumption of the question of subjectivity (liberty) of a human. Moreover, in the divine sacred world, like in the technical world, the freedom is seen as freedom from the forces of objectification. According to Foucault, «People have dreamed of freeing up machines. However, freedom machines do not exist by definition. This does not mean that the realization of freedom does not depend on the distribution of space, but such projects could function only if there is a known convergence between freedom and space» [14, p. 224-225]. We can say that a person's dreams about freeing up machines are neither more nor less than a reaction of a human that was awaiting for the rescue, but eventually realized that the salvation is dissolved in the history and care about him rests now on the producing machines, or on a man in a machine's role.

Ultimately, the radical process of historicizing the salvation process, paves borders in the culture not only

as a combination of the properties of technical devices and meanings of the sacred, but literally embodies them in its limit. In the post-history, the sacred and the technical are looking for self-conclusion in its border-limit. That role of the limit undertake a post-apocalyptic machine, which intends to continue the existence in the modality of self-conclusion. Therefore, you cannot say that a human exist in the border area of the sacred and the technical, but their achievement of its ultimate coincidence expresses itself the boundedness of a man in the modern culture.

Figurative expression of such an unusual way of existence could be seen in the sculptures of an American artist Chris Cooksey [15]. The main theme in his work is the post-apocalyptic machine.

The machine center is quoting of any known artistic image – «The Three Graces», «Venus and Mars», «the Virgin Mary», etc. Quoted grotesque image is reinterpreted. For example, Mars is holding a spear gun in his hand instead of spear, and eyes of the Virgin Mary, are combined magnifying glass, that is usually used in watchmaking. The space surrounding the central figure is full of technical details and devices, bodies, body parts, fragments of all sorts of things. Many critics give the definition of «baroque chaos of post-industrial Rococo» for this mottle wealth of detail [16]. If you look at the sculpture as a whole, it will appear in the form of a hybrid, in which are mixed various forms of existence from the animal, human and divine worlds, of inorganic nature. Simultaneous of parts and centers plurality and making out of them a single hybrid mass is strictly shared by the artist on verticals and horizontals, and has a clear geometric perfection – in the form of a circle or pyramid. The growth of figures and things reaches the hard limit, which transition is not possible – subject intension of the composition and sense saturation, as a result, compose the inside solidity of the plot. Such the plot, whose inner space and world do not need any spectators. The dramatic art of the created artistic image is focused on itself and becomes a closed space limitation of the composition – the border-limit.

At the same time, each item is independent and self-sufficient, what creates a space of autonomy of each individual element of art in a multiplicity of other elements in the whole sculpture. Details are not linked in a common horizon of meaning; they are rather connected as an aggregation. Each machine node presents its own history (the machine), in the general chorus of them is played a plenty of dramatic acts. Each of them is subjected to irony. However, the irony defeat the purpose of itself inside the borders, there is just a cruel inhuman world after the irony that cause melancholy and immerse in a state of frustration. In the post-apocalyptic world, the way of recog-

nition humanity inside the person is the mechanical mobilization of sacred spaces, which guarantees only the presence of a mobilization itself.

What is the point for the boundary of the sacred and the technical? Firstly, a function of distinguishing and synthesis is weakened and the limit value is enhanced. Secondly, such a boundary itself is a machine that produces copies of sacred spaces in the immanent. Thirdly, it is a hybrid. Fourth, such a boundary defines the limits of the metabolic processes circulation in the hope of some kind of immediate, direct communication, but as the hybridity of the sacred and divine dispose its border-limit in the logic of self-identity, communication with the other turns out as a loose step of auto

communication. Finally, the post-apocalyptic mode of the boundary of the sacred and the technical spaces is the existence in the cooling track of historicity disaster.

Yet, bearing in mind the idea of Walter Benjamin's frozen time as the gate to eternity, we can assume that the hope of the saving realization does not completely left the humanity in the post-history. The endlessness of the history, where does not come the divine promise of the new world – its implementation is entrusted to the technique, what means that the history and the man are saved, for this reason the discourse on the transcendental boundaries and culture borders unfolds a new perspective on a problematic of questioning about man and the world.

## Список литературы:

1. Steinbock A. Limit-Phenomena and the Liminality of Experience // *Thopos*. 2009. № 2-3. P. 192-213.
2. Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. M.: Exmo, 2006. 608 p.
3. Nancy J.-L. *Being Singular Plural*. Mn.: Logvinov, 2004. 272 p.
4. Gehlen A. *On Cultural Crystallization* [electronic book]. Available at: [socionavtika.narod.ru/Staty/Methodologos/gelen1.htm](http://socionavtika.narod.ru/Staty/Methodologos/gelen1.htm) (accessed 17 January 2016)
5. Bultmann R. *History and Eschatology: The Presence of Eternity*. M.: «Kanon+» ROOI «Reabilitacia», 2012. 208 p.
6. Bibikhin V. *The philosophy language*. M.: *Yazyki slavianskoy kultury*, 2002. 416 p.
7. Agamben G. *The Open: Man and Animal*. M.: RSUH, 2012. 112 p.
8. Kassung Ch. *The device-is not a hock* // *Logos*. 2010. № 1 (74). P. 164-172.
9. Marion J.-L. *The Idol and Distance* // *Symbol*. 2009. № 56. P. 1-290.
10. Bataille G. *Inner Experience*. SPb.: Axioma, Mythril, 1997. 336 p.
11. Habermas J. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. M.: Ves Mir, 2003. 416 p.
12. Zenkin S. *Undivine sacred: Theory and artistic practice*. M.: RSUH, 2012. 537 p.
13. Samsonow E. *Body, machine and art. Interview with Prof. Elisabeth von Samsonov* // *Chora*. 2010. № 1-2. P. 150-156.
14. Foucault M. *Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews*. M.: Praxis, 2006. 320 p.
15. Kris Kuksi official site [electronic resource]. Available at: <http://kuksi.com/> (accessed 15 January 2016).
16. *Estetico* [electronic journal]. Available at: [estetico.me/posts/view/mrachnyj-assambljazh](http://estetico.me/posts/view/mrachnyj-assambljazh) (accessed 15 January 2016).

## References (transliterated):

1. Steinbock A. *Limit-Phenomena and the Liminality of Experience* // *Thopos*. 2009. № 2-3. P. 192-213.
2. Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. M.: Exmo, 2006. 608 p.
3. Nancy J.-L. *Being Singular Plural*. Mn.: Logvinov, 2004. 272 p.
4. Gehlen A. *On Cultural Crystallization* [electronic book]. Available at: [socionavtika.narod.ru/Staty/Methodologos/gelen1.htm](http://socionavtika.narod.ru/Staty/Methodologos/gelen1.htm) (accessed 17 January 2016)
5. Bultmann R. *History and Eschatology: The Presence of Eternity*. M.: «Kanon+» ROOI «Reabilitacia», 2012. 208 p.
6. Bibikhin V. *The philosophy language*. M.: *Yazyki slavianskoy kultury*, 2002. 416 p.
7. Agamben G. *The Open: Man and Animal*. M.: RSUH, 2012. 112 p.
8. Kassung Ch. *The device-is not a hock* // *Logos*. 2010. № 1 (74). P. 164-172.
9. Marion J.-L. *The Idol and Distance* // *Symbol*. 2009. № 56. P. 1-290.
10. Bataille G. *Inner Experience*. SPb.: Axioma, Mythril, 1997. 336 p.
11. Habermas J. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. M.: Ves Mir, 2003. 416 p.
12. Zenkin S. *Undivine sacred: Theory and artistic practice*. M.: RSUH, 2012. 537 p.
13. Samsonow E. *Body, machine and art. Interview with Prof. Elisabeth von Samsonov* // *Chora*. 2010. № 1-2. P. 150-156.
14. Foucault M. *Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews*. M.: Praxis, 2006. 320 p.
15. Kris Kuksi official site [electronic resource]. Available at: <http://kuksi.com/> (accessed 15 January 2016).
16. *Estetico* [electronic journal]. Available at: [estetico.me/posts/view/mrachnyj-assambljazh](http://estetico.me/posts/view/mrachnyj-assambljazh) (accessed 15 January 2016).