

CULTURES, NATIONS AND NATIONALISM *

UDC 316.7

Jelena Petković

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Serbia
E-mail: jelena-p@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Abstract. *Despite the current aspirations towards globalization and universalization, and as a response to the ever-increasing superiority, dominance and the hegemony of powerful countries over the rest of the world, there is more and more support for national particularism, and the aspirations towards the egoism of national and cultural identities are more and more pronounced. By asking certain questions and thinking certain thoughts about the cited relationship (between culture, nations and nationalism), this paper makes a unique contribution to the discussions on this complex issue, while considering the following topics: the type of effect of the national cultural sense, as well as of the extreme forms of the ideology of nationalism in the field of culture; what role the modern mass media have in realizing cultural cooperation between different nations, but also in building national stereotypes and prejudices; can the projects of globalism and multiculturalism be realized but with the preservation of cultural idiosyncracies, the specificities of different nations and the sovereignty of their states; is there any danger or hope in the division of mankind into nations?*

Key words: *cultures, nations, nationalism, the mass media, cultural cooperation*

"As soon as a man rises slightly above national egoism, it becomes clear to him that a nation of itself does not represent what the philosophers called «value». Value can only be given to it by general cultural ideals, which could put it to use."

Slobodan Jovanović

Received August 05, 2011

* This paper is being published within the macroproject Traditions, modernization and national identity in Serbia and in the Balkans during the process of European integrations (179074), realized by the Center for Sociological Research of the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš, and financed by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

INTRODUCTION

The modern world-historical scene, on the verge of unstoppable integration processes of regional, continental and global dimensions, has indicated the significance of the national phenomenon, as well as the nature and role of a nation and national state as a historical form of complex social integration and identification. The world market, the establishing of international economic and political organizations, informatization and the mass media influence on the global level, the internationalization of the cultural heritage, as well as the development of a global, planetary awareness of people have lead to all nations, countries and regions of the world becoming interconnected and interdependent. These conclusions nevertheless are overshadowed by a specific paradox which mankind is facing today, considering that the unequal distribution of economic and political power has roughly divided the world into the rich and the poor, that is, into developed and undeveloped parts, so many people today are tempted to protect their national and cultural identity from neocolonialism, imperialism, economic, the political and cultural domination of world powers. Most post-socialist societies, which are located between traditionalism and modernization, are still "wandering" trying to find adequate transitional models and adequate social-political and cultural development strategies. Former Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union were caught up in the processes of fragmentation and disintegration, due to numerous regional contradictions, the deepening of political, ethnic and religious conflicts, due to their focusing on tradition and the past. Thus, despite the longings for globalization and universalization, as a response to the ever-increasing hegemony, dominance and the prevalence of powerful states over the remainder of the world, national particularism is gaining more and more support, and the tendencies toward the egoism of national and cultural identities are more and more prominent. Thus, actually, the process of world globalization has placed a great new challenge before nations, who are now facing new possibilities, but also new unsolvable problems and uncertainty.

Relying on these starting points, this paper will focus on the attempt to discuss several significant questions: what is the fate of nations in modern society; what is the effect of a national cultural sense, as well as of extreme forms of the ideology of nationalism in the field of culture; what roles does the mass media have in realizing cultural cooperation between different nations, but also in building national stereotypes and prejudice; can the projects of globalism and multiculturalism be realized with the preservation of cultural idiosyncrasies, the specificities of different nations and the sovereignty of their states; is there any danger or hope in the division of mankind into nations?

DEFINING THE TERM NATION AND ITS CULTURAL CONCEPT

It is quite certain that a nation, as a historic category, is one of the more significant phenomena of the modern world. Searching for the origin and acceptance of the concept of a nation, we can note that it was only at the end of the 19th century was it mentioned for the first time in the leading encyclopedic dictionaries of world languages (in 1893 this term found its way into the Dictionary of the French Academy). It is etymologically derived from the Latin words *nasci* – to be born, *nation* – type or race, *natio* – a tribe or people. The well-known French philosopher and historian Ernest Renan, as an analogy to the title of a lecture he gave at the Sorbonne in 1882 asked the following question: "What is a nation?" Drawing the attention of many theoreticians in different fields of study, this

phenomenon was defined differently within social, political and cultural discussions and analyses. Even today, the determination and definition of the concept of a nation causes numerous scientific polemics, which stem from different theoretical and even ideological approaches to this phenomenon. On the one hand, the French idea of nationality reduces the concept of a nation to the institutional and theoretical frame of a state, identifying it with the civil population, that is, citizenship, while the European meaning, on the other hand, looks upon a nation as a primarily cultural and linguistic community to which a person belongs on the basis of ethnic proximity (for more details see Stevanović, 2008: 93-101).

The national phenomenon has especially attracted attention in the epoch of the bourgeois revolutions, especially following the French Revolution, even though the national idea was in a historical sense present even earlier. As far as Europe is concerned, it is usually stated that the birth of a nation came about at a crossroad of social development from feudalism into capitalism, with the creation of a unique national market, when the processes of national awakening started, along with the creation of independent national states and the need for the cultural national identification of the people. It is a fact that all these processes did not take place easily and without conflict. Problems surfaced especially in those areas where the uneven processes of the political constitution of a nation took place in a relatively narrow geopolitical and cultural space and under the influence of the interests of the ruling classes and their aspirations for conquest. It was particularly in the area of the restless Balkans, following the break-up of the Ottoman Empire, that sharp conflicts and disputes occurred between nations (Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania) usually regarding the division of territory, where the national cultures of all the states were almost always in a state of mutual overlap and permeation. This, among other things, contributed to the creation of a specific "Balkan spirit", which arose from a variety of life and cultures of the Balkan people. In addition, the question of the guarantees and realization of the rights of national minorities often caused problems and was a source of national conflict in socialist countries, which led to the complete dissolution of the socio-political system, to civil wars and finally to the dissolution of the socialist federations.

Setting aside the political and ideological instrumentalization of nations, we could say that the forming of modern national states was marked by a spiritual-historic constitution of a national cultural identity, with numerous changes in the political, economic and cultural sphere of social organization. Aware of the complexity of the encompassing determination of the concept of a nation, we can agree that a nation is a specific global social community, conditioned by the historic development and capitalist division of labor, within which various types of integration of a single people are realized. The basic characteristics of a nation are precisely the elements of a joint community – common territory, history, tradition, a common language, and to a smaller or greater extent, developed economic connections, a shared life within political (state) and ideational (religious and other) communities. As a significant marker of every nation we can cite precisely the *national self-awareness* within the construction of a national identity, which includes the self-verification and self-understanding a nation. What this actually is, is the subjective feeling of belonging to one's country and one's people, identification with one's own nation and its cultural tradition, which includes the element of a national awareness. Connor (1994) states that nations differ from ethnic groups precisely due to this self-awareness, that is, self-determination, to which, I believe, we need to add the phenomenon of national ideology – as the mainly non-critical representation of one's own people, its interests and future.

When discussing what a nation is, anthropologists and psychologists point to certain features of a collective character and mentality, which develop from accumulated experiences, customary forms of behavior and history. Taking part in studies of the "national character" of Americans, the English, Russians and Japanese, Margaret Mead reached the conclusion that culture, in the sense of common tradition, myths, symbols, and values is of significant importance in the integration of people belonging to a particular nation (Mead, 1972: 555). The characteristics of a particular culture, created over time and within certain historical circumstances, indicates certain specificities which differ from nation to nation. Each nation forms a certain, special cultural model and thus a unique cultural awareness and idiosyncrasy. What is more, cultural theories of nation adopt the stand that a nation is formed through cultural continuity, that it is a community of culture, and thus that the issue of national identity is almost inseparable from the issue of the cultural identity of a people. Thus, in fact, the cultural national identity reveals itself as an attachment to one's own culture, which affirms the specific nature of a nation, where it does not limit cultural contacts, but, as was noticed by Anthony Smith, encourages the borrowing and adaptation of developmental models with the aim of regenerating the national cultural community, refusing any form of its assimilation (Smith: 1991). This can be confirmed by numerous examples of borrowed words from Turkish in the languages of the Balkans, as well as Turkish dishes, clothing, and oriental music, but also by the numerous technical achievements accepted from other cultures. In the cultures of Balkan people, we can identify a common cultural element. They make cultural communication among the Balkan nations possible, as well as tolerance of cultural diversity.

Thus, with the development of individual consciousness, with the development of human society and civilization, with the development of numerous possibilities of communication, people have understood that the differences between people, and even between nations, do not necessarily represent a handicap, flaw, problem on its own (which was the case in primitive communities, when it was believed that every tribe that was belonged to a different species). In that sense, culture is an important feature of human life which binds all people, but also separates them, enabling their individual, national characteristics, autonomy, but not self-sufficiency. Thereby the need for the adequate formulation of the cultural politics of each nation is indicated, which in the context of modern world events, via acculturation and other dynamic processes in culture, can lead to enrichment, modernization, democratization, to emancipation, and even to the preservation of the cultural identity of a people. Otherwise, each form of cultural egocentricity of a nation can have very serious consequences for the cultural and social development of a people in general. With this new consideration we are clearly on the road to raising a new question – the question of cultural nationalism.

NATIONALISM AND ITS MANIFESTATIONS IN CULTURE

The theoretical and research interest for the problem of nationalism has been especially topical in the last few decades, under the weight of the times we live in, evidenced by the numerous books, articles, debates and polemics related to this topic. To use the words of Elie Kedourie, nationalism is an urgent problem in current events. The historical balance undoubtedly indicates that nationalism, depending on the aims and the bearers of ideological movement, has had various meanings and manifestations. This has led to various approaches to the explanation of this phenomenon and its effects in, among other things, the field of culture.

An important segment in the formation of a nation is the forming of a national consciousness, but also the (de)construction of one's own national ideology. It is necessary to distinguish between a sense of nationality, and nationalism, which in its essence contains a perfidious desire towards the homogenization of a nation around a unique national interest, which usually has very delicate political consequences. Nationalism is often understood as a sort of national exclusivity and hegemony, depicted in noncritical representations of one's own nation, its interests and future. This, nevertheless, determines the unreal positive valuation of one's own nation in relation to any other one, often including the building of a rival national identification. Taking part in the analysis of Nazism, Miomir Naumović indicates that throughout history, the fight for German imperialism at the expense of European and Asian people has been founded precisely on the intellectual, and moral, supremacy of the Arian race which was considered to be solely responsible for the creation of human culture. A totalitarianistic idea regarding the achievement of the moral progress of mankind through the destruction of lower races and the extermination of other people was built upon the basis of the understanding of the racial superiority of Germans (Naumović, 2008).

Simultaneously, when speaking of political nationalism, we can also speak of nationalism in culture, even though some authors are prone to giving evaluations regarding the impossibility of their strict separation. More significant identification with a nation has taken place, as a rule, under critical historical, social and political circumstances, due to wars, migrations, illnesses, violent attempts at assimilation, etc. These circumstances have, due to ontological insecurity and a sense of being threatened, imposed the need for a more firm national, cultural hegemonization and have enabled the strengthening of a sense of group belonging. National and nationalistic feelings have found their support in the various cultural realizations of nations, in their literature, music, art, tales of joint struggles, perils and victories, in the building of myths and customs. It has been confirmed, among other things, also on the example of Serbian history, that national-liberational tendencies were often accompanied by a form of cultural egoism, the glorification of one's own nation through artistic creativity which has glorified "national heroes", and an unrelenting national pride. It is understood that every political community can to a smaller or greater extent be prone to evaluations of their own "divine origin" and the fact that they are "the chosen ones" with a lot of self-love, so this need not be understood as a specific or exclusive feature of our mentality and national spirit. Speaking of nationalism as a intergroup identification imperative, Branislav Stevanović says: "The dedication of one's own nation and all national mystique exist, first and foremost, as an a priori condition for making communal life possible, and for making existential problems a part of a unique common "destiny". National idolatry, like all other types of mythic product, was not built on rational premises, and instead, its primary interest is to pave the way for a future which would be as safe as possible. The fact that ancestors are primarily made up and that their progeny is far from being the direct heirs of a single ethnically pure group is of no importance – what is important is *the faith* in historical and spiritual continuity and it, as we all known, does not subscribe to the rules of scientific verification" (Stevanović, 2008: 250).

Nationalism is often considered a danger which lurks in the release from western cultural imperialism. Sveta Lukić thinks that "the nationalism of the cultures of smaller nations in Europe, as well as the cultures from other non-european continents, defends them from a classic western expansion, which leads to the excessive emersion of their own national values" (Lukić, 1981: 22). That is actually how it happens that in the fight for international cultural equality, cultural values necessarily turn from universal into national ones, and

become too narrow, only to end their journey in a purely political pragmatism within national borders. Cultures oftentimes fall into the trap of different political concepts, especially when the state or the concept of a nation plays a deciding role in the explicit, totalitarian ideologization of a cultural sphere. Closed cultures are created with rival national identification, which, becoming the prisoners of their state-party ideas, inspire nationalism, traditionalism, and question the acceptance of individual and national cultural diversity.

All of this leads us to the conclusion about how important it is for culturally mediated integration and identification within the concept of a nation not to call for national, racial and cultural exclusivity, homogeneity and isolationism, since then the identity of the Other, the Different, would be brought into question. It often happens that the processes of cultural identification, burdened by irrational conflicts, which come as a consequence of fatal unity between culture and nation, and thus of the reduction of culture to the question of national-ethnic identity. Due to manipulation of identity and stereotypes, culture becomes an instrument in political mobilization. This could lead to alarming degrees of ethnic distancing, religious intolerance, aggression or even armed conflict. Evidence of this can be found in the attempts of minority groups to preserve their cultural identity in those societies where the individual choice of cultural values, which is contrasted with collective traditionalism. This form of traditionalism is reflected in social forces which are loyal to nationalism and ethnic exclusivism. They represent a desire for the negation of other nations and ethnic groups, avoiding or completely disabling respect for their cultural and other rights.

Overcoming cultural nationalism involves, among other things, the realization of equal rights of all people to a culture, as well as the preservation of cultural differences in numerous possibilities for decision making and the creation of dialogue and cooperation. In the case of national minorities, it is reduced to the need to enable their cultural survival and development, considering the fact that in relation to the greatest part of the nation, they are characterized by special ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic idiosyncrasies. Thus, the basic minority rights in the field of culture, which are normatively used to support the principle of cultural autonomy and the preservation of cultural autonomy and the preservation of diversity, include the right to: (1) the preservation of one's own culture and tradition, (2) the use of their native tongue and alphabet, including their use in the educational process at all levels, (3) the exchange of information in their own language, (4) as well as the possibility of having every freedom and attaining right to special organization and action in the realm of the media (Kartag-Odri et al., 1999: 185-223). The realization of this minimal amount of cultural rights, which can further be operationalized, can to a significant extent contribute to social integration of national and ethnic minorities into society at large. This is one way of avoiding political unification and the assimilation of minority cultures into the dominant culture of the national majority. Despite cultural differences, and contrary to the monocentric, nationalistically blinded model of cultural politics, this could contribute to the development of mutual respect and acceptance within multicultural societies.

In the case of cultural production, it is undeniable that the state monopoly and national ideology, their dominance within culture, on the one hand brings material wealth, privilege and honors to "loyal artists", while on the other hand conditions the controlled and guided cultural production towards desirable ideological and other goals, supports the lack of critical thinking, lack of creativity and stifles free individual inspiration and creation. This conclusion speaks in favor of the fact that the effect of cultural nationalism cannot be separated from the effects of political nationalism, or in other words, that "via the sphere of cultural and international cultural cooperation, or cultural aid, they wish to realize not only or nor primarily cultural goals, but

also to use this sphere to realize more long-terms ideological and political influences in a more subtle way" (Prnjat, 1979: 22). It is unnecessary to remind ourselves how much the political and ideological instrumentalization of culture narrows, limits, and even disables the development of spiritual potential and the more versatile development of a nation. For this reason it is necessary, no matter how difficult it may seem, for cultural awareness, activity and cultural institutions to rise above ideological manipulation, to be based on critical thought, free creativity and authentic cultural needs. Only in this way can the culture of a nation, with the expressed tolerance and respect for other people's differences, realize a beneficial cultural cooperation with other societies and nations, and to include their own values into the wider, civilizational, universal, humane values.

THE ROLE OF MASS MEDIA IN THE REALIZATION OF CULTURAL COOPERATION AND IN THE SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT

The development of existing and the creation of new media technologies, which proudly rest on the increasingly more perfect telecommunication systems, satellites, computers, its majesty the Internet, cell phones and other media-technology gadgets, influences social change on a global level, which in the last few decades have been an increasing presence in our everyday lives, as well as in the lives the societies and cultures which we live in. By informing, educating, advertising, entertaining, indoctrinating, the modern media actually identify, (de)mystify and create modern trends. At the same time, they influence, among other things, a global connection among people, the building of social awareness, the formation of public opinion, the shaping or remodeling of cultural needs and the reevaluation of cultural and all other values of modern nations. One should be aware of the power of the mass media, primarily because they are an important agent in the formation (alteration) of moral, political, and esthetic attitudes, which can have a great influence on the shaping of public opinion thanks to the power of persuasion. Thus, considering the fact that communication via the media represents an essential factor in the realization of the process of globalization, the need to take into consideration and emphasize its role in the creation of a modern global community and the realization of the concept of the so-called planetary culture is imposed.

If we start to look for the determination formation which determines the role of the mass media in the modern world, we cannot omit the sequence of negative effects and influences which it realizes. We are primarily referring to the mystification of modern society by means of the media, to the realization of cultural neocolonialism and imperialism, to the creation of artificial needs, the acceptance and placement of culturally and artistically worthless contents with the desire of establishing contact with as great a public as possible, etc. It is a fact that the ownership of the media is limited, and that the mass media are mostly ruled by the state, large political or business interest groups, which supervise, control, guide and dictate the content of mass communication, which is reason enough for us to conclude that the abuse of the media today is possible and present.

It is thus quite certain that many nations today are endangered precisely by media manipulation, which is reflected in a characteristic indoctrination of ideas, in the ideological-political attempt to use the mass media to impose certain conclusions, beliefs and modes of behavior. Abuse of the media can have its own implications within a nation or a culture (in the afore mentioned media encouragement of nationalist tendencies and visions, revenge, in further problems regarding the question and fate of national minorities and the like), but abuse can also be occur in international relations, on a wider international plan. This of course can cause very

problematic consequences for the image or picture which is built of a nation in the world, and then for its overall development and position in the international system. Non-objective and untrue information disseminated in the mass media, under the control and guidance of the world's most powerful groups or countries, can be involved indirectly in many international conflicts and crises, supporting thus questionable national ideas and interests or creating national or even nationalistic stereotypes. In this way the media to a great extent contribute to the creation of simplified and value-colored representations of certain nations, which can breed intolerance, even hatred and the contempt of the world.

As an illustration of the abovementioned we can cite the activities of the western media institutions during the war in the former Yugoslavia, as well as on the territory of Kosovo and Metohija. It is quite certain that some of the world's powerful media did not give comprehensive and objective coverage of the events in the war-torn area to the world-wide public, and that the essence of many events were clouded, and many truths about Serbs (regarding their tragedies, the desecration of Serbian churches, monasteries, and other cultural edifices) were silenced, which led to a biased interpretation of the inter-ethnic conflicts in our part of the world. That is actually how the creators the new world order, with the help of a very powerful Albanian world-wide lobby, mainly by means of the media, managed to build a unique stereotype about the Serbian nation. The Serbs were projected in the media as brutes, primitive people, villains, people prone to aggression and the like. At the basis of this, as in the case of many other national stereotypes, there lies an incorrect and mainly unjustifiable overgeneralization, which explicitly or implicitly can be a mediator in endangering the position of one nation and its national identity. Within the context of modern day occurrences in the world, focused on overcoming national and state borders, it turns out that the Serbian nation does not have an easy task – by designing adequate state-national and cultural policies it should block out the many absurdities about itself, and to "earn" international support in its endeavors to be included in modern civilization trends.

The question which this chapter only touches upon, but which has to do with the role of the mass media in the creation of modern society, and the fostering of cultural cooperation, the creation and launch of national and nationalistic stereotypes, and thus a possible endangering of the position of certain nation and their cultures, demands, naturally, a more detailed explanation and analysis. What remains, thus, is the need to repeatedly, time and time again, evaluate the power of the mass media not only in forming national attitudes and behavior, but also in the shaping of our representations of cultural norms and values, in the desire to allow the mass media to avoid the unfavorable and socially disintegrating aspects of modern society.

CULTURAL COOPERATION AS A MODERN CHALLENGE FOR NATIONS

In the context of modern current events, solidarity, cooperation, the permeating and intertwining of cultures in all their variety is being imposed more and more as a fundamental need. That is why the postulation of the thesis regarding the justification of the existence of society, that is, national communities, which finds its justification solely in self-sufficiency. The survival of these societies and nations in conservative, closed economic, political, cultural and other relations is seriously endangered, and what is more, is even rendered impossible. We can note that international relations and clashes of cultures are today becoming more and more current and more important for getting to know and creating cultural and general social reality.

Unlike the numerous historical examples of cultural imperialism, which sometimes takes place latently and sometimes very directly, in the form of an open assimilation of mainly small nations right when they are starting to attain their national self-awareness, we could say that in the sphere of contemporary cultural policy we can note significant changes, which, primarily, refer to the creation of the concept and policy of multiculturalism. Dealing with this issue, Andrea Semprini indicates that multiculturalism represents an idea or ideal of the harmonious co-existence of various ethnic and cultural groups within a pluralistic society. He further states that, starting from the right to differ, multiculturalism surpasses the specificity of each individual national context and extends to all contemporary societies "a grandiose civilizational challenge" (Semprini, 1999). This is why the politics of multiculturalism invite various nations, various ethnic groups to have more pronounced tolerance towards cultural diversity and to build their relationship with other nations and their cultures on the possibility of community, co-operation and co-existence.

Modern, democracy-based cultural policies, among other things, demand the development of an awareness of the new relationship between the national and the universal in culture, which requires that cultural values, even though created in the context of various national cultures, be understood and accepted as a part of universal movements and a general civilizational development. It then turns out that the increasingly present process of regional, continental and planetary integration and globalization imposes the necessity for overcoming every form of national parochialism, and at the same time for the support of intercultural cooperation, that is, the concept of a multicultural society. This conclusion, nevertheless, opens up a completely new question, and once we attempt to answer it we go straight to the center of the problem of multiculturalism, and that is: does multiculturalism negate the context of the national, that is, can we live in a multicultural society and not lose our national identity, our idiosyncrasy, can we not reject or annul our own tradition?

That opinions of modern theorists are divided in terms of the possible consequences and effects of the intertwining of cultures is obvious, as is the possibility of co-existence of various nations in just one space. On the one hand, a certain conservatism is expressed in the lack of trust of any form of cultural ties, and thus also the doubt of all cultural values and influences which come from outside. This is mainly determined by a sort of fear of losing one's own being and national idiosyncrasy, of the possible stifling and loss of values of some other more developed culture, which is usually justified by national and cultural interests. In accordance, it is believed that a multicultural society can endanger the identity of certain nations, due to manipulation and abuse of social and economic power, as well as the excessive domination of certain countries and nations in the world. The proponents of these ideas usually cite examples of violently carried out acculturations (which include various forms of coercion) and which may as a consequence lead not only to resistance, but also the complete disappearance of another culture. There are many examples of forced acculturation throughout history (Hitler's unhidden desire to Germanize the entire world), but, to be honest, there are some examples in the modern world as well (different forms of neocolonialism), which make the proponents of this type of thought ever more convinced that their opinion is right. There are certain authors who openly express their pessimistic attitude, emphasizing that the cultural differences between people in the world will inevitably turn out to be a source of conflict and clashes between civilizations (Huntington, 1996; Janjić, 1991).

On the other hand, many theoreticians warn us that overcoming cultural differences is necessary, and that the wealth of various nations and their cultures does not have to a priori

be guided by conflict and division, and thus that multiculturalism is not only a challenge, but more a necessity of modern society. In this context, the closed-off nature of cultures, their egocentricity, international and intercultural exclusivity are evaluated as absolutely unjustified, antiquated, egoistic, and finally even degoutant. This is primarily because communication and cooperation between nations does not destroy the inevitable cultural specificities or cultural "matrices" of both or several cultures which permeate it. In this process, the national element is not lost, and need not be lost; what is more, it plays an important role in the declaration of various cultures. Theoreticians of this orientation point out that the politics of multiculturalism is all the more necessary if we accept the fact that one culture can be considered more developed and prosperous the more democratic it is, the more open it is and more prepared to accept and modify universal values of culture to fit its own needs.

Irrespective of the pronounced fears of many theoreticians regarding the realization of the concept of multiculturalism, which are supported by many antiglobalists, emphasizing that the Americanization of the world is underway in a neo-colonial form, we can still say that the dynamic nature of the world is reflected precisely in their intertwining, their cooperation and how they complete one another, which of course gives us the right to negate the possibility of various altercations, divisions or misunderstandings. This type of discussion, undoubtedly, leads us to consider the political and cultural circumstances in the Balkans, which, maybe more than in any other area, has always been the cradle of various people, religions, races, different cultural identities. Long-term co-existence in this field has led to permanent cultural contacts, mutual influence and the intertwining of different nations, which has depicted the Balkans as a multicultural space *par excellence*. Cultural co-habitation in the Balkans has unfortunately in the past few years experienced its political opposition, and thus the rich variety has served not as the basis of the eurointegrations of the Balkans, but as the basis for the dissolution and clashes between various nations.

The dramatic events in the sphere of international relations, which took place here and in many other areas, remind us of the need to reevaluate all the political concepts to date and not to reject all those ideas which hinder the common cultural, and any other, existence of various nations on one territory, and even in the entire world. A richer cultural future could only be imagined in a pluralistic form, which alludes to the need to preserve peace and safety in the world by improving cooperation among people, their mutual familiarity and understanding, with the simultaneous preservation of what is specific and recognizable in every national culture.

CONCLUSION

The question of the fate of nations in the modern world has caused an apparent standstill between concrete attitudes and evaluations of certain theoreticians who are dealing with this phenomenon, even though the possibilities up to date and the ability for scientific prediction on this issue have proven to be very difficult. Objective contradictions are conditioned by the uneven development and different positions of nations in the world, and have lead theoreticians to very pessimistic evaluations of the future of a nation. As long as there are nations and national divisions in the world, the state of harmony in international relations, which should exclude and overcome any conflicts and confrontations between opposing national interests, is something that is unattainable in the modern world. This, then, develops the idea of the inevitable conflict between civilizations (S. Huntington), of the prevention of cultural integrations, of cultural and all other types of conflict among nations, and thus the creation of so-called marginal personali-

ties (R. Park) due to the cultural shocks to which many nations are exposed. On the other hand, there are also those predictions which point out that, before the onset of the continental and world integration processes, nations and national states will completely disappear from the modern world-historical scene. It is nevertheless quite certain that the current, dramatic events in the sphere of international relations have absolutely refuted these evaluations, considering that national problems, now more than ever, have been imposed upon the modern world. Some theoreticians on the other hand, place all their hopes on modern society gaining all the feature of a multicultural society, in which the fortunes of various nations and cultures will be based on mutual tolerance, understanding and coexistence. In the context of all the aforementioned opinions, we can agree with the evaluation of Anthony Smith that there is both danger and hope in the division of mankind into nations, and in the perseverance of the power of the national identity the world over. Whatever the fate of a nation, one thing is for sure – in order to overcome existing contradictions, for adequate development and prosperity, for supporting cultural and all other types of cooperation, what is primarily needed is a mature, critical and at the same time self-critical awareness and self-awareness of nations.

The modern cultural policy of every nation, in its desire to affirm its authentic national and cultural identity under the threat of many influences which could lead to cultural domination of world powers, must find the way to overcome nationalism, to reject the prejudice about its own national culture and tradition, to overcome nationalist parochialism and its closed-off state. There is no doubt that cultural exclusivity, xenophobia, isolationism, lead nations into the process of cultural stagnation, while the openness of cultures, the expansions of mutual influences and cooperation is a need which imposes itself all the more, by the fact that it conditions every detail in the development of national cultures, their enrichment and promotion, as well as the positioning of one's own national cultural values into the context of wider, universal cultural values. At the same time of course, it is necessary for cultural policy to be focused on the strengthening and preservation of one's own cultural identity, which in the long run would support and enable creative and stimulating international relations.

It has been shown that modern day means of mass communication can to a great extent support and enable these processes of connection and cooperation between nations, considering that the cultural identity of various ethnic communities, among other things, is also confirmed by the use of new methods and means of expression and communication. Abuse of the media in the realization of political and ideological interests of certain nations warns us about the great responsibility which the mass media have been assigned in the modern world, since they not only transfer and spread information and cultural formations, but also select and create their content.

Thus, multiculturalism with expressed tolerance, intercultural cooperation and a peaceful intertwining of cultures with a tendency of preserving one's own national and cultural specificity, is imposed as an ideal towards which the world should strive. This is something that every nation needs to know, in order for us to have a peaceful present and a certain, progressive future. Otherwise, every political, ideationally manipulated cultural and national idea, without tolerance and respect for other people's differences, will guide us into the destabilization of global world relationships and into an uncertain tomorrow.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, Benedikt, *Nacija: zamišljena zajednica*, Plato, Beograd, 1998.
2. Božilović, Nikola, *Globalizacija kao nova akulturacija*, u: Globalizacija, akulturacija i identiteti na Balkanu, Filozofski fakultet – Institut za sociologiju, Niš, 2003.
3. Butigan, Vjekoslav, *Kulturna politika kao deo strategije razvoja Balkana, strategija razvoja i procesi regionalne saradnje na Balkanu*, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, 2000.
4. Connor, Walker, *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.
5. Đokić, Radoslav, *Prožimanje kultura*, Univerzitet umetnosti u Beogradu, Beograd, 1976.
6. Fukujama, Frensis, *Sudar kultura*, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika i nastavnih sredstava, Beograd, 1997.
7. Gidens, Entoni, *Posledice modernosti*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 1998.
8. Grupa autora, *Enciklopedija političke kulture*, Savremena administracija, Beograd, 1993.
9. Grupa autora, *Sociološki leksikon*, Savremena administracija, Beograd, 1982.
10. Huntington, Semjuel, *Sukob civilizacija i vaspostavljanje svetskog poretka*, CID, Podgorica, 1996.
11. Janjić, Dušan, *Pretnje novog rasizma*, Vreme, br. 53, 1991, str. 48-49.
12. Kale, Eduard, *Uvod u znanost o kulturi*, Čkolska knjiga, Zagreb, 1977.
13. Kartag-Odri, A., Milinković, B., Simović-Hiber, I., «Manjinska prava u oblasti kulture», u: *Kulturna prava*, Beogradski centar za ljudska prava, Beograd, 1999., s. 185 – 223.
14. Keduri, Eli, *Nacionalizam*, CID, Podgorica, 2000.
15. Lukić, Sveta, *Kultura među narodima*, Radnička štampa, Beograd, 1981.
16. Mid, Margaret, *Nacionalni karakter*, u: Antropologija danas (Zbornik), Vuk Karadžić, Beograd, 1972. s. 555.
17. Mitrović, Ljubiša, *Savremeno društvo*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, 1996.
18. Naisbiitt, John, *Megatrendovi*, Globus, Zagreb, 1985.
19. Naumović, Miomir, *Lice nacizma, Harizmatiski politički vođa i njegovi sledbenici*, Studentski kulturni centar, Niš, 2008.
20. Park, Robert, *Kulturni konflikti i marginalni čovek*, u: Teorije o društvu II, Vuk Karadžić, Beograd, 1969.
21. Prnjat, Branko, *Kulturna politika*, Radnička štampa, Beograd, 1979.
22. Radojković, Mirosljub, *Međunarodno komuniciranje*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1984.
23. Semprini, Andrea, *Multikulturalizam*, Clio, Beograd, 1999.
24. Smith, Anthony, *National Identity*, Penguin Books Ltd, London, 1991.
25. Stevanović, Branislav, *Demokratski principi i političko-kulturne vrednosti*, Filozofski fakultet u Nišu, Niš, 2008.
26. Stojković, Branimir, *Evropski kulturni identitet*, Prosveta, Niš, 1993.

KULTURE, NACIJE I NACIONALIZAM

Jelena Petković

Uprkos savremenim težnjama za globalizacijom i univerzalizacijom, a kao odgovor na sve veću nadmoćnost, dominantnost i prevlast moćnih zemalja nad ostalim delom sveta, sve više se podstiče nacionalni partikularizam, sve intenzivnije su izražene težnje ka egoizmu nacionalnih i kulturnih identiteta. Otvarajući pojedina pitanja i izvesna promišljanja naznačenog odnosa (kulture, nacije i nacionalizam), rad daje svojevrsan prilog raspravama o ovoj kompleksnoj problematici, uz promišljanje sledećih tema: kakav je efekat kulturnog nacionalnog osećanja, kao i ekstremnih vidova ideologije nacionalizma u oblasti kulture; kakvu ulogu imaju savremeni masovni mediji u ostvarivanju kulturne saradnje među različitim nacijama, ali i u izgrađivanju nacionalnih stereotipa i predrasuda; mogu li se projekti globalizma i multikulturalizma ostvarivati uz očuvanje kulturnih osobenosti, specifičnosti različitih nacija i suvereniteta njihovih država; ima li opasnosti ili nade u podeli čovečanstva na nacije?

Ključne reči: kulture, nacije, nacionalizam, masovni mediji, kulturna saradnja.