

UNDERSTANDING THE CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL MYTH THROUGH THE PRISM OF NATIONAL IDENTITY

UDC 323.1

Katarina Milošević¹, Miša Stojadinović²

¹University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Serbia
E-mail: lakisara@yahoo.com

²Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract. *The political myth is a very complex problem that was analyzed by scholars of the various fields of science, but it seems that they did not achieve the desired result, i.e. its full understanding. The authors of this paper will try to overcome this problem by analyzing the modern political myth through the prism of national identity. In that sense, this paper is divided into three parts. In the first part the authors analyze the contemporary political myth. The second part analyzes the influence of national identity on the forming of national myth. Finally, in the third part the authors summarize their results in the context of the Serbian political myth.*

Key words: *myth, political myth, national identity, the Serbian political myth, contemporary society.*

Myths have been the subject of many philosophical and scientific studies. The phenomenon of the creation, expansion, preservation and dissolution of myths was analyzed by many scholars. We can find numerous contradictories and controversial opinions about myths over the centuries, but there is no precise definition of this problem and it is unlikely that it would ever happen. The main reason for this problem is that it resists the logically-discursive restrictions of the mythic structure of opinion. A myth does not recognize a critical attitude, nor does it recognize time, while space is described by hazy "iconography" that cannot be accurately and geographically verified. The absence of a strong connection of cause between the mythical elements, which is mostly manifested in the answers to the question of 'how' but not 'why', causes a lot of difficulties for modern researchers in terms of how to apply the strict logical methods to the study of mythical structures of thought. Theorists engaged in the exploration of myths over the centuries have tried to point out the existence of different types of myths. A myth can be divided into: natural and social myths – natural myths are related to the explanations of natural

phenomena and social myths to the explanations of social phenomena; theogonic myths which explain the creation of the godly as well as the world as such; cosmogonic myths attempting to answer how the world should live; anthropological myths that are related to genesis and the development of human kind and eschatological myths that deal with futuristic projections and with the end of the world and human kind; narrative myths have the function of entertaining; explanatory myths give explanations and interpretations, etc. (A. Krešić, 1968:2).

Although in the modern science of myths, papers that deal with traditional forms of myths still dominate, there is a growing interest in contemporary myths. The important characteristics of modern and traditional myths are: believing in myths without asking for any arguments, its main goal is to turn chaos into order, to make threatening and destructive forces of nature to be capricious associates of human destiny, and to represent a dramatic historical events as temptations for some future "golden age" which would finally come at the end.

Contemporary mythical thought is not the same as original mythical thought which is a form of pseudo-mythical opinion. From numerous anthropological studies one can find out that in the archaic and totemic communities, mythical consciousness was the main binding force that was never questioned. The myths of the 20th century are not inclined to "moral verticals". They are no longer "real", but "false" myths since the object of mythical belief is no longer a transcendent, non-existing, perfect being, but specific aspects of social reality. The processes of creating a myth in this century are occurring in all the spheres of social life. However, the greatest importance is attached to the myths created in the political sphere. In their explanations of the creation and preservation of political myths, scientists and philosophers assume that they represent the content of social consciousness, and they also assume that political peacemaking, as a form of secular religion analogous to the classical religions, is an ideological process which is unknown to those who impute godly attributes to the aspects of political reality.

Political myths are an ideological explanation of political phenomenon in which some social groups believe. They are "very simple" and they are "an extremely simple way of explaining a complex social reality". Some deep social and psychological needs support their expansion (A. Krešić, 1968:4). They represent collective and self-contradictory creations that are the result of the collective/unconscious. On the one hand they are the result of spontaneous ideological processes, and on the other they constitute certain political ideologies. In that sense we take them as an artificial creation of individuals or small social (political) groups emphasizing their instrumental and manipulative role. They are often made according to some plan and they serve to deliberately arouse religious sentiments towards selected aspects of the political sphere. This idea is sometimes overemphasized and the other dimensions of political peacemaking are neglected, like the spontaneous creation of political myths.

Milan Matić said that most of the general aspects of political myths, which were created in ancient philosophy, suggest that the political myth is a mythical story that is related to the common conditions of human life, the creation, preservation and change of the order in human society and to its internal balance and moral cohesion, whereby political myths seek to establish themselves as the basis of values and beliefs about the social order and political relations, i.e. as a way of validating the idea of the state, political authority, leadership, hierarchy, power and government, respect for order, equality or inequality, whether they are justified or challenged (M. Matić, 2005:101). Myths are essen-

tially pragmatic because they exist only if they are important for resolving the problems that some communities face. The main subjects of political myths are not individuals but social groups which the mythical traditions address (op. cit: 104-105).

CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL MYTH

The modern political myth is fluid, non-existing, mutable, and changeable, without clear boundaries and full of contradictory meanings. We argue that all this ambiguity, contradictive and amorphous, is not an obstacle for the creation of some kind of mythological logic or mythic discourse. This logic is the reason why political myth does not contain within itself anything of the unexpected or arbitrary. The mechanisms of the collective imagination are mainly related to a limited number of patterns.

One of the trademarks of the modern political myths is certainly that they try to turn losers into winners, and winners into losers. They also try to represent all wars as wars in which each side is fighting for freedom, justice and to defend themselves (even in a Holy War), because each of the ethnicities in such a confrontation has religious support. However, most scholars do not equate political and religious myths, but point out the important differences between them. Religious myths are eschatological, their concept of the supernatural is primary, and its basic substances are God and the human being. Contrary to religious myths, political myths are not related to the supernatural because their main spiritual content is a human being. Although there is a certain difference between political and religious myths, political myths can still get some kind of theological nuances of meaning. In this sense, the myth is not just a story to be told, but it is a reality that is to be experienced. Myth becomes a form of thinking that goes beyond that, because it wants to find out the truth that is revealed. Members of the team "Factory of Myths: Political Myths in the Former Yugoslavia and Successor States" that was the part of the project "Facing the Past – Searching for the Future" had a meeting in The Hague in 2010 where they were working on the creation of collective narrative related to the topic of political myth. Scientists from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and Serbia, in order to contribute to the deconstruction of political myths in divided multiethnic societies, have come to the conclusion that political myths are very often the causes of civil wars, serious conflicts and long-term instabilities. Also, in their opinion each of the emerging "nations" in the former Yugoslavia, regardless of their actual economic viability and progress in the political transition, envisions itself in accordance to its own wishes. These nation-building myths look at the neighbors as their enemies and aggressors who have caused all the trouble in previous, present and future historical development. Finally, all of the participants agreed that all the countries of former Yugoslavia need the political culture of democratic secular society that is free from mythical interpretation of history and mythic identity and mentality.

The French historian Raoul Girardet in his famous study "Mythes et Mythologies Politiques" came to the conclusion that "the political turmoil during the last two centuries of European history was followed by surprisingly strong mythological exuberance" (R. Žirarde 2000:9). The main models for his research were the anthropological studies of Claude Levi-Strauss and Gaston Bachelard's studies of the natural elements. The main focus of this historian is on the genesis and the effects of four major political myths in the modern age: the myth of conspiracy, the myth of the Savior, the myth of the golden era and the myth of unity.

The myth of conspiracy represents politics as a privileged ground for the systematic spread of influence with the important help of manipulation. A conspiratorial organization is shrouded in mystery and it is hierarchically regulated. It has a clear plan and every individual is completely lost like a pawn for achieving its "higher goals". The organization is driven by "the will for power and the repetition of the eternal dream of building a planetary empire in which the whole world will be united by the same power" (op.cit: 39). In the myth of the Savior, Girardet discusses the four basic patterns that are able to accommodate mythical construction: "Cincinnatus mode" (named after the Roman consul and dictator); the "pattern of Alexander the Great" without a scepter or justice: holding the sword in his hand; the next pattern is known as the "Solon lawmaker" whose most general expression is found in the memories of the "nations' fathers", i.e. famous ancestors, because whenever we need some answers, or the way to overcome some serious challenges it is always easier to do that in the name of allegiance to the messages left by our ancestors; the last model is Moses, or the archetype of the preacher – here the author demonstrates the merging of individuals with the destiny of the entire people in the parade of the numerous great leaders in the 20th and 21st century.

In his analysis of the myth of unity, Girardet questions the idea of myth, introducing categories of multiplicity, difference, otherness, which most frequently defy the ideas of beneficial and political plausible effects of the myth of unity. The author argued in his study that in the history of political theory a great deal of scholars tended to comprehend the idea of unity, which can be presented in all social spheres only if it has an appropriate and persistent campaign. Enthusiasm about the uniting of the fatherland unites all the believing hearts in the love of God (op.cit:186).

THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY ON THE FORMATION OF NATIONAL MYTH

The crises of legitimacy and identity are common denominators of all crises that, at least in history, gave birth to a myth. At the beginning of the 21st century, these crises have led to the fact that the Serbs were torn between different forms of national and state identifications. That is the reason why it is very difficult to determine the true and original foundations of the Serbian political and state forms. The problem is whether that could be the Kosovo myth, the myth of Corfu, the AVNOJ myth, or some kind of newly created state that is completely unfinished and improvised (M. Matić 2005:388). Behind this mixture of patterns we can see a hazy and diffuse symbolic system: from the national anthem and insignia, to the extent of dualism and parallelism of member countries, and to the extended and chaotic system of the days that the state celebrates in which we honor the dates of both Yugoslavia, Serbian, national, international and religious holidays, without having clear signs of what really makes a state, as well as also public and civic identity. Populist holiday arrangements are the sources of new illusions that complement party celebrations with their regional ideological mythology, and abuse in an iconic fashion many characters and figures from the national and religious tradition (op. cit: 388).

We especially emphasize the fact that national myths are one of the most widespread political myths and they are very often associated with a particular nation and national identity. Despite the predictions that the end of the 20th and the beginning of 21st century will be the "time without nations", national identity remains one of the incessantly current topics of research. However, the actuality of the problem does not always mean theoretical unity in its determination.

We can find numerous approaches to the problem of national identity and therefore we can find numerous definitions. It is not easy to decide which one to choose and therefore we will give a brief overview of these approaches and the determinations that explain the concept of national identity, nation and national myth, trying to overcome the pros and cons of the dichotomy.

Nikola Božilović suggests that the concept of national identity comes from an older concept known as "the national character" which was created in Europe in the 17th century and which is also very easy and convenient, as it is for the concept of "national spirit" to bind various stereotypes and prejudices. It should be noted that national actions could have a positive role in the establishment of national identity, but they can also be extremely negative and destructive encouraging the vulgar and the animal-like (essentially anti-cultural) lines that are formed under the influence of extreme nationalism as a social phenomenon and its derivatives such as chauvinism, xenophobia and ethnocentrism (N. Božilović 2007:46).

David Miller in his search for the definition of national identity emphasizes that national identity has five main elements (D. Miller, 1995: 21-27): Firstly, it is characterized by a common belief and commitment because "nations exist only when their members recognize one another as fellow citizens and when they believe that they share relevant characteristics". The second characteristic of national identity is that it is an identity that embodies historical continuity. The third very important characteristic is that it is an "active identity" in which members of all nations represent groups of people that live and work together, make decisions and achieve certain goals. The fourth characteristic is that it links a group of people with a specific geographic area, and the fifth one, national identity requires from its members to adopt something that Miller calls "common culture". We cannot say for a group of people which is accidentally connected in one place that it represents a nation. It is necessary that this group of people share a sense of community which is based on common characteristics, which have nothing to do with biological characteristics, otherwise this would lead to racism. These characteristics are primarily related to common culture, history, language, etc.

Anthony D. Smith in the beginning of his famous book *National Identity* emphasizes the existence of two models of national identity: the western or civic and non-western or ethnic (A. D. Smith 2010:11-36). He points out that Friedrich Meinecke was right when he made the dichotomy "Kulturnation" (passive cultural community) and "Staatsnation" (active self determined political community) in 1908, although we may agree or disagree with the use of these terms or with the terms themselves. The notion of national identity includes, among many other things, a sense of political community, no matter how insignificant it actually is (op. cit: 22). This political community implies common institutions, one code for all its members, but also points out the specific territory where these members belong, which is very important for their identification. This concept of nation is specific for the West. Anthony Smith believes that its main characteristics are: historic territory, legal/political community, legal and political equality of all its members, and common civic culture and ideology. Analyzing the non-Western model of a nation, Smith points out that it is characterized by: genealogy and supposed relations based on lineage, national mobilization, Vernacular languages, customs and traditions.

When it comes to different approaches to the problem of national identity, one should mention the existence of primordialism and the opposing theoretical concepts (J.

Milošević Đorđević, 2008: 31-38). First of all, one should distinguish the primordialistic from the instrumentalist approach to national identity. While the first approach is characterized by fixity and permanence, the main characteristics of the second approach are fluidity and changeability. According to the *primordialistic* concept, national identity looks like a solid and unchanging category that is irrational by itself. The major weakness of this concept is definitely its dual identity. In fact, people very often have several national identities. Also, national identity is not always the most important identity for all people. Many individuals may emphasize other types of identity as the primary ones. The *instrumentalist* conception on the other hand believes that national identity is a variable category which is not fixed and immutable. Every individual can change its national identity which represents some kind of interest group created for pragmatic reasons. The emotional dimension in this concept is reduced to a minimum. The *constructivist* approach represents a combination of certain aspects of instrumentalist and primordialistic concepts. According to this approach, national identity is built over a life time and it is characterized by strong and unchangeable connections. It also has two dimensions: *universality* which ranges from very strong to very weak and *conferment* of national identity by the others. The *situationist* approach is also one that opposes the primordialistic concept. This approach underlines social importance for establishing and preserving national identity. The *functionalist* approach also opposes the primordialistic concept and believes that national identity has certain functions for the individual or the society.

Phinney and Rotheram define national identity "as an expression of symbolic, cognitive and emotional attachment of citizens to their own country which is characterized by the awareness of belonging to a national group that includes the existence of shared beliefs, values and goals" (in: V. Mihić, 2009: 203). Ethnically the term "nation" comes from German Romanticism and it is in relation with tribal unity, legends and myths. The civil concept of nation has emerged as a product of the French Revolution. This concept does not see ethnic identity as an integral part of the nation and the state, but it believes that it is in relation with the community which is determined by cultural and political identity. The modern concept of nation combines nationality with citizenship. According to Smith "an ethnic concept of nation highlights the birth and the native culture as starting points from where we came from, and the country is perceived as a holy land and a homeland"(in: Z. Golubović 1999:76). "Civic (cultural and political identity) is seen as a community that is not based on the myth of common origin of blood and soil, but it is historically formed by the state and the culture as a symbolic universe that gives individuals a general framework of orientation in a specific political community" (op.cit: 77). While some authors emphasize the importance of the objective characteristics of the nation in their definitions, it should be noted that the subjective dimension is equally important or even more important for understanding of a nation. Ernest Renan in the 19th century emphasized the inadequacy of objective characteristics for the definition of a nation and pointed out the importance of spiritual principles, solidarity and consciousness (E. Renan, 1994). "It is true that a pure race does not exist and submitting our politics to an ethnographic analysis means relying it on a chimera (...) What has been said about the race, must be also mentioned about the language as well. Language calls for unity, it does not force it. Every individual believes and acts in accordance to its possibilities and preferences. There is no longer a state religion (...) Nationality also poses a sensitive issue. A country is not more important for the nation than the race. The nation is a spiritual princi-

ple which results in deep historical complications and spiritual family, it is not a group determined by a specific configuration of ground" (D. Schapper 1996: 64-65).

Branimir Stojković indicates that objective factors of the nation in modern science are: territory; state (or some form of sovereignty/ autonomy); language; culture; and, history (B. Stojković, 1993:111). These five objective factors are followed by a sixth one and also the most important one known as the sense of national belonging, which indicates that the essence of the nation should be found in its cultural nature. This means that all scholars who insist on its subjective nature are right. Benedict Anderson is certainly one of those. He defines a nation as an imagined political community that is both inherently limited and sovereign (B. Anderson, 1990:17). Let's look at Anderson's explanation of this definition. A nation is an imagined community because the individuals even in the smallest nation will never meet most of their members, but they nevertheless still have in their minds a sense of unity. A nation is limited, because even the greatest nations have their borders. It is sovereign because it was born in the time of the Enlightenment and the revolution that "destroyed the legitimacy of the hierarchical dynastic kingdom which was ruled by the Grace of God" (op. cit.: 19), and thereby they created a new source of legitimacy. In the end it is the community "because regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that could be present within it, it is always seen as a strong horizontal comradeship" (op. cit.: 19).

Nikolai Berdyaev believes that the nation is a cultural and historical fact, and he says in his criticism of nationalism that it represents the attitude about that fact that "it is some kind of the conversion of natural facts into an idol" (N. Berdajev, 2007:68). Nationalism is, according to him, an emotional phenomenon, which is why all intellectual arguments that oppose it are doomed to fail. There is a useful anecdote that illustrates Berdyaev's claim about this problem: "In a French society where prominent politicians were gathered, some Frenchman was upset about Englishmen who consider themselves as the first nation with a special mission in this world and who do not recognize that they are equals with others. Another Frenchman has astutely observed: Why are you so upset? We French think the same about ourselves. The other Frenchmen replied: Yes, but that is true (op.cit. 69).

When Dominique Schnapper defined the concept of the nation, she said that it represents a very specific form of political unit whose specificity needs to be analyzed on the basis of strict definitions, and not forgetting that every definition is also a theory which is characterized by the integration of population into the community of citizens, whose existence legitimizes activities within and outside the state (D. Schapper, 1996:33). The term nation must be distinguished from ethnic groups, political units, and nationalism (op.cit: 33-47). An ethnic group is one that perceives itself as the heir of a historical and cultural community, which also has the will to sustain this community that is determined by two dimensions: historical unity and the cultural specificity. Nations are often confused with political units or states. That means that political units are those whose sovereignty is recognized by the so-called international order. Finally, the concept of a nation must be distinguished from the concept of nationalism which is used to signify the demands of ethnic groups to be recognized as a nation, as well as to make historical/cultural communities and political organizations coincide, and to confirm the will of the power in already constructed nations. Zagorka Golubović in her famous study "Me and the Others" believes that it is possible to distinguish several types of nationalism: *Benign nationalism* represents a feeling of belonging which is manifested by patriotism and pride. It is developed in opposition to members of other groups and that is why we can find it in the elements of

the so called aggressive nationalism. *Nationalism as a political ideology* represents ideological nationalism that demands the existence of the state on behalf of ethnic groups, reducing at the same time social emancipation to national emancipation. Finally *extreme ultra nationalism* represents a pathological phenomenon of fanatical political loyalty to a nation.

INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION:
THE SERBIAN POLITICAL MYTH
("FROM THE BATTLE OF KOSOVO TO THE GLORIOUS PRESENT")

Language and religion, honor and property, family and state, morality and law, history and geopolitics; they all are integral parts of national identity. "These layers can be recognized in all varieties of national self-consciousness, whether it is called national integralism (or integral nationalism) or is on its opposite side which is marked by non-national (provincial) localism and (or) anti-national globalism (internationalism). The main difference between these varieties of national self-consciousness is in the fact that it can either be very developed or hypertrophied. These differences became deeper and deeper in the context of historical troubles because all common characteristics of the national character and all other similarities are firstly ignored, and then they are denied – until in time they begin to oppose and confront each other. That is why it is possible to explain and understand all old and new contradictions within the Serbian national identity only with a critical analysis of the old and the new historical contexts that are important for the development of the rational historical self-consciousness" (M. Mitrović, 1990: 32).

In our opinion all debates about national identity should be aimed at designing the national identity which is very important for existence and internal social development. This is the way national identity can be the most important argument of the Serbian nation in current and upcoming regional and European integrations. Only in this sense can we claim that it is a modern national identity that relates to everything that is important for all the people preserving them in the new and changed conditions in the present and the future no matter what the internal or external challenges that drive those changes (K. Milošević, 2012:115). Results of many studies show that Serbs are proud of their nationality:

Table 1. *How proud are you of your nationality?*
(Serbia, 2006)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent	Valid percent	Cumulat. valid percent
Very proud	513	42.0 %	42.0 %	48.5 %	48.5 %
Quite proud	396	32.5 %	74.5 %	37.5 %	86.0 %
Not very proud	130	10.7 %	85.2 %	12.3 %	98.3 %
Not at all proud	18	1.5 %	86.6 %	1.7 %	100.0 %
Don't know	41	3.4 %	90.0 %		
No answer	28	2.3 %	92.3 %		
Not applicable	94	7.7 %	100.0 %		
Total	1220	100%		1220	100%

Source: *World Values Survey*: <http://www.wvsevsvdb.com/wvs/WVSAanalyzeQuestion.jsp>

Also here are the results that show us the requirements which must be fulfilled to become a citizen of Serbia:

Table 2. Requirements for citizenship
(Serbia, 2006)

	having ancestors from my country		being born on my country's soil		adopting the customs of my country		abiding by my country's laws	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Very important	274	22.5%	327	26.8%	389	31.9%	640	52.5%
Rather important	421	34.5%	409	33.5%	545	44.7%	446	36.6%
Not important	448	36.7%	417	34.2%	228	18.7%	78	6.4%
Don't know	65	5.3%	53	4.3%	44	3.6%	43	3.5%
No answer	12	1.0%	14	1.1%	14	1.1%	13	1.1%
Total	1220	100%	1220	100%	1220	100%	1220	100%

Source: *World Values Survey*: <http://www.wvsevsdb.com/wvs/WVSAnalyzeQuestion.jsp>

Finally, Ivan Milenković in his review of Raoul Girardet's book "Mythes et Mythologies Politiques" emphasizes that the Serbian contribution to the modern political myth is not negligible and that the biggest breakthrough and innovation the Serbian regime made is the exposing of the global conspiracy against itself and several other related myths, the myth of the Savior (I. Milenković, <http://www.bibliotekaxxvek.com/index.php>). The figure of the Serbian Savior combines: fighting spirit (which is reflected in the ongoing winning wars), justice (he is always right, though often on the wrong territory), state wisdom (the country is richer, the territory is larger and the state is stronger), firmness (which can submit the most powerful military force in the world), stateness (tireless creation of new states), persistence (preservation of sovereignty and territorial integrity), legislation (care for the world in the next millennium), consistency ("No one can hurt you"), charisma ("spontaneous" gathering of people who enthusiastically cheer for him and love him), an erotic attraction (flushed housewives dancing with his picture, kissing it and pushing it into their bosom) and everything else that could be attributed to one authentic leader – the Savior.

Girardet's myth of a golden age remains also unknown to Serbian inventiveness. The Serbian interpretation of the present looks like this: the past is "experienced and described as a period of grief and destruction" in opposition to the bright present, does not arise "the absolute of the past characterized by fullness and brightness" because "the golden age of the Serbian people is right now" and Serbia experiences its most successful moments. As such it should be an example and a role model for the entire world. The difference with its mythical construct of the golden age is not based on the contrast between the present and the past (this is from the Serbian inventiveness point of view seen as anachronistic), but it is based on the contrast between myth and reality.

In the Serbian version, even the myth of unity gets a perverted touch. "The mythological disunity of the Serbs is famous since the memorable defeat in Kosovo that took place in 1389 and it became an important leitmotif in political discourse, while unity

eludes us like a mirage: whenever we think that we are getting closer to it, it disappears us thanks to the conjunction of different elements prone to disunity. Serbian history would be better, nicer and more successful only if Serbs become united. That is precisely the problem. In this regard, it is worth noticing that the unity of the Serbs has never been better than it was at the beginning of their acute decline into the civilization cloaca: that was in the beginning of the reign of the Serbian Unifier" (op.cit).

Finally, we point out that the search for identity is still current from the beginning of the history of human society until the present and that it will continue to be the one of the most important studies of the human race. It should be noted that national identity at the beginning of the 21st century continues to exist as one of the most influential social frameworks and sources of collective identity, and it is impossible to even imagine the moment when it will become obsolete (M. Stojadinović, 2012:165).

We hope that the search for national identity will not be responsible for the transformation of politics into a myth or mysticism, and our paper presents one of the attempts that try to explain and solve this problem.

REFERENCES

1. Antoni D. Smit, *Nacionalni identitet*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd, 2010.
2. Andrija Krešić, *Političko društvo i politička mitologija, Prilog kritici "kulta ličnosti*, Vuk Karadžić, Beograd, 1968
3. Branislav Stevanović, *Demokratski principi i političko-kulturne vrednosti*, Filozofski fakultet, Niš, 2008.
4. Branimir Stojković, *Evropski kulturni identitet*, Prosveta, Niš, Zavod za proučavanje kulturnog razvitka, Beograd, 1993.
5. Benedikt Anderson, *Nacija: zamišljena zajednica – razmatranje o porijeklu i širenju nacionalizma*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1990.
6. Vladimir Mihić, *Da li smo mi Evropljani? Povezanost i korelati evropskog i nacionalnog identiteta*, Psihologija, Društvo psihologa Srbije, br. 2/2009.
7. Ernest Renan, *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation*, Academic Press Leiden, 1994.
8. David Miller, *On Nationality*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
9. Dominik Šnaper, *Zajednica građana – o modernoj ideji nacije*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad, 1996.
10. Zagorka Golubović, *Ja i drugi*, Republika, 1999.
11. Ivan Milenković, *Logika političkog mita*, na:
12. http://www.bibliotekaxxvek.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=71:irarde-raul--politiki-mitovi-i-mitologije&catid=48:irarde-raul&Itemid=50
13. Jasna Milošević Đorđević, *Jedan pokušaj klasifikacije teorijskih razmatranja nacionalnog identiteta*, Psihologija, Društvo psihologa Srbije, br. 2/2003.
14. Joseph Zajda, *Nation-Building, Identity and Citizenship Education: Introduction, Nation-Building, Identity and Citizenship Education Cross-cultural Perspectives* (priredili: Joseph Zajda, Holger Daun, Lawrence J. Saha), Springer, 2009.
15. Jasna Milošević Đorđević, *Značenje nacionalnog identiteta*, Politička revija, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 1/2002,
16. Jasna Milošević Đorđević, *Čovek o naciji*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, 2008.
17. Jael Tamir, *Liberalni nacionalizam*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 2002.
18. Katarina Milošević, *Politička participacija građana i nacionalni identitet kao faktori stabilnosti društava i lokalnih samouprava*, Politička revija, Political Review, Godina (XXIV) XI, vol=31, Br. 1 / 2012.
19. Miša Stojadinović, *Potraga za identitetom*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, 2012.
20. Miša Stojadinović, Vukčević Dejana, *Problem očuvanja identiteta na Balkanu*, Nacionalni interes, Godina VII, vol. 10, Broj 1/2011., str. 87-100

21. Miša Stojadinović, *Izazovi formiranja identiteta u savremenom društvu*, Politička revija, Political Review, Godina (XXIII) X, vol=29, Br. 3 / 2011
22. Miša Stojadinović, *Pitanje nacionalnog identiteta u XXI veku*, Politička revija, Political Review, Godina (XXIII) X, vol=27, Br. 1 / 2011.
23. Milan Matić, *Mit i politika*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, 2005.
24. Milovan Mitrović, *Sociologija i istorijska samosvest*, u Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 1990.
25. Nikola Božilović, *Kultura i identiteti na Balkanu*, Filozofski fakultet, Centar za sociološka istraživanja, Niš, 2007.
26. Nikolaj Berdajev, *Sudbina čoveka u suvremenom svijetu – za razumevanje naše epohe*, Verbum, Split, 2007.
27. Raul Žirarde, *Politički mitovi i mitologije*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd, 2000.
28. Tomas Hilan Eriksen, *Etnicitet i nacionalizam*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd, 2004.

POIMANJE SAVREMENOG POLITIČKOG MITA KROZ PRIZMU NACIONALNOG IDENTITETA

Katarina Milošević, Miša Stojadinović

Politički mit predstavlja jedan veoma kompleksan problem kojim su se bavili stručnjaci različitih disciplina, ali to kao da nije doprinelo željenom rezultatu, tj. njegovom potpunom razumevanju. Autori u svom radu pokušavaju da prevaziđu ovaj problem posmatrajući savremeni politički mit kroz prizmu nacionalnog identiteta. U tom smislu ovaj rad je podeljen na tri dela. U prvom delu autori analiziraju savremeni politički mit. U drugom delu se razmatra uticaj nacionalnog identiteta na formiranje nacionalnog mita. I na kraju, u trećem delu autori, sumirajući rezultate svog rada, dolaze do sagledavanja problema srpskog političkog mita.

Ključne reči: *mit, politički mit, nacionalni identitet, srpski politički mit, savremeno društvo.*