

ETHNICITY AND NATIONAL CULTURE: PAST, PRESENT FUTURE

ETNICIDADE E CULTURA NACIONAL: PASSADO, PRESENTE FUTURO

ETNICIDAD Y CULTURA NACIONAL: PASADO, PRESENTE FUTURO

Gulnaz Kazbekovna GIZATOVA¹
Olga Gennadievna IVANOVA²

ABSTRACT: Many contemporary philosophers, and especially postmodern ones, emphasize that history is one of the representative practices by which the human subject is reproduced. It can probably be argued that the past is a definite model with which, in conditions of total uncertainty, historical perspectives can be outlined for the consolidation of society. It is the past that can become a “useful” resource with the help of which the ethnic group recreates its integrity and - accordingly - its present and future. , the main subjective nature of ethnocentrism is emphasized by many researchers. Thus, according to anthropological interpretations, subjective vision (how national problems, considered in their historical retrospective, are seen by the agents of the conflict) may be more important than the objectivity of historical science. In fact, distrust of historical meta-narratives is becoming an integral feature of modern social theories. This does not mean that arguing for subjectivism as an essential feature of ethnocentrism is the only position. It will be more correct to compare not nationalism and ethnocentrism, but nationalism and ethnicity, as a deep foundation of nationalism. So, in Western social science it is customary to connect nationalism with nation-building, identifying it with statehood, while ethnicity is considered as a source and way of constructing identity. At the same time, various approaches to assessing the correlation of ethnicity and nationalism have developed. So, there is an interpretation of nationalism as a kind of a political movement based on a false consciousness, which is created by ethnicity, but cannot be explained, because it has deeper roots that lie in political economy, and not in culture. Collective memory supports historical continuity through recollections of specific elements from the “archives of historical memory”. This makes an analytical approach to the subjective discursive construction of ethnic identity possible, especially regarding the issue of what kind of "national history" is told, what and how is recalled, and between which “events” a connection is established, which is reflected in subjective representations.

¹ Assistant professor, PhD in Philosophy, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Social Philosophy, Kazan Federal University Address: 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18; e-mail: Gulnaz.Gizatova@kpfu.ru, ID SCOPUS: 56242662100, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7997-2034>

² Assistant professor, PhD in Philosophy, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Public Relations and Applied Political Science, Kazan Federal University Address: 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18; e-mail: Olga.ivanova.ksu@mail.ru, ID SCOPUS: 56242466400, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5378-1109>

KEYWORDS: Ethnicity. Natural culture. Globalization. National identity. Memory. Ethnic conflicts

RESUMO: Muitos filósofos contemporâneos, especialmente pós-modernos, enfatizam que a história é uma das práticas representativas pelas quais o sujeito humano é reproduzido. Provavelmente, pode-se argumentar que o passado é um modelo definitivo com o qual, em condições de total incerteza, as perspectivas históricas podem ser traçadas para a consolidação da sociedade. É o passado que pode se tornar um recurso "útil" com o qual o grupo étnico recria sua integridade e - conseqüentemente - seu presente e futuro. , a principal natureza subjetiva do etnocentrismo é enfatizada por muitos pesquisadores. Assim, segundo as interpretações antropológicas, a visão subjetiva (como os problemas nacionais, considerados em sua retrospectiva histórica, são vistos pelos agentes do conflito) pode ser mais importante do que a objetividade da ciência histórica. Na verdade, a desconfiança em metanarrativas históricas está se tornando uma característica integrante das teorias sociais modernas. Isso não significa que defender o subjetivismo como uma característica essencial do etnocentrismo seja a única posição. Será mais correto comparar não nacionalismo e etnocentrismo, mas nacionalismo e etnicidade, como um fundamento profundo do nacionalismo. Assim, nas ciências sociais ocidentais, costuma-se conectar o nacionalismo com a construção da nação, identificando-o com a condição de Estado, enquanto a etnicidade é considerada uma fonte e uma forma de construção da identidade. Ao mesmo tempo, foram desenvolvidas várias abordagens para avaliar a correlação entre etnia e nacionalismo. Portanto, há uma interpretação do nacionalismo como uma espécie de movimento político baseado em uma falsa consciência, que é criada pela etnicidade, mas não pode ser explicada, porque tem raízes mais profundas que residem na economia política, e não na cultura. A memória coletiva apóia a continuidade histórica por meio da rememoração de elementos específicos dos "arquivos da memória histórica". Isso possibilita uma abordagem analítica da construção discursiva subjetiva da identidade étnica, especialmente no que diz respeito à questão de que tipo de "história nacional" é contada, o que e como é lembrada, e entre quais "eventos" se estabelece uma conexão que se reflete em representações subjetivas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Etnia. Cultura natural. Globalização. Identidade nacional. Memória. Conflitos étnicos

RESUMEN: Muchos filósofos contemporâneos, y especialmente los posmodernos, enfatizan que la historia es una de las prácticas representativas mediante las cuales se reproduce el sujeto humano. Probablemente se pueda argumentar que el pasado es un modelo definido con el que, en condiciones de total incertidumbre, se pueden esbozar perspectivas históricas para la consolidación de la sociedad. Es el pasado el que puede convertirse en un recurso "útil" con cuya ayuda el grupo étnico recrea su integridad y, en consecuencia, su presente y futuro. , muchos investigadores enfatizan la principal naturaleza subjetiva del

etnocentrismo. Así, según las interpretaciones antropológicas, la visión subjetiva (cómo los agentes del conflicto ven los problemas nacionales, considerados en su retrospectiva histórica) puede ser más importante que la objetividad de la ciencia histórica. De hecho, la desconfianza en las metanarrativas históricas se está convirtiendo en una característica integral de las teorías sociales modernas. Esto no significa que defender el subjetivismo como una característica esencial del etnocentrismo sea la única posición. Será más correcto comparar no el nacionalismo y el etnocentrismo, sino el nacionalismo y la etnicidad, como una base profunda del nacionalismo. Entonces, en las ciencias sociales occidentales es costumbre conectar el nacionalismo con la construcción de la nación, identificándolo con la estadidad, mientras que la etnicidad se considera una fuente y una forma de construir la identidad. Al mismo tiempo, se han desarrollado varios enfoques para evaluar la correlación entre etnia y nacionalismo. Entonces, hay una interpretación del nacionalismo como una especie de movimiento político basado en una falsa conciencia, que es creada por la etnicidad, pero no se puede explicar, porque tiene raíces más profundas que se encuentran en la economía política y no en la cultura. La memoria colectiva apoya la continuidad histórica a través de la recolección de elementos específicos de los "archivos de la memoria histórica". Esto posibilita una aproximación analítica a la construcción discursiva subjetiva de la identidad étnica, especialmente en lo que respecta al tema de qué tipo de "historia nacional" se cuenta, qué y cómo se recuerda, y entre qué "eventos" se establece una conexión, que se refleja en representaciones subjetivas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Etnia. Cultura natural. Globalización. Identidad nacional. Memoria. Conflictos étnicos*

Introduction

Ulf Hannerz, a professor at Stockholm University, introduces a new term that more or less allows to cover a broad array of problems that today are increasingly becoming controversial and acute. The term that he uses when analyzing social processes unfolding in the late 20th - early 21st centuries is "transnational anthropology". The term is not accidental, since the problems bounded with ethnicity, ethnic conflicts, the nature of these phenomena, as well as attempts to comprehend the phenomenon of man in their frameworks, become central to modern social discourse. There are a number of reasons that determine the growing interest of social theorists in these issues. This is a contradictory nature of the impact of globalization processes on the modern world, national cultures and the individual; these are unabated ethnic conflicts, which, despite their local

character, draw a huge part of the world into their orbits; one cannot fail to mention the transformations that the subject undergoes as a representative of an ethnic group under conditions when the national-ethnic identity of a person is problematic, becoming both multiple and unstable.

Another difficulty in understanding these problems is associated with the interpretation of the concept of ethnicity. Thus, in Russian philosophical tradition there is an understanding of this phenomenon, which differs from its interpretation in Western science. The concept of “ethnos” is much more widespread in Russian philosophy, implying the inclusion of a wide variety of ethnic communities, but the concepts of “ethnos” and “ethnicity” are often used as synonyms. Thus, E.A. Orlova, notes that “ethnos” today is one of the central categories denoting a cultural unit; it can be considered as an integrity, in structural-functional and dynamic, synchronous and diachronous aspects. This category denotes people with certain identification characteristics, traditionally inherited from generation to generation. And, even if they are not recognized as carriers, they are objective in nature (ORLOVA, 2004). The British author, C. Lerche, claims the opposite. Ethnicity, in his opinion, is subjective, even if it is based on and refers to “objective” or common cultural or historical features or causes them. In other words, ethnicity is not and cannot be an objective phenomenon. First of all, there is no unambiguous correspondence between culture and ethnicity. Cultural differences in themselves do not determine ethnicity; a culture, or cultural difference, becomes ethnic if and when a group accepts it and uses it in a specific, concrete and modern ways (<http://www.gmu.edu>). Recognizing the argumentativeness of both positions, we take the view of third approach, which in Russian philosophy has received the name “integral”. According to this approach, ethnic formations, as cultural-psychological phenomena, are formed through self-identification, self-determination of their national self by real people who get the opportunity to self-identify and to represent the originality of the community to which they belong through “imagination”. However, such a subjective national “imagination”

is possible in the presence of external objective factors: ethnic territory - a homeland, a center of culture and spirituality; language and culture; historical path and historical memory of the people; economic ties, etc (MNATSAKYAN, 2004).

Methods

The presence of various approaches, sometimes diametrically opposed, to the definition of ethnos, ethnicity, as well as interethnic conflicts demonstrates the complexity of these phenomena; it is not surprising that they acquired the status of interdisciplinary and are the objects of an entire complex of social research. However, despite the existence of theories and approaches that are so different from each other, there are some meeting points that are recognized by all or almost all researchers of ethnicity. Firstly, it is a consideration that the latter is inextricably linked with culture.

It is characteristic of recent decades studies, to consider culture as being in constant change, fluidity, and variability. As for the problems of ethnicity in this regard, they are "placed" in such zones where there is a "convergence", and most often - a clash of cultures. It is in this situation that ethnic problems manifest themselves most distinctly, and ethnic contradictions are exposed.

Results and Discussion

It is no coincidence that U. Hannerts, mentioned above, analyzing the concept of "transnational anthropology" as key concepts revealing its essence, considers the concepts of "flows", "boundaries" and "hybridization". He notes that as many concepts of modern social theory they are used at a large extent metaphorically, which creates the basis for further discussion, inevitable in the analysis of the impact of globalization on the modern world. All these concepts, in his opinion, reflect the procedural nature of culture; he emphasizes that the concept of "flow" (fluidity) means that only being constantly in motion, always recreated anew, meanings and semantic forms can acquire stability.

Maintaining culture means constantly reinventing it, reflecting on it, experimenting, preserving it in memory and transmitting it. The concept of “border”, on the contrary, denies any continuity, expressing, first of all, a gap, a demarcation line, but this is not a sharp contour, but the border, which first of all, outlines a zone within which one goes into something else, this is a zone of ambiguity and uncertainty. The concept of “hybridization”, perhaps one of the most common in the analysis of modern ethnic processes, has many closely related terms, such as melange, bricolage, creolization transculture, etc .; all of them, partly also metaphorical, at the same time acquired an analytical status, reflecting the concern of social theorists about sharp contradictions pervading modern national-cultural processes (<http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk>) All this together leads to a disruption of the fragile balance between global flows and the preservation of the unique cultural identity, which is being rehashed. As a result, “the structure of subjectivity in a multicultural society is thoroughly pervaded with a mismatch of local and global, which is manifested in the leveling of ethnic specificity, the emergence of a space of tension between stability and variability, the marginalization of entire ethnic groups, the loss of connection with the past, the change of meanings, the unification “otherness” of the subject” (Gizatova & Ivanova, 2013).

The second common feature inherent to most ethnic-cultural studies of ethnicity, as well as of national cultures, is the recognition that eventually all ethnic groups and, accordingly, the scientific concepts of ethnic groups one way or another raise the question of the past. Anthony D. Smith, a prominent scholar in the study of ethnicity and nationalism, has identified criteria that explain ethnic affiliation and its origin. These include shared historical experience and shared historical memories, myths about a common origin and common ancestors, common culture, as well as a connection with a historical territory or homeland in which a group may or may not reside at present (<https://www.britannica.com>). Thus, among the attributes of an ethnic group, the most important place is taken by characteristics connecting the ethnic group with its past, these

are “common historical experience and common historical memories”, as well as “myths about a common origin and common ancestors”.

Why, then, it is the past that is decisive in identifying one or another ethnic group? Many contemporary philosophers, and especially postmodern ones, emphasize that history is one of the representative practices by which the human subject is reproduced. It can probably be argued that the past is a definite model with which, in conditions of total uncertainty, historical perspectives can be outlined for the consolidation of society. It is the past that can become a “useful” resource with the help of which the ethnic group recreates its integrity and - accordingly - its present and future. The American anthropologist J. Eller argues: “Like most terms in anthropology and other social sciences, *past* has a large and diverse semantic field, and its connections to the field of ethnicity and ethnic conflict are numerous. It is possible to identify four such connections, which are quite different though related: the past as a tradition or the cultural past, the past as history..., the past as myth, and the past as “resource” for the present. Most, if not all ethnic groups incorporate some alloy of all of these factors, sometimes in such a way that the distinctions between them are disguised or mystified in consequential ways” (<https://books.google.com>). For analysis of the roots of interethnic conflicts, J. Bouchard introduces the concept of archemyth as a phenomenon with an extensive symbolic configuration (<https://books.google.com>). In this sense, it has tremendous power to influence the collective consciousness of an ethnic group, largely determining its historical choice. For an ethnic group, a retrospective view of its history is one of the key elements of its national consciousness. And it is precisely appealing to the past that often creates the basis for interethnic conflicts. Archemyths pervade collective imagination, and their impact is especially noticeable when large social groups experience a sense of “symbolic emptiness”, the absence of ethnomobilizing ideals. As M. Eliade notes: “... myth is an integral part of a human condition and it reflects an anxiety of a person living in time” (<http://www.aquarun.ru>). Myth helps to rebuild reality due to its anthropological and existential

functions, and consistently reproduced mythology becomes the basis for constructing a national identity (GIZATOVA & IVANOVA, 2015).

J. Eller argues that the "ethnic past", being a reconstruction, is always subjective. Being an anthropological phenomenon, the product of this reconstruction is called a "usable past," "a respectable past," or "a suitable past." What is its potentiality? According to the author, primarily it is the fact that the past can be used and is used as a resource. And, as such, the past has two crucial functions. The first function is to support certain cultural or historical symbols or "markers" for identification and association, it is most closely associated with a mythic character of the past, this function is creative, ethnogenetic. The second function determines an important connection between the past, present and future, that is, it creates group ways of expression, foundation for realization of the social present and ingenerates, creates a feeling that the present belongs to them. This is one of the ways to express oneself or "gain a social voice" and to use culture and history for purpose, calling for group or national uniqueness along with ideals like "social justice" or "self-determination" (<https://books.google.com>).

As already noted, the main subjective nature of ethnocentrism is emphasized by many researchers. Thus, according to anthropological interpretations, subjective vision (how national problems, considered in their historical retrospective, are seen by the agents of the conflict) may be more important than the objectivity of historical science. In fact, distrust of historical meta-narratives is becoming an integral feature of modern social theories. This does not mean that arguing for subjectivism as an essential feature of ethnocentrism is the only position. Thus, V. Kovrigin notes: "the question of the universality of ethnocentrism leads to an answer to ... the question of its objectivity. If this phenomenon is universal, then it cannot be pure subjective. The universality of ethnocentrism implies a certain standardized element of ethnic consciousness, a stereotype of the behavior of representatives of an ethnos" (KOVRIGIN, 2015).

Considering globalization as the most important driving force of the world history, a number of researchers urge to focus on its ideological structure. Even the technological component of globalization, which manifests itself also in the development of mass communication media, is considered, first of all, in its cultural dimension, where signs acquire (often latently) special power. As F. Jameson notes, today the statement of the expansion of communication networks has gradually transformed into an idea that has a semantic message about the new world culture (<https://doi.org>) Regarding ethnocentrism as one of the leading ideologies of the modern world, it should be noted that it is often identified with the concept of “nationalism”. The latter in itself is the subject of heated debates that relate to its nature, essence, estimations U. Beck notes that despite the fact that the manifestations of nationalism are extremely diverse, they are found in various parts of the world and vary in importance, nevertheless, they are based on general characteristics, the most important of them is the metaphysical essentialism of the “nation” (www.researchgate.net) It should be emphasized that the revival of both ethnocentrism and nationalism in recent decades has become a reaction to and a result of globalization processes that have, deep transnational consequences, including decentralization, sharpening of differences, marginalization, as well as the construction of new ones and the elimination of old entities. Hence the multifaceted manifestation of nationalism gave rise to a curious phenomenon in the social sciences: it is the polarity of the definitions of nationalism, the range of which varies from negative-critical to apologetic. As U. Beck stresses, “If our idea that the meaning of national and local changes in the process of the internalized globalization is true, then the most important methodological consequence for all social sciences will be the conclusion that all the usual concepts of social sciences become zombie concepts - empty terms, in the Kantian sense. Zombie concepts are the living dead among the concepts due to which the social sciences are blind to the rapidly changing realities both within and outside nation states” (www.columbia.edu). Indeed,

nationalism is extremely heterogeneous, since its sources, genesis, historical contexts, and discursive levels are heterogeneous. As C. Calhoun argues, the discourse of nations is expressed mainly in the language of passion and identification, and the discourse of states similar to it in many respects more often uses the language of reason and interests.

Nationalism has such an emotional influence, in part because it helps us become who we are, inspiring artists and composers and connecting us with history (and therefore with eternity and immortality (WODAK ET AL., 1999)).

Summary

Probably, it will be more correct to compare not nationalism and ethnocentrism, but nationalism and ethnicity, as a deep foundation of nationalism. So, in Western social science it is customary to connect nationalism with nation-building, identifying it with statehood, while ethnicity is considered as a source and way of constructing identity. At the same time, various approaches to assessing the correlation of ethnicity and nationalism have developed. So, there is an interpretation of nationalism as a kind of a political movement based on a false consciousness, which is created by ethnicity, but cannot be explained, because it has deeper roots that lie in political economy, and not in culture.

In contrast, Anthony Smith tried to show that nationalism has deeper roots that lie in ancient ethnicity. He agrees that nationalism, as an ideology and movement, dates only to the late eighteenth century, but argues that the "ethnic origin of nations" is much older. Myths, symbols, memories and values have continuity, and with the development of an ethnic group they do not lose their significance, on the contrary, they become universal. Ethnic groups, unlike other social groups, are predominantly cultural-symbolic groups (T. Parsons), they are inextricably linked with the past of the ethnic group, primarily because these groups reproduce this past as an ethnomobilizing resource for the present and future. Collective memory, according to Halbwax, supports historical

continuity through recollections of specific elements from the “archives of historical memory”. This makes an analytical approach to the subjective discursive construction of ethnic identity possible, especially regarding the issue of what kind of “national history” is told, what and how is recalled, and between which “events” a connection is established, which is reflected in subjective representations. It is no coincidence that ethnic groups are often represented as “systems of cultural representations” (S. Hall). All this shows, that nationalism and ethnicity are inseparable. The approaches according to which “nationalism was bad when it was similar to ethnicity, but good when it was associated with a modernizing state” (<https://books.google.com>) reduce both the phenomena of nationalism and ethnicity and their inextricable connection.

Conclusions

So, in the conditions of modern sociocultural transformations a person’s national-ethnic identity becomes more complicated, more problematic. Thus, there is an increase in interethnic contradictions that often leads to ethnic conflicts, a balanced approach to understanding the phenomena of nationalism and ethnicity, their immanent dialectical relationship is urgent.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

BECK, U. The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242750059>
BOUCHARD, Gérard. National Myths: Constructed Pasts, Contested Presents. <https://books.google.com/books?id=D1-4cQC8VtcC&printsec>
Calhoun, Craig Nationalism and Ethnicity.
<http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/U6800/>
Cit.ex: Tina Kempin Reuter. Ethnic Identity, Ethnicity, And Ethnic Group. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/ethnic-conflict>
ELIADE, M. Myths of the modern world. <http://www.aquarun.ru/psih/relig/relig1p1.html>

ELLER, JACK DAVID. From Culture to Ethnicity to Conflict: An Anthropological Perspective on Ethnic Conflict.

<https://books.google.com/books?id>

ELLER, JACK DAVID. From Culture to Ethnicity to Conflict: An Anthropological Perspective on Ethnic Conflict.

<https://books.google.com/books?id>

Gizatova, G.K., IVANOVA, O.G. (2015). Myth in Construction of National Identity. *Rethinking social action. Core values, 1*, 577-581.

GIZATOVA, G.K., IVANOVA, O.G. (2013). Transformation of subjectivity in the modern multicultural society. *Bulletin of the Russian nation, 5*, 104 - 120.

HANNERZ, U. Flows, boundaries and hybrids: Keywords in Transnational Anthropology.

<http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/hannerz.pdf>

Jameson, F. Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue. *The Cultures*

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2658665>

KOVRIGIN, V. (2015). Understanding the phenomenon of ethnocentrism: modern connotations. Constructive and destructive forms of mythologization of social memory in the past and present, Lipetsk, 399 p.

LERCHE, Charles O. *The Conflicts of Globalization.*

<http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/index.htm>

MNATSAKYAN, M.O. (2004). Nation and nationalism. *Sociology and psychology of national life. - M., UNITY-DANA, . - 367 p. - (Series Cogito ergo sum)*, 14-15.

ORLOVA, E.A. (2004). *Cultural (Social) Anthropology.* M.: Academic Project, - 480 p.

WODAK, R., DE CILLIA, R., & REISIGL, M. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse and Society, 10(2)*, 149-173.