

UDC 008: 304.2

ABOUT THE ESSENCE AND FORMATION OF THE NATION DIFFERENT TEACHINGS

Saduakassova Karlygash

Master of pedagogy, regional universal scientific library named after A.
Tazhibaev, Kyzylorda, Kazakhstan

The article analyzes the concept of nationalism and its historical formation and role in modern society. Nationalism was formed based on such important events as the War of Independence in North America and the French Revolution in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Under the influence of European colonialism, nationalism has become the main ideological tool in the struggle for national independence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Ethnic diversity and cultural and religious differences in the new national states that emerged during the period of decolonization in the 20th century affected the stability of the state. The author analyzes the relationship between the development of national states and the political meaning of nationalism and determines the relevance of modern nationalism.

Keywords: culture, tradition, innovation, society, science, research, method, refinement, education, value.

Introduction

The root of the definition word «national» is «nation», which has two meanings: nation and state. As we enter a new century, globalization deepens, some people consider nationalism as an outdated concept, especially the emergence of a super-ethnic community like the European Union, which convinces people that the future of human society can actually take place. get rid of the disastrous consequences of excessive nationalism. However, the recent conflicts and conflicts between the countries of the European Union, the strict anti-immigration policies of the conservative parties, the confrontation between protectionism and multiculturalism are constant reminders that the charm of nationalism is constantly increasing, because «human dignity, pride and participation in history and doing one's own affairs the feeling of satisfaction from management fills the souls of followers» [1].

Nationalism was officially formed in the late 18 th and early 19 th centuries, and its most important events were the War of Independence in North America, the French Revolution, and the publication of Fichte's Address to the German Nation. When the European colonialists conquered the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, nationalist ideas spread widely in these regions, and at the same time, it

became an important ideology in the struggle for national independence in these countries. In the second half of the 20 th century, in the post-colonial era, due to the emergence of a number of new national states, the concept of «nation» went beyond the concept of ethnicity and acquired political connotations closely related to the concept of the state. It was even the first political principle that defines nationalism [2].

The main part

There are some differences between these new nation-states and modern nation-states in the traditional sense. In the middle of the 17th century, the first national states in the modern sense appeared in Europe within the framework of the Westphalian system. These countries were founded primarily on the basis of ethnicity, and since then, human society has entered the era of warfare based on its national interest. However, as for the new nation-states that emerged in the post-colonial era, these countries were made up of different ethnicities due to the European colonizers' own demarcation of borders during the colonial era when these countries achieved national independence. In other words, at the beginning of the emergence of nation-states, the political principle of nationalism, in particular, «the unity of political and national units» was not in the first place. However, its importance in the post-colonial period for countries that have achieved independence is clear.

The content of the scientific analysis of the concept of «nation» is subject to a long and heated discussion. Past (E. Renan, I. Herder, O. Bauer, M. Weber, N. Berdyaev) and present (B. Anderson, E. Gellner, L. N. Gumilev, E. Smith, M. Khroch, E. Hobsbaum) despite the participation of many outstanding scientists, there is still no universally accepted definition of the concept of «nation» in world science, which combines all the diversity of views, opinions and teachings on this issue.

S. Huntington points out: «Researchers usually distinguish two types of nationalism and national identity and give them different names: civic and ethnic, or political and cultural, or revolutionary and tribalistic, or liberal and organic-mystical, or civil- territorial and ethnic-genealogical, or simply patriotism and nationalism» [4, p. 62].

The variety of interpretations of the concept of «nation» is mainly due to the difficulty of rigorous scientific analysis of this category and classification into its constituent elements. In this regard, many researchers, in general, doubt the very possibility of objectively studying the meaning of this phenomenon. For example, at the beginning of the 20th century, the Russian thinker Nikolay Berdyaev said: «Truly, the nation does not succumb to any rational definitions. No rationally perceived signs can exhaust its existence. The life of the nation goes to mysterious and irrational depths whenever rational psychological and sociological definitions are applied to it» [5, pp. 75-76].

Some modern researchers also agree with this opinion of N. Berdyaev. In particular, the Russian ethnologist S. Cheshko pointed out the inability of all existing theories to reveal the essence of the national phenomenon and writes: «Researchers, regardless of any methodological tricks, are faced with a phenomenon that undoubtedly exists, but always slips through their fingers. It can appear everywhere, affect every sphere of human life and activity, and at the same time it does not exist anywhere clearly. S. Cheshko concludes about the «irrational nature» of the nation. According to him, science, unlike religion and art, works with purely rational methods of cognition, so the ability to study such an «irrational phenomenon» as a nation will be limited. S. Cheshko claims that this phenomenon cannot be defined by any specific definition, at least at the current stage of the development of science.

However, partly due to the lack of a universally accepted theory of nation in modern science, national processes in world history can be explained as a relatively historical phenomenon, despite the widespread opinion that this phenomenon cannot be determined almost forever. The widespread use of the term «nation» is associated with the Great French Revolution at the end of the 18th century. Introduced by the leaders of the French Revolution, this term meant the community of free citizens of the country and was the opposite of the concept of «subjects of the king». In their interpretation, the concept of «nation» means the state and the people as an ideological and political unity. So the French revolutionaries used this term not in an ethnic sense, but in a civil and political sense. The ideologues of the French Revolution formulated the so-called principle of the nation, according to which each nation as a community of citizens is sovereign and has the right to establish its own state. Thus, the idea of the nation as a free and voluntary union of citizens became an alternative to republicanism and democracy.

From a theoretical point of view, it is still difficult to give a clear definition of the concept of «nation». Some scholars believe that a nation is simply an «imaginary community». Other scholars argue that it can be defined in terms of culture or voluntarism, but there are many uncertainties in such an approach. However, «belonging to a certain nation is not an innate quality of human being», because in the era when the national state became the subject of international relations, only the requirements of time made it «an innate quality, it is a feature of human nature». In other words, we still have reason to question the legitimacy of the concept of "nation".

The main emphasis within the postmodern approach is on the concept of national identity. In other words, efforts to create a different version of national identity can end in success or failure, just as the actual image of the nation, even if the project is implemented, can differ significantly from its original version.

Secondly, from the point of view of reality, most of the countries in the modern world are not made up of one ethnic group, the situation of «one nation, one country» is rare. Moreover, «the idea of saving the oppressed minority is the following. misses

the point: once oppressed minorities become rulers in their country, they immediately begin oppressing other minorities under their rule». Therefore, nationalism demands that each nation have its own independent state, but «ignoring history and neglecting its people, the peculiar idea that each nation should have its own Motherland does not consider the issues of economic and military security at all». From this point of view, many conflicts in the modern world are directly related to this demand for nationalism. Therefore, we must be careful when using it.

Moreover, the representation of one's national identity is a social phenomenon that has appeared only in recent years. In the long history of agrarian society, in groups living in relatively closed societies, «its members may not be interested in clearly portraying their distinctive features». Because in an agrarian society, «the economic and political existence of a family depended entirely on the skillful use and preservation of incomprehensible things, on the preservation of remaining options and various connections». Therefore, E. Gellner believes that «the social organization of an agrarian society does not promote the principle of nationalism, does not contribute to the integration of political and cultural institutions, and does not contribute to the preservation of cultural homogeneity and the value of distribution in each educational institution» [6].

In the 19 th century, this idea gained further value in European countries. It was during this period, the so-called age of nationalism, that nations gradually became the dominant factor in the world political landscape. And the urgent need to understand the processes taking place in the life of European communities at that time prompted the development of the theory of nation. In Western European countries, the bourgeoisie raised the slogan of creating a national state, and behind this slogan, national states were created in Europe. It was useful. These national states were born as a means of self-preservation of the nation. However, this did not happen in real life, despite the fact that the international legal system is a source of national sovereignty, and the state is a means of self-preservation and development of the nation. A paradox here is that in the era of national states, most of the states were formed from various nobles and ethnic groups. At this time, all the states tried not to provoke the extreme nationalism of these nobles, and thus not to destroy the integrity of the state. Turning to the scientific theory, nationalism is more than two or more people living in the same country. one or all of them turned the language of their nation into the state language, their representatives of the authorities He wants to rule, the state to be his own, so he fights with political means.

And, the history, culture, level of development of the Eastern countries, the history of the European countries. Indeed, it was different from the level of development, civilization, and religion. The culture of these countries, as well as the history of the formation of nations there, developed differently. Therefore, in order to open the gap between nation and state and to fully understand the concept of national state, we need to understand the concept of nation, ethnos. We have to review the

scientific theories. What goals should we choose in the national policy in order to maintain social stability in our diverse Motherland in the context of globalization? What values should be promoted in order to unite the people of Kazakhstan? Is it possible for us to unite as one nation? We are going to go to bed. According to the meaning of Western scientists, and considering the peculiarities of the life of Western Europe today, the nation is also German is a mature type of ethnicity in a developed society. We are a nation - when feudal disintegration is destroyed and capitalism is established, that is, economic and other economic and professional relations become stronger. At that time, there was mass literacy, literature was written in one language, education and industrial relations were conducted in one language. It is the unity that is formed when national consciousness emerges through that language. This definition does not correspond to the definition of a nation in Eastern countries, but it is a correct definition according to the history of European countries. .

E. Renan's views played a major role in further research in this direction and gave impetus to debates in the scientific world about the nature and origin of the nation. As noted above, this discussion regarding the original concepts of the identified issues, that is, the meaning of the term «nation», continues to this day. mordialytic theory asserts that there have always been prototypes of nations and ethnic groups and that they are «an objectively given, primitive type of humanity». As for the nation, the primordialists consider it to be the highest form of development of the ethnic group that emerged on the basis of economic relations, territorial unity, language, cultural characteristics and psyche during the formation of capitalism. In other words, they focus on the ethnic content of this concept.

Thus, in the primordialist concept, ethnos is considered as an innate quality of human existence, which has its objective basis either in nature or in society. Based on these two objective foundations of the existence of the ethnos, all theories formulated within the framework of the primordialist approach can be divided into two directions: social-biological and evolutionary-historical.

Proponents of the first direction insist on the biogenetic nature of the nation. Explaining their approach, Van dan Berg wrote: «With the progressive increase in the size of human societies, the boundaries of the ethnic group widened, the ties of kinship became correspondingly blurred. However, the collective need became more extensive. more than a circle of close relatives by biological origin also exists in modern mass industrial societies» [7].

Representatives of another direction of the primordialist approach (evolutionary-historical direction) show the idea of economic or cultural determination and consider ethnic groups as a social community closely connected with socio-historical context rather than biological. These are actually existing groups that have their own characteristics that distinguish them from other similar groups - language, culture, identity. In particular, the founders of Marxism aspired to primordialism, although they did not give specific definitions of the concept of «nation».

Adherents of the modernist (constructivist) theory say that the formation of nations was important as a result of the development of industrialization and the growth of urbanization, the elimination of feudal disunity, the creation of a single internal market, and the development of the national economy. As a result, the nation is based on processes of abolition of feudal disunity and is associated with the unification of language and culture.

At the same time, according to the modernist theory, nations differ from pre-national formations - their members, first of all, perceive themselves as representatives of a certain nation, and only then they are members of lower-level groups - class, family group, professional group, etc. And in this sense, closed and isolated conglomerates of the pre-national era in the form of kinship, tribal, feudal communities were not yet a nation in the true sense.

It is characteristic of the medieval dynastic states of Europe that they did not try to achieve cultural uniformity of society, and since then it has not been important at all. Therefore, it is not surprising that representatives of some social classes, for example, clergy or members of the ruling families of different states, had closer relations with each other than with the people of their own state.

Unlike the primordialist view, the modernist theory states that nations are not given to us by nature, they are not a political version of the theory of biological species. And nation-states were not a predetermined culmination of the development of ethnic or cultural groups, «The national identity is not an innate human trait». Modernists believe that nations are not the awakening and self-assertion of mythical, natural, and predetermined communities. It is, on the contrary, the creation of new communities that correspond to the current situation, although using the cultural, historical and other heritage of the pre-nationalist world as raw material [8].

This is the main difference between modernists and primordialists. Unlike the latter, who considered the transformation of an ethnic group into a nation as a natural and predetermined process, modernists proceed from the fact that nations are intellectual constructs of writers, scientists, and politicians. According to them, it is the representatives of the intelligentsia who create the national ideology, which is the theoretical basis of the formation of the nation and national identity. We come here to the concept of «personality».

According to modernists, the process of formation of a nation begins with the emergence of a corresponding national ideology, when a small group of intellectuals declares the existence of a nation, and in most cases at the initial points of its existence, it is the creation of a national ideology. urban elite. It is in the intellectual-educated environment that images of the nation and concepts of national interest are discussed, formed, modernized and brought to the masses. In this context, nationalism, being a form of expression of national interest, is a state-building project created by intellectuals.

Of course, modern nations have deep roots in the early ethnic communities, because the messenger of the modern nation is the ethnic community of the past era. From this point of view, the cultural homogeneity characteristic of modern nations is formed on the basis of a specific ethnic community, which becomes the basis for the creation of a nation. The ethnic and cultural characteristics of the population targeted by intellectuals significantly influence their conceptions. In this regard, it cannot be said that the original ethnic material has no importance in the process of designing the nation by the intellectual elite.

The process of ethnic group becoming a nation is usually called ethnic group nationalization, and the purposeful actions of the state, its political institutions or ethno-political elite aimed at turning an ethnic group into a nation are called state building. At the same time, the process of formation of a nation can take different forms depending on specific historical and socio-economic conditions.

Conclusion

Therefore, we divided the national concepts into the theory of nation based on citizenship and the theory of nation based on ethnicity. We divided it into a rough construction concept and a primitive concept. Obviously, there are many other typologies. For example, there are enough contextual, instrumental theories of the nation, even brief definitions that do not make any sense. Here we aim to define the meaning of the nation and the state. Because, the history of the formation of European nations is very important in the era of globalization, when the issue of nationality is an important factor of politics. what a world.

If the direction of the state's national policy is not clear, or it does not take into account the «primordialist» mentality of the people of Kazakhstan, It is not surprising that if we continue to present the idea of a civil nation, which the people are not accustomed to, to the people, it will damage the social stability. Moreover, there are no prerequisites for the formation of European nations in our country. In European countries, language schools should be strengthened, and the administration should write to those who have not learned the language. if it was formed through authoritarian methods, as far back as the 18th-19th centuries, this would have been considered a normal situation. In the current era of democratic-market globalization, we cannot use such methods. Our ethnic history also developed differently.

This research has been funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Grant AP19677146. Cross-cultural and axiological analysis of ethnic identification processes of ethnic minorities in the southern region of Kazakhstan.

REFERENCES

- 1 Giddens Anthony. The Nation State and Violence / Translated by Hu Zongze. Sanlian Publishing House. - 1998. - p. 45.
- 2 Weber A.B. Globalization and Sustainable Development: The Problem Field. // Dilemmas of Globalization. Societies and Civilizations: Illusions and Risks.- M. Variant, 2002. - p. 283-301.
- 3 Timofeev T.T. Paradigms of Globalization // Dilemmas of Globalization. Societies and Civilizations: Illusions and Risks. - M. Variant, 2002. - p. 35
- 4 Huntington.S. Clash of Civilizations. – M. OOO Izdatelstvo AST, 2003. – 603 p.
- 5 Berdyaev N. Philosophy of Inequalities. Letters to Enemies in Social Philosophy. Paris, 1970. – 231 p.
- 6 Cheshko S. Man and Ethnicity//Ethnographic Review. 1994. No. 6. – P. 15-28
- 7 Sowell Thomas. Intellectuals and Society / Trans. Zhang Yayue, Liang Xingguo. 1st edition. Publishing House of Citic Corporation. - 2013. - p. 250.
8. Renan E. What is a Nation? // E. Renan. Collected Works. Vol. 6. Kyiv, 1902 p. 3-27.

О СУЩНОСТИ И ФОРМИРОВАНИИ НАЦИИ РАЗЛИЧНЫЕ УЧЕНИЯ

Сәдуақасова Қарлығаш Орысбайқызы

В статье анализируются понятие национализма, его историческое становление и роль в современном обществе. Национализм сформировался под влиянием таких значимых событий, как Война за независимость в Северной Америке и Французская революция в конце XVIII — начале XIX веков. В условиях европейского колониализма национализм стал важным идеологическим инструментом борьбы за национальную независимость в Азии, Африке и Латинской Америке. Этническое многообразие, культурные и религиозные различия в новых национальных государствах, возникших в процессе деколонизации в XX веке, оказали влияние на их стабильность. Автор анализирует взаимосвязь между развитием национальных государств и политическим значением национализма, а также определяет актуальность национализма в современном мире.

Ключевые слова: культура, традиция, инновации, общество, наука, исследование, метод, утонченность, образование, ценность.

ҰЛТТЫҢ МӘНІ МЕН ҚАЛЫПТАСУЫ ТУРАЛЫ ӘР ТҮРЛІ ІЛІМДЕР

Сәдуақасова Қарлығаш Орысбайқызы

Мақалада ұлтшылдық ұғымы, оның тарихи қалыптасуы және қазіргі қоғамдағы рөлі талданады. Ұлтшылдық Солтүстік Америкадағы Тәуелсіздік соғысы және XVIII ғасырдың аяғы мен XIX ғасырдың басындағы Француз революциясы сияқты маңызды оқиғалардың әсерінен қалыптасты. Еуропалық отаршылдық жағдайында ұлтшылдық Азия, Африка және Латын Америкасындағы ұлттық тәуелсіздік үшін күрестің маңызды идеологиялық құралына айналды. XX ғасырда отарсыздандыру процесінде пайда болған жаңа ұлттық мемлекеттердегі этникалық әртүрлілік, мәдени және діни айырмашылықтар олардың тұрақтылығына әсер етті. Автор ұлттық мемлекеттердің дамуы мен ұлтшылдықтың саяси маңыздылығы арасындағы байланысты талдайды, сонымен қатар қазіргі әлемдегі ұлтшылдықтың өзектілігін анықтайды.

Кілт сөздер: Мәдениет, дәстүр, инновация, қоғам, ғылым, зерттеу, әдіс, нақтылау, білім, құндылық.

Қолданылған әдебиеттер

- 1 Giddens Anthony. The Nation State and Violence / Translated by Hu Zongze. Sanlian Publishing House. - 1998. - p. 45.
- 2 Weber A.B. Globalization and Sustainable Development: The Problem Field. // Dilemmas of Globalization. Societies and Civilizations: Illusions and Risks.- M.Variant, 2002. - p. 283-301.
- 3 Timofeev T.T. Paradigms of Globalization // Dilemmas of Globalization. Societies and Civilizations: Illusions and Risks. - M. Variant, 2002. - p. 35
- 4 Huntington.S. Clash of Civilizations. – M. ООО Izdatelstvo AST, 2003. – 603 p.
- 5 Berdyaev N. Philosophy of Inequalities. Letters to Enemies in Social Philosophy. Paris, 1970. – 231 p.
- 6 Cheshko S. Man and Ethnicity//Ethnographic Review. 1994. No. 6. – P. 15-28
- 7 Sowell Thomas. Intellectuals and Society / Trans. Zhang Yayue, Liang Xingguo. 1st edition. Publishing House of Citic Corporation. - 2013. - p. 250.
8. Renan E. What is a Nation? // E. Renan. Collected Works. Vol. 6. Kyiv, 1902 p. 3-27.