

## **Social and philosophical analysis of the phenomenon of national identity**

*Murtozayeva Muqaddas Sohiq qizi*

*Applicant for Samarkand*

*State institute*

*Foreign languages*

**Annotation.** This article reveals the phenomenon of national identity, which is an integral part of the development of ethnic community. The concepts of ethnicity, nation and national identity are related. It is shown that the process of formation of a nation and its national identity have a dialectical relationship and interdependence.

**Key words:** nation, ethnicity, nationality, ethnic identity, national identity

Being one of the most important subjects of activity, the nation is formed over a long historical period, being closely connected with such a substratum of the highest level as ethnicity. As social collectivities, they are interconnected in many ways, and it would be quite correct to clarify that ethnicity is essentially the very soil on which is formed and develops, since national consciousness synthesizes the basic ethnic mechanisms.

The ethnos is situated in the border of the biologic and social sphere as the contradictory opposite of the nation, provides an exclusive component of national consciousness. The discussion regarding the definition of the concept “ethnic group” is still ongoing, since there is no consensus on the stage by stage boundaries of the use of this concept. Mostly, researchers come across difficulties when trying to distinguish between the concepts of “ethnicity” and “nation”, therefore, in one case, all known social collectivities that have undergone ethno historical evolution are considered an ethnos. In general, many agree that an ethnos is a group of people connected spatially at the time of formation [2, 238-242].

According to the opinion of Roger Brubaker, who considers it a fallacy to call “nations and ethnic groups real entities, actual, time-lasting collectives with clearly defined boundaries” [5, 110-111]. The scientist believes that even formulating the question of what a nation is not a completely correct task, since in this case the researcher redefines the concept of “nation” in terms of objective reality, whereas it would be more appropriate to refuse the common understanding of a nation as community of people, collective, special organism. Furthermore, interpret it as a concept related to a number of value categories. It works well in the language of political activists seeking to change people's perceptions of themselves, to appeal to their loyalty to “the nation”, but it is not suitable as a tool of analysis. Therefore, it is necessary to get rid of it, like other “categories of practice” [5, 110-111].

At present days there is neither a generally accepted definition nor unity regarding the concept of “nation,” we recognize the nation as a special quality of social education, possible at a certain level of socio-economic development of society. Historical experience convinces us that it is quite appropriate to interpret the ethnic not only as limited in content in comparison with the national, but also as a component of the national. In general, the definitions “nation” and “ethnic group” are interchangeable in many cases, which can be explained by the semantic similarity of the concepts themselves.

Moreover, you need to understand that both of these definitions already have an established categorical affiliation and are semantically relevant for their own objects of study.

Let us analyze one of the definitions of the concept of “nation”, which was proposed by the domestic researcher Yu. D. Granin, and, according to V. G. Babakov, most adequately represents the essence of the phenomenon of a nation: “In reality, a “nation” is a collection of people connected between into a community not only by common citizenship, but also by common territory of residence, common language and common culture. Nation - united by similar feelings of specialness and unity, common significant historical and current factors, a socio-cultural community of people politically united in one state, which (the state) together with the institutions of civil society through mass communication systems and a national education system for. It creates their imaginary image of a “nation” (“Russia”, “France”, etc.) and a “civic consciousness” in people that dominates older racial and ethnic identities.” [6, 15-16; 7, 32].

Thus, the nation has a complete system of ethnic identifiers traditions, customs, self-awareness, language, value foundations. Miroslav Groch especially emphasized the importance of language in the formation of a sense of national community: some authors believe “Language and ethnicity (cultural specificity) in most European countries were not invented by “nationalists” . The "printed" language is codified and plays an important role as a means of communication, as a means of "ethnic consciousness", that is, as a means of ethnic identity. This was especially the case during the period of (enlightened) absolutism, when language was standardized and codified. People felt that they understood better those who used the same language, and they were aware of their belonging to the same ethnic group, which may or may not have caused "national" feelings, that is positive attitude towards those who speak the same language."

The question of when a new social collectivity is formed in the form of a nation, and what happens at this moment with another social collectivity an ethnic group can be answered as follows when play a priority role evidence of the existence of a nation is discovered ethnic factors cease. One of the distinctive features of a state is sovereignty, since only by having sovereignty will be a state be able to fulfill its functions and realize its competencies. The state cannot deal with the problem of the sovereignty of an ethnic group, since this is the path of its own destruction, and it is concerned with its own sovereignty, and not with the sovereignty of a single ethnic group.

It is obvious that as well as concepts communities denoted through these concepts this have certain identical characteristics: a nation and an ethnic group are connected, first of all, by the common territory within which the history of a given people unfolds by the common language, culture and mentality. In the historical evolution of an ethnos and a nation, there is a differentiating factor - this is the state: if an ethnos can exist before the emergence of a state and under the conditions of a state, then a nation appears only after the formation of statehood. There is no doubt that such a factor as the emergence of a state should determine the appearance of a specific component in the content, first of the concept and social collectivity “nation”. Consequently, the differences in the role and status of such social subjects deepen as ethnicity and nation. These differences will be especially noticeable in a specific social situation.

Apparently, one should listen to the opinion of A. S. Blinov, who believes that “a nation is a more symbolic structure, expressed in the feeling of belonging to one group of many individuals deprived of the possibility of direct physical contact” [4, 15].

The starting point in determining the content of the concepts “ethnic group” and “nation” is the state. For both an ethnos and a nation, important components are territory, language, culture, psychology, and mentality. The concept of “ethnicity” does not cover those processes that work to satisfy state-political interests, while the nation is primarily included in social processes and, for the purpose of its own development, strengthens the state, which it delegates the most important competencies, related to the political arrangement and economic provision of the territory of their own habitat.

When defining the concept of “nation,” in our opinion, it is first of all worth noting that this social collectivity is very complex and its formation took several centuries, while one of its distinctive abilities is the ability to constantly change.

As I. F. Ilyasov defines a nation: “A nation is an association of people that arose on the basis of a common central government, territory, economy, language and awareness of common interests, characteristics of character and culture” [8, 82].

A nation is one of the social collectivities in the form of a social community of the highest level. It is synthetic in nature, it contains ethnic, socio-economic and spiritual components. A nation absorbs the identifying components of an ethnos - language, mentality and other conservative elements that form a core or platform that ensures the uniqueness of its existence. The further existence of a nation, realizing itself in all public spheres through a complex of social acts, results in the structuring of the entire system of social relations and social differentiation within the territorial space of the nation.

Active knowledge of the surrounding reality in the process of activity forms and improves all forms of social consciousness, or at least gives a certain coloring under the influence of certain factors. These include ethnicity and nationality, since the specific nature of each of the social collectivities necessarily influences the nature of thinking, then these same features will manifest themselves in the form of a reflection of the surrounding world, that is, consciousness.

National consciousness is not an ideal structure capable of independently existing and developing. It should be spoken a product arising from the creativity of selected individuals who are responsible for the renewal of tradition, analyzing the nation's past and designing its future.

By formulating the past of a historical community called a nation in myths, representatives of its elite are trying to create conditions for the implementation of their political will. For them, national self-consciousness is a special form of objectification of an already past existence - the history of the nation, through which a given social collectivity is created and saved. As a rule, the national elite in every possible way idealizes the past of the nation, since it knows that any of the put forward and expressed positions and proposals becomes part of the collective unconscious, under the influence of which self-awareness is formed and on the basis of which national-state ideas are created [10, 120 -122].

Speaking about national identity, it is worth emphasizing that each of its components, having varying degrees of expression, is directly related to the processes that take place in society. And depending on what processes this or that component of self-awareness is currently under the influence of, we can, on the one hand, talk about the state of this complex system formation, and on the other, about the nature and trends of the social processes themselves, that is, characterize the state society itself.

It is obvious that national identity cannot be solely the result of the influence of external factors, and therefore all the metamorphoses of this structure are a manifestation of its creative potential, the role and influence of which is very significant. This is a manifestation of such a quality of national self-awareness as controversy.

The core of national self-awareness is the political will of the ruling layer, which synthesizes the collective ideas of an ethnic group organized into a state and modifies them in accordance with one or another mobilizing messianic idea. Agreeing with Husserl's opinion that "the perceiving consciousness is not an empty box in which the object of perception appears uninvited and ready-made. Rather, we note the object of perception is internally constituted by an overly refined meaning-giving structure of perception", that the elite consciously chooses, on the one hand, an illusory-utopian idealization of the past and on the other, designing the desired future, since it can position itself as an exponent fundamental state-forming interests, that is, forming national identity in this case.

There is no doubt that representatives of the same community, which arose on the basis of national-ethnic identity, will have largely identical assessments, views, and opinions regarding particularly important and significant institutions, processes and results of their own activities. Otherwise, there would be no reason to consider them to belong to the same collectivity. One of the conditions for the formation of common and similar features of mentality and worldview is a common historical path and subsequent interpretation of the past. It is in the course of such comprehension of one's history and determining the place of one's community among others that one understands one's peculiarities, specificity and common features with other ethnic groups, and develops not only rational, but also emotional empathy for one's unity.

In the past time, discussing Russian self-consciousness and comparing with populist (read ethnic), Nikolai Berdyaev clarified that: "National consciousness is a qualitative consciousness, not a quantitative one. The populist consciousness was, after all, an admiration for quantity, for the simple masses; it rests on faith in the immanent truth of the mass collective, the truth of unconscious simplicity" [3, 264].

National self-consciousness performs an unique function: thanks to it, a person determines himself, since, being the basis, the foundation of national consciousness, it is national self-consciousness that is responsible for the formation of the entire evaluation system. By creating the core of this system, national self-awareness makes it possible to structure rational and value concepts, thanks to which a person can become an active participant in socio-political life and assimilate all the components of spiritual life. If we compare national consciousness and self-awareness, then in the latter we should note a special level of individualization.

National self-awareness took shape over a long period; its genesis extended through historical time and predetermined largely by the phenomena and processes of the historical process. It is obviously that its development is understandable: the impact of external factors caused divergent emotional reactions, influencing the ethno psychological level of an individual and the community as a whole. This peculiar mechanism is responsible for the basic antithesis "us - them", "friends - strangers". Thanks to him, each component is formed in human consciousness. Thus, "a person finally realizes by contrasting one's group with certain "others" or "strangers himself as part of the whole, a member of "his" group. So Ladygina O.V. in the abstract of her doctoral dissertation notes: "Self-organization of national self-consciousness: theory and practice" says: "National self-consciousness... is a complex self-organized system. The objective basis of the self-organization of the system is the dialectical interaction of chaos and order, as a result of which coherence of the hierarchical levels of the system arises. The mutual transition of the system from chaos to order has a certain periodicity and is manifested in the alternation of hierarchization and dehierarchization" [9, 24].

The revival of national self-awareness is to a certain extent due to the disharmony that arises as a consequence of the crisis in interpersonal relations. In such conditions, a deformation of moral values inevitably occurs, and such significant institutions as family, mercy, and friendship are destroyed. To stop this destruction, a very strong idea is needed that will heal society and ensure either restoration or re-formation of stable and mutually beneficial relationships both within the social collectivity and beyond.

**Bibliography:**

1. Husserl E. Logical Investigations. Vol. 1. (J. N. Findlay, Tran.). London-NY. 2001. P. 319.
2. Antonov E. A. Russian national identity in the context of globalization // Scientific bulletins of the Belgorod State University. 2011. T. 17. No. 14 (109). pp. 238-242.
3. Berdyaev N. A populist and national consciousness // The fate of Russia. M.: Eksmo. 2007. P. 264.
4. Blinov A. S. The nation state in the context of globalization: the contours of constructing a political and legal model of the emerging global order. M.: MAX Press. 2003. P. 15.
5. Brubaker R. Myths and misconceptions in the study of empire and nationalism. M.: New publishing house of the magazine "Ab Imperio". 2010. pp. 110-111.
6. Granin Yu. D. Will Russia become a national state // Questions of Philosophy. 2010. No. 1. P. 15-16.
7. Grokh M. Consensus explanation of the formation of a nation // Questions of philosophy. 2010. No. 1.S. 32.
8. Ilyasov F.N. National consciousness and behavior // Country and World (Munich). 1990. No. 6 (60). P. 82.
9. Ladygina O. V. Self-organization of national identity: theory and practice. Dushanbe. 2010. Abstract... diss. Doctor of Philosophy. P. 24.
10. Fink R. A. On the issue of expressing national self-determination in the national idea // Omsk Scientific Bulletin. 2012. No. 1-105. pp. 120-122.