

Globalisation (possibility and deficiency) - national identity in threat?

by Dragan M. Popovic, MA
Presented at International Conference in Ethnology and Anthropology
April 02- 05, 2006, Craiova, Romania | INTRODUCTION

Who we are? Are we able to say more about our identities? Are we really sure that we, in cultural sense, quite belong to the particular world sites? Those and similar questions can be raised by many people especially considering the power of the new comer in our lives - "globalisation". Its primer clue is unification of all diversities through the different instruments, but with most visible power of market that is represented by the system of multinational companies and supportive world institutions like WTO, IMF, World Bank among others.

Many scholars are thinking that there is nothing new in globalisation. In some extent they are right. During the centuries, from the period when conventional history started to be counted and first artifacts dated, examples of similar processes with almost same effects, although in their proto-stadiums, were very much in power. The idea of previous sentence can be followed through efforts of traditional ancient Empires like Egypt, China, or Rome to unify territories of their jurisdiction as well as their citizens in political, military, and cultural sense. For instance, when Roman Empire was in the summit of power people who was part of it could not call them - Romans. This was the privilege. Actually, people needed it due to thing that it was, obviously, ticket to prosperity, peace and security. Symbol of the Roman citizenship was the first prominent category in terms of globalisation, also, attempt for creation of the single cultural system through the feeling of Roman exclusivity and everlasting virtues like "All of the roads lead us to Rome". On the grave monuments, some traders beside their names put how many times they had been there. Therefore, Rome was synonym for universal virtue - citizen of the world, and from here we can pulp the first clear vision of meta-globalisation.

In those times people qualified themselves according to the nobles whom they owed taxes or work. Borders were sacred, but of the lands or pastures and not of the states. There could not be clear vision of the state territory especially for the reason of frequent wars. Great multiethnic states and universal doctrine of "Empire" had formed vision that little ethno-confessional groups through participation in magnificent empires can model or remodel picture of the global world order as sacred titulus of Empire universality. Not just territory, but multi ethnicity of the ancient or medieval countries could create certain image of the Empires. In that sense the most prominent effort was widening of the state territory. However, although they shared visions of universalism, Emperors did not want to share the titulus of the master of the world, since only one could claim that he is universal lord which can be very comparable with visions of certain groups of power that inspire modern globalisation process.

With the systematic falling of the Roman Empire doctrine of universalism underlined new institute - confession. Movements of different civilizations observed as ongoing and unstoppable process created milieu of certain Empire as a defender of universal principle. In that evolution process in some moment, religion has started to be determined force for political and cultural development, which represents starting point in nation states creation. Namely, nation state is a chain between two different types of globalisation.

There are special nation symbols or effects, which represent particular ethnicity. If we combine them we can get mixture of life style sources or determined culture. The term culture is essence of this paper as well as questions that can be pulped from it. For instance, how national culture and national exclusivity can survive in the forthcoming process of global unification? Or, in general, what is the meaning and importance of the term national culture? Is globalisation really possible?

It is very easy for one ethnic group, which is connected by territory and self- governance, blood, language, confession, history and tradition to create political formation that is represented by the term - "nation". Therefore, nation states in structuring need to have as their base, some crucial virtues and values that everybody accepts as common characteristics.

Situation when few ethnic groups would like to create bigger community is process of globalization on the small scale. From that perspective we will overlook globalization itself.

II DIFFERENT TYPES OF CULTURE

We can speak about two different types of culture: 1) "culture as objective" and 2) "culture as a tool". This distinction is, we deem, crucial for understanding of globalisation.

"Culture as objective" is something which is exclusively related to certain ethnic groups. It mostly includes tradition and history and all products connected with them - material, social or spiritual culture, then all ethic virtues, traditional songs, stories which were transferred from generation to generation, or, simply, everything that can represent one nation as a sole system.

Surely, we should not take this distinction so strict due to thing that "culture as objective", defined in a way that previous paragraph shows can be very powerful instrument in defending of national uniqueness. Therefore, it is able to function as "culture as a toll", too. Some ethnic groups could protect their cultural products in spite of, for instance, fierce of occupation. When they have become overrun those products were fences toward very new occupiers' culture. In that respect, for instance, with the Christianity they defended themselves from the Islam. If we have, roughly speaking,

invaders in any sense (cultural, economical, colonial…), with very strong ideology without any possible connection with, let us say, perspective life philosophy rooted in the territory that is target for "assaults", from one side, and from the other ethnic group who have been prepared from the very beginning that it has to do business with something evil, in those circumstances establishing of closer mutual interaction is almost impossible. Reason is -nonexistence of common characteristics. Therefore, diversification is possible starting point for the clashes from which was pulped later fight between one another. That thing makes both system closed. Everything said seem that it is possible to implement institute of the Froyd's theory of person: one cannot make any step further in new life condition because novelty is something which affects him/her strong and in bad manner. We can give an example. Islamic system of Ottoman Empire was totally unacceptable for the Christian Balkan population. Invaders have destroyed everything, which previously was so important for certain population that from the other side fulfilled psychological fear of loose. Because of that we can see very viable and visible development of the traditional way in cultural production and continuation of the patrimonial and patriarchal behavior that resisted to the occupied forces. That behavior has made afterwards, for example, Serbian nation and Serbian nation state.

"Culture as a tool" is very important instrument in favor of globalization. It is powerful institute that can break walls of national traditions down. Proclamation of different products as universal accomplishment, which everybody should use, is a perfect example. People are making decisions about somebody or certain goods through very authoritative TV channels or advertisements that after global consummation become stereotypes. One of the most important examples is surely connected with slimness and widespread ideal of beauty. However, we do not think that jeans, hot-dog, McDonald's or any kind of global products can change things of how people really look like. Behind the jeans they still belong to particular ethnic groups. Problem arises when "culture as tool" creates global opinions through mentioned instruments. "Culture as a toll" will decide what is good and what is wrong as universal virtue. In that sense we can speak about jeans or sushi, or hot-dogs as very fancy products but about retrograde influence of the religions.

It is completely impossible and unacceptable that something can be created as universal virtue simply - by proclamation. Time is necessary element in decision what should be common feature for the human race. According to this cultural type everybody will be excluded from the prosperity if does not accept characteristics of the proclaimed modernity. This is the thing that collects people from different world site in opposition toward globalisation.

III PROCESS OF GLOBALIZATION IN THE SENSE OF UNIFICATION BETWEEN DIFFERENT ETHNIC GROUPS

We deem that creation of nation states is natural strain of every single ethnic group. It is a political category and can be created when some ethnic group collects all national virtues and cultural products and interlink them on that way that all people from one territory feel as one, like compatriots. In most of the cases building of nation states cannot go without obstacles, clearly without opposite interests of the neighbor ethnic groups.

Widening of the state territory is also well known process. It was happening on different ways: with wars; with agreements when few ethnic groups because of predictable common characteristics and other benefits want to create bigger community; or it was creation of the big power interest games. However, widening of the states in political or cultural sense can be seen as micro-globalization movement. On the certain examples (Yugoslavia and European Union) we will see the possibilities and deficiencies of such political approach and it possible transfer to other regions.

1) Former Yugoslavia

Yugoslav idea, creation of South Slav romantism and civil revolution, was kind of "brainstorming" among scholars. Dissatisfaction with every day life formed flammable atmosphere amid common people, who certainly could not understand intellectual generalizations. Still, political interests had clearer dimension for Yugoslav struggle. However, fertile land for implementation of the Yugoslavism, without understandable perspective how future state should look like and how differences will get to the common ground, was based.

We will try to look deeper in the Yugoslav situation. Essence of observation should be put on two the most numbered and the most determined ethnic Yugoslav groups, Croats and Serbs. Percentage of unity and misunderstanding between Yugoslavs was exclusively result of the interactions between mentioned groups.

Croats were very passionate Yugoslavs. Bedrock of their vision was activity of the "Illyrian movement" (beginning of 19-century). Members of that organization were on stance that Yugoslav cultural area should have been integrated in one exclusive corpus. According to Ivo Banac, well-known Croatian historian, Serbs never believed in the efforts of the "Illyrian movement" because it was nothing but Croatian ethno-national revival (Banac, 1984). From the other side, Serbian Yugoslavism was continuation of efforts toward west and recollection of Serbs in unified state.

Nevertheless, everybody believed that diversities between Yugoslav people would have been solvable with unified state. Traditional cultures of all people were used in organizing and explanations of the Yugoslav unity. Still, there were people who had strong remembrance of conflicts between Yugoslavs. Here we think on conversion of the people from Orthodoxy to Islam or from Catholic Christianity to Islam or on the Serbian Orthodox tradition in the Military Frontier where Catholic Church and Catholic Croatian Parliament wanted to implement their political will over Serbian Genzers;

core of the Austro-Hungarian army in 1914 on the Balkan front was consisted of Croats and Muslims, and in some small number of Serbs and Slovenians. This position found its greatest implementation during the Second World War and establishing of Independent State of Croatia where Serbs were objects of dreadful atrocities. It is worth to say that Vatican is first state that recognized Croatian independence in 1941 and in 1991. On that way, common people were very unsatisfied which prepared worse functioning of the state. Every problems or changes start from the bottom with support of the common people. They did not participate in any decision but they were able to feel everything of real state life and how cultural products did build atrocities.

In next few lines we are going to summarize development of Yugoslav idea from Croatian position. First intention (beginning of 19-century) was making of closer links with Serbian Kingdom as a Piedmont of the pan-Yugoslav idea. Therefore, with that term "Yugoslavia" Croats marked South Slavs territory of Austro-Hungary as a land of their responsibility. Second stage was separation of Yugoslavism with Serbdom. With entirely different name, which could generate all South Slav ethnic names, Croats had fought against "Serbianization". This was very visible during and after the First World War. However, division between terms "Serbianization" and "Yugoslavism" was the first evolution of the Yugoslav idea in the Croat frames. When Croats finally entered in unified Yugoslav state to the Serbs started to connect Yugoslavism with Serbdom. According to them, interwar Yugoslavia became Serboslavia. This would be the third part in development of the Yugoslav idea in Croats mind. Actually, after liberation from Austria-Hungary they wanted after 1000 years to establish again sole national Croatian state. Serbs were on the road against their intention.

After clear signs that it is impossible to go in the direction of Yugoslav unification Serbian intellectuals, previously supporters of Yugoslavism, have strongly claimed recreation of Serbian traditional culture through new cultural organizations. Here we notice comparable wishes in Yugoslav communist state organization after Constitution from 1974 when all Yugoslav republics, including autonomous regions within Serbia (Vojvodina and Kosovo), had their sole cultural, political and economic area. However, everything started with the cultural problems and feelings that some groups have been doing something in suppression of exclusive rights of the other groups.

First open revival of Croatian national idea was in 1954 (Communist Yugoslavia) with agitation for liberalization of the Croat languages from "foreign words" - Serbian words. Cultural organization of the Croats, "Matica Hrvatska" - "Queen of Croatia" proclaimed independence of the Croatian language from the Serbian one. According to its representatives, expression, Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian language should change in the separate campus, namely Croatian and Serbian languages. That claims flamed Belgrade cultural establishment who immediately replied that Croats have stolen Serbian language and that they have suppressed Cyrillic script in Republic of Croatia, which was matter of Serbian feeling and their determination as Serbs.

Croatian thinkers were more pragmatic than Serbs who preferred stressing of emotions in the state structuring. In the Croatian sense, emotions were just one of the instruments that covered reality. Croats perceived emphasizing of Serbian casualties from the Serbian side as a complex or that they should pay something to them. Actually, it has been just manifest side of the problems. Something, which has all the time stayed between different South Slav groups, was their explanation of Yugoslav cause on very different ways. Disputes reached political level again at the beginning of the 1970s after proclamation of "Croatian Spring". That struggle for state independence have not stopped until its materialization at the beginning of the 1990s when Franjo Tudjman, former Yugoslav Peoples Army general and creator of "Croatian Spring" was elected for president of Croatia. Under his rule, Serbs were excluded from Croatian constitution as constitutive element. From that point nothing could stop revitalization of the bad memory from the past in Serbian mind. Product was clear - Civil war.

Jovan Erdesljanovic, Serbian ethnologist from the beginning of the 20th century gave very good definition of ethnic culture. "Under term ethnic culture of the some ethnic group we think that it is - complexity of productivity or attainment of the human spirit and lives, which certain ethnic group reached during its ethnical development" (Jovan Erdeljanovic, 1938: 3, 4). In the case of former Yugoslavia ethnic culture was, for instance, Serbian culture, Croatian culture etc. One sole ethnic culture can be transformed in higher form, namely national cultural corpus with the same name as its ethnic culture forerunner had. It will happen if one ethnic culture has viable form and passed through many stadiums, which help certain ethnic group to feel unified together with sole tradition, history, language, blood, territory and self-governance. This was the situation with Slovenians, Croats and Serbs. From the other side, sum of the particular ethnic cultures with different names can form universal culture, also. In that case, we are talking about ethnic cultures, which did not reach form of national culture because of shortage of mentioned references. Precisely cultural products did not reach level of general acceptance by every member of certain ethnic group. This was the situation with Muslims, Montenegrins and Macedonians.

However, do any ethnic cultures/national cultures, taken together, can form universal national state culture? It is possible if they are not so separate one another. First thing is formation of common base that should be acceptable by every group. In the case of Yugoslavia it could be South Slav origin and partly language because not all Yugoslav groups were using Serbian, Croatian, Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian. Still, there was not unity in any sense among South Slavs. Yugoslav idea (which was defined, as we could see, on very different ways by every Yugoslav group that made question of South Slav unity very questionable) could gather all differences but it could not repair them because of the harsh cultural diversities between Yugoslav ethnic groups that have been existing and developing through centuries as a

consequence of different socio-political and cultural contexts of their living.

Every of Yugoslav groups should have thrown out some of the characteristics that bothered others and without feeling of loosing. However, determined South Slav cultures could not permit themselves to loose ethnic products in the contexts where there was not any sense of togetherness. Loosing of their parts will be perceived as a threat.

Combining defined cultures because of formation some new cultural form, without common characteristics looks like artificial new form of culture. Therefore, Yugoslavia was artificial state that nobody wanted. Because of that it was sentenced to failure.

2) European Union

EU is one of the most prominent institutions which clearly mark globalization process as such. Mutual distrust between France and Germany and fears of communism and Soviet Union, pushed European states, namely France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg in closer co-operation for constructing something that will later be known as "European Coal and Steel Community" - cornerstone of European Union. After many stages western European states became an economic giant with single market system as a cohesive force. Nevertheless, there is something that should be asked: Are economic interests strong enough to cover or recover all of the problems which currently exist inside of European Union?

"Future of Europe" debate raised many questions: What is the European perspective? Should it go forward with the same institutional arrangements? How government officials will reconcile inter-governmental and federative approach in restructuring of EU?

Those questions become essential for reestablishing of European institutions and European future in general. However, there are many opposite visions between main actors of European structure. It is the most visible when we consider two conflicting mentioned theory toward Future of Europe. Supporters of inter-governmental approach are emphasizing independence of nation states and all things that represent state sovereignty. Those countries often recall exclusivity of nation culture and tradition. Europe should continue to pool its existence from national democracies, and democratic elected national parliaments and governments, which representatives have chair in European Institutions. Every transfer of nation states special rights to the European level would be thought as defeat of sovereignty. Because of that, adherent states did not establish EURO as single currency system nor they want to apply in arranging of common foreign and security policy, or to create universal tax system. They will continue to support EU only because of economic interests. Problems of environment, pollution, food safety, economy (common market), unemployment, national states will continue to transfer to the European level, because, according to the principle of subsidiarity Europe can better manage with mentioned problems. Great Britain and Scandinavian states are representatives of this direction in structuring of European affairs.

From the other hand, followers of federative position think that only stronger co-operation between states are able to defend national cultures and traditions, which is completely opposite to the stance of inter-governmental approach supporters. President of French Republic Jacques Chirac has said: "Our states are the source of our identities and our sense of belonging. The diversity of their political, cultural and linguist traditions is one of the strength of our Union. In the future, too, the nation state will remain people's first point of reference." Similar position has President of Germany, Johannes Rau, who explained that European federation had to be established because of struggling against globalization and effective protection of nation state sovereignty and culture.

Federative forces accepted single currency system. They wish to organize "pioneer group" of states (suggestion of the former president of the European Commission Jacques Delors) or "core group" (suggestion of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Joschka Fisher) of states that will represent center of gravity of countries which will be ready in some moment to create stronger unity based on federative principle. Center of gravity is certainly the most important improvement for supporters of this theory, which means closer cooperation between countries based on the, again, generally accepted common characteristics. Main allies of "Paris-Berlin axis" are Greece and Belgium.

Here, the very important thing that should be noted is that that both groups of states in their base have certain common features, actually, minimum of values which everybody accepts. For the supporters of inter-governmental approach it is common market and economic prosperity that arose from it. For the federative block economic prosperity and common market are just starting points for, maybe, stronger gathering or stronger integration. Therefore, they put in their base single currency system (EURO), Schengen agreement, and wish for continuation in structuring of Common Foreign and Security Policy. That really means that nation state is transferring previously exclusive right of it to the higher community level. Center of gravity ("pioneer group", "core group") will be formed with new special treaty. After signing, this treaty will be obligatory for it participants, which means, like in the EU case, that there is no way back. Still, one can think that they are forced to continue as center of gravity. We cannot approve that because before entering they have to agree with defined obligations. Beside that, with free will they are going to make decision about the accession. However, we can see that supporters of federative principle have much more common characteristics then first alignment, which creates

participants of federative approach much integrated for the reason of the larger number of common interests. Because of good base, in time, number of common and acceptable values can be only higher, which will possible produce cornerstone for real European cultural determination as collector of exclusive national cultures. Going in same direction, we cannot say that economic prosperity is powerful institute considering term "common virtues". Only if economic prosperity is national interest states will support it. Beside that, economic wealth as a minimum of common values in the sense of the inter-governmental approach supporters can be defended only by EU treaty because EU states cannot step aside from that alignment. EU treaty cannot force them to create more integrative elements between them. Due to everything said we can conclude that supporters of inter-governmental approach are in some extent subjugated by the national interests and their unity around mentioned idea is just current interest game which can be, maybe tomorrow, changed with something else.

Decision-making process and Enlargement

Now we are going to see deeper in the same problem but from different levels: from the positions of EU citizens and "new comers", states that will be part of EU from 2006.

Supporters of inter-governmental approach think that Europeans are not interested in details about decision-making processes or how European institutions function. How European citizen can be closer to the EU when they do not know anything about, for instance, such important thing as decision-making process? Our point is opposite. European public should know how that especially considering way of decisions creation - behind close doors and without public debate, therefore on a way which is familiar with decision-making process within Communist countries in Presidiums or in similar Committees without eyes of citizens. They are proposing strengthening role of European Council, which will mean continuation of implementing decisions from above.

Every single Treaty was made with compromises between European counterparts. Nobody knows how that debate looked behind close doors, but everybody could see and hear that those debates were not easy. Obviously, nation interests of some country (countries) are ruined in some extent by proposing consensus. If we look in that way, we can be sure that citizens of "ruined" state will be very opponents of that new idea and they will vote against it. Slow approaching in European integration (or hesitation in acception of new rules) fear enough public of states and they logically accept direction of their governments because they feel much more safety if follow them. Here we can include low turnout in last elections for EP, and, for instance Danish "NO" for Maastricht Treaty, and immediately after that 1% above 50% in French ratification of Maastricht or, which is today very outstanding Irish "NO" toward approval of Nice Treaty on the referendum.

Therefore, Europe should be settled on a way how nation state institutions were formed. European citizens would like to see on European level structure of institutions, which are very familiar to them.

National governments did not consult citizens about their wishes toward widening of Europe. As a result, we have Irish rejection of Nice Treaty. Europeans are very worried about possible migration movements from the eastern countries to the Western Europe because, according to their opinion, citizens of 10 "new comers" are cheap labor force. They are also worried about competition and employment/unemployment. Problem of European governments is managing with, from the one side, absolutely economic prosperity with widening of the market, and from the other side, fears of citizens that they incomes now will be transfered to the less developed area of new member states.

Applicant countries are very strong supporters of Europe because of their almost certain step further to the direction of greater economic prosperity, which is reasonable expectation considering success of EU. New countries would like to take an important role and to become very respectful. They are proud as well of their culture setting, history, and tradition and much more sensitive because of very recent reestablishment of national identity, which were suppressed so long by influence of Soviet Union. They are also disappointed because of Europeans eyesight on them that they are cheap labor force and possible immigrants to the western states. Applicants are saying that mentioned situation would not take place, as well as similar situation did not happen when Greece, Portugal, and Spain entered in EU. However, legacy of previous regime (Communist regime) is still visible especially if we take in account problematic socio-economic and political situation of applicant countries. Things started to change but facts are still strong.

It is out of question to make comparison between Greece, Spain, and Portugal with any other new applicants. First, when they enter in EC their industry potential was not ruined. They had clear market economy, very strong civil society and strong democratic tradition, though Greece, Portugal, and Spain had dictatorship regime. Second, EC in that time was not strong as EU is today. Criteria for EC participation in that time were not as hard as they are nowadays. Beside that, EC sought strategic areas for widening of its influence. EC succeeded and become the greatest world "corporation". Third, in addition of East Germany, It did not pass through the painful process of transition because of great inflow of money from West Germany. Those things cannot be included in the destiny of new comers.

Beside that, new comers are very sensitive bearing in mind stances of both blocks of states. They are aware of fears of inter-governmental approach followers, chiefly because of possible division on "us" and "them" that could be generate from their ideas. From the other side, new comers were participants of former and not successful federations. Sounding

of "F" word in their ears maybe cannot be good music. Theirs federation experience often carries hard remembrance of ethnic or civil conflicts, like that one in Slovenia.

We think that rising of influence of European regions is very useful thing especially, considering the power of nation state and culture. In globalised world the first victim will be nation state. If it transfer all of the prerogatives to it regions, sole national tradition, especially local history and with that national history, too, will remain exclusive and secure. In the European setting it is the matter of the strongest importance. It can be compared with the problems that Aztecs have had after Cortez units arrived in 16 century. Aztecs strongly believed in their religious books. According to them they could expect comers who would get them prosperity. However, Cortez burnt all of the relics, especially books, from which Aztecs pulped life philosophy. Without main levers of the life style Aztecs easily became loot of the Europeans. It was ethnocide that finish with later genocide. In some extent, roughly speaking, process of globalization carries with itself threat of ethnocide - destroying of national cultures, especially because of different proclamations what cultural product, social movement or tradition is acceptable, and what is not. National culture is the base of Europe. Without it Europeans can finish as Aztecs. Because of that power of regions is crucial thing for European nation states as well as for European Union.

We could see from the words of European officials' importance of national products. Previously we have said that any global process can reach it realization only after establishing of features that would be accepted by everybody. Those things are something which clearly marks sovereignty of states and national interests of the states like educational system, foreign policy, security, tax system ... Without those links we cannot speak of successful globalisation. For current Europe, common characteristic is economy. Every of the states that are part of EU are very happy because of the economic prosperity that single market gave. Still in the case of current Iraq crisis they are completely on the different stances. Every of them support their own national interests, no matter do they for the war or against it, but certainly common economic success is not strong enough to bring opponents in the same campus about this problem. Therefore, an exclusive national interest is much more powerful than global idea.

IV POSSIBLE WAY OUT

Culture is perfect tool for spreading of new ideas due to reason that it may convinced people that implementation of the patterns from successful regions (precisely, western world) can become roots for good life perspective in the underdeveloped areas. However, important part of this process is: everybody should abandon something which can be opponent to western philosophy, namely - tradition. If somebody wants to have same level of success like other people the best way to reach it is to copy already applied instruments. In some extent it is very logical, but here we have to include that not all people were upbringing in the same way or in the same social contexts. Namely, successful institutes may have other surface in different social surrounding and because of that show themselves - false.

Although western states, generally speaking, can be announced as reformers and proponents of new life styles, in our case, globalisation, we did not see any clear mark that those states are ready to abandon their national visions. Actually, globalisation is "one way ticket" where flowing (selling) of products is exclusive right of rich states. In that constellation of power vice versa situation cannot be applied. In that sense globalisation is huge need that means multiplying of the capital. Therefore, there is strong necessity for open borders. Nevertheless, western states are very will to preserve their exclusivity and primacy in the sense of economy, which is manifest representation of global reforms, and through it to cement "clean" national situation, as a latent vision of globalisation as "one way ticket" process. Quotation from this paragraph we will try to explain considering discussion about restructuring of the European Union through the opinions of supporters of inter-governmental approach in reorganizing of the EU. We deem that Scandinavian countries are perfect example. They are very proponents of globalisation and soft customs barriers in the sense of economy, but only through the vision of "one way ticket" theory. For instance, there are more then 90% of Danish people in Denmark or other Scandinavian countries. Going in the same direction, it is very difficult for many people to go there. The reason is obvious. With great people movements and settling new mother country will loose some of the previous characteristics due to the raising of cultural differences. Mother country will reshape its cultural looking and gets new cultural formations that really can threat traditional culture. Therefore, ethnic groups that have created frames of traditional culture will feel afraid of loosing their own products and feel threaten in their own formation - nation state. Influence of different religions also should be taken in account. For instance, Islam supports procreation. Considering way of upbringing in European setting, as well as number of family members, we can easily conclude that permission for settling in the countries with small number of family members (like in Scandinavian countries) is almost impossible to get to those ethnicities whose traditional philosophy of family life support great number of family members. In that surrounding, groups that formed certain countries, and gave their ethnical name to the state can be in very few years after minority in own national state creation.

Problems that previous paragraph stresses we will try to explain from the position of United States. The biggest proponent of globalisation is surely America. In that respect it is worth and useful mentioning expressions "American dream" or "American way" including description of the American nationalities - Italo-Americans, Hispano-Americans, Afro-Americans. Mentioned terms are showing very rational thinking of the American national interests. It population is from different cultural bases and with different ethnic origins, some kind of conglomerate of all cultural sorts that were brought on the American soil during colonization or, today, with economic movements. From the starting point these ethnic groups, in most of the cases European settlers, immediately started shaping themselves as Americans. The first thing

was fight against indigenous population that all of them combined in the same front. Thing of the strongest importance for Americanization was the war for Independence at the second part of 18 century. As the strongest state on Earth it citizens have accustomed with the term "Americanism, Americanization" and transferred their ethnic identity to universal American because of the feeling of greatness. This is very important human characteristic - pulping the strength from the powerful. Considering masterpiece of Erich From, "Escaping from freedom", this is one of the most problematic and unhealthy human characteristics but very useful for globalisation.

However, in the case of America we could see again importance in creation of common ground (fight against indigenous population; war for independence and all it products; most powerful state world state) for feeling of togetherness in creation of the national identity.

This representation of American culture cannot be comparable with the case of Europe where almost every nation succeeds in formation of "pure" ethnic state and "pure" ethnic cultural products. Europeans were participants of different national or almost national states at the end of 18 century, which were frequently in fight against one another. "Pure" nation state as the most prominent European creation, with overwhelming majority of certain population that gave it ethnic name to state itself (Frenchmen-France), is still core of European identity and in this moment cannot be exceeded like it was possible in America after "Mayflower" and war for independence.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that fluidity of cultural product in terms of cultural exchange depends on the level how much certain territory was opened or not for different ethnic movements, trade or other social and economic features. Many of the contemporary nationalities have similar medieval or even ancient products which belong right now to everybody that have features of global unification but it still does not mean that those improvements can provide better understanding between different nationalities and bedrock for future global relations.

In any unification process first step is creations of common values and virtues. Economic measures are only the supportive principle for, we deem, the most favorable tool - culture. Culture, organism that is not so visible, but which generate national identity, is the system that gives to people from one territory feeling of uniqueness and exclusivity. We think that next 10 points (Erdeljanovic, 1938: 5), which mentioned Serbian ethnologist Jovan Erdeljanovic suggested for better communication and unification between Yugoslav people, are good example how it is possible to form common ground for ethnic groups of different cultural base as a starting point in any kind of unification, from micro to global, world level.

1. (...) one of the main tasks should be propagating … that we are Yugoslavs, people, of one blood and one origin.
2. In masses should be promulgated knowledge about every part of our people as much as possible.
3. (…) Empowering assurance that only strong state and people community can provide free life, development and happy future in every part of our people.
4. Create as much as possible chances that different parts of our people should come in as much as closer connection one another and to acquaint themselves better (…)
5. Strive that youths from one Yugoslav tribe should be educated for certain years in schools in the areas of other tribes.
6. Exchange of very useful cultural, material and spiritual acquisition of one tribe.
7. Having as much as possible lectures in towns and villages in which it would be preached and broaden idea of Yugoslav people's unity, and (…) cultural unification of all of our people parts.
8. All of ours tribal and confessional disputes from the past should be as sharply as possible suppressed. Yugoslavia should look only in bright future, and not in the dark past.
9. It is very necessary promulgating (…) good knowledge of our main Yugoslav literal dialect, Serbo-Croatian (…) and equal use of our both scripts, Cyrillic and Latin …
10. The most important thing is work on appeasing of confessional differences among our people. The first and the best step in (…) that direction should be introduction of our people's language in church ceremonies and in every spiritual ceremony among all of ours faiths.

Indeed, mentioned points can create good base for globalization because they protect national exclusivity. This is crucial thing for any global formation due to thing that every single ethnic group have their sole ethnical interests and culture as we could see, for instance, from the text about European Union. With suppression of ethnic exclusivity, like it is situation today, it is almost impossible for the people to perceive globalisation as acceptable process but only as intimidation.

V CONCLUSION

Considering globalization process the most prominent factor, which should be taken in account, is nation state. It is relatively recent formation which started with its existence from the late 18 century but that process it in full power during 19 century with great examples of Italian and German national unification. Ethnic groups have passed through different stages when they reached the possibility to enter in another phase that is represented by complete national awareness. Factors that helped in creation of the common virtues were common language (in some extent even dialects), same blood, pain, history, religion, mythological base of fight for liberation and unification, or tradition in general.

Every single ethnic group would like to form their own state. Ethnic situation in Europe, with some exceptions like it was with Yugoslav ethnic groups, were not so problematic due to thing that particular groups were on the same territory so long and where generation of the people felt covered by identical ideology. That is surely good starting point for later proclamations - meanings of the term "compatriots". For that occasion first step is ideology. Ideology can be different. In the sense of the Balkan countries it was religion, Christianity, both, Orthodox and Catholic. Because of the better understanding we are going to take certain case from the Balkan. It will be Serbia.

The state of Serbia passed through many temptations during it (re)structuring. After the arrival on the Balkan Peninsula Serbs formed a very powerful state under the Nemanjic dynasty, but after two centuries of the prosperity they failed under Ottoman rule. Remembering of the previous state formation that was the source of fighting against invaders was a second step. It was first part of the nation creation. Serbian visions of Orthodox Christianity created vision that fights against Ottomans were not just ordinary fight for liberation but religious war as such. In that sense essential influence was done by traditional representations which were transferred from generation to generation on very idealistic and romantic form, during the night and among people who were sitting around the hearths. In the traditional stories virtues of the Kosovo battle and sacrificing of the Serbian knights became the main line of Serbian struggle. This was the thing which connected all Serbian thoughts in the direction of national unification. Beside that, role of the Saint Sava, the person who enabled independence of the Serbian church, took on his body, according to the tradition, role of a messenger between Serbs and heaven. "His basic effort" was fixation of Serbian sufferings as unreachable virtue of all Serbian national aspirations. With burning of his relics Ottomans tried to suppress the power of Serbian ideas in favor of liberation, but that act made Serbs completely stubborn that they are in the same front in specific national-religious war against devil himself.

The performance of the new regime influenced certain number of Serbs who were very close to think that with changing of faith will improve their position on the social structure level. In some extent they succeeded but confessional changes convinced tradition and rest of Serbs that those people are traitors of the Kosovo knights and universal Serbian virtues. Mentioned things were the cornerstone of the Serbian struggle for liberation and feeling of togetherness. It was not stopped until the complete liberation which was proclaimed by the Berlin Treaty in 1878. Confessional disputes are very important fact to note for the Yugoslav civil war.

During this time many Serbian scholars has worked hardly on the unification of all Serbian virtues: sole territory, common suffer, common tradition, values of the Kosovo, religion summarized in the struggle of the Saint Sava for spiritual jurisdiction over the Serbian ethnic territory and, finally, language and grammar. All of the mentioned things made ethnic unification of the Serbs possible. Of course it was long distanced process in which many of the characteristic from different regions and influences from abroad were accepted or suppressed because of the state cause. This is the process which was very familiar to other European nations that passes through similar lanes until creation of sole identity.

There is a strong need among people within certain ethnic territory for group identity. We mean here on the national identity, as a wider construction in comparison with family, wider family, and so on. Going in the same direction maybe people can feel much better in some wider creation like, for instance, in European Union. However, new identity needs to be formed by new common virtues that can be comparable and formed like national structures, which EU obviously does not have. TV stations, internet and other sources cannot form distinguished models of behavior because they are very different in their representations. With tools that some cultural structures should be defined as acceptable or unacceptable and in very determined terms, it is impossible to reach the top of universalities because everybody feels themselves - unique. Somebody whose performance is defined as good will perceive globalizations as suitable process, but others do not have power to be on same stances. When uniqueness started to be counted as universal form, and without evaluation that something is "holy" or "unholy" people would not be afraid of globalization.

Certain artifacts connected with social, material and spiritual culture can be defined as tradition of particular region after long period of using and developing. After that people from some region collect themselves around and accept it as their own virtue which can help them in the feeling of group identity. In the globalised world wish for unified market system is the most important value and also very recent creation, from which many of the ethnic groups are excluded.

Some scholars think that globalization has not power with which it can cover all wishes and demands in the sense of control due to thing that everything is in the flux. As the best example they use Internet. Everybody can use it or put their sites or read about all world regions or find out about different developments. We are on different stance. You are in front of the monitors and communicate with faraway people, but without possibility to see or feel them - real. This is the main problem. Human beings need human beings in very realistic way. Without them there is no chance to live their lives on healthy way or to feel as one. Monitor of the computer cannot replace the face or the voice, but it can break the barriers, psychological complexes, hesitation of the communication and approaching to the people. In that we are finding the most important source of the control. People are out of the streets. They read about different world sites from the internet, from the picture which often was given from not quite good perspective. You are loosing your wish to visit distanced areas because everything is on the web. Much better situation would be free traveling all around the world and acquainting diversities. Only on that way people will know that different vision of life styles and cultures are also important. This can be important measure and good managing inside of global system, which will open the door of the many nationalities that are excluded because of their wish for ethnic exclusivity.

From the other side, it is useless to be against globalization. It has started when to clans entered in deeper connections, for instance, due to protections from the other clans who wanted to capture their caves. Or they became unified for the reason of better hunting. Beside that, we cannot say that certain features that are globally accepted and with long term using, like Greek philosophy or Roman law, are something which can be threat for the space of local tradition and national history. Those things entered in the global entail as universal cultural products. Similar universal values can be base for restructuring of the world system and good mechanisms for global unifications, like those included in creation of nation state - common territory, blood, language, tradition, history … Therefore, in global system people need to recognize something that is familiar to them and similar to the institutes of their national creations. Transferring of power from narrow economic (geo-strategic) interests to universal and acceptable virtues (national culture, local tradition, confession …) with intermediary of, for instance, Roman law and Greek philosophy is crucial need for global peace. With strengthening of these values fierce of global unification, according to our opinion, world would be much better place for living.

VI BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ivo Banac, Nacionalno Pitanje u Jugoslaviji (National question in Yugoslavia), Zagreb, 1984
2. Jovan Erdeljanovic, Koju cemo kulturu: samo srpsku ili jugoslovensku (What culture do we support: Serbian one or Yugoslav one), Belgrade 1938, p. 3-4
3. Speech by Tony Blair, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to Polish Stock Exchange - Warsaw, 06/10/2000
<http://www.number-10.gov.uk/news.asp?NewsId=1341&SectionId=32>
4. Tuesdays for Europe" debate on the future of the European Union: record of the hearing of Jacques Delors at the French National Assembly's Delegation for the European Union (open to all MPs and the press), Paris, 19/06/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont190601_en.htm
5. Extracts from a speech given by Jacques Chirac, President of the French Republic in the German Bundestag, Berlin, 27/06/2000
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/spjune2000_en.htm
6. From Confederacy to Federation - Thoughts on the finality of European integration". Speech by Joschka Fischer at the Humboldt University - Berlin, 12/05/2000
<http://www.auswaertigesamt.de/www/de/infoservice/download/pdf/reden/redene/ r000512b-r1008e.pdf>
7. Speech by Rytis Martikonis, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, at the colloquium "The Aims of European Union: Ideas and Concepts of the Candidate Countries" - Bonn, 16-17/11/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp171101_en.pdf
8. World Television Day Message by H.E. Mr. Jan Kavan
President of the Fifty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2002/1121tv.htm>
9. Big Development Projects Need Cultural Impact Assessments
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/develop/2002/1118toepfer.htm>
10. The Drawbacks of Cultural Globalization by Wole Akande
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2002/1110cult.htm>
11. Intercultural Dialogues and Cultural Security by Jean Tardif
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2002/09intercultural.htm>
12. The Hidden Dimensions of Globalization: What is at Stake Geoculturally By Jean Tardif
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2002/0529geocultural.htm>
13. Arab Speakers See Threat to Culture by Globalization By Bassam Za'za'
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2002/0321arab.htm>
14. Return of the Nation-State-and the Leviathan By Tom Barry
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/nature/11leviathan.htm>
15. Now where? Draft epilogue to George Steinmetz, ed., State/Culture: New Approaches to the State in the Social Sciences (Cornell University Press, forthcoming) Charles Tilly Columbia University May 1997
http://www.sociology.columbia.edu/people/professors/ct135/miscellaneous/now_where.html
16. Robert I. Rotberg: The New Nature of Nation-State Failure
<http://www.twq.com/02summer/rotberg.pdf>
17. DIRECTORS LECTURE 14 November 2001 David Held
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/meetthedirector/pdf/14-Nov-01.pdf>
18. Globalization and the Future of Democracy
<http://www.fathom.com/feature/122000>
19. Globalization and the Nation State: Erosion from Above by Sylvia Ostry
<http://www.utoronto.ca/cis/timlin.pdf>
20. Has Globalisation Really Made Nations Redundant? By Noëlle Burgi and Philip S. Golub
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/global.htm>
21. Sovereignty By Stephen D. Krasner
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/realism.htm>
22. Self-determination and the Future of Democracy By Prince Hans-Adam II of Liechtenstein
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/future/0308lich.htm>
23. National Identities Need to Adapt and Survive by Janez Drnovsek

<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/politics/1001euid.htm>

24. Clash of Globalizations

<http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20020701faessay8523/stanley-hoffmann/clash-of-globalizations.html>

25. Economic Globalization and Culture

<http://www.ml.com/woml/forum/global.htm>

26. Economic Globalization and Culture 2

<http://www.ml.com/woml/forum/global2.htm>

27. Globalisation and Poverty Online Debate

http://www.panos.org.uk/environment/globalisation_and_poverty_online.htm

28. Globalization

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/>

29. Is it globalization

<http://www.umassd.edu/specialprograms/mideastaffairs/global1.htm>

30. The Reach of Transnationalism

<http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/kastoryano.htm>

31. Globalization and the Postmodern Turn

<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/dk/GLOBPM.htm>

32. The Challenges of Globalization: The Role of the World Bank

<http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/extme/jdwsp040201a-en.htm>

33. The politics of globalisation

<http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article.jsp?id=6&debateId=27&articleId=283>

34. Europe must face globalisation

<http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article.jsp?id=6&debateId=27&articleId=278>