THEORETICAL CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF IDENTITY: ON THE FALSE PROBLEM OF NON-COMPLEMENTARITY OF COLLECTIVE AND PERSONAL IDENTITY

Dr. Dusanka Slijepcevic, MA

Senior Teaching Assistant, Department of Applied Sociology, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Electronic reference *(Cite this article):*

Slijepcevic, D. THEORETICAL CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF IDENTITY: ON THE FALSE PROBLEM OF NON-COMPLEMENTARITY OF COLLECTIVE AND PERSONAL IDENTITY. *Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(11), 01–12. https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v2i11.178

ABSTRACT

The research subject refers to the theoretical perspectives of the identity of several authors – N. Sekulic, Z. Golubovic, B. Anderson, N. Djukic, E. Goffman, M. Castells, R. Watson, G. Small, Z. Bauman, S. Hall, V. Jerotic, R. Jenkins and A. Benoist. The search is for an answer to *the question: Could priority be given to personal or social identity, according to importance?* A noticeable *research problem* is the pluralism of conceptions that attach more importance to either individual or collective identity. *The main hypothesis* is that there is a false problem of non-complementarity of collective and personal identity, as well as an experiential connection (scientific law) between the political construction of collective identity and totalitarianism. *The scientific goals* are: 1) *to describe* the identity and the process of its creation; 2) *to classify* and *explain* the difference between personal and collective identity, with an emphasis on the integrative point of view of Golubovic and Jenkins on the complementarity between them; 3) *to anticipate* the experiential connection between the political construction of collective identity and totalitarianism due to the exclusion of Others from the constructed identity pattern, in order to establish complete state-political (party) control over all dimensions of everyday life beyond States. *The methods* of *(descriptive and comparative) analysis, deduction, synthesis, induction, case studies and content analysis of identity conceptions based on a simple classification (significant - less significant type of identity)* (Kukic & Markic, 2006: 217) and *desk research* will be used. *The results of qualitative research* are knowledge about identity, its types, its construction and the consequences of identity engineering, which were obtained through secondary, qualitative data (Kothari, 2004; Dale, Wathan & Higgins, 2008) during 'research in the library' (Kuba & Koking, 2004: 90) on bibliographic units from an abstracted sample.

Keywords: *collective, personal, hiper-consumer, identity, identity construction, integrative perspective*

INTRODUCTION

Could priority be given to personal or social identity in order of importance? - is the central question of this research.

According to the professor and academic, *Vladeta Jerotic*, the American psychotherapist *Erik Erikson*, in the book 'Childhood and Society' from 1950, wrote that today's dealing with the problem of identity began when identity became problematic. According to Zagorka Golubovic, that was the time of the 18th century, the collapse of the traditional, kinship, order of pre-industrial (traditional) society, when the problem between the individual and society appeared, that is, when, in the 19th century, emphasis was placed on individuality, as a demand of individuals to be 'different' from each other in modern pluralistic societies, in which individuals participate in a large number of groups and social relations, due to which the problem of reconciliation between self-identification and the existence of the 'other' arises.

Therefore, when the transition from the old patriarchal, peasant family, of extended type, i.e. the 'tree family' (according to Le Play in: Milic, 2001: 19) (which consisted of the oldest or youngest male offspring staying with the parents for hereditary, economic and spiritual continuity of the family, as well as the stability and social harmony of society and the state) was achieved to a narrowed and individualized 'conjugal (marital) family' (according to Durkheim in: Milic, 2001: 20), which consists of spouses and children, the family identity was destabilized, which strongly shaped the individual identity of family members.

Furthermore, confronting individuals with a large number of offers and choices in modern society causes dilemmas and doubts regarding belonging and identification. This is especially a problem in the global constellation of social relations, as globalization brings with it challenges for diversity, that is, the uniqueness associated with belonging to a community.

In addition to the conceptual determination of identification and identity, some conceptualizations of identity and its *type classification (typology)* will be briefly presented:

1. *National (imaginary) identity* – Benedict Anderson;
2. *(Hyper) consumer identity* - Nemanja Djukic;
3. *Fragmented identity* - Zygmunt Bauman and Stuart Hall;
4. *Virtual identity* - Erwin Goffman, Manuel Castells, Richard Watson, Gary Small;
5. *Unstable identity* - Vladeta Jerotic;
6. *Ambivalent identity* - Richard Jenkins;
7. *Integral (holistic) identity* – Zagorka Golubovic;
8. *Unified identity*, as a form of totalitarianism - Alain de Benoist.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

The subject of the research are the theoretical perspectives of identity of several authors - Nada Sekulic, Zagorka Golubovic, Benedikt Anderson, Nemanja Djukic, Ervin Goffman, Manuel Castells, Richard Watson, Gary Small, Zygmunt Bauman, Stuart Hall, Vladeta Jerotic, Richard Jenkins and Alain de Benoist. *The search is for an answer to **the research question**: Could priority be given to personal or social identity, according to importance? A noticeable **research problem** is the pluralism of conceptions that attach more importance to either individual or collective identity. **The main hypothesis** is that there is a false problem of non-complementarity of collective and personal identity, as well as an*

experiential connection (scientific law) between the political construction of collective identity and totalitarianism.

The scientific and professional goals of the work are: 1) *to describe* the identity and the process of its creation; 2) *to classify* and *explain* the difference between personal and collective identity, with an emphasis on the integrative point of view of Zagorka Golubovic and Richard Jenkins on the complementarity between them; 3) *to anticipate* the experiential connection (scientific law) between the political construction of social (collective) identity and totalitarianism due to the exclusion of Others from the constructed identity pattern, in order to establish complete state-political (party) control over all dimensions of social and personal, everyday, life beyond States.

The methods of *(descriptive and comparative) analysis, deduction, synthesis, induction, case studies, content analysis of identity conceptions based on a simple classification (significant - less significant type of identity)* (Kukic & Markic, 2006: 217) and *desk research* will be used. ***The results of qualitative research*** refer to knowledge about identity, its types, its construction and the consequences of identity engineering, which were obtained through secondary, namely qualitative (in the form of words) data (Kothari, 2004; Dale, Wathan & Higgins, 2008), during 'research in the library' (Kuba & Koking, 2004: 90), that is, during studious work on bibliographic units from an abstracted sample.

DETERMINATION OF IDENTITY

Etymologically, the concept of ***identity*** (lat. *identitas* – sameness) means sameness (Mimica & Bogdanovic, 2007).

According to ***Nada Sekulic*** (in: Mimica & Bogdanovic, 2007), identity arises as a result of the process of identification (lat. identificatio - identification), that is, identification with others, especially with parents, and through assuming social roles and status in society. Generally speaking, it is imitating, learning by model, that is, taking over the ideas, symbols, values, attitudes, characteristics of other people or groups, and most often some reference groups (religious, ethnic, generational, ...).

It is a specific ability of people, based on self-reflexivity, i.e. on a person's ability to simultaneously be both a subject and an object of perception, i.e. observing others and observing oneself through the eyes of others. All this is achieved through the process of comparison, playing social roles, evaluation and assessment, and affective behavior. Within the framework of social sciences, the influence of society is considered, as mental constructs, i.e. performance, i.e. the influence of social factors on the process of identification.

One of those factors, according to *Charles Cooley*, is the process of interacting with others, whereby, in addition to observing others, we are also guided by observing ourselves through the 'eyes' or other people's ideas about us ('me in the mirror'). This is how identity is formed because the process of communication is based on language that enables internal conversation and requires us to assume the role of the other in communication, as the founder of social psychology, *George Mead*, points out.

According to **Zagorka Golubovic**, identity concerns the question of *who I am, who is the other*, so it is determined against someone else through the principle of otherness, that is, the difference between me, that is, between us and other people. 'Erik Erikson defines i. as the ability to preserve inner sameness and continuity and to think of oneself as a different being in relation to others' (Mimica & Bogdanovic, 2007: 180). Thus, while the process of self-identification is taking place, the process of deconstruction of identity is also taking place,

which contributes to the dynamism of the process of identification and identity, as a product of that process.

The elements that make up the feeling of identity are: the feeling of unity, coherence, autonomy and belonging. 'Identification with the collective i. it does not necessarily mean the assimilation of individuality (uniqueness), but is a prerequisite for the process of individuation" (Mimica & Bogdanovic, 2007: 181). This means that rooting in the social or cultural environment is first necessary, through the process of socialization (starting from the primary), so that individuals (groups) could determine their position in the world, that is, in order to face the wider social milieu, so that from that position worked on developing their uniqueness.

THEORETICAL CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF THE IDENTITY

1. National (imaginary) identity – Benedict Anderson
In the book 'The Nation as an Imaginary Community' (Anderson, 1988), **Benedict Anderson** deals with the question of the origin of nations and their functioning as 'imaginary communities'. While nations exist as an objective reality, they are previously a product of collective consciousness, collective ideas and perceptions of people (mental construct). *Language, media and art* are of great importance for the constitution and maintenance of imaginary communities and national identity. Hence, the nation is 'imagined', 'imaginary community' because people can imagine that community and belong to it, even though they do not meet all the members of that community.

Therefore, the social factors that influence the formation of collective, in this case, national, identity, according to Anderson, are: the spread of the written word, the invention of photography and the development of journalism, which overall helped shape national ideas and unite people. The British sociologist *Anthony Smith* also spoke about the irreplaceable importance of national identity, in his book of the same name from 1988, noting that national identity in postmodernity 'has a far more significant impact than any other form of identity, because it represents a substitute for personal identity, which is problematic in dramatic times' (Vukovic, 2014: 74).

2. (Hyper)consumer identity - Nemanja Djukic
'By reconciling personal experience with the imperatives of the system through the processes of socialization and internalization' (Djukic, 2013: 30), the conversion of personal, individual, identity (personality), which refers to self-awareness, into a socially acceptable type of identity, which is constructed through state control mechanisms, through fulfilling society's expectations (social roles) in reference social groups. 'Institutions of socialization and identification (traditional family, political parties, religion) are in a phase of weakening, but the state retains its central place' (Halpern & Ruano-Borbalan, 2009: 5).

Therefore, due to the reduced power of traditional agents of primary socialization (religious, kinship and educational institutions), the central role in formatting, i.e. constructing, identity is taken over by agents of secondary socialization, that is, 'the system now maintains a central role in the social control of identity through the media and information technologies' (Djukic, 2013: 36).

Therefore, identity in the post-industrial society and postmodern culture is a function of the dominant economic model and new production forces, as well as the market and

presentation on the market, in accordance with the dictates of the **hyper-consumer society** (Djukic, 2013), i.e. changing social circumstances. Since fashion, market trends change rapidly, earlier identity choices also become obsolete, to be replaced by new ones, which overall contributes to the insecurity of both individuals and identities, because insecurity is 'the basic existential state of personality in postmodern society' (Djukic, 2013: 38). 'Unstable social conditions of postmodernity, through the modification of identity, thus produce a personality crisis, because they make it impossible for individuals to adapt to constantly changing external circumstances' (Djukic, 2013: 35).

Susan Harter also wrote about this 'classic contrast: personal self versus social identity' (according to Harter in: Ashmore & Jussim, 1997: 81 - 106), pointing to the barriers on the way to achieving authenticity in society. Thus, 'although each individual has his own personal identity, these identities are shaped through membership in social groups' (Haralambos & Holborn, 2002: 927).

3. Virtual identity - Erwin Goffman, Manuel Castells, Richard Watson, Gary Small

Since the basis of identity is 'person, group and role' (Burke & Stets, 2009: 112), virtual groups also influence the formation of **virtual social identity** (according to Goffman in: Ricer, 2009), in addition to the real one. Virtual social identity refers to the desired projection of oneself, that is, an ideal-type expression, which refers to what we should be and what we would like to become (proving to ourselves and others, a sense of importance and acceptance in society, and the like).

On the basis of group pressure, which also occurs in virtual social groups, there is the formation of specific phenomena, which Watson (2016) calls 'online crowds' and 'online collectivism' (p. 20), which he points out adversely affect individual wisdom and the experience of the individual and that, through social networks or the media, they force online presence and adaptation to the rules. 'It is increasingly difficult for us to escape from the presence of others and to be alone in thoughts and ideas' (Watson, 2016: 20), which can have a negative impact on our psyche as well as on our creativity, because without solitude there are no discoveries or innovative ideas and achievements. Young people are particularly at risk due to the search for identity, during adolescence, as a result of which they often experiment in order to release excess energy and creativity.

> 'The ability to immerse yourself in a fantasy space game, or the ability to be only a few keystrokes away from any acquaintance around the globe, shapes - for good and bad - the identity and self-esteem of any young person: and these are essential elements which dictate human actions and determine their humanity' (Smol & Vorgan, 2011: 118).

About the influence of 'networked' ie. of the information society, in the digital era, **Manuel Castells** also wrote about identity, emphasizing that identity is a complex and fluid concept that is formed in the interaction between the individual, group and society. People are increasingly involved in (digital) communication networks, thus creating a virtual identity, the best example of which is the identity on social networks. Virtual identities are fragmented and multiple, thus allowing people to express different aspects of themselves in different contexts. For the formation of such identities, social and political movements can be crucial.

The information age is characterized by the emergence of social movements, such as feminist and ecological ones (Manuel Castells in: Petrovic, Vujovic, 2005: 187), which become the backbone of identity constitution. Therefore, Castells is particularly oriented

towards the study of social movements, as collective actions in society, and their role in the struggle for change, through the process of resistance and mobilization. Identity emerges as a result of the process of construction of meaning and is shaped through different social, cultural and technological contexts. As a reaction to the crisis of national identity, we observe the emergence of territorially defined identities at the level of regions, cities, and neighborhoods.

4. Fragmented identity - Zygmunt Bauman and Stuart Hall

Zygmunt Bauman's conception of identity best explains the impossibility of creating a permanent identity because people voluntarily change their identity, in accordance with the choice and with some of the postmodern life strategies, one of which refers to the 'player strategy' (according to Bauman in: Haralambos & Holborn, 2002: 926; Bauman, 2000). According to this strategy, the player perceives life as a game, which he plays to win, even though the results won have no lasting consequences for his personal and/or social identity, because changing social circumstances require an 'identity game' throughout his life, as long as the lifelong process of socialization lasts.

That is why it is important to participate, and not necessarily to win, because participation provides inclusion in real and virtual social and identity flows as opposed to marginalization. 'Although people will try to play each identity game well, this will not prevent them from changing the game and, when they conclude that a certain game is over, play some new identity' (Haralambos & Holborn, 2002: 926). Because of all this, it is possible to talk about a *fragmented identity,* according to **Stuart Hall**, because people no longer have a unique idea of who they are, since they possess multiple, sometimes contradictory identities (Haralambos & Holborn, 2002).

5. Unstable identity - Vladeta Jerotic

'Some core of our personality, which is difficult to describe, always remains the same despite all the changes we are exposed to from the outside or that we create ourselves' (Jerotic, 2004: 17), although the subjective content of our experience is constantly changing. According to Academician **Jerotic**, the feeling of identity is all the more stable if a person experiences more frequent and intense internal and external changes, because it is as if these changes are a condition for the stability of this feeling. 'It seems that it is increasingly difficult in modern life conditions, especially after surviving revolutions, but also in the face of threatening new ones, to keep the sense of identity of the world in man upright and stable' (Jerotic, 2004: 19).

Academician Vladeta Jerotic talks about the fact that, in times of social transformations, i.e. transitions from one system to another, earlier idealities become destabilized due to the state of anomie, apathy, and resignation. That is why the question of identity is always actualized in such situations. Due to the instability of identity in times of social crises, sudden changes, which lead to insecurity regarding the belonging of individuals (groups), in order to protect against insecurity, the search for new identities is resorted to. Man is at a turning point and when it comes to a choice in the matter of identity – 'crucified between the spirit of confirmation that would maintain his identity and the identity of the world, denying death, and the spirit of renunciation that, apparently, accepting death, strives for the mutation of the former identity, exalting himself as the only lord of heaven and country, which is already capable of destroying one world and creating (?) a new one' (p. 21).

Therefore, just as there is no personality without an ethical or ethical-religious component, there is no collective without a national-ethnic component, in accordance with the understanding of prof. Jerotic, in the essay 'On the complementarity of ethical and ethnic' (Jerotic, 2017: 107 - 113). All this points to the connection between collective identity and personal identity, because the insecurities brought about by social trends are also reflected in personal insecurities, so that there are fears of constant changes, even though these changes are a prerequisite for further consolidation of both personal and collective identity.

6. Ambivalent identity - Richard Jenkins

Starting from the ideas of the representatives of one of the most influential contemporary sociological theories - *symbolic interactionism* - identity theorist **Richard Jenkins** claims that identity arises from the interactive relationship between an individual and other people, which means that it is given an ambivalent value because it is possible to talk about *internal ('individually unique')* and *external ('collectively common') identity* (Jenkins, 1996), where the first type refers to what we think we are, and is formulated through difference from others, while the second type refers to what what we think of others and what others think of us, in accordance with their own perception, and is formulated through similarity with others, without any of these types of identity 'being more important than the other' (according to Jenkins, 1996: 27 in: Haralambos & Holborn , 2002: 927). Therefore, this perspective can be considered integrative.

In evaluating Jenkins' theoretical concept of identity, *Haralambos and Holborn* (2002) point out its postmodernist character and concordance with the contemporary sociological viewpoints of the theorist Zygmunt Bauman: 'And while Jenkins' views differ somewhat from Hall's (for example, whether reflexivity is the first path developed into the modern), are particularly consistent with the claims of postmodernists like Bauman' (p. 928).

7. Integral (holistic) identity - Zagorka Golubovic

According to **Zagorka Golubovic**, there is a problem of the relationship between freedom and authority in the formation of both personal and collective identity. *Personal identity* 'implies the existence of awareness of oneself as different from all others, i.e. the notion of oneself as an authentic being' (Mimica & Bogdanovic, 2007: 181). 'Personal identity is necessary for an individual to differentiate himself from others and to be able to develop his personality' (according to Jovo Bakic in: Halpern & Ruano-Borbalan, 2009: 443). But the formation of personal identity also depends on the conformity of individual and social integrity and on satisfying the need for security and emotional acceptance in the community.

Collective identity can be: class, cultural, national, professional, etc. Authority plays an important role in the formation of *collective identity*, which can be an obstacle to the formation of personal identity, which is why the problem of the relationship between authority and freedom arises. 'Therefore, collective identity is complementary to personal identity, that is, every human identity is a social identity because man is basically a social being, which is oriented two-dimensionally - towards individuality and towards sociality' (Golubovic, 2007: 181). This is why we can talk about complementarity (harmony) between personal and collective identity.

8. *Unified identity*, **as a form of totalitarianism - Alain de Benoist**

The construction of identity, as an instrument of social control, best testifies to the essence of politics, viewed in global coordinates, because politics has been reduced to a dominant and hegemonic practice. Putting itself in the role of ritual exclusion of Others, through its own creation of identity patterns, politics became totalitarian in action. Why is that so? Precisely because of the establishment of complete state-political (party) supervision over all dimensions of social and personal, everyday, life outside the state, which is the common nature of all totalitarianisms.

French academic, philosopher and famous critic of neoliberalism, *Alain de Benoist*, proposes to define *totalitarianism* according to its purpose:

'The imposition of a single model of social behavior, the imposition of a single thought at the expense of diversity, which is in fact a real treasure for humanity. If we assume it in this way, then we understand that such a goal can be achieved by means that do not have to be violent. This means that there can also be 'mild totalitarianism', whose models are today's Western societies' (according to Benoist in geopolitika.rs, 2016).

The totalitarian nature of (neo)liberalism was noticed by its supporters, such as *George Soros*, who points out that 'neoliberalism has taken upon itself all the features of totalitarian ideology (such as fascism and communism), declaring itself the supreme 'truth'' (according to Soros in: Milosevic, 2004: 118).

In accordance with the totalitarian concept of generalization (appropriation of the whole), the very existence of the Other and the different is problematized to the extent that their very existence is treated as an obstacle to the expansion of the borders of the 'free world'. Due to such a policy, they (others) must stop being them, renounce their own 'controversial' identity, in order to be tolerated, otherwise debt collection will follow according to the principle 'power does not pray to God'. Thus, in an apparently free society, individuals' right to self-determination is revoked, because totalitarians do not accept the individual's right to determine himself as he wishes - in freedom, autonomously. Why is it so? Simply because national determination, as well as identities in general, are a matter of the state, i.e. the current constellation of power and its holders.

The banality is that this whole process is considered non-violent, or even presented as the result of the 'success' of liberalization. Those, supposedly liberal, policies propose integration and oppose the emphasis and development of a separate ethnic identity, but only when it concerns minorities. However, the fact is that this so-called 'civil', i.e. the 'general', 'common' identity is not any general, nor common, but it is, precisely, the majority which is imposed as 'general' in the totalitarian construct. In this regard, majority communities within an ethnically complex society often see their own ('our') as general ('common').

Today, quite a lot of literature has accumulated that is critically oriented towards the idea of universal citizenship. *Iris Marion Young*, one of the most influential among such critics, proposes, instead, an ideal citizenship, differentiated according to group affiliation, and built on group representation and group rights. She argues that the notion of an 'unbiased general perspective' is actually a myth. As different social groups have different needs, cultures, histories, experiences, perceptions of social relations, citizenship, therefore, should not strive to transcend such differences but should recognize and acknowledge them as 'irreducible' (Marion Young, 1989: 257, 258; Marion Young, 1990).

By imposing such constructions of reality, in the service of the majority that aspires to become a whole, systemic suppression and marginalization of others occurs. This completely appropriates the entire space, which the majority was previously 'forced' to share with others. Therefore, every call to give up identity in favor of a supposedly 'general' one is a call to the Other to give up the choice (rational or emotional) he has made and, in fact, a call to abolish freedom. This is a position from which freedom of choice is denied, as the very essence of liberalism.

In the existing circumstances of advanced totalitarianism, that 'general' identity is not 'general' neither for members of the majority nation, nor for members of minorities, but quite specifically majority, as e.g. in the *case of Bosnia and Herzegovina* - for Bosniaks 'our Bosnian', and for Serbs and Croats – 'their Serbian or Croatian'. That it is so, says the almost everyday warning graffiti with categorical messages addressed to those others, as well as whistles to the hymns of the 'enemy Other', etc.

As long as this is the case, or more precisely until everyone can, without justified fear of consequences, support whoever they want, there is every chance that such a country with irreconcilable and ever-emerging divisions (like Bosnia and Herzegovina) will not be a free country. Therefore, until the problem of freedom and the right of everyone, especially those who are a minority in a certain social context, to freely express their identity and to be treated as equals, is not solved not only in legal regulations but also in real life, living under a common roof, in accordance with the principle of peaceful coexistence, there is no prospect for perspective.

Therefore, the imposition of the majority, as a general, is the essence of power politics based on 'victory' over the Other, and on total victory - by pushing out and denying that any Other exists at all. It is a policy of an expansionist character that aspires to absoluteness, since power for totalitarians expands without limits. Such a policy is also offensive, because it believes that there are no limits to the legitimate expansion of one's own supremacy over all others. The complete destruction of every Other and everything different ensures the security of the dominant (expansive 'our') identity. Therefore, such a policy imposes its standards, values and identity on everyone, with a mandate for their unquestioning adherence.

American expansionism (also presented as 'liberal'), is based on the idea that it is not legitimate to remain one's own, if that implies diversity in relation to given values. That's why otherness wants to be reduced to diversity that needs to be eliminated. This denial of freedom, autonomy and the right of every individual and every ethnic group (or even nation) to stay and develop as they want - without imposing someone else's identity, aims to make us all, with the use of force and propaganda, laws and (if need) weapons, make them members or at least silent subjects of the dominant discourse.

The dominant discourse concerns the ideology, which today rules the West and aspires to world domination, and which, according to de Benoist, represents a mixture of the ideology of human rights (politically correct moralism) and selfish and market values. As such, it characterizes the eternal Western pretensions to export its values to the whole world, since they are supposedly universal. 'Such an ideology promotes a narcissistic, immature man.' He also explains *the case of the United States of America*, i.e. the role of 'world policeman' that the USA has assumed, which best reflects its foreign policy, which, as de Benoist claims, has never respected the diversity of cultures and peoples.

> 'Today we live in an age of world instability, it is also a period of transition, a kind of interregnum. The United States of America, since

its inception, has always believed that it has a global task to convey the American way of life to all the peoples of the world in every possible way' (according to de Benoist in geopolitika.rs, 2016).

After the terrorist attack on its territory, the USA turned from the banner of anti-nationalism and the fight for human rights into the bearer of hot nationalism, which strives for the uniform cultural exclusivity of all different identities, with the tacit violation of the human rights that guarantee them. The methods used by this new attempt at domination are: ignoring, not noticing, assimilation, expulsion, erasure, war and violence. The consequence is the disappearance of all other identities, and thus of all other communities, which find themselves in the way of the one powerful enough and big enough to displace them.

Regardless of the liberal rhetoric of such policies, they are a threat to the main idea of liberalism, which is freedom. Therefore, advocating for the survival of different and minority identities is today the task of every politician who really cares about freedom.

CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS

The research confirmed the hypothesis that there is a false problem of non-complementarity of collective and personal identity, and it was also confirmed that there is an experiential connection (scientific law) between the political construction of collective identity and totalitarianism. The goals were realized because the identity was described, just like the process of its creation, and the classification of identity types (national, hyper-consumer, fragmented, virtual, unstable, ambivalent, holistic and unified) was carried out, with an explanation of the difference between personal and collective identity, with an emphasis on the integrative point of view of Zagorka Golubovic and Richard Jenkins on the complementarity between them, which was also represented by Vladeta Jerotic.

An experiential connection (scientific law) was anticipated between the political construction of social (collective) identity and totalitarianism due to the exclusion of Others from the constructed identity pattern, in order to establish complete state-political (party) control over all dimensions of social and personal, everyday life. Therefore, the results of qualitative research were achieved in the form of knowledge about identity, its types, its construction and the consequences of identity engineering. The limitation of the research refers to the impossibility of presenting all existing conceptions of identity due to the limited scope of the work. Another limitation of the work is the impossibility of conceptualizing identity in full, from the perspective of the selected samples.

In contemporary social circumstances, under the influence of the process of globalization and the challenge of unification, it is increasingly difficult to preserve uniqueness. There is a complementarity between personal and collective identity because man is oriented towards both individuality and sociality, which would mean that this dilemma about the importance of one or the other identity can be considered false or another of the so-called 'false problems' in sociology, which were written about by Georges Gurvich (1965), dealing with the typical sociological dilemma of the individual - society.

Ignorance of the previously mentioned false identity dilemma leads and can continue to lead, if it is not prevented or stopped by enlightenment, to the political construction of identity in order to mold and exclude the unmolded. As politics has become hegemonic and totalitarian in action because it strives for total control over the public but also the private domain of human existence, according to the system of colonization of the lifeworld by the system (Habermas), so the practice used by such politics - the construction of identity - is

itself totalitarian. There is a causal relationship between the political construction of identity and totalitarianism, based on the historical experience of the Holocaust and similar blasphemous examples of political engineering, which experienced exaltation in the extermination of certain members of the human race, such as Serbs, Jews, Roma, Armenians, etc., and which consequently legitimately can be considered endangered and protected.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. (1988). *The Nation: An Imagined Community*. Belgrade: Platon.

Ashmore, R.D. & **Jussim**, L. (1997). *Self and Identity: Fundamental Issues*. Oxford University Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burke, P.J. & **Stets**, J.E. (2009). *Identity Theory*. Oxford University Press.

Dale, A. **Wathan**, J., **Higgins**, V. (2008). In Alasuutari, P., Bickman, L., Brannen, J., *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods,* pp. 520 – 535, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, SAGE Publications.

Gurvich, Z. (1965). *Contemporary vocation of sociology*. Sarajevo: Veselin Maslesa.

Halpern, K. & **Ruano-Borbalan**, Z. K. (arr.). (2009). *Identity(s): Individual, group, society*. Belgrade: Clio.

Haralambos, M. & **Holborn,** M. (2002). *Sociology - topics and perspectives*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.

Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods & Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd., Publishers.

Kuba, L. & **Cocking**, J. (2004). *Methodology of creating a scientific text*. Podgorica: CID, Banja Luka: Romanov.

Kukic, S. & **Markic**, B. (2006). *Methodology of social sciences: Methods, techniques, procedures and instruments of scientific research work.* Mostar: Faculty of Economics, University of Mostar.

Milic, A. (2001). *Sociology of the family: Criticism and challenges*. Belgrade: Chigoja Press.

Mimica, A. & **Bogdanovic**, M. (2007). *Sociological dictionary*. Belgrade: Textbook Institute.

Ritzer, J. (2009). *Contemporary sociological theory and its classical roots.* Belgrade: Official Gazette.

Small, G. & **Vorgan,** G. (2011). *The Internet Brain: How Digital Civilization Shapes Our Children's Brains*. Novi Sad: Psychopolis Institute.

Vujovic, S., **Petrovic,** M. (edited). (2005). *Urban sociology.* Belgrade: Institute for textbooks and teaching aids.

Young, I. M. (1989). *Political Organization and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship.* Ethics 99.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press,

Watson, R. (2016). *Future Minds: How the Digital Age is Changing Our Minds*. Belgrade: PLATO.

Vukovic, Đ. (2014). *The context of political culture*. Banja Luka: Graffid.

Djukic, N. (2013). *Personality and community: Blueprint for a sociology of the world of life*. Banja Luka: Association of Sociologists - Banja Luka.

Jerotic, V. (2004). *Man and his identity*. Belgrade: Ars Libri.

Jerotic, V. (2017). *Religion and nation*. Belgrade: Ars Libri.

Milosevic, Z. (2004). *Transition and the Serbian Church: On political models of ecumenism, democracy, education and culture in the Serbian Orthodox Church*. Belgrade: Institute for Political Studies.

Internet source:

Geopolitika magazine. (2013). *Alain de Benoit. Europe is a body without sovereignty.* http://geopolitika.rs/index.php/sr/intervju/514-alen-de-benoa-evropa-je-telo-bez-suvereniteta [06/10/2023]