



UDC 172.15:316.64-057.875(470+571)(47.11)
Manuscript received: 04.03.2013.
Accepted for publishing: 28.03.2013.
Review article

Serbian Political Thought
No. 1/2013,
Year V, Vol. 7
pp. 81-104

Irina Trotsuk¹
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Moscow

Uroš Šuvaković²
University in Priština, Faculty of Philosophy
with contemporary Head office in Kosovska Mitrovica

The Value of Patriotism for Students in Russia and Serbia

Abstract

Results of the survey regarding the relation of students with reference to the values of patriotism in Moscow, Belgrade and partly in Kosovska Mitrovica are comparatively presented in the paper. The technique of questionnaire was applied in the survey, in Moscow on random and in Belgrade on two-stage, quota sample, while the instrument was the same. The survey on student population was also performed in Kosovska Mitrovica, but by another instrument application, so that conclusions on students' patriotism might be indirect. The results of the survey in both countries show that more than the half of students declare themselves as patriots, while this percentage grows with Serbian students when the patriotism is concretized (e.g. the relation regarding Kosovo). It is noticeable that Russian students in the first place show patriotic pride regarding the heroic history of their country, while Serbian students put in the first place deideologized values – natural beauties.

Keywords: patriotism, Russian students, Serbian students, survey.

1 Associate professor
irina.trotsuk@yandex.ru

2 Associate Professor
uros-s@eunet.rs

“Patriotism deserves a special attention as one of the feelings that should inspire a man of science. For him, it has completely positive connotation: he is eager to improve the prestige of his country, but without destroying the reputation of his contemporaries”

(Santiago Ramón y Cajal, 2007)

“Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country. It is patriotic to support him insofar as he efficiently serves the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country”

(Theodore Roosevelt, 1918)

On the one hand, the meaning of the word ‘patriotism’ is absolutely clear as fixed in numerous dictionaries – “love for one’s country, one’s motherland”, thus ‘patriot’ is “a lover of the fatherland, the adherent of its good and welfare” (Даль 1978: 24). On the other hand, the concept ‘patriotism’ allows many different and ambiguous interpretations considering the current and historical political situation and ideological grounds of the authors that appeal to it: patriotism can be seen as an absolute good or, on the contrary, as a source of national strife and social disintegration – the famous Russian writer Leo Tolstoy once wrote about patriotism: “it’s a shameful feeling because it turns a man not only into a slave, but a game-cock, a bull, a gladiator, who is ruining his life not for himself but for his government” (Шаповалов 2008). Probably every Russian public and literary figure spoke about patriotism although the thematic contexts and assessments of this social phenomenon differ greatly focusing for the most part on the so called ‘national question’ (the relationship of patriotism and nationalism is one of the most complex and challenging issues in the Russian society throughout its history) or, let us say, on the geopolitical consequences of the dominant interpretation of the word ‘patriotism’. For each case we can find quite opposite quotations in the Russian scientific, fiction and non-fiction literature that has always produced fierce debates. For instance, such a ‘globalist’ interpretation: “alive and active patriotism by definition excludes any international strife, thus a patriot is ready to work for the good of the whole mankind, if he can be helpful. Limiting one’s activities only to the native land is the result of one’s knowledge and understanding that this is exactly the place where one can be most helpful... True patriotism as a particular manifestation of love for all humanity simply cannot coexist with a dislike for certain nationalities”

(Добролюбов 1948: 567). The great Russian scientist Dmitry Mendeleev denied such an interpretation: “some extreme individualists try to present love for the country or patriotism in a bad light saying that it is time to replace it with some kind of common love for humanity... The falsehood of such an idea, in my opinion, is quite clear due not only to important historical facts of accumulation of people in large states that caused the very rise of patriotism but because no one can imagine in any possible future that countries and continents will merge and distinguishing features of races, languages, beliefs and forms of governance will disappear for such differences are the basis and source of competition and progress...” (Менделеев 1907: 111-112).

Such a terminological confusion led to the present situation – the dictionary interpretation of patriotism given by V. Dal (broadly speaking it’s “love for the country and defense of motherland’s interests”) seems to be basic and widely acknowledged in the Russian society for one can build any further arguments on such a definition, focusing on the historical destiny of the country, pride for its achievements and criticism for shortcomings, sympathy for the sufferings and social needs of the people, respect for the heroic past and traditions, attachment to the place of birth or residence – ‘love for the graves of our fathers’, willingness to sacrifice, to struggle against the enemies of the fatherland, protection of its interests and so on (Левашов 2006). On the other hand, vagueness and ambiguity of the concept complicates the work of teachers and researchers that are to ‘teach’ and to study patriotism. For instance, most federal, regional and local programs reduce the so called ‘patriotic education’ either to some kind of military training or to different activities contributed to keeping up distinctive features of national minorities (then ‘patriotic’ in fact is replaced by ‘ethnic’) or preserving cultural autonomy.

Since 2007 the Sociological Laboratory of Peoples’ Friendship University of Russia has conducted sociological surveys on the value orientations of Russian students. These empirical studies are based on representative samples (by profiles of higher education training – technical sciences, social sciences and humanities, natural sciences) of Moscow students (typically the sample size is about 1000 respondents). The questionnaire includes several thematic groups – the needs of the young people in the educational field, their expectations of their future employment and job requirements, their family and marriage values and priorities in interpersonal communication with neighbours and wider social environment, interests in the political sphere and partici-

pation in elections, etc. One of the most interesting thematic groups of the questionnaire includes questions on whether the Russian students consider themselves to be patriots and where they see the main sources of national pride for today's young generation.

During the social transformations in the 1990's, the old Soviet system of patriotic education collapsed, destroying the very concept of patriotism: if previously this word had a very specific meaning and associations, in the early 1990's the notion of patriotism acquired a rather negative connotation with a sarcastic tone to it. The concepts of 'homeland' and 'state' drifted apart, while in the Soviet era they were practically identical. In the 1990's the word 'Homeland' evoked warm emotions, memories of childhood, of one's own home, of the nature of one's native land, pride in one's language and culture, while the word 'state' was associated with bureaucracy that used the notion of patriotism in manipulations aimed to substitute collective values in such a way that if you love your home and native land, you love your country, and the country is the state. In the individual consciousness, however, this substitution did not work, as the people could not understand why and how their warm feelings for the native land should make them, for instance, do military service and pay taxes to the heartless state machine, which did not provide any sense of social security and infringed on private life.

However, since the early 2000's, Russian public opinion polls have shown a gradual increase in the number of respondents who consider themselves patriots – this figure seemed to stabilize in the mid-2000's, and by 2010 the number of those who considered themselves patriots reached 84% – most of them live in Moscow and Saint Petersburg and mostly are elderly people (88%) (New Russian Patriotism ...).

Would you identify yourself as a patriot?				
(closed question, one answer), %				
	2005	2006	2008	2010
Yes, of course	47	42	48	41
Rather yes	37	42	40	43
Rather no	8	10	6	9
Absolutely not	2	2	2	1
Hard to say	6	5	5	6

Table 1.

The new patriotic consciousness is a subject of great interest for sociologists, historians, political scientists, exploring, in particular, the so-called 'patriotic spirit' of young Russian citizens, whose adulthood fell on the era of perestroika – a situation quite different from that of previous generations in terms of the role of Russia in the world and its prospects for development. In the majority of studies patriotism is described as respect of the citizens towards society and the state, the country's history and traditions – in other words, as the fundamental unifying idea of the people. The main components of patriotism as a socio-cultural phenomenon include spiritual and ideological values, as well as individual values that ensure readiness for a patriotic act in the interests of society, manifesting themselves at three levels – the national, group and interpersonal level.

The subject of patriotism does not only have a 'diagnostic', but also a practical potential in that it develops the state's national ideology to fill up the 'content' of patriotism in the face of the declining authority of the state bodies, strong separatist and nationalist movements and increasing globalization. The first five-year state program "Patriotic Education of Citizens of the Russian Federation", adopted in 2001, aimed to revive patriotism as the person's spiritual heritage and the foundation of social and national system necessary to maintain social and political stability in the country. The program focused on the development of patriotic education aimed to enhance the citizens' patriotic consciousness, loyalty to the Motherland, readiness to do one's civic and constitutional duty of protecting the interests of the country, and implied providing military and patriotic education through film and video production, publishing and other creative activities.

In 2006, the first state program of patriotic education of citizens of the Russian Federation was followed by the second one (Program... 2006) that focused on further developing patriotic consciousness as the most significant foundation of the spiritual and moral integrity at the national level. The second program took it for granted that the first one had created an institutional system of patriotic education based on the unified public policy at the federal and regional levels and focused primarily on the younger generations in order to improve the evolving system of patriotic education, particularly through the establishment of coordinating councils and centres for patriotic education.

The latest state program of patriotic education, adopted in 2010, focuses on eliminating extremism and increasing political stability in the country (Правительство Российской Федерации 2010). Asserting

that 'the system of patriotic education of citizens has mainly been created' and 'patriotic consciousness of citizens is increasing' (coordinating councils and centres for patriotic education, regional programs of patriotic education are implemented, festivals, exhibitions and competitions devoted to patriotism take place etc.), the program is to improve legislation in the field of patriotic education, develop 'professional patriotic education' and encourage the people to use the Internet more actively for social and educational purposes.

We did not plan to evaluate the overall results of the two national programs of patriotic education (to 'measure' the levels of patriotism before and after the development and implementation of the programs) – our goal was to assess the general patriotic mood of Russian students (on the example of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia). According to our survey in 2011 (we designed a questionnaire thematically focused on patriotic issues), the notion that provokes the warmest feelings in the Russian youth is 'my country' (Russia) (29%), followed by 'the whole world' (19%), 'my city, town, village' (17%), 'my territory, republic, region' (12%) and 'Eurasia' (9%). Approximately half of the respondents replied to the question 'For you Motherland is...' 'Russia as a whole' (46%), one in four answered 'family and friends' (23%), 16% of the respondents marked the location (city, town, village), in which they were born, and only 12% believe that their Motherland is the territory, region, district in which they live.

Despite the fact that the vast majority of the respondents (89%) agree with the statement that the national symbols are quite important for every country to distinguish it from any other (90%), although they carry no special meaning (87%), and serve to unite the country (66%), only one in three knows the origin, meaning and transformation of state symbols (36%), and one in five (21%) 'is not interested in the state symbols and believes that this topic is obsolete and not interesting.' However, almost half of the respondents (44%) feel excitement and pride for the country, when they hear the national anthem of Russia, and a quarter of the respondents 'simply like it' (23%).

According to the survey results (78%), Russia is a country with a great potential for development, which should not depend on other countries, especially the U.S. and the West (62%), and all its troubles come from the inability of the elites to rule the state, their self-interests (62%) and the lack of 'normal' laws (70%), so in the next 10-15 years Russia will turn into a moderately developed country (58%). The majority of respondents (71%) believe that the citizens of Russia do have

reasons both for pride and for extremely negative emotions. Answering the question ‘As a citizen of the country I am proud of ...’ the respondents were able to choose more than one answer. The undisputed leader of our conditional rating of pride is the heroic past of the country (77%), in the second place – the art (52%), in the third – sport successes, cultural, scientific and technological achievements; every fourth respondent believes that he/she should be proud of the spirituality of the Russian people. Very rarely the respondents mention that, as citizens of Russia, they can be proud of the ‘economic development of the country’, ‘Russia’s domestic policy’, ‘power structures’, ‘protection of the rights and freedoms of the citizens’ and the ‘social security system’.

As a citizen of the country I am proud of ...	%	«Places»
Heroic past of the country	77,4	1
Art	52,1	2
Sport successes	42,8	3
Culture of the country	41,8	
Scientific and technical achievements	40,4	
Spirituality of the Russian people	24,8	4
Educational system	17	5
Russia’s foreign policy	13,6	6
Russian army	8,8	7
Economic development of the country	5,8	8
Russia’s domestic policy	4,6	9
Power structures	4,1	
Protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens	4,1	
Social security system	3,4	10
Other	1,7	

Table 2.

Such a distribution of the answers seems to be predetermined by the respondents’ perception of the overall situation in the country (we used a set of dichotomous scales, which increases response rates compared with other types of questions): nearly two-thirds of the respondents believe that there is a threat of social unrest (73%), every second – a threat of mass unemployment (51%), environmental disaster (53%), failure of

the economic policy (58%), collapse of science and education (53%), loss of national culture (50%), to a greater extent (66%) – a threat of religious conflicts; nevertheless, all that would not lead to the country's disintegration (78% of the respondents rejected this possibility) or a military dictatorship (83%).

Every fourth respondent (26%) found it difficult to identify themselves in terms of patriotism, 60% do consider themselves patriots, while 14% do not. The main reason for hesitation is the difficulty to name one's attitude to the country using an unambiguous notion of patriotism (37% of those who did not identify themselves in terms of patriotism), some consider the term too ideological, which makes them reluctant to deal with it (19%), or out of date (17%), others believe that this term is artificial, invented for manipulative purposes (14%). However, all the respondents seem to be quite consolidated naming the basis of the concept of patriotism – love for the country and pride in the achievements of the country and its people. This consolidation is manifested in the obvious overlapping of the concepts of Motherland and the state: 65% of the respondents believe that their peers will take part in military operations to repel the aggression of other countries – just as many are convinced that their peers will not take part in military operations to suppress an attempted coup.

This interpretation of patriotism (love of the country) is confirmed by the beliefs of the respondents that the level of patriotism grows during war periods, revolutions, radical political upheavals (74%), but not in situations of extreme social conflicts (23%). The individual patriotic spirit intensifies in consequence of the national team's victory at international sport events (59%), when citizens or nationals of Russia are awarded important international prizes for scientific, cultural, athletic and other achievements (42%), when one goes abroad (39%) and at the time of national holidays (38%). The most patriotic holiday for Russian students is Victory Day (85%).

In the open question asking to name 'a true patriot' among one's contemporaries, one in ten respondents indicated V.V. Putin (11%), far behind him go D.A. Medvedev and V.V. Zhirinovskiy (3%). When the same question is referred to Russian history, the respondents name Peter the Great (13%), who is followed by Stalin (4%) and Suvorov (3%), i.e. all 'true patriots' are 'statesmen.' Moreover, when choosing options to complete the expression 'A true patriot of the country is a person who ...,' the respondents also stressed the 'presentational' component

of true patriotism: first of all, he respects the history and traditions of the people (72%), after that comes doing military service in the armed forces (31%) and the desire to maintain the most positive image of the homeland and intolerance towards any manifestations of disrespect for the country and its citizens (36%); the third set of patriotic behavioural practices includes the non-political social activities and one's personal life position – a good family man, father and friend – 21%, who is diligent and successful in his work or study – 17%, is actively involved in patriotic events and activities – 19% and in unpaid community work (volunteer, voluntary work, donations, etc.) – 16%. Only 12% of the respondents consider membership in any political and social organizations as the main criterion of patriotism.

Almost half of the respondents (44%) believe that patriotism should be purposefully taught to the youth, 27% of the respondents believe that patriotism should emerge spontaneously rather than act as a pseudo-imposed force, 29% – that patriotic feelings should be formed spontaneously and purposefully. However, half of the respondents think that the Russian government and the president only speak about patriotism instead of taking practical steps to strengthen the patriotic mood of the population, one in five is sure that the authorities do absolutely nothing in this direction.

In addition to the thematic questionnaire aimed to measure patriotic values, we included some relevant questions in a comprehensive questionnaire designed to study the Russian students' value orientations. The patriotic cluster here is very small and duplicates the basic questions on patriotism presented above, but with the second questionnaire we are interested not only in patriotism itself, but in how it 'behaves' in the context of other values of young people. The results of the 2011 survey show that every second Moscow student (the sample size was 1000 respondents representing students by training profiles) considers himself a patriot; the request to identify oneself in terms of patriotism causes difficulties for every third respondent, because it is hard for them to define their feeling towards the country as 'patriotism' (in fact, it is a rather trite word, especially in the Russian public discourse). Every third student who had difficulties answering this question uses the proposed response option – an appeal to the concept of a globalizing world (Table 3). Taking a look at the dynamics of answers to this question we can speak of the increasing erosion of the term 'patriot' in the Russian everyday discourse (despite its active and politically sensitive use in the media and public discourse), because the number

of those who found it difficult to identify themselves as patriots, refusing to name their attitude to the country as patriotism, has grown by 14% since 2007, when for the first time we used our questionnaire in a representative survey of Moscow students.

Moreover, since 2007 the number of young people confidently naming themselves patriots (despite the ambiguity of their assessments of the political processes in the country and the world detected by the responses to other questions), has not decreased and remains stable at about half of the answers, while the number of negative answers to this question has dropped by almost a half – from 18% to 11% (Table 4).

If you did not answer the previous question ('Do you consider yourself a patriot?'), explain why:	2007	2011
I do not understand the meaning of the term 'patriotism'	14%	8%
It is difficult for me to clearly define my attitude to the country as patriotism	51%	65%
In the modern era of globalization the concept of patriotism has lost its meaning and is no longer relevant	29%	24%
Other	6%	3%

Table 3.

Do you consider yourself a patriot?	2007	2011
Yes	51%	51%
No	18%	11%
It is difficult for me to clearly answer this question	32%	38%

Table 4.

Regardless of their self-assessment in terms of patriotism, Moscow students are proud of the historical past of the country (Table 5), its natural resources (Table 6), cultural heritage (Table 7) and sports achievements (Table 8) (we used a set of dichotomous scales in the questionnaire).

The position of Russia in the international arena is a source of pride for every fourth Moscow student, scientific achievements and the educational system – for every second, and the Russian army – for every fifth student. According to the table below, the objects of national pride and anti-pride are quite stable, as there are no significant fluctuations in the corresponding figures. We should only mention an almost two-fold increase in the number of respondents who do not consider the cultural heritage a cause for personal pride (from 7% to 13%). This is probably due to the fact that in recent years the mass media have been discrediting and often denying the cultural achievements of the Soviet period, formerly seen as clearly positive. On the other hand, there is a significantly evident political rhetoric ‘it’s enough, we should no longer live falling back on past achievements, if there is nothing to be proud of in the present’, which could also determine a slight decrease of this indicator.

As a citizen of the country are you proud of its history?	2007	2011
Yes	87%	89%
No	13%	11%

Table 5.

As a citizen of the country are you proud of its natural resources?	2007	2011
Yes	87%	88%
No	13%	12%

Table 6.

As a citizen of the country are you proud of its cultural heritage?	2007	2011
Yes	91%	87%
No	7%	13%

Table 7.

As a citizen of the country are you proud of its sports achievements?	2007	2011
Yes	78%	73%
No	22%	27%

Table 8.

It is important to emphasize that, unfortunately, there is a clear trend in the responses of Moscow students: the pride in the cultural heritage in the broadest sense of the word (achievements of the previous generations) has remained on a high level since the mid-2000's, while the dissatisfaction with life in Russia has been gradually growing (although within the limits of statistical error) in all the indicators considered. The common areas of students' dissatisfaction (anti-pride figures are close to the mark of 90%) are: the development of the economic and social spheres (13% of the respondents find grounds for pride here), the rights and freedoms of individuals (17%), the activity of state bodies (15%) and in general – the standards of living of the population (10%). Such a high social discontent lowers the level of trust in the basic social institutions of the Russian society. Thus, only one-third of Moscow students trust the government, the Russian and international NGOs working in Russia, the courts and the media, and every fourth – the Council of the Federation and the Public Chamber (probably a relatively high degree of confidence in the last institution can be explained by the fact that the respondents do not fully understand its mission and functions), one in five trusts the State Duma (68% do not trust). An absolute leader of the students' trust rating was the President of the country (58%, although a third of the respondents refuse to trust him), followed by the church (50% trust it), banks (47%) and big business (40%). The 'anti-leaders' of the social trust rating are political parties (72% of the respondents do not trust them), the police and law enforcement agencies (77%), and the army (65%).

In the light of all said above, the five key problem areas in Russian society that the students indicate seem quite predictable: drug and alcohol addiction (less often smoking, but all together leading to health problems), followed by the moral degradation of society, and crime (emphasis is made on the behavioural characteristics of Russian society), then comes the cluster of 'objective' factors apparently determining the problems mentioned previously – unemployment and, as a consequence – lack of financial resources, corruption, no access to education, and at the same time – as a result of the above said reasons – the economic, civil and legal situation, and understanding of problems created by the generation gap (Table 9).

In your opinion, what are the most acute problems of today's Russian youth?	%	«Places»
Drug addiction	76%	1
Alcoholism	60%	2
Moral degradation of society	48%	3
Smoking	38%	4
Crime	31%	5
Health problems	28%	
Unemployment	25%	6
Lack of financial resources	25%	
Lack of support from the state	24%	
Corruption	19%	7
Inaccessibility of education	16%	8
Economic situation in the country	14%	9
Violation of civil rights and liberties	13%	
Limited opportunities for leisure, boring life	12%	
Lack of mutual understanding with parents	12%	
Political situation in the country and in the world	4%	10

Table 9.

Given that only one in ten students (Table 10) is confident that the situation in the country (described above in dark colours) has nothing to do with his/her life plans (the number of those who hold this position has reduced by 6%), one would expect a very pessimistic assessment of the future by the students (Table 11), but young people look into the future with hope and optimism (every second respondent) or are not worried about it, or without much hope and illusions (about 40%). Perhaps, such optimism about life in the light of the above given data can be explained by two factors: on the one hand, by the so-called 'youth maximalism' and the inherent youth confidence that everything will be just fine; on the other hand, by the above-mentioned areas of national pride – the cultural heritage in the broad sense, which provides confidence in one's potential and forms the role models to follow. One third of the respondents consider themselves optimists, a third – realistic, and a third – situational opportunists (whose choice of behavioural strategies depends on the situation); nearly half of the respondents plan their life in the short term, every third respondent has a long-term plan.

In your opinion, how much can the situation in the country affect your life plans?	2007	2011
The situation in the country has nothing to do with my life plans	16%	10%
It may affect my plans, but insignificantly	32%	34%
It will have a significant impact on my plans	25%	34%
Realization of my life plans fully depends on the situation in the country	7%	6%
Hard to say	20%	16%

Table 10.

You look into the future...	2007	2011
with hope and optimism	46%	49%
without much hope and illusions, unaffected	43%	43%
With anxiety and uncertainty	8%	7%
With fear and despair	3%	1%

Table 11.

In 2009, with the help of the same questionnaire, we conducted a survey on a representative sample of university students in Maikop (Adygeya) to evaluate the stability of the identified value orientations of Russian students in a regional context. As the survey shows, quite predictably the ‘traditionalism’ of the Circassian society predetermines a higher level of social trust (by about 10%-13%) of Maikop students to the basic social institutions: the federal government (46% vs 33% in Moscow), the State Duma (33% vs 21%), the Council of the Federation (37% vs 26%), the media (39% vs 30%). And the picture is the same when the objects of distrust are considered – the social distrust level is lower in the regional centre concerning the police and law enforcement agencies (do not trust 77% of Moscow and 69% of Maikop students), the army (65% vs 51%) and political parties (72% vs 63%). However, a number of fundamental indicators in the diagnosis of the social wellbeing of young people in Moscow and Maikop ‘behave’ almost identically – identification in terms of patriotism, objects of national pride and anti-pride, assessment of one’s future prospects, the main institutional actors of trust and confidence, the key problems of young people etc. Thus, we can confidently say that the

younger generations in Russia do possess stable collective evaluations of the country's cultural heritage and today's social institutions which shape up their quite optimistic social mood.

Regarding the patriotism in Serbia, we have researched the relation directly to it as the value on population of Belgrade students in 2010³, but also indirectly several times through the relation of students in Kosovska Mitrovica to the protection of integrity and sovereignty of their state. Before we expose the results of the researches conducted in Serbia, it is necessary to mention that after the political changes in Serbia and Yugoslavia in the year 2000, the new authorities actively worked on presenting to the citizens the values of patriotism as "anti-value" (see Avramović 2009, 2012; Radojičić 2009), as something on behalf of which "crimes" were conducted in the wars on the territory of the former Yugoslavia, or great malversations and misuses were conducted regarding the spending of state assets⁴. The ideas of the "Patriotism" and the "Patriot" have been derided and mocked during the first decade of the 21st century. "New elite turn their back to the homeland and the nation to which they belong, to the domicile state, tradition and patriotism. International connections, market, piling of money, glamour are becoming the essence of life for them. On this basis has appeared the parole that patriotism is the last asylum for rascals" (Smiljković 2011: 132). It even should not be mentioned that during the whole last decade the socialization of the youth in Serbia through the schooling system was not performed according the idea of patriotic, but of mundialistic education. Considering that patriotism as the value is accepted in the childhood, through the process of primary socialization in the family, but also through the national education (Marković 2010: 33; Šuvaković 2010: 130-145) that is expressed in the schooling system and through

3 This survey was set wider, it included also the survey of the values of patriotism, and it was conducted on the instrument made by RUDN that was adopted to Serbian population. Such the survey was simultaneously conducted in Russia, China, Serbia, Czech Republic and Kazakhstan. The bearer of the survey for Serbia was the Serbian Academy of Education, the Head of the survey was Prof. Dr. Danilo Ž. Marković, and the survey was conducted by the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University in Pristina with contemporary Head office in Kosovska Mitrovica that has performed empiric sociological surveys for years.

4 Television "B92" within their broadcast "Insider" during 2012 broadcasted a series named "Patriotic Pillage" referred to the events in Kosovo and Metohija, in which they presented the data of Albanian separatistic authorities as legitimate, with an attempt to present the Serbs that live and work in the north of Kosovo and Metohija and their representatives as "criminal structures".

political socialization that leads to interiorization of a certain pattern of political culture (Podunavac 1993: 1091-1097), then it is clear that it cannot be reduced only to the “constitutional patriotism”, as Habermas tried to do, but it is necessary to include it also in the idea of patriotism. Unfortunately, Serbian schooling system even today has not institutionalized the process of patriotic education of pupils and students, but on the contrary it favors a mundialistic model through so-called “Bologna process”, although it is quite clear that even from logistic point of view mundialism as attitude is – unviable. This is because the general in individual exists only through the special, or as academic Mihailo Marković concretized: “In order to belong to the humankind, one must belong to a concrete society. An individual who does not belong to any society, even not to the one for which he is connected with his language and culture from which he arised – is and remains a narcissist who loves only himself and misrepresent himself in public as a humankind lover” (Marković 1994: 398). While in other states, including both Serbia and the Russia, patriotism as the value is questioned, “in America so-called patriot act (The Patriot Act) has been adopted, the act that limits many human rights and freedoms just refering to the value that has been questioned in other parts of the world in many ways – to the patriotism” (Nadić, Šuvaković 2010: 863).

The survey was conducted in May 2010 by quota and two-stage cluster sampling of 500 Belgrade students, by applying the technique of the questionnaire in the field. The two-stage cluster sampling was necessary in order to comprise all four groups of Belgrade University, while the choise of faculties within the groups was free (never only one faculty within the group), and the selection of students that entered the sample was random.

To direct question if they considered themselves as a patriot, 64.1% answered with “Yes”, 11.1% with “No”, while 24.8% stated that it was “difficult for them to give a specific answer”. If we sum up those with decided answers of “No” with those who had difficulties to give answer, it comes out that a little more than 1/3 of Belgrade students at least have problem to qualify themselves as patriots. The distribution of answers to the requested explanation why they refused to qualify themselves as patriots (this question was answered only by those who did not qualify themselves as such) was as follows:

If it was difficult for you to answer the previous question, please explain why?	2010 (in %)
I do not understand the meaning of the idea of patriotism	9,80
It is difficult for me to define my attitude to the country as patriotism	45,10
In the modern era of globalization the concept of patriotism has completely lost its meaning and is no longer relevant	33,20
Something else	10,90

Table 12.

The solid domination of the second offered answer clearly indicates the lack of socialization, especially the secondary – institutionalized, in the patriotic spirit. It should be kept in mind that the surveyed population had vague memory of the wars in the former Yugoslav territories, that they were not able to judge their causes on basis of their own insight, and they were socialized in the direction that Serbia is responsible for them and that the proof of „Europeanship“ of each Serbian was to be as less patriot as possible. However, encouragement was that even in spite of such propaganda that lasted for a decade, even 2/3 of respondents declared themselves as patriots, at the greatest university in the country, in its capital town, where the influence of the ideology of globalization was the greatest.

In order to establish with which sphere of life the Belgrade students were the proudest of, and which of them excited the feeling of patriotism, we put the question „Are you proud of“, offering 13 spheres of life and leaving the possibility for dichotomous answer.

Are you proud of:	Yes (%)	No (%)	Rank
History of the country	85,6	14,3	4
Natural resources	91,7	8,3	1
Cultural heritage	87,6	11,9	3
Work of state authorities	11,0	89,0	9
Position of the country in the world scene	8,4	91,6	10
Economy in the country	3,7	96,3	12
Situation in the social sphere	5,3	94,7	11
Respecting human rights and freedoms	29,1	70,9	8

Are you proud of:	Yes (%)	No (%)	Rank
Educational system	34,8	65,2	5
Standard of living of citizens	3,3	96,7	13
Army	31,3	68,7	6
Development of science and technique	29,5	70,5	7
Sport achievements	88,4	11,6	2

Table 13.

It is visible from the table that Belgrade students are the proudest of what have neutral value in the contemporary social-political context and yet represent the source of patriotic feelings with them: natural resources, sports achievements, cultural heritage, history of the country (each of these areas with more than 85% of Yes answers), far behind on the 5th place is educational system (approximately 35% of Yes answers), while on the other hand one might say that they are almost ashamed of the citizens' standard of living (96.7% encircled No), economy, situation in the social sphere and position of the country in the world scene (more than 90% of respondents had negative reaction to these answers).

Considering that respondents were students, it was necessary to ask them also what were, according to their opinion, the greatest problems with which the youth is faced. Vices hold two places among the first four: even 80% of respondents identified drug addiction as the greatest problem of the youth, while alcoholism is in the fourth place (46.8%). Problems that society must solve were on the second and the third place: crime (58.3%) and unemployment (57.8%). It was interesting that only every tenth respondent identified lack of state support as problem, which might be interpreted by getting used of students to that fact.

What are the greatest problems that jeopardize the youth today (respondents could encircle 5 at the most)	Yes (%)	Rank
Drug addiction	80,0	1
Crime	58,3	2
Unemployment	57,8	3
Alcoholism	46,8	4
Moral degradation of society	36,5	5
Economic situation in the country	35,3	6

Corruption of the authorities	31,9	7
Lack of financial resources	28,9	8
Smoking	23,7	9
Lack of mutual understanding with parents	13,1	10
Political situation in the country and in the world	12,4	11
Lack of support from the state	10,8	12
Inaccessibility of education	10,8	12
Limited opportunities for leisure, boring life	10,6	13
Health problems	8,0	14
Violation of civil rights and liberties	6,9	15
Others	1,6	16

Table 14.

Although political situation in the country and in the world was only at the 11th place (12.4%) of the list of problems that mostly jeopardized the youth at the moment, nearly 57% of respondents considered that actual political situation in the country influenced accomplishment of their life plans. Such a comprehension of the youth was understandable considering that it was the period of implementation of the toughest principles of party state (see Šuvaković 2011).

In your opinion, how much can current situation situation in the country affect realization of your life plans?	(%)
The situation in the country has nothing to do with my life plans	8,8
It may affect my plans, but insignificantly	25,1
It will have a significant impact on my plans	47,4
Realization of my life plans fully depends on the situation in the country	9,5
Hard to say	9,1

Table 15.

However, regarding the look into the future, Belgrade students were rather realistically determined: 43.7% of them were looking into the future with hope and optimism, 30.3% calmly and without special hopes and illusions, while concern and uncertainty showed only 1/5 of respondents, and fear and desperation every tenth Belgrade student. Yet, the

greatest number of respondents was making plans only for the near future (44.5%), a little less than 1/3 was planning even the furthest perspective (30.1%), while 16.1% mainly was not planning their own future, and 9.3% never thought about it. “These data are in accordance with the recorded trend in the states with transitional experience where difficult economic crisis produced the feeling that everyday life is actually a struggle for existential survival in the life of the majority of the population. The phenomenon of “shortening perspective” dominates in such a social atmosphere, which is manifested by redefinition of long-term goals, interests and strategies for making plans in always shorter terms” (Petrović 2011: 892).

However, it should be noticed that declaring oneself as patriot is one thing and being patriot in reality is quite another thing. Unfortunately, Serbs, and also Serbian students, are in the phase of permanent testing of patriotism through the relation regarding Kosovo and Metohija, the territory of Serbia where separatists have proclaimed “independence” and which great Western powers are trying now to realize *de facto* and *de iure*. Therefore, we are giving here a comparative review of the attitudes of students of the University in Belgrade and the University in Pristina with contemporary head office in Kosovska Mitrovica regarding this question, on basis of the survey conducted in Belgrade in 2010 and in Kosovska Mitrovica in 2012 by quota sampling of 400 respondents by the technique of the questionnaire in the field.⁵ It was offered to students to opt for answers regarding the recognition of so-called independence of Kosovo.

Serbia should not recognize independence of Kosovo	Completely disagree (%)	Irresolute (%)	Completely agree (%)
Students of the University in Belgrade in 2010	7,9	11,2	71,1
Students of the University in Kosovska Mitrovica in 2012	2,8	6,1	87,1

Table 16.

⁵ This survey, as well as the same kind conducted in 2009 among students' population in Kosovska Mitrovica, was managed by prof. Uros Šuvaković, Ph.D. and doc. Jasmina Petrović, Ph.D. and was conducted by the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University in Pristina with contemporary Head office in Kosovska Mitrovica within the project III 47023 “Kosovo and Metohija between national identity and Euro-integrations”.

Although a five-degree scale was offered, the number of those who partially agree, i.e. partially disagree was negligible. Actually, such opinions are comprised in the attitude of irresoluteness. Therefore, regarding this distinct direct relation to the own state, students expressed clearly a patriotic attitude, which is considerably more expressed with Belgrade students⁶ comparing to the situation when they were asked to declare whether they were patriots or not. Higher percentage of determined regarding this attitude of the students in Kosovska Mitrovica is understandable, considering that the city is divided and local students have direct experience with terror performed daily by Albanian extremists over members of Serbian nationality. Therefore, their attitude that Serbia should not recognize independency of Kosovo is actually the attitude that they should survive and live in that area, since otherwise it should not be possible. On the other hand, high percentage of Belgrade students declaring the attitude on non-recognition of so-called independency of Kosovo shows patriotic orientation of Serbian students and contradicts the analysts pleading for the thesis on students as extremely globally oriented population, obviously without empirical foundation. Maybe it was the goal of various creators of public opinion in Serbia, but regarding the results – it was not accomplished.

Conclusions

Comparing Belgrade and Moscow students regarding the relation to the patriotism, it is certain that this population of young people feels like patriots. Even 51% of respondents declare as such in Moscow, while in Serbia 64.1% of respondents feel like that. The number of students not feeling like patriots is the same in Moscow and in Belgrade – 11%, while there are respondents who find it difficult to answer clearly to this question – 38% in Moscow and 24.8% in Belgrade. It is obvious that the systematic anti-patriotic campaign that global organizations and media lead against the idea of patriotism, and especially against such an idea with Slovene people, has given results. However, one may notice that the campaign in Serbia has not accomplished the goal completely. Actually, the real indicator of patriotism with all Serbs, including also the students' population, is the relation regarding the issue of preserving Kosovo and Metohija as integral part of Serbia, which practically represents a concretization of the idea of patriotism in the

⁶ Students in Kosovska Mitrovica were not asked direct question on patriotism.

case of Serbia. Even 71.1% of respondents are against recognition of the “independency of Kosovo”. Indeed, that percentage reached 87.1% in Kosovska Mitrovica in 2012, but the fact that surveyed population live in an area of frozen conflict must be considered. Therefore, it is clear that the solid majority of students in Serbia is absolutely against recognition of “independency of Kosovo”, which is the best indicator of their patriotic determination.

The minority – both of Russian and of Serbian students – that responded that it was difficult for them to define themselves as patriots was asked why they declared like that. The answer that it was difficult for them to define their own relation to the country as ‘patriotism’ dominates in both cases, which clearly indicates the lack of institutional socialization in the patriotic spirit, which the Russian authorities have valued well by starting realization of programs in that direction. The second most common answer in both groups of respondents was that patriotism “have lost its sense” in the world of globalization. This answer, which is more present with Belgrade than with Moscow students, actually indicates the popularity of globalization ideology among the students’ population, which is surely the problem with which both Russia and Serbia must confront.

However, the differences between Moscow and Belgrade students regarding what are they proud of in their countries are interesting. The first places among Moscow students took the heroic past of the country (ranked on the 1st place, 77.4%), the art (2nd place, 52.1%), sport successes, culture of the country, scientific and technical achievements (3rd place – 42.8%, 41.8% and 40.4%). However, Belgrade students were less “political”, so they are mostly proud of natural resources (1st place, 91.7%), sport successes (2nd place, 88.4%), cultural heritage (3rd place, 87.6%) and then the history of the country (4th place, 85.6%) and educational system (34.8%). Therefore, the mutual things among the leading ranks of both Russian and Serbian students are proud of the history of the country, sport successes and cultural heritage, where the number of those with positive determination regarding the offered elements is higher with Serbian students. On the other hand, the fact is that they are mostly proud of something that has nothing common with politics, and educational system is best ranked regarding the current institutions. However, Moscow students in the first place put the proud of the history of the country, which is par excellence political respond, but if tables are compared – both groups express rather great discontent with e.g. economic situation, social security system, etc.

Regarding the problems that distress students in Russia and Serbia, the common problems among the five most important are drug addiction (in the 1st place in both cases), alcoholism, crime and moral degradation of the society. Among the first five, Serbian students also rank unemployment (the 3rd place – 57.8%) and Russian smoking (the 4th place – 38%). It is obvious from this that the problems of the youth in transitional countries are almost the same, and differences might be explained both by considerably lower rate of unemployment in Russia (6.1% of active citizens in 2011) in comparison to Serbia (22.2% of active citizens in 2011) and by cultural reasons regarding the problem of nicotine mania with Serbian students. In fact, even today in Serbia – although a great campaign against smoking is going on – it is not considered as a great vice, which is the consequence of a tradition that lasts for several centuries.

Russian students in lower extent consider that the situation in their country might influence their life plans, while such an influence is emphasized by an absolute majority of Serbian students' population. This might be considered as a serious indicator of the stability of the Russian and instability of the Serbian society. In general, Russian students look into the future with more hope and optimism than Serbian students (49% of Russian and 43.7% of Serbian), while a realistic position regarding the future hopes “without special hopes and illusions” again take more Russian than Serbian students (43% of Russian and 30.3% of Serbian). The feeling of anxiety is considerably higher with Serbian students: even every fifth expresses concern and uneasiness, and every tenth fear and desperation, while regarding Russian students the situation is significantly different: only 7% of them express concern and uneasiness and only 1% fear and desperation. Such the result probably might be explained by the feeling of belonging to a great and powerful nation, regardless if it is consciously expressed as patriotism or not.

Bibliography

- Avramović, Z. (2009) *Rodomrsci (o jednom delu srpskih političara i intelektualaca od 1990 - 2009)*. Novi Sad: Kultura polisa – Grafomarketing.
- Avramović, Z. (2012) *Demokratija i bombardovanje*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Правительство Российской Федерации (2010) „Государственная программа ‘Патриотическое воспитание граждан Российской Федерации на 2011-2015 годы’”, [online]. Available at: <http://base.garant.ru/199483> [Accessed March 13, 2013].

- Правительство Российской Федерации (2005) „Государственная программа Патриотическое воспитание граждан Российской Федерации на 2006-2010 годы“, [online]. Available at: <http://base.garant.ru/188373/#100> [Accessed March 13, 2013].
- Даль, В. (1978) *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка*. Москва: Русский язык.
- Левашов, В.К. (2006) „Патриотизм в контексте современных социально-политических реалий“, *Социологические исследования*, 8: 67-76. 22
- Marković, D. Ž. (2010) „Uloga nacionalnog vaspitanja u očuvanju kulturnog identiteta u globalizirajućem društvu“. In: Denić, S. (ed.) *Mogućnost nacionalnog vaspitanja u vreme globalizacije*. Vranje: Učiteljski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu. pp. 32-45.
- Marković, M. (1994) *Osporavanja i angažovanja. Izabrana dela, knj. 8*. Beograd: BIGZ – GENES-S Štampa – Prosveta – SKZ.
- Менделеев, Д.И. (1907) *К познанию России*. С.-Петербург: Издание А. С. Суворина.
- Nadić, D., Šuvaković, U. (2011) „Patriotizam kao vrednost kod studenata krajem prve decenije XXI veka“, *Godišnjak SAO*, 6: 859-870.
- Всероссийский центр изучения общественного мнения (2010) „Новый русский патриотизм: национальный, государственнический или гражданский?“, [online]. Available at: <http://wciom.ru/index.php?id=268&uid=13603> [Accessed March 26, 2013].
- Petrović, J. (2011) „Vrednosni stavovi studenata: religioznost, prosocijalni stavovi i odnos prema budućnosti“, Beograd: *Godišnjak SAO*, 6.
- Podunavac, M. (1993) „Socijalizacija (politička)“. In: Matić, M. (ed.) *Enciklopedija političke kulture*. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- Radojčić, M. (2009) *Istorija u krivom ogledalu: nevladine organizacije i politika interpretiranja skorije južnoslovenske prošlosti*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Smiljković, R. (2011) „Moralno-ekonomska kriza buržoaske restauracije u Srbiji i odgovornost elita moći“, *Politička revija*, 10(2): 125-156.
- Шаповалов, В.Ф. (2008) „Российский патриотизм и российский антипатриотизм“, *Общественные науки и современность*, 1: 124-132.
- Šuvaković, U. (2010) „Nacionalno vaspitanje – put usvajanja i globalnih i nacionalnih vrednosti“. In: Denić, S. (ed.) *Mogućnost nacionalnog vaspitanja u vreme globalizacije*. Vranje: Učiteljski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu.