

57c'59, 56-12 2110

002108279

Politics and the Individual Volume 3 Number 2 1993

© Verlag Dr. R. Krämer Hamburg

PATRIOTISM AS FUNDAMENTAL BELIEFS OF GROUP MEMBERS¹

Daniel Bar-Tal *

Abstract Patriotism is viewed from a social psychological perspective as an attachment of group members towards their group and the country in which they reside. This attachment is reflected in beliefs and emotions that individuals hold. In its fundamental form, patriotism has positive implications, being an essential condition for group existence. It gives meaning to group membership and serves important functions of personal belonging and identification, as well as group functions of unity, cohesiveness and mobilization. Without patriotism groups disintegrate and therefore every group tries to inculcate it in its members through cultural, social, and political mechanisms. But, although in its fundamental form patriotism is genuine, it may have negative consequences when beliefs of specific contents are added.

Introduction

Patriotism is one of the most important foundations in the life of a group or a nation.² Considering it as a desirable value, every group tries to inculcate it in its members through cultural, social, and political mechanisms. The literature honours the deeds of patriots; sculptures and paintings eternalize them for subsequent generations; national holidays commemorate their birth, death, or achievements, while official societal institutions view patriots and patriotism together with the national anthem and the flag as the most important features of their own identity (see for example Karsten, 1978; Shafer, 1972). The educational system, too, explicitly attempts to impart patriotism as a value to the younger generation by formally glorifying the life of patriots and emphasizing the importance of patriotism for the group's survival. From time to time there is a call for patriotic sacrifice in every group or nation. Group members may be asked to give up their personal convenience, wishes or even needs to help achieve group goals in the name of patriotism. Patriotic deeds often involve the ultimate sacrifice: the loss of life. Generally, the most revered patriots are

* *Daniel Bar-Tal, School of Education, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv 69978, Israel.*

Daniel Bar-Tal

those who participated in wars or struggles for national independence. Every nation has its own patriots who are considered national heroes. It is hard to find an Italian who has not heard about Giuseppe Garibaldi, an American who is ignorant of George Washington, a Pole who is unfamiliar with Tadeusz Kosciuszko, and an Israeli who has not heard about Joseph Trumpeldor. Patriots have always served as examples and symbols for their group members.

According to the present conception, patriotism is not only a political, historical, and sociological phenomenon, but should also be discussed from a psychological perspective. According to this view, patriotism is a cognitive-motivational response reflected in beliefs and emotions. Since individuals are not born with patriotism, but learn it in their groups or nations, it is always acquired, at first, as a set of beliefs which are stored as a schema of patriotism in the cognitive system. From the core beliefs emanate a semantic network of associated meanings and implications, as well as emotions, which have motivating characteristics and they influence individuals' judgments, evaluations and behaviours (Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Markus & Zajonc, 1985). Thus, the present approach places special attention on the cognitive aspect of patriotism - the beliefs.

This paper's focus on beliefs is based on the premise that the study of individuals' beliefs enables understanding their behaviour, since it is assumed that individuals' beliefs to a large extent determine their behaviour. That is, individuals behave in accordance with their beliefs. This assumption, which has been advanced by a number of psychologists (Asch, 1952; Brunswik, 1956; Heider, 1958), has special importance for understanding the influence of patriotic beliefs on group behaviour. Most In the present analysis, patriotism is reflected in personal beliefs' repertoire. Considering individuals, as group members, hold patriotic beliefs with high confidence, considering them as an important and necessary basis for their group existence. They may vary, however, with regard to the degree of centrality they attach to these beliefs and with regard to the level the latter are interrelated with other beliefs (see for example Grodzins, 1956). But first of all, group members may differ with regard to meanings and implications they attribute to their patriotic beliefs (Page, 1915; Snyder, 1976). Thus, our next task is to discuss the definition of patriotism.

Meaning of Patriotism

The word patriotism derives from the Greek word *pater* which means "father". It indicates a sentiment based upon loyalty to the parent. On the basis of the word *pater*, emerged the Greek word *patriotes* which means "a fellow countryman" and the word *patria* which refers to "a fatherland" or "country". Today's definition of patriotism is "The character or passion of a patriot; love of or zealous devotion to one's own country" (Oxford English Dictionary, 1933), or "love for or devotion to country, the virtues and actions of a patriot" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary, 1967). In spite of this apparent agreement about love and devotion to one's country, Coker (1953, 26), in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* pointed out that "the word patriotism has no precise definition, and there are vague and varying ideas as to the

psychological springs, historical origins and characteristic manifestations of the sentiment of patriotism".

A particular combination of ambivalence and equivocality shrouds the meaning of patriotism. While on the one hand patriotic deeds have always been highly praised and almost every group can be observed to have tried to strengthen patriotic values; patriotism on the other hand, has been often seen as the root of all evils. The perception that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel", as expressed by Samuel Johnson, or that "the spirit of patriotism is the spirit of the dog and the wolf", as noted by Mark Twain, is not surprising in view of the fact that patriotism has often been seen as a cause of war, conflict and prejudice (Holmes, 1925; Snyder, 1976; Somerville, 1981; Tolstoy, 1936; Waldstein, 1917). It has been critically viewed, especially during the first half of the century and is still often used interchangeably with chauvinism.

The outbreak of World War I, the emergence of Nazism and Fascism and their destructive effect on mankind, demonstrated the possibly, subversive power of patriotism when it is embedded into political ideology and goals. In this spirit Morray (1951, 1) posed the following question:

Patriotism is stamped with blood and iron. It is born in rebellion and nourished by war. Patriotism wears a habit of violence, and one of our problems is to determine whether this is an accidental dress which can be changed or whether violence is of its nature.

In their classic study about the authoritarian personality, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford (1950, 107) concentrated on discussing negative patriotism which they labelled pseudopatriotism, defining it as "blind attachment to certain national cultural values, uncritical conformity with the prevailing group ways, and rejection of other nations as outgroups". This pseudopatriotism was found to be highly related to prejudice against blacks and other American minority groups. In fact, in this conceptualization it constitutes part of ethnocentrism, which was found to be related to antisemitism, fascism, and conservatism. Adorno et al. (1950, 107-108) did however recognize that there might also be a genuine patriotism which reflects love of country and attachment to national values. "The genuine patriot", they wrote, "it would appear, can appreciate the values and ways of other nations, and can be permissive toward much that he cannot personally accept for himself. He is free of rigid conformism, outgroup rejection, and imperialistic striving for power". Four decades have passed since the publication of the seminal study by Adorno et al. (1950) and still the double meaning of patriotism has not been clarified. The study of patriotism has not received the attention it deserves. In spite of being one of the most important ingredients of group behaviour, neither psychologists nor political scientists have devoted much effort to the study of this social-psychological-political phenomenon. The present paper attempts to analyze the essence of patriotism, suggesting that it can be defined positively in a fundamental form which can be applied for every group. The proposed conception may serve as a baseline for evaluating various beliefs and acts considered patriotic and may also explain its evolvement as a necessary condition for group existence.

Definition

*It is proposed that in its fundamental form patriotism refers to attachment of group members towards their group and the country in which they reside.*³

Attachment, in this definition, implies a binding affection between a person and his/her group and the land. Patriotism, thus, can probably be found in every ethnographic group which has an attachment to a certain geographical place. This attachment, which reflects motivational forces and is associated with positive evaluation and emotion, is expressed by beliefs connoting contents of love, loyalty, pride or care. These beliefs are learned and on their basis motivational - emotional reactions are formed. That is, group members who form beliefs of the type "I love my country and my people", "I am loyal to my country", "I am proud of my people", also develop the evaluational and emotional feeling of attachment. In line with this view, patriotism should be seen not as a motivational-emotional reaction only, but holistically, together with the accompanying beliefs which express the attachment. These beliefs, on the one hand, serve as antecedents of the motivation and emotion and, on the other hand, function subsequently as its expression, explanation, and justification. Since patriotism is expressed by beliefs and through their study, it is possible to find out the specific meaning that individuals attribute to it, the study of patriotic beliefs is the focus of the present conception. This focus on beliefs is in line with those conceptions of motivation and emotion which underlie their cognitive basis (Kagan, 1972; Lazarus, 1982; Weiner, 1986).

The present definition implies that the basic element of patriotism is the desire to belong to a group which is positively evaluated. That is, patriots want to be part of their group, define themselves as members of it and feel some kind of "we-ness". Patriots do not want to be members of another group and/or live in other places. Even when, as a result of special circumstances, patriots leave their country, they always wish to return. This desired belonging to the group is of special importance, since individuals are born into groups and perceived as their members. However, in spite of their ascribed membership, they may not always wish to be part of the group in the course of their life. Individuals may move to new places and develop patriotic feelings (i.e., attachment) to a new group and country. But, without developing a sense of belonging, individuals cannot experience patriotism. Only on the basis of the sense of belonging, additional beliefs and emotions reflecting attachment can be developed. Indeed, there are a number of beliefs and emotions which can express fundamental patriotism as defined previously. In order to qualify for this function, they ought to be universal, without referring to specific contents characterizing particular groups or subgroups. Among these, one of the emotions often considered as the main expression of patriotism is love of the group and the country. This love by itself may be considered a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for patriotism, since it may happen that tourists fall in love with a country or a nation too. In contrast, patriots first of all feel belonging and on this basis love is added. The objects of love are usually the people, the culture, the landscape, the flora and fauna of the country and so on. In addition, patriotism also reflects concern about the group. Patriots have an interest in what happens to their people and the country, and care about their well-being. Other fundamental, universal beliefs associated with patriotism

may refer to devotion, loyalty or pride, and it is probable that there are additional beliefs which express group members' attachment to their group and country. While discussing the definition of patriotism it should also be noted that for many people patriotic beliefs also have behavioral implications by motivating people to take certain action. Voluntary acts for the benefit of the nation and country, may be implied by beliefs related to belonging, love, loyalty, devotion or concern. In extreme cases, patriots may be willing to sacrifice their life. But in less extreme situations patriots are ready to perform actions which contribute to the group and the country. The inclusion of behavioral implications allows differentiation between passive and active patriotism. Passive patriotism is related only to the cognitive-affective aspects of attachment. It consists of the beliefs and emotions the person has towards his/her group and country. Active patriotism involves behaviours which are carried out as a result of patriotic beliefs. The range of patriotic behaviours varies and depends on group requirements, as well as on personal factors. In any event, they almost always involve some kind of personal sacrifice.

Not all the definitions of patriotism are limited to the above presented fundamental beliefs. It is recognized that group members in certain groups may form additional, specific beliefs expressing patriotism (Lang, 1974). There are individual and cultural differences with regard to the kind of specific contents which can be added to the fundamental universal belief (Page, 1915; Snyder, 1976). In fact, it may be suggested that groups can generate unlimited contents to express their patriotism. For example, they may think that patriotism should involve support of a particular ideology (e.g., Communism), or the glorification of a particular leader (e.g., Hitler), or the backing of a specific government policy. These types of beliefs and emotions, though included in the definition of patriotism by certain groups, are not universal and cannot therefore be considered fundamental. They refer to specific contents characterizing particular groups during certain periods or in particular situations.

The present approach refers to genuine fundamental patriotism independent of specific conditions, goals, means, or ideology, and proposes a definition in terms of general beliefs reflecting attachment which can be held by all the members of all groups. Group members can be patriots irrespective of their political affiliation, social values, or religious convictions, only through their attachment to their group and land. Patriotism is unconditional - irrespective of the ruling regime, practised policy, dominant ideology or values emphasized. The attachment is not dependent on these and other factors which are often temporary. It is directed towards the people as an ethnographic group and towards the geographical place, based on historical heritage, as well as cultural and social ethos.

Finally, the definition of patriotism should clarify the interrelationship between the objects of the attachment - the group (or more specifically, the nation) and the country. These two components are necessary elements of the definition. On the one hand, a person cannot feel patriotically toward a nation or a group without reference to the geographical place to which the nation or group is attached. On the other hand, a person cannot have patriotic feelings toward a specific geographical place without relating it to a nation or a group which resides there. The definition of patriotism suggests that the subjects of the attachment are both a nation/group as well as a country. These two elements are interwoven. The nation/group and country

Israel, does not leave it, and objects to emigration and b) the Israeli patriot acts to secure the country by serving in the army, and by volunteering for combat units. In another study, Kelly and Ronan (1987) found that high school students in a small community in Arizona associated patriotism mostly with the following five themes: "Military, Protection, War", "Love, Respect, Pride, "Flag, July 4th, 1776", "Country, Nation, U.S.", and "Heroes, People, Friends". But in spite of the general agreement, the study revealed several subcultural variations by gender, ethnicity and reading ability.

Patriotism and Similar Concepts

A number of concepts (e.g., nationalism, ethnocentrism) in the social sciences are sometimes used interchangeably with patriotism. Therefore, while defining patriotism, it is important to establish its uniqueness by differentiating it from other concepts.

One of the concepts often associated with patriotism is nationalism. Nevertheless, there are major differences between the two. While nationalism is a political - sociological term, which refers to self-determination of the group as a nation in a state (Kohn, 1955; Smith, 1971; Snyder, 1954, 1976), patriotism does not necessarily imply nationalism (Doob, 1964; Snyder, 1976). Nationalism relates to a specific content, focusing entirely on the fundamental goal to have a separate, distinct and independent nation-state. It considers this particular political organization as indispensable for the social, cultural and economic functioning of the people. In contrast, patriotism does not dictate the nature of political organization to the group. It is a more general and basic sentiment. Any ethnographic group attached to a geographical place such as the Eskimos or Beduins, may be patriotic just like Frenchmen or Americans, but without defining themselves as a nation striving to establish their own state. Therefore, historically, the political claim of nation-state sovereignty is a relatively new one, whereas patriotism concerns an age-old attachment.

Of special interest for the differentiation between patriotism and nationalism is the study by Kosterman and Feshbach (1989). By administering their Patriotism / Nationalism questionnaire they demonstrated that the two concepts are described by two different sets of beliefs. While patriotism, as they investigated, "assesses the degree of love for and pride in one's nation - in essence, the degree of attachment to the nation, the Nationalism vector, in comparison, reflects a perception of attachment to superiority and an orientation toward national dominance" (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989, 271).

Comparing, in turn, between patriotism and ethnocentrism, it becomes obvious that while the former concept concerns intragroup beliefs and emotions, the latter focuses on intergroup beliefs and attitudes. As originally presented by Sumner (1906), ethnocentrism refers to a tendency to accept the own group and reject outgroups; the concept comes to differentiate between group members' beliefs and attitudes towards their own group as against outgroups (Forbes, 1985). Characteristically, group members with ethnocentric beliefs consider their own group as virtuous and superior and the outgroups as contemptible and inferior (Brewer & Campbell, 1976; LeVine &

Daniel Bar-Tal

constitute one unit for a patriot. This relationship is reflected everywhere in the nation or group's history and culture.

Two points should be noted with regard to the relationship between a nation and a country: a) There is not always agreement among patriots about the boundaries of the country towards which they feel patriotically; and b) There is not always agreement among patriots about the groups which constitute the nation. In the former case, the disagreement may concern a region or regions which are not assumed to be part of the country by all the patriots. In this case, although all the patriots feel patriotically towards at least certain parts of the country, some may not feel like this towards other parts of it.

In prehistorical as well as historical times, groups wandered across continents in search of a place to settle. They conquered countries and took up residence in them. Wars and conquests continue until the present day. The boundaries of states have changed numerous times in the course of history. The differences between the maps of Europe in 1812, 1815, 1848, 1919 and 1945 vividly illustrate such change. In cases where boundaries change and regions pass from hand to hand, part of a nation may not form patriotic sentiments towards a certain part of the country. Thus, for example not all Germans today consider the Sudetenland and Pomeranian part of Germany; not all Frenchmen in the 1950s considered Algeria to be part of France; and not all Israelis have patriotic feelings towards the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Also, people form and re-form beliefs involving patriotism towards new countries and nations. For example, American patriots of today are descendants of Englishmen, Scots, Poles, Irishmen, Italians, Mexicans, or Japanese who arrived in that country relatively recently. Or again, Bedouins who came to Jordan about eighty years ago from the Arabian peninsula are now patriotic Jordanians while many Israeli patriots were assimilated Jews elsewhere until fairly recently. Thus, members of a nation may differ with regard to tradition and extent of attachment to geographical places.

In the case of patriotism toward the nation, the disagreement may concern the composition of the nation. A group of patriots may, for example, hold that certain ethnic, racial, or religious groups do not constitute part of the nation. Disagreement of this type arises in nations or groups which are heterogeneous in their composition. Thus, for example, there have always been Americans who do not view blacks as part of their nation; and many Germans in the 1930s and 1940s excluded Jews from the German nation, although the Jews considered themselves German patriots of the Jewish religion.

Some studies have investigated how members of different groups understand the concept of patriotism. From these studies it is clear that lay-people's conceptions, in this respect, are not substantially different from the definition presented above. Bar-Tal and Raviv (1985) asked about three hundred Israeli adolescents to define the concept "an Israeli patriot". The results showed that the adolescents agreed on several characteristics of the definition. The majority of the respondents (about 60%) referred to the positive attitudes a patriot has towards Israel (e.g., loves it, is devoted, is loyal). Also, about half of the respondents referred to the activities in which the patriot is involved for the benefit of the country (e.g., volunteers, contributes money or time, exerts special efforts). In addition, of special importance for the adolescents were two characteristics unique to the Israeli context: a) the Israeli patriot lives in

Campbell, 1972). According to Sumner (1906) this differentiation is important for group survival in spite of the over-simplification and distortion it involves.

This ethnocentrism refers to positive beliefs and attitudes towards the own group in comparison to other groups. Own group elevation is the main outcome of ethnocentrism. Therefore, it has been regarded critically by social scientists who viewed it as an expression of intolerance, prejudice, and chauvinism. In contrast, patriotism reflects merely the attachment to the own group, without reference to outgroups. In its fundamental form, it expresses a positive bond between a person and his/her group.

Patriotism is also different from the concept of chauvinism introduced in the last century. Chauvinism and a related concept, jingoism, denote extreme forms of nationalism and national pride (Lasswell, 1953). This phenomenon reaches its summit during intergroup conflict and it expresses inflamed feelings combining nationalism together with militarism and patriotism. According to Shaler (1955), the chauvinist and jingoist show forms of zealous and fanatical nationalism together with blind and fervent patriotism which rejects outgroups while strongly distrusting and disliking foreigners. Thus, while chauvinism and jingoism have unfavourable meanings and are used to describe negative phenomena, patriotism, as defined above, is seen as a desirable product of intragroup processes.

Recent studies performed in Australia, South Africa and Great Britain confirmed that patriotism does not have to have a negative meaning. These studies found that fundamental patriotic beliefs do not correlate with racist or fascist attitudes, but reflect genuine care and love of the country (Heaven, 1984; Heaven, Rajab & Ray, 1985; Ray & Furnham, 1984). Patriotism, defined as such, is a necessary outcome of group formation. The next part will analyze its emergence.

Patriotism and Group Formation

Patriotism probably first appeared when human beings, living in groups, stopped wandering and settled in a particular place. It is likely that they should have begun to develop an attachment to a place at this point. And though the organization of groups has seen changes through the ages, patriotism has continued to exist as a human phenomenon. Tribes, ethnic groups and nations are still strongly based on patriotism and make all possible efforts to maintain it. In order to understand the nature of patriotism, the following part will describe conceptually the development of this phenomenon. To accomplish this task it is necessary to focus on the group formation process. Patriotic beliefs appear in the process of group formation and the emergence of group members' social identity. They are part of the set of basic beliefs which serves as a foundation for group existence.

The crucial phase in the process of group formation is the emergence of beliefs concerning group existence (i.e., "We are a group"). Individuals have to believe that they constitute a group with something in common that unites them. This belief is based on self-categorization and becomes part of the reality of the individuals who constitute the group (Bar-Tal, 1990; Turner, 1987). That is, once individuals categorize themselves as group members, awareness of their membership becomes

part of their self-concept, forming their social identity. Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) provides a seminal analysis of the development of social identity, defining it as:

"... that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value an emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1978, 63).

This perspective assumes that individuals' view of themselves also derives from their membership in certain groups. As a consequence, a link is formed between the perception of the group and the perception of self. The self-perception of a group member together with his/her evaluation of the group determines his/her social identity.

On the assumption that people have a basic need to positively evaluate themselves social identity theory posits that people who define themselves in terms of some group membership are motivated to evaluate their group positively (Tajfel, 1978, 1981, 1982). That is, they seek to establish a positive social identity. In Tajfel's (1981, 256) words:

"It can be assumed that an individual will tend to remain a member of a group and seek membership of a new group if these groups have some contribution to make to the positive aspects of his social identity, i.e., to those aspects of it from which he derives some satisfaction".

This pursuit is not surprising in view of the fact that group membership contributes to fulfilling individuals' emotional needs. Individuals usually take pride in the accomplishments of their group and thus enhance their self-esteem. As a consequence, group membership not only defines one's identity, but also serves as a basis for one's own self-evaluation. Positive evaluation of the group increases self-worth. It is thus people's personal interest and need to perceive their own group positively. Indeed, when social identity in terms of a particular group membership is unsatisfactory and individuals do not succeed in reaching satisfactory positive evaluation of the group, one way of coping with this situation is to leave this group and join a more positively evaluated group (Tajfel, 1978, 1981).

The present conception suggests, for groups which settle in one place, that together with the development of self-categorization as a group member and the emergence of social identity with its desire for the group's positive evaluation, patriotic beliefs and emotions appear. Positive evaluation and social identity serve as a foundation for patriotic beliefs. Group members, who feel favourably towards their group develop attachment. Patriotism adds an important element to group membership. It provides the binding glue among individual, group and place in which the group resides. The appearance of the sense of belonging, feelings of love, concern, loyalty, devotion and pride towards the group is an integral part of ethnographic group development. Individuals construct the meaning they attribute to a group not only through self-social categorization, but also via shared attachment to the group. Patriotism is the necessary addition to social identity, and the group needs it in order to survive. It is suggested that social identity and patriotism together constitute the most important

Functionality of Patriotism

Patriotic beliefs have always played an important role in the life of group members. The idea that beliefs and attitudes fulfil various needs for different people is not a new one. Years ago, social psychologists already proposed functional theories of beliefs and attitudes (e.g., Katz, 1960; Krech & Crutchfield, 1948; Sarnoff, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). They suggest that in addition to the fundamental function of beliefs and attitudes which is to provide individuals with a meaningful structure of the world, they also serve other personal and group needs. With regard to the group, it should be pointed out that groups as social systems have various needs that are fulfilled by beliefs and attitudes held by group members (Bar-Tal, 1990; Lane, 1973). For example, an important function of beliefs is to delineate the boundaries of the group. That is, the belief system enables the formulation of social identity, which is "a sense of group placement, of allies, of people like me, in contrast to strangers and enemies" (Lane, 1973, 97). Other beliefs concerning goals, security or solidarity, may also support the group. Patriotic beliefs at the same time serve both the personal needs of the group members and the needs of the group as a social system.

Personal Functions

Of special importance among the personal needs that patriotic beliefs fulfil, is that of belonging and identification. In his theory of human motivation, Maslow (1954) suggested that "belongingness" is a basic human need. Since the group has a determinative role in personal survival, individuals strive for a place not only in their family, but also in their group. They want to be affiliated, be part of a social entity and have meaningful relations. Patriotic beliefs satisfy this need. They indicate that a person is a member of a group, that together with other individuals, he/she constitutes a social entity, that the group is attached to a land and that other group members share the same beliefs. The sense of shared attachment is related to a strong feeling of belonging.

Patriotic beliefs do not only strengthen the sense of belonging, but also support the definition of an individual's social identity. In fact, the sense of belonging and social identity are exclusively related. Social identity can be formed on the basis of a sense of belonging. As Hogg and Abrams (1988, 7) pointed out:

Identity, specifically social identity, and group belongingness are inextricably linked in the sense that one's conception or definition of who one is (one's identity) is largely composed of self-descriptions in forms of the defining characteristics of social group to which one belongs. This belongingness is psychological, it is not merely knowledge of a group's attributes. Identification with a social group is a psychological state very different from merely being designed as falling into one social category or another. It is phenomenologically real and has important self-evaluative consequence.

cognitive-motivational basis for group existence. They are the part of the individual's repertoire which makes him/her a group member. Awareness of being a group-member and the attachment to the group and the country provide the sense of "we-ness". Both elements are essential for the construction of the group members' shared social reality. On a symbolic level, these cognitive-motivational social aspects of patriotism make an individual in his/her reality a group member. Moreover, since group members are aware of sharing them, it is they who constitute the uniting bond. The present conception also extends the perspective for understanding group identification. In analyzing this process Bar-Tal (1990) proposed that it takes place when group members lose their confidence in those beliefs which define their distinctive social identity or when these beliefs become so peripheral in the group members' repertoire that they are rarely accessible. Presently, we add to this that groups whose members do not develop patriotism or, with time, group attachment, dissipate and eventually disappear. A group with a membership which does not desire to belong, does not love it, does not feel loyalty, is not concerned with the group's well-being and is not willing to act on its behalf, cannot survive. Groups cannot exist for any considerable length of time without the patriotism of their members. It has been suggested that groups whose members do not hold patriotic beliefs disintegrate with time. McDougall (1921, 66) expressed this idea by saying that:

The group spirit, involving knowledge of the group as such, some idea of the group, and some sentiment of devotion or attachment to the group, is then the essential condition of all collective life and of all effective collective action.

A sociobiological theory proposed by Johnson (1986, 1987, 1989) strengthens the point about the necessity of patriotism for group survival. Within the framework of the evolutionary approach, he suggests that patriotism is the product of an interaction between genetically based predispositions and socialization processes which cultivate and redirect these predispositions. He views patriotism as an important mechanism which provides the bond that holds large-scale societies together. Patriotism allows integration, serves as a basis for solidarity and, most important, leads to self-sacrifice for the benefit of the group. Johnson's theory which is based on kin selection, a model explaining genetic altruism with reference to kinship, extends the scope of self-sacrificial behaviour to the non-kin. It suggests that socialization teaches cues for recognizing the non-kin who is nevertheless a member of the ingroup. As a result, a group member, even in large-scale society, learns to act altruistically on behalf of society as a whole for the benefit of its members. This behaviour is a necessary requirement for group survival. Patriotism is an evolutionary achievement: Groups which do not develop mechanisms to maintain patriotism, do not survive. The genetically evolved disposition together with developed socialization mechanisms are an important condition for group existence. This analysis implies that patriotism is fundamental for the group and this premise will be further elaborated in the next section.

Patriotic beliefs and emotions of love, care or devotion toward the group express clear social identity. Group members with high confidence in patriotic beliefs, which are central in their cognitive repertoire, have especially strong identification with the group.

Group Functions

Among the important group needs that patriotic beliefs serve, are unity, cohesiveness and mobilization to act for the group's welfare.

Unity

A necessary condition for group existence is a minimal degree of unity. Group members ought to believe that they are united through some kind of similarity. Unity indicates that they belong to the same social entity. Patriotic beliefs reinforce the sense of unity among group members who feel attachment to the same group and country. In spite of possible differences among group members in numerous respects such as attitudes, goals, values or ideology, patriotic beliefs are among the factors which underlie general similarity and therefore confirm the unity. Patriotism implies a common interest and a common fate. In this respect, patriotism enhances integration and feelings of solidarity and minimizes differences by focusing on a commonality and allegiance.

In defining the identity of individuals, patriotic beliefs draw the line between ingroups and outgroups. In other words, they unite group members by emphasizing their similarity in contrast to the different outgroups. Patriotic beliefs provide one of the criteria for differentiation between ingroups and outgroups. They imply that members of the ingroup hold these beliefs, while those belonging to outgroups do not. These beliefs are unique to the group members. In this line the point made by Sherif can be understood (1951, 395). He suggested that:

"the most important consequence of group structuring is the delineation of ingroup from outgroup. The development of ingroup and "we experience" is accompanied by the demarcation and setting of boundaries from outgroups.

Cohesiveness

One of the important conditions for group existence is the personal willingness on the part of individuals to be group members. Social scientists have defined this willingness as group cohesiveness, "the resultant of all the forces acting on members to remain in the group" (Festinger, 1950, 274). The concept of cohesiveness embodies the essential feature of group belongingness. It expresses the degree to which the satisfaction of individuals' needs implies the attraction of the group and the willingness to belong, which in reality provide the basis for the formation of the group. Patriotism can be viewed as one of the forces acting on the members to remain in the group. The attachment expressed by love, care or loyalty serves as a crucial bond which keeps the group members together. Patriotic beliefs not only increase cohesiveness, but also,

conversely, can be seen as an indicator of its strength. It can be assumed that the stronger the patriotic beliefs, the more cohesive the group. The relationship between patriotism and cohesiveness is further clarified by Turner (1987, 59) view of cohesiveness. He suggested:

That group cohesion or mutual attraction between ingroup members is a function of mutually perceived similarity (identity) between self and others in terms of the defining characteristics of the ingroup self-category.

In the same vein, Hogg and Abrams (1988) pointed out that similarities shared with large numbers of other people increase the social attraction of the group. That is, the development of social identity which produces psychological belongingness, leads individuals to perceive intragroup similarities which in turn enhance intragroup attraction. Individuals tend to like people who are members of the same group. In the case of patriotism group members are aware of their shared attachment to the group and the country. This common experience serves as a basis for feelings of similarity. Patriotic beliefs both increase the sense of similarity among group members and at the same time reflect the level of attraction to the group. In this way, patriotism can be seen as enhancing cohesiveness, thus serving as the psychological cement that keeps people in a group. It is hard to imagine a member in an ethnocentric group who would not have at least minimum confidence in fundamental patriotic beliefs. A person, who does not have this confidence, signals that he/she does not want to be a group member and that the group does not serve for him/her as a positive reference. The more group members feel this way, the less cohesive is the group.

Mobilization

Patriotic beliefs mobilize group members to act on behalf of the group. They play an important role as motivators for individuals functioning as group members. Patriotism motivates people to be concerned about the group, to act for its welfare and even sometimes to sacrifice their own life. Without such acts the group cannot exist. Patriotism, thus, is an activating, cognitive-affective force which not only binds individuals together but also provides the necessary ideology, explanation and justification for action on its behalf.

The beliefs of patriotism cause individuals to give up personal comfort and to contribute their efforts, time or money for the benefit of their group. The personal reward is often merely satisfaction. The welfare of the group and country is one of the primary interest of patriots. Patriotism may lead people to different forms of behaviour depending on the exigencies of the situation and their individual dispositions.

The goals for which patriots are mobilized differ from group to group and may change over time. Also, there are individual differences with regard to patriots' level of willingness to commit themselves, as well as with regard to the goals they consider important. Although the leadership may set goals and mobilize patriots to achieve them, the latter may not consider them important and set their own goals. But the

common motive in different acts of patriotism is the willingness to do something for the benefit of the group and country, even when this may involve personal cost.

Conclusion

The present paper views patriotism as a social-psychological phenomenon. Group members not only form their social identity on the basis of their self-categorization, but also develop an attachment to their country and group by feeling concern, loyalty, and devotion to its well-being. Within the proposed framework, patriotism is viewed as binding a person as a group member, the land, and the group as a whole. This attachment is related to the belief and emotions which express it. Individuals store these beliefs and emotions, retrieve them in various situations and may act according to them.

Patriotism historically evolves through group life. It gives meaning to group membership. It can be seen as a kind of ideology with an affective basis, which provides a rationalization for individuals' group membership. Patriotism is a necessary condition for group existence. On the basis of members' attachment, cohesion and their willingness to act, the group can develop. Without these, groups disintegrate.

Patriotism, thus, should be viewed as an existential aspect of the group. The present conception has attempted to clarify the ambivalence toward the inherent virtues or vices of patriotism. In its fundamental form the latter can be shown to have positive implications expressing the genuine attachment of an individual to his/her group and country. Patriotism is an universal human phenomenon which underlies every ethnographic group. As long as human beings are organized in groups - something which in the twentieth century predominantly takes the form of national or ethnic groups - there will be patriotism.

Obviously, whether patriotism is viewed either positively or negatively depends on how people define it. We have attempted to argue that patriotism should not automatically be identified with chauvinism. Attachment to one's own group and country does not require any deliberate disparagement of the rights and interests of other groups. The question of the evaluation of patriotism can be illuminated by analogy with the changing concept of stereotype. In the same way that this concept has moved from a connotation of negativity and erroneous over-generalization to one which stresses it as the natural outcome of the social categorization process (Stroebe & Insko, 1989), so patriotism's accepted meanings can be seen to evolve. Both, stereotyping and patriotism are immanent human phenomena, indispensable for adaptive social functioning. But just as stereotyping may have negative expressions and implications, so all depends on the set of beliefs that comes with the fundamental ones. Thus, as stereotyping can take a negative downgrading form, up to the point of delegitimization (see Bar-Tal, 1989), and may be expressed behaviourally in discrimination, so certain beliefs associated with fundamental attachment may have negative implications and consequences. For example, patriotism may be associated within certain groups with chauvinism, as happened in Germany during 1933-1945. Also, patriotism may be monopolized by certain subgroups which associate it with a particular ideology, goals, or means (e.g. Lang, 1974), as has been the case in the Soviet

Union after the Bolshevik Revolution or in Argentina during the regime of the generals' junta. But these phenomena are not necessary results of patriotism. Positive patriotism as presented in its fundamental conception can be observed in many groups, contributing to personal well-being and to group adaptive functioning.

In the present times, most of the references to patriotism are in the context of the modern nation-state (Shafer, 1972). In this context, patriotism has attained its most notable development. Civic bonds and duties towards the nation and the state have come to be recognized explicitly and rated supreme among the social loyalties of man. Within this focus, patriotism receives much attention on the public agenda of many nations. Nations view patriotism as a desired value and actively impart it to their citizens through all possible mechanisms. Only when individuals experience this attachment and hold the accompanying beliefs we can talk about national patriotism. Patriotism as an idea, value and symbol not only serves as a basis for nationhood, but also is a powerful force, affecting national processes and structure. Understanding the psychological basis of patriotism helps to analyze its political and societal manifestations. Patriotism has an effect on such processes as political participation, political mobilization, conflict management or societal conformity and obedience. The study of patriotism can shed an important light on these processes and it is thus important to pay attention to this phenomenon.

Notes

1. Portions of this article were presented as a paper at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Helsinki, 1991.
2. Since it is assumed that not only nations develop patriotism but also ethnographic groups, the content applies throughout the paper to both nations and groups although on occasion I may refer to only one of them. It is recognized, though, that in present times the special interest in patriotism refers usually to the national context.
3. The word "country" in this context does not necessarily denote a political state but may well denote a locality - *pays* rather than *patric*.

References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. Harper, New York.
- Asch, S.E. (1952). *Social psychology*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J..
- Bar-Tal, D., & Raviv, A. (1985). Who is a patriot? Perceptions of the high school students the concept patriot. *Studies in Education*, 42, 33-52 (Hebrew).
- Bar-Tal, D. (1989). Delegitimization: The extreme case of stereotyping and prejudice. In: D. Bar-Tal, C. Graumann, A.W. Kruglanski & W. Stroebe (Eds.). *Stereotyping and prejudice: Changing conceptions*, 169-182. Springer-Verlag, New York

- Bar-Tal, D. (1990). *Group beliefs: A conception for analyzing group structure, processes, and behaviour*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Brewer, M.B., & Campbell, D. (1976). *Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence*. Halsted, New York.
- Brunswick, D. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of psychological experiments* (2nd ed.). University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Coker, F.W. (1953). Patriotism. In: E.R. Seligman (Ed.). *Encyclopaedia of the social sciences*, 11, 26-29. Macmillan, New York.
- Doob, L. (1964). *Patriotism and nationalism*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. In: *Psychological Review*, 57, 271-282.
- Fiske, S.T. & Taylor, S.E. (1984). *Social cognition*. Random House, New York.
- Forbes, H.D. (1985). *Nationalism, ethnocentrism, and personality*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Grodzins, M. (1956). *The loyal and the disloyal: Social boundaries of patriotism and treason*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1984). Afrikaner patriotism today: The role of attitudes and personality. In: *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, 11, 133-139.
- Heaven, P.C.L., Rajab, D., & Ray, J.J. (1985). Patriotism, racism, and the disutility of the ethnocentrism concept. In: *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 181-185.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. Wiley, New York.
- Hogg, M.A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identification: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. Routledge, London.
- Holmes, J.H. (1925). *Patriotism is not enough*. Greenberg, New York.
- Johnson, G.R. (1986). Kin selection, socialization, and patriotism: An integration theory. In: *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 4, 127-154.
- Johnson, G.R. (1987). In the name of the fatherland: An analysis of kin term usage in patriotic speech and literature. In: *International Political Science Review*, 8, 165-174.
- Johnson, G.R. (1989). The role of kin recognition mechanisms in patriotic socialization: Further reflections. In: *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 8, 62-69.
- Kagan, J. (1972). Motives and development. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 22, 51-66.
- Karsten, P. (1978). *Patriot-heroes in England and America: Political symbolism and changing values over three centuries*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24, 163-204.
- Kelly, R.M., & Ronan, B. (1987). Subjective culture and patriotism: Gender, ethnic, and class differences among high school students. In: *Political Psychology*, 8, 525-546.
- Kohn, H. (1955). *Nationalism: Its meaning and history*. Van Nostrand, Princeton.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. In: *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.
- Krech, D., & Crutchfield, R.S. (1948). *Theory and problems of social psychology*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Lane, R.E. (1973). Patterns of political beliefs. In: J.N. Knutson (Ed.). *Handbook of political psychology*, 83-116. Jossey Bass, San Francisco.
- Lang, D. (1974). *Patriotism without flags*. Norton, New York.
- Lasswell, H.D. (1953). Chauvinism. In: E.R.A. Seligman & A. Johnson (Eds.). *Encyclopaedia of the social sciences*, 361. Macmillan, New York.
- Lazarus, R.S. (1982). Thoughts on the relations between emotion and cognition. In: *American Psychologist*, 37, 1019-1024.
- Levine, R.A. & Campbell, D. (1972). *Ethnocentrism theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behaviour*. Wiley, New York.
- Markus, H., & Zajonc, R.B. (1985). The cognitive perspective in social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.). In: *Handbook of social psychology*, 3rd ed., 1, 137-230. Random House, New York.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row, New York.
- McDougall, W. (1921). *The group mind*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- Murray, J.P. (1959). *Pride of state: A study in patriotism and American national morality*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Page, F. (1915). *An anthology of patriotic prose*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Ray, J.J., & Furnham, A. (1984). Authoritarianism, conservatism and racism. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 7, 406-412.
- Sarnoff, I. (1960). Psychoanalytic theory and social attitudes. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24, 251-279.
- Shafer, B.C. (1955). *Nationalism: Myth and reality*. Harcourt, New York.
- Shafer, B.C. (1972). *Faces of nationalism: New realities and old myths*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York.
- Sherif, M. (1951, 388-424). A preliminary experimental study of intergroup relations. In: Rohner, J.H., & Sherif, M. (Eds.). In: *Social psychology at the crossroads*, Harper, New York.
- Smith, M.B., Brunner, J.S., & White, R.W. (1956). *Opinion and personality*, Wiley, New York.
- Smith, A.D. (1971). *Theories of nationalism*. Duckworth, London.
- Snyder, L.L. (1954). *The meaning of nationalism*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N.J.
- Snyder, L.L. (1976). *Varieties of nationalism: A comparative study*. Dryden Press, Hinsdale, Ill.
- Somerville, J. (1981). Patriotism and war. In: *Ethics*, 91, 568-578.
- Stroebe, W. & Insko, C.A. (1989, 3-34). Stereotype, prejudice, and discrimination: Changing conceptions in theory and research. In: Bar-Tal, D., Graumann, C., Kruglanski, A.W., & Stroebe, W., (Eds.). *Stereotyping and prejudice: Changing conceptions*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Summer, W.G. (1906). *Folkways*. Ginn, Boston.
- Tajfel, H. (1978, (61-76). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison. In: H. Tajfel (Ed.). *Differentiation between social groups*. Academic Press, London.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Daniel Bar-Tal

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

The Oxford English Dictionary. (1933). (Vol. 7). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tolstoy, L. (1936). *The kingdom of God and peace essays*. Oxford University Press. London.

Turner, J.C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Waldstein, C. (1917). *Patriotism: National and international*. Longmeans, Green, New York.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary. (1967). G. & C. Merriam, Springfield, Mass..

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. Springer-Verlag, New York.