

Eurasian Journal
of Humanities and
Social Sciences



The Harmonization Of The Principles Of Nationality And Modernity In Fine Arts Education

**Baltayeva Xalima
Toraboyevna**

Lecturer,
Department of Art Studies,
Urgench State Pedagogical Institute.
E-mail: baltayevaxalima583@gmail.com. Phone: +998937448191.

ABSTRACT

This article theoretically analyzes the question of the dialectical harmonization of the principles of nationality and modernity in fine arts education. The author interprets these two principles not as opposing, but as mutually enriching phenomena, and reveals the theoretical-methodological foundations and practical mechanisms ensuring their harmonization

Keywords:

nationality, modernity, harmonization, fine arts education, tradition, innovation, cultural dialectics.

INTRODUCTION

In the development of the contemporary education system there exists a question often interpreted as a two-pole, mutually contradictory tendency: on the one hand, the necessity of preserving and transmitting national-cultural heritage, and on the other hand, the necessity of providing education corresponding to the modern, global requirements of society. In fine arts education this question manifests itself with particular acuteness, since art, by its very nature, is a field that needs both deep historical roots and constant renewal and development. In much pedagogical practice, nationality and modernity are set against one another, as though strengthening one necessarily weakens the other, as in a zero-sum game.

The purpose of this article is to critically analyze this incorrect, dichotomous conception, and to theoretically substantiate that nationality and modernity can in fact exist in a dialectical harmony, as mutually enriching phenomena. The relevance of the topic lies in the fact that,

under conditions of globalization, one of the most important tasks facing education systems is to prepare competitive specialists who meet the requirements of the contemporary world without losing national distinctiveness, and fine arts education has a particular strategic significance in resolving this task.

ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE ON THE TOPIC

The question of the dialectic of nationality and modernity has a long history in philosophy and culturology. Hegel's dialectic, with its law of the unity and struggle of opposites, creates an important methodological foundation for understanding this question — according to it, two opposing tendencies, without excluding one another, may serve development through the creation of a new, higher-quality synthesis. In art studies and pedagogy as well, this question has been the subject of much research — in particular, the dialectic of “tradition and innovation” is one of the central problems of contemporary art theory.

In international pedagogical literature, the concepts of “culturally responsive pedagogy”

and “glocalization” (global + local) are likewise devoted to precisely this problem — the question of harmonizing local-national and global-modern tendencies within the educational process. According to these approaches, the most effective educational strategy is neither to completely reject the local-national context nor to cling to it entirely, but to creatively synthesize it with contemporary global tendencies. At the same time, existing research has not sufficiently developed the specific theoretical-methodological mechanisms ensuring this synthesis precisely in the context of fine arts education, which determines the scientific novelty of this article. The concept of “glocalization” put forward by the sociologist R. Robertson deserves particular attention, since he interprets global and local tendencies not as mutually exclusive but as mutually permeating, mutually shaping processes. When applied to fine arts education, this concept shows that the “global” (modern, universal) and the “local” (national) elements cannot in practice exist separately from one another — any modern pedagogical approach becomes “localized” within a particular cultural context, while any national-cultural content becomes “globalized” through modern pedagogical forms.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research employed the methods of dialectical analysis, comparative analysis, and theoretical generalization. The concepts of nationality and modernity were first analyzed separately from a philosophical-pedagogical point of view, after which their mutual relationship was examined from a dialectical point of view. The theoretical conclusions were practically substantiated through specific examples drawn from the practice of fine arts education.

The theoretical groundlessness of setting nationality and modernity against one another. Setting nationality and modernity against one another is a theoretically groundless position, since these two concepts in fact belong to different classificatory dimensions: nationality is a cultural-content dimension (“what” is being taught), while modernity is more a methodological-instrumental dimension

(“how” it is being taught). In other words, national content can be taught through the most modern methods, and, in exactly the same way, modern content can be taught through outdated methods. Setting these two dimensions against one another is a logical error, and in practice it creates an artificial barrier between national heritage and modern pedagogical achievements.

Historical evidence: national art itself has always been renewing itself. A deeper historical analysis of the national artistic heritage itself shows that it has never been a static, unchanging phenomenon — on the contrary, it has constantly developed by assimilating the “modern” tendencies of its own era. Eastern miniature painting itself, too, developed at various periods under the influence of various schools (Herat, Bukhara, Samarkand), assimilating compositional and technical solutions that were new for its own time. This means that “national tradition” itself has been the result of continuous renewal in the course of history, which shows that nationality is by no means opposed to modernity, but is, on the contrary, its constituent part.

A conceptual model of harmonization: the metaphor of “roots and branches”. To understand the harmonization of nationality and modernity, it is useful to apply the metaphor of a “tree”: national heritage is the root of the tree, providing stability, nourishment, and distinctiveness; modernity is the constantly growing branches and leaves, which adapt to new conditions and needs. A tree without roots cannot survive, but neither can a tree develop without branches. In fine arts education as well, national heritage is the student’s artistic-cultural “root,” giving the student a stable aesthetic-value foundation, while modern pedagogical methods and technologies perform the function of the “branches” that adapt this foundation to the requirements of the new era.

Practical mechanisms of harmonization: the content-method distinction. In practice, the most effective mechanism for ensuring the harmonization of nationality and modernity is to consider the content of education and the method of education separately. Giving priority

to nationality at the level of the content of education (using samples of national art), and using the most modern pedagogical technologies at the level of methods and means (interactive presentations, digital tools, project-based learning) — makes it possible to implement these two principles simultaneously, without any contradiction. For example, studying Eastern miniature painting (national content) through virtual reality technology (modern method) is an example of the ideal synthesis of these two principles.

The creative result of harmonization: a neo-national artistic language. The harmonization of nationality and modernity can yield not only a methodological but also a creative result — a new aesthetic phenomenon that may be called a “neo-national” or “modernized traditional” artistic language. When students harmonize national ornament and compositional principles with modern graphic design, digital art, or even modern painting styles, they do not merely copy traditional art, but recreate it in a new, modern context, that is, they carry out a genuine creative synthesis. Such creative synthesis develops to a high degree not only the student’s technical but also his conceptual-creative potential.

Risks that may arise in harmonization. There is a risk of falling into two kinds of extremes in harmonizing nationality and modernity. The first risk is “pseudo-nationality,” that is, “attaching” national elements to modern products only as an external, decorative form, without taking into account their deep content and historical-cultural context. The second risk is “museumified nationality,” that is, regarding national heritage only as a phenomenon belonging to the past, unchanging and “untouchable,” which hinders it from living as a vital, developing tradition in contemporary life. Finding a balanced, scientifically grounded path between these two extremes is the main methodological task of the harmonization of nationality and modernity.

Examples of harmonization in international experience. In international art education practice, one can find many successful examples of the harmonization of nationality and modernity. In Japan, traditional calligraphy

(shodo) is taught in combination with modern graphic design education, in which students learn to apply the principles of traditional line and composition in modern visual communication tools. In China, traditional painting (guohua) is taught integrated with modern digital drawing programs. Such international experience confirms that the harmonization of nationality and modernity is not an abstract theoretical concept but a proven pedagogical strategy that has yielded practical results in various cultural contexts.

DISCUSSION

In discussing the results of the analysis carried out, it should be emphasized that the harmonization of nationality and modernity should be regarded not as a one-time, static result but as a continuously ongoing dynamic process. Every new generation, every new technological era, must reshape this harmonization anew, in accordance with its own conditions. For this reason, fine arts education, too, must be organized not as a static, once-and-for-all-developed recipe, but as a constantly self-renewing, adaptive pedagogical system.

It should also be particularly emphasized that this process of harmonization gives rise to the necessity of changing the role of the teacher — the teacher is no longer merely a “keeper” of national heritage or merely a “disseminator” of modern technology, but must perform the function of a “cultural mediator” who creatively synthesizes the two. This function demands of the teacher a high level of professional-creative preparedness and adaptive pedagogical thinking.

Criteria for assessing harmonization in students’ creative work. In order to assess the successful harmonization of nationality and modernity in students’ creative works, the following criteria can be applied: first, the content depth of the national element — whether the student has applied a national ornament or motif not merely as an external form, but with an understanding of its symbolic meaning; second, the organicity of the modern form — whether the modern means or style has been “artificially” attached to the work, or has become its natural part; third, integral artistic-

conceptual unity — whether the work expresses a new, integral artistic idea, rather than being a mechanical sum of national and modern elements. Each of these three criteria reflects a particular component of harmonization, and their comprehensive application allows the teacher to consistently monitor the dynamics of the quality of harmonization in students' creative work.

CONCLUSION

The research carried out shows that, in fine arts education, nationality and modernity are not opposed to one another, but are phenomena that exist in dialectical harmony, mutually enriching one another. Their harmonization can be implemented through the content-method distinction (national content — modern method), on the basis of the “roots and branches” principle, and through the teacher's role as a “cultural mediator.” As a result of such harmonization, a new “neo-national” artistic language may be formed, in both a pedagogical and a creative respect.

The development of specific lesson plans and methodological samples ensuring this harmonization in practice, as well as the empirical study of the influence of this process on students' creative development, remains an important task for future research.

LIST OF REFERENCES USED

1. Hegel G.W.F. Wissenschaft der Logik (Science of Logic). — Nuremberg, 1812–1816 (modern English edition: Hegel's Science of Logic, transl. A.V. Miller. — Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 1969).
2. Ladson-Billings G. Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Asking a Different Question. — New York: Teachers College Press, 2021. — 224 p.
3. Abdirasilov S.F. Methodology of teaching fine art. — Tashkent, 2012.
4. Pugachenkova G.A., Rempel L.I. History of the Arts of Uzbekistan. — Moscow: “Iskusstvo” Publishing House, 1965.
5. Robertson R. Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. — London: Sage Publications, 1992. — 224 p.
6. Normative-legal documents of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the development of the field of education.