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Abstract

Culture, as a sign of identity, becomes a contentiously debated issue when an inclusive strategy of cultures is created. Cultural identities have to become, contrary to these trends of integration, elements that are beyond stereotype, they have to become structures considered "standard", affirming the multiplicity of cultural phenomenon, where the plurality of forms and cultures does not threatens with anything the concept of universality. Recognizing cultural diversity not only as a phenomenon, but even as a process involves value that is a historical prerequisite for survival. Cultural entities, in all their inner diversity demonstrates that the universal as the key concept of the contemporary world cannot be understood outside the analysis of cultures as identity structures.
The current title should not be analyzed in its strictest form, as the current paper is intended as a “niche” in the extremely vast plane of the creational phenomenon, a timid way of opening new horizons in analyzing a complex, controversial, synchronic and diachronic process – culture.

Our attempt is full of risks since we can hardly claim to analyze and include all essential aspects that should totally satisfy the reader.
As a sign of identity, culture remains a vividly disputed issue now that an integrating strategy of cultures is more and more conspicuously being delineated. Contrary to such integrating tendencies, cultural identities have to become elements that surpass stereotypes and standard structures, asserting the multiplicity of the cultural phenomenon wherever the plurality of forms and cultures does not infringe on universality.

Admitting cultural diversity as a phenomenon as well as a process implies value, which represents an essential condition of historical survival. Cultural entities in the totality of their inner diversity demonstrate that the universal as a key concept of the contemporary world cannot be understood outside cultures as identity structures.
Macro-history also implies “local history”, the universal at cultural level implies the particular not as simple mathematical sum but first and foremost as value and historical engagement. Current cultural unity can only exist through its structural and value diversity. As a sign of identity, culture has been heatedly debated nowadays when an inclusive strategy of cultures is being developed. However, contrary to these integrative trends, cultural identities should become elements beyond stereotyped "standard“ structures, voicing the multiplicity of cultural phenomena, where the plurality of forms and cultures does not impede universality.
Recognition of cultural diversity as a phenomenon and as a process involves value, which is an essential prerequisite for historical survival. Cultural entities, in all their inner diversity show that the universal as key concept of the modern world cannot be understood outside the analysis of cultures as identity structures.

Macro-history involves "local history", the universal at cultural level implies the particular, not as simple mathematical summation but primarily as value and historical engagement. Current cultural unity can exist only through its structural diversity and value. The deeper our analysis to the specification details, the more possible the recovery in the immanent universal. The archaic and traditional cultural background cannot survive in isolation from other cultures, it survives in the "memory" of people who have created it and becomes individuality in universality.
Every culture has an archetype which we can consider to be unique because of its inner ethnic nature; unique as inner specificity, but open to the universal through value and symbol. The pulse of a common ancestral background but also the nuances related to the "archeology" of every specific ethnic spirit can always be discovered in archaic and symbolic traditional thinking. We cannot speak of an equivalence of cultures but we can assert that beyond their ontological, axiological, and historical dimension, cultures have common values and symbols.
Nowadays, the universal cannot be designed as integrative dissolution, it involves a new approach required by a new historical order. The need for intercultural communication is acute and communication requires a language that even if universal – the language of values – it has individual accents as well as a wide semantic opening.

This paper aims to study those aspects which, due to identity components, do not lock us inside the national self but enable to identify ourselves as a spiritual matrix without isolation in the "socio - cultural autism", preventing returns to diseased historical forms.
Defining ethnic identity through the ethnic aspect has been lively debated, precisely because it has been a challenged theme in philosophy, recast, reformed and accepted under its positive and negative aspects, yet it has never reached a final and definitive explanation.

This paper does not undertake to exhaust such a generous issue which is full of unexpected aspects, it will only reapproach national identity through the cultural phenomenon in an imbalanced, retaliation and even geo-political vacuum-torn historical time. We have considered that the phenomenon of identity defined through its ethnic element involves studying the archetypal code with all its different shades and tones specific to the Romanian space.
Through our archetypal structures, through coded language of symbols, with all archetype-defining elements we can perform the historical, political and cultural remodeling within the modernity and postmodernity space. Our history is not only defined as what belongs to "tradition", rather it has always been situated at this level of continuous search for self definition within a "generous" space of mutable facts and events.
If this was the "generosity" of history at least in terms of cultural phenomenon, then we have to discover and rediscover the elements of stability, national and cultural entity at an agreement with a certain history. In the future, Europe's cultural paradigm can no longer be situated in the exclusive either / or; the Cartesian logic and rationale should be replaced by the and/and judgment for recognition of cultural diversity and at the same time cultural unity. The contradiction between individual and universal acceptance should be overcome by their "reconciliation".
We have assumed this analytical approach precisely because we would like to impose a critical behavior through which to preserve the difference between tradition, modernity and postmodernity, not excluding history, on the contrary by discovering the identity connecting tradition to modernity, and simultaneously by perceiving differences and distances based on decisive discontinuity that separates us. Manifestation of that distance can represent the loss of identity secret that plagues us today.
The present can only be seized if we cross a contemporary analytical perspective that can be created starting from the fundamental characteristics that make up our world. The role of theoretical aspects is revealed here, the role of theory in apprehending certain dimensions of the contemporary world "the philosopher, sociologist and specialist in political theory, can no longer place themselves upstream of current life phenomena, but further down ... It is the end of emancipation and early interpress ... to indicate trends, not to give directives ". 
In essence, modern society is in an identity crisis, even in times of "autarchic individualism' and culture is marked by this element, by differences that have not been addressed on the " ... exclusivist axis, of the other’s denial, rather from a complementary perspective. Far from leading to total harmony, equal recognition of these differences seeks to pacify direct confrontations, enabling peaceful coexistence of opposites. The latter can only be achieved by a culture of compromise".
In contemporary society there are series of conceptual shifts even shifts of value within the phenomenon that is generically called culture. "Mutation is carried out not through a desire for change ... it is imposed naturally at first; it gets rooted in the individuals’ unconscious who are threatened by habit alteration ... Far from being a subtle and radical break, mutation is part of gradual dynamic, constant, and deep changes”.

We exist in a space of postmodernity with manifest tendencies of globalization. This phenomenon manifests itself at the level of cultures, therefore, it is not by chance that the search of cultural "identity" and its assertion is a „revived” aspect today. The ideational support of this work was derived from such considerations.
Knowledge of cultures, of the mediated humans is not a simple process that requires our direct access, rather their possible knowledge can be obtained by interpreting culture-specific signs and symbols (in our case, those of the Romanian traditional culture); through them we can apprehend man, his "universe" and the former’s cultural particularities. These are a few possible referential aspects through which man can be considered a symbolic being, resorting to the following plans:
1. **The Synchronic Plan** - we appeal to the facilities provided by hermeneutics and semiotics to discover the capacities acquired by human beings, valences identifying a particular human thinking that starts from the significance of ritual gestures, of words that are considered magical and continues to cosmogonic scenarios that are rich in meanings where nothing escapes without being symbolically valuated. This is in itself a way of man’s being in the universe as individualized being. In order to understand and define man as a symbolic being in general and as a symbolic being that belongs to the traditional, we have to discover the "warp" on which the human being contour has been created, to discover the "paradigm" that is often considered to be lost.
2. **The Diachronic Plan** – through it we resort to "scenarios" and stages which in time have become to represent human self-identification. Man can not be defined in an absolute way but as a symbolic being who creates symbols, he/she living in a universe "outside which he/she would remain a mere mammal". Man lives in a symbolic universe, full of meanings which he symbolizes. If the universe is so complex, its symbolization is similarly complex. Therefore our approach appeals to semiotics and hermeneutics to the speculative, linguistic, pragmatic-gestural, theoretical, simbolico-artistic, folkloric and arcaic-traditional filiations in order to decode the human universe as symbolic being, able to create symbols. Our analytically possible "opening" wishes to point out the "stages" that were taken in the creation of the synthetic human thought that triggered the symbolic image of the "whole". Our approach involves three specific ways of language in defining the human as a "symbolic universe":

1. The linear-mythical language - involving possible errors from our part as it belongs to man’s "unconscious logic”, therefore we are limited to the achievement of only speculative and contemplative analysis because at archaic levels man did not realize the transparency of meanings and we can only reevaluate and resignify the archaic being.
2. **Religious – metaphysical language** – through which the traditional man enters time and history, man has not yet fully detached himself from the Whole and he exists in a "universe" which is dominated by stories, where the world is infinite, accessible, centered on divinity, where the divine paradigm may be logically entertained.
3. **Mediating - secular, language**, may represent a middle path in defining man as a symbolic being, where "order, disorder, interaction, organization" dominate and which implies an approach at the analytical contemporary level through which we can discover man as symbolic being not only as archaic and traditional but as socially involved human being. "We are beings endowed with the capacity and willingness to take a deliberate attitude towards the world and to render it meaning. Whatever the meaning might be, it will lead us to judge certain phenomena of the human existence in its own light and to answer them as totally meaningful".
All these methodological elements that are inserted as possible analytical benchmarks used in the future approach of man as symbolic being, demonstrate that his complex cognition is not knowledge in itself as much as challenge. Our intention was to respond to such a "challenge" regarding man as a social being, as homo faber, homo cogitans, and not least, homo symbolicus.

It is hard to assert if the culture of a certain people includes subordination and superordination relations of value, but we believe that there is a fusion of the "opposites" of archaic, traditional, modern and postmodern aspects.
These issues were unintentionally formed by "transmission" of values descending from the ancient world where there is a semiotic synthesis accomplished by the "virtues" of the sacred, continued in the "semiotic matrix, which rests on establishing pragmatic and biblical scenarios, cosmic elements that suggest cosmogony and cosmogenesis and the nature and cosmos included human.

These two traditional archaic elements together with the element of modernity and postmodernity, render value, revalue, signify and resignify, create and re(create), without replacing earlier elements, and without denying them, all of them being found within the current cultural content.
Culture in general includes the semiotic triangle (Archaic → tradition → modern) as an expression of the one and the multiple, as value stored and redimensioned, even creatively multiplied, maintaining the source of value re(potential). These issues while symbolically compressing, trigger symbolic codes that existed outside and inside of history that irrevocably propose reading and re-reading. This process involves intuitive semiotico-hermeneutic and logical scenarios from our part through which we can discover relational and interpretive variants of the signs and symbols as formulas of resonance and coherence for our traditional culture.
We are currently witnessing a phenomenon of release, decentralization of perspectives in interpretations of the cultural phenomenon, by removing the hegemonic ethnocentrist, reductionist views in this vast field of plenary assertion of humanity, creativity and culture.

The title of this work should not be considered in its strictest form, precisely because the present study was meant as a "niche" in the vast phenomenon of creation, a timid endeavour of opening new horizons in analyzing a complex, controversial, synchronous and diachronical process which is culture.
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