

## Culture in Globalization Processes

Leon Dyczewski , Professor, Catholic University of Lublin

### 1. Globalization processes

Globalization is a series of processes owing to which transgressing various boundaries and barriers occurs. As its result nations, countries, institutions, organizations and individuals unite, forming new economic, social, political, cultural and spatial arrangements and making the world more closely connected<sup>1</sup>. In a so generally understood globalization particular researchers emphasize different things. Roland Robertson thinks that the set of processes, that globalization consists of, effects a “compression of the world and intensifies the awareness that the world is a whole”<sup>2</sup>. Marek Pietraś perceives in globalization processes the phenomenon of “deterritorialization” as their significant feature<sup>3</sup>. Others stress that along with globalization processes widening and thickening of mutual connections occurs, with a simultaneous uprooting from one’s own local environment. “Distant places, writes Hans Siebers, are connected in such a way that local events are shaped by events happening anywhere, and vice versa. Social relations become deprived of roots, that is they are increasingly “taken out” beyond the context of local interactions”<sup>4</sup>.

Irrespective of what we consider an essential feature of globalization processes, their effect is shortening of geographical, political and cultural distances; living in different ethnic and national societies we relatively easily communicate with one another, we undertake common actions, but we also differ from one another. Hence, although as far as communication is concerned the world

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. Hall, D. Held, T. McGrew. *Modernity and Its Features*. Cambridge 1992: The Open University and Policy Press, p. 229.

<sup>2</sup> R. Robertson. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage 1992, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> M. Pietraś. *Istota i zakres procesów globalizacji* (The essence and scope of globalization processes). “Sprawy Międzynarodowe” 2002 no 2, pp. 5-34.

<sup>4</sup> H. Siebers. *The Management of Multiculturalism: Coming to Terms with the Multiplication of Experienced Difference*. “International Journal on Multicultural Societies” 6:2004 no 2, pp. 300-321.

becomes “a great village”, as Marshall McLuhan observed, the village is by no means uniform in the cultural sense. And Anthony Giddens stresses that although the world is more connected by various institutions and dependencies than was the case in the past, a variety of disagreements occur in it. They result from a peculiar dialectics of globalization that makes it possible for the same event to induce different phenomena in the global and local scales<sup>5</sup>. Edmund Wnuk-Lipiński, following Giddens, sees the dialectics of particularism and universalism<sup>6</sup>. The feature of temporal flattening may be added to these pairs of dialectics of globalization, as everything is given the feature of topicality; what is not topical becomes unimportant. In globalization processes also time has been shortened and geographical borders have become blurred; we live temporarily and without geographical borders.

Globalization processes accelerate changes in many domains as well as in the whole life, in the whole world, and in particular parts of it. At the same time changes happen a lot more quickly than ever before, and they happen unevenly. We may talk about different ranges and paces of changes. In developed countries they are faster and more harmonious, and in countries of Africa and Asia they are slower and often not harmonious; that is in some areas they are great, but in other ones they are only slight. Hence, some societies profit from globalization to the maximum degree, whereas other ones are marginalized as result of these processes.

Ulrich Beck mentions 7 areas, or paths, that globalization follows: technology, communication, ecology, economy, organization of work, culture, shaping the civil society<sup>7</sup>. In turn, Douglas Kellner reduces the number of the areas to three: economic, political and cultural, emphasizing that on the basis of these areas a new world is being created<sup>8</sup>. Ulderico Bernardi reduces globalization processes to economic life, arguing that it comprises many branches of life, among them social relations and work, and economization of everything occurs<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> A. Giddens. *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. “Ja” i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności* (Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age). Translated into Polish by A. Szulżycka. Warszawa: PWN 2001, p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> E. Wnuk-Lipiński. *Oblicza globalizacji – konceptualizacja pojęcia* (Faces of globalization – conceptualization of the notion). In: S. Amsterdamski (ed.). *Globalizacja. I co dalej?* (Globalization. And what next?) Warszawa 2004, p. 19.

<sup>7</sup> U. Beck. *Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalismus*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp 1997.

<sup>8</sup> D. Kellner. *Globalization and the Postmodern Turn*. <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed>.

<sup>9</sup> U. Bernardi. *Globalizacja i kultury. Przeciw starym i nowym przesądom* (Globalization and cultures. Against old and new views). “Społeczeństwo” 1998 no 2, pp. 175-176.

All the mentioned globalization processes occur simultaneously, but they are most advanced in the economic, political and communication areas.

Economic globalization is first of all manifested in the free flow of the capital, technology, commodities and services, in the integration of markets, in forming corporations with a global dimension (e.g. the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization), in the functioning of supra-national great businesses whose financial turn-over exceeds the budgets of many countries; e.g. in 1999 General Motors, Ford Motor and Daimler-Chrysler had a greater turn-over than the GNP of 182 countries<sup>10</sup>.

Political globalization is manifested in forming common institutions for maintaining security (e.g. UN, NATO) and for opposing various threats, like terrorism or organized crime..

Globalization in communication can be seen in different forms; it is best perceived in establishing centers for collecting, storing, processing and propagating data concerning various areas, in the easy communication between people who are hundreds of miles distant from one another, or in establishing big media concerns (e.g. AOL-Time-Warner, Viacom, Walt Disney Comapy, News Corporation, Bertelsmann, Vivendi Universal, Sony Corporation). Media concerns, having their branches nearly in all the world, work as multimedia world centers. For instance, the Bertelsman concern includes television (RTL Group), press and book publications (Gruner + Jahr and Random House), record companies (BMG), companies rendering marketing and courier services (Arvato). Being the greatest media company in Europe in 2008 it employed more than 102 thousand people in more than 50 countries, and its turn-over was 7.2 milliard euros. In Poland, besides the Świat Książki publishing house, also the publishing company G+J Polska with its several popular periodicals, like "Claudia", "Glamour", "National Geographic" belongs to Bertelsman.

In modern societies that are characterized by a high level of development of globalization processes individuals are preferred who are able to think in a matter-of-fact and systematic way, who easily can recognize and analyze the processes going on in the objective world, who know how its particular elements and forces function and are able to fit and join them in order to obtain new products. The supreme posts are held by individuals with organizational abilities, who pursue the defined goal at possibly lowest outlays. Especially privileged are those individuals who search for new technologies

---

<sup>10</sup> The report of the International Forum for Globalization. Does globalization help the poor? Łódź 2003, p. 95.

and work out models of development, as well as managers who implement their accomplishments. This type of individuals form a special social group that may be called technological-economic-managerial intelligentsia. Just like in the past in the Polish or Russian society intelligentsia as a peculiar social group was formed by those individuals who best interpreted values that were essential for the whole of individual and social life, who defended those values and consolidated them, and at the same time they generally had a good general education, after the model of Erasmus of Rotterdam, now the group of technological-economic-managerial intelligentsia is made up by those who easily shape the whole sphere of owning, who can find out human needs and satisfy them with new products. Thanks to the technological-economic-managerial intelligentsia everyday life becomes easier, more comfortable and more enjoyable. This type of intelligentsia has a supra-national, global character, and where it developed earlier, the objective world is better ordered, clean, colorful and comfortable, life is more affluent and safer, the force of human muscles is more often substituted by robots, and the tiresome intellectual work is substituted by electronic devices; the rate of newborn babies' mortality is decreasing, life expectancy is increasing, and life of animals is being protected. These positive phenomena are ever more clearly accompanied by negative ones, like: weakening of the ability to look for an answer to the question of the meaning of life, weakening of bonds between people, or an increase in the number of lonely, depressive or addicted people<sup>11</sup>.

In a unifying, and at the same time still diversified world, we are especially interested in the area of culture, in connection with which a number of questions arise: What influence do globalization processes have on culture? Does a global culture form, and if so, then what is it like, what are its characteristics, do they favor formation of the identity of individuals and of groups, or do they hinder this process? Are globalization processes and the characteristics of culture formed under their influence a threat for ethnic, national, regional and local cultures? Will a great village be formed and will everybody living in it think, play in the same way and wear the same clothes? The next part of the present article supplies the reader with a lot of data allowing him to answer these questions on his own.

---

<sup>11</sup> I write more on this subject in: L. Dyczewski. Wiedza i skuteczność działania dopełniane rozumieniem i aksjologią (Knowledge and efficiency of action complemented with understanding and axiology). In: Współczesne procesy fragmentaryzacji i dekompozycji. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Profesorowi Jerzemu Mikułowskiemu Pomorskiemu (Modern processes of fragmentation and decomposition. The book in honor of Professor Jerzy Mikułowski Pomorski). Ed. A. Surdej. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej 2007, pp. 157-170.

## 2. The characteristics of culture in globalization processes

Globalization processes comprise also the area of culture and new phenomena appear in it. Researchers mention many of them and assess them in various ways. Anna Sugier, following Giddens, who characterizes globalization dialectically, discusses such characteristics of today's culture, as: globality – localness, diversification – standardization, supra-nationality – ethnicity, breaking barriers – of time and space, artificiality and simulation, spectacularity<sup>12</sup>. The very definitions, as well as the interpretation of the phenomena hidden under these definitions, indicate that most of them coincide with the characteristics of globalization. Kazimierz Krzysztofek thinks that globalization is “first of all powered by economic mechanisms”, and this is why he considers that creation and propagation of culture is “ruled by the Decalogue” of such features as: commercialization, liberalization, deregulation, privatization, promotion of innovation, action as a global actor, creation of new needs, translating everything into picture and spectacle, fighting against intellectual piracy<sup>13</sup>. Krzysztofek thinks that it is exactly such features that are characteristic of global culture. Czesław Wróbel mentions the following features as the fundamental ones for the culture being formed in globalization processes: rejection of the past in the name of the present and a tomorrow that is not closely defined, economism and universal consumerism, standardizing everything and everybody, secularization of ideologies, axiological chaos, weakening of national cultures, or even their break-down<sup>14</sup>.

Taking into consideration various characteristics of today's culture it has to be accepted that along with the development of globalization processes culture changes and its new features are shaped, with different intensity in different societies. Among the most clearly formed and best promoted characteristics of culture in the recesses of the present globalization I rate the following:

---

<sup>12</sup> A. Sugier-Szerega. Korporacje medialne a cechy kultury globalnej (Media corporations and the characteristics of global culture). “Kultura i Społeczeństwo” 2004, no. 4, pp. 37-64.

<sup>13</sup> K. Krzysztofek. Globalna kultura i globalne zarządzanie (Global culture and global management). “Sprawy Międzynarodowe” 2000, no. 1, p. 69.

<sup>14</sup> Cz. Wróbel. Globalizm – w stronę totalitaryzmu i utopii (Globalism – towards totalitarianism and utopia). “Annales Academiae Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Sociologica I”. Kraków 2006 (35), pp. 80-83.

### **2.1. Cultural variety and standardizing culture**

Globalization processes facilitate mutual communication between nations, ethnic groups, centers, peripheries, regions, local societies, religious groups, circles creating culture. Identical cultural artifacts, products for everyday use and services reach millions of people scattered all over the world. The same values and behavior patterns are accepted by various social circles. In the processes standardizing culture strong nations and countries dominate. Their products and services flood the markets in poor countries. Experts from rich countries and institutions penetrate poorer countries. And economic advantage is followed by cultural domination. The English language, the language of rich countries, in recent years has passed from markets and economic transactions to universities and academic conferences and has become the modern lingua franca. Popular culture of rich countries, especially of America, or speaking more precisely, the culture of the circles based in Hollywood, clearly dominates in film and television, and in this way the values, norms and behavior patterns of these circles are omnipresent, and accepted in their own lives by a considerable part of viewers. Coca-cola, fast foods, jeans quickly became popular all over the world. Music played by bands belonging to Western culture passes to cultures of the East. Families with few children typical of developed countries gradually become common in Africa and Asia, where the rule that there are many children in the family is a well grounded model of family life. Therefore globalization carries a peculiar standardization in the area of symbolic culture, and first of all in the area of everyday life. Commodities and behavior patterns connected with basic needs become common most easily.

Despite such standardization of culture in the global scale cultures of small nations and ethnic groups do not disappear. What is more, at present there is a strong tendency to protect them, and the very groups become more conscious of the values and of the importance of their own culture, of the dissimilarity between their culture and other cultures. Owing to the globalization processes we also know a lot more about them than in the past. Now, as never before, we realize the great variety of cultural products, human behaviors, religious beliefs, values and moral norms. It turns out that the cultures of small ethnic groups or small nations do not disappear.

Owing to the media, tourism and migrations cultural variety has also come to societies that were almost uniform before. Germany is an example of this process; in this country the number of people who have settled there since 1950 and of their descendants in 2009 exceeded 16 million, of which 3 million have their roots in Turkey, 2.9 million in the countries of the former Soviet Union, 1.5 million

in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, and nearly 1.5 million in Poland. It has to be added that the newcomers do not integrate easily with the German society, especially the Turks, and even after 50 years and three generations spent in that country they remain culturally alien<sup>15</sup>.

Various national, ethnic, religious minority groups, as well as great nations, defend their cultural dissimilarity, and at the same time they undergo the processes of standardization in the area of culture. Both these processes go on mainly thanks to the media and to the free market. On the one hand the media and economic products are non-national and non-religious, and on the other they strongly emphasize cultural differences and often it is just owing to them that they win when they have to compete.

## **2.2. Institutionalization and participation in culture before creating culture**

Cultural products are created today by specialized groups and highly qualified individuals, and then they are promoted by institutions and media specially established for this goal. Cultural creativity, and especially artistic creativity, is subject to a high degree of concessionalization. Both the authors and transmitters of cultural products make efforts to gain possibly a greatest number of viewers, listeners or readers. They try to reach them by their works not so much in order to serve them, or because they care for their level of knowledge, experiences, desires, esthetic feelings and behaviors, but to make them buy their cultural products that they treat as a commodity. Profit and fashion are the main motive for creating and promoting cultural products. These motives of cultural creativity in a globalizing world are ever more clearly joined by political goals. Such motives of cultural activity often make its contents and forms alienated from actual life and actual people, from problems that are important for them. Cultural products often present unimportant, banal problems, they show problems of various minority groups and political parties, they are first of all characterized by an attractive form and a lot of publicity when they are entering the market. The cultural products that are offered are immensely numerous, diverse, and they come from different cultures, which makes it difficult to understand and experience them and include them in one's life.

In turn, from a rich offer average recipients choose those cultural products that best suit their tastes, the level of their knowledge and experience, and often sheer incident helps make the decision about the choice. Such choices do not raise the level of their knowledge, esthetic experiences and

---

<sup>15</sup> [news.money.pl/.../a-record-number-of-immigrants-and-their-children-in-Germany](http://news.money.pl/.../a-record-number-of-immigrants-and-their-children-in-germany), accessed on 25.08.2010.

behaviors. What is worse is that average citizens of the modern society do not create culture; they only participate in it, most often passively, and speaking literally, they consume it. They limit their participation in culture to individual experiences, and at the most, to a reflection with respect to their personal lives; it does not evoke creative social activity in them nor does it strengthen interpersonal bonds.

A great role between culture creators and recipients is played by the media. They fulfill the function of the middleman. Hence Dariusz Wadowski rightly defines participation in culture through them as mediated participation in culture<sup>16</sup>. A lack of direct contacts with the authors and with their works largely impoverishes the cognitive contents, esthetic feelings and emotional experiences in those who only with the mediation of the media participate in culture. Therefore the media consolidate passive participation in culture and weaken creativity in the area of culture.

### 2.3. Spectacularity and stardom

Modern technology facilitates making an interesting spectacle of anything. This form of expression and of transmitting cultural works is already dominant in film, theater, television and speeches made by politicians or professors. A television news item is short, dramatic, shown in a spectacular way, and the person who presents it is elegant both as far as his clothes are concerned and in his gestures; he is also witty and attractive. He will do anything to find his way to the consciousness of the viewers, to be remembered and recurred to.

A spectacle is a phenomenon typical of modern society. On the side of its authors, as Guy Debord stresses, it belongs to the world of production, and on the side of the viewers – to the world of consumption, in fact mass consumption<sup>17</sup>. Therefore the main motive for creating a spectacle is profit, and the main motive to view it is satisfying the need to learn and experience something interesting in a light and pleasant way. A spectacle is not a simple concentration of images and sounds, but an intentional composition. And even though it appears to the viewers as an “unquestionable obviousness”, it is not a reflection of reality. A spectacle is not even “a complement

---

<sup>16</sup> D. Wadowski. Konstrukcja rzeczywistości a kultura popularna (The construction of reality and popular culture). In: Relacje między kulturą wysoką i popularną w literaturze, języku i edukacji (Relations between high and popular culture in literature, language and education). Ed. B. Myrdzik, M. Karwatowska. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, p. 50.

<sup>17</sup> G. Debord. Społeczeństwo spektaklu (Society of the Spectacle) and Rozważania o społeczeństwie spektaklu (Comments on the Society of the Spectacle). Translated into Polish and supplied with an introduction and commentaries by M. Kwaterko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy 2006.

of the real world”, or its “decorative setting”, but “the very core of the unreality of the real society”<sup>18</sup>. It is a composition of what viewers expect from it, and not of what really exists. If a spectacle reflects reality to some degree, then, according to Debord, it trivializes it. Anyway, trivialization of reality is a general characteristic of the world of the media and of today’s culture<sup>19</sup>.

A spectacle is not complicated in its form and contents, it is pleasant to view, it arouses strong emotions. It has its climaxes that increase its attraction and draw viewers. It also has a star, that is a person who best embodies the values and behaviors contained in the spectacle. Debord calls such a person “the spectacle’s servant”<sup>20</sup>, and today we usually use the word “celebrity” to define him or her. A celebrity is characterized by special features, like:

A celebrity gets rid of his own personality and is incarnated in such a personality that is useful for the producer’s aims and that is willingly accepted by viewers.

A celebrity is multi-optional, that is he does not have constant views or norms, behavior patterns or predilections. He willingly borrows himself to all products and services (e.g. perfumes, banks, both common and especially good alcohols), to politicians and businessmen, he takes part in meetings of various groups and becomes their advisor, he is present at fairs and contests, political party congresses and important academic conferences. A celebrity may be anywhere and may have a lot of faces, but his face has a precise price, sometimes a very high one.

A celebrity first of all presents originality of his characteristics, his visionariness and corporality. By his properties he inscribes himself in the viewers’ imagination and memory. He forces them to talk about him, to want to see and hear him again, to imitate him in speech, clothes, gestures and behaviors.

Modern spectacles and celebrities do not give the viewers the reality as it really is, but a created one; they first of all and most often show esthetic, hedonistic, material values – anything that is connected with the consumer society. In spectacles celebrities ostentatiously demonstrate wealth, comfort, functionality, satisfaction with life; they manifest rather the culture of being and the social culture than symbolic culture, rather the attitude of “have” than that of “be”.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 34.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, p. 55.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 56.

Spectacularity and stardom destroy privacy and intimacy; they reveal the most intimate spheres of life to the public, according to the principle: everything is for sale and the public will buy anything; and the more something is intimate, the more willing the public is to buy it. Voyeurism has become a feature of the authors of spectacles and of celebrities. The TV program “Big Brother” is an example of it.

Spectacles and celebrities, as a rule, do not show a phenomenon or a problem as a whole, but they choose only fragments of it. In each fragment of life, or in every situation a celebrity may be a different person: at home he is democratic, he enters dialogs and he is generous, and at work he is authoritarian, ruthless, and he exploits his subordinates in an unscrupulous way.

Spectacles and celebrities transmit all values, but in such a way that they are difficult to understand and to be ordered hierarchically. They will offer people anything; and also the ability to choose without respecting any hierarchies of values, and in this way they decompose the model of the coherent, teleological world, and the hierarchy of values that is consolidated in the society. This is the most destructive result of spectacles and stardom in a globalizing world.

Spectacles and celebrities are a source of knowledge, opinions and life experiences for their recipients in all the areas of life. The recipients take over their values, norms, behavior patterns, choices, which may be unfavorable for the development of their personalities. Being guided by their favorite celebrities’ predilections and choices they may make choices that are wrong for themselves and in this way incoherence of the roles they play may be formed.

Spectacles and celebrities favor shaping an indefinite or fluid identity in the recipients; they do not support the recipients’ taking root in the social circles that are important for them. Even the family they live in may stop being an important community for them. Also the religious group to which they have belonged since they were children may stop being an important reference group for them. Being under the influence of celebrities they become typical cosmopolites who may change their identity like clothes – but do they feel good in this situation? This question is answered in the negative by the lives of many people.

#### **2.4. Looking forward to a change**

In a globalizing world a novelty runs after a novelty: what yesterday was a vaunted latest event today is relegated to the back of the recipients' minds. Expectation of the future, that in many young people is almost the only expectation, is the attitude that is commonly encountered today. Often it is accompanied by the ideology of efficient action, quick effects and profits, without paying attention to the consequences. This results in a negative attitude to the past; makes continuing all actions difficult; it disturbs the process of accumulation of knowledge and experiences, and it exposes one to the possibility of making utterly unnecessary errors and mistakes that are later difficult to rectify.

With such an attitude each coming generation wants to form its own system of values, norms and behavior patterns; it selects significant cultural products to form their basic set, in their own way it defines the center (canon) of their national culture. This may disturb the continuation of culture and hinder the inter-generation communication. Hence, the son, the father, the grandfather and the great-grandfather may fly by the same plane, use the same facilities, but they may understand man, the world, such basic principles of life as social justice, tolerance, patriotism, responsibility, or such problems as e.g. Polish-German relations in completely different ways. Living under one roof, sitting next to one another in a car, they may quarrel about the simplest problems and things, and remain silent, or talk about just anything. The young generation, living in their own present, without being rooted in the past and without understanding it, may feel uncertain of itself and of its future. Such an attitude makes accumulation and continuity of culture difficult; the continuity of experiences and the common memory breaks down; and these phenomena are immensely important for the identity of every society.

#### **2.5. Shaken axiology and diversity ending up even in contradiction; splitting the existing whole – a lack of coherence and of a new whole**

In the contemporary culture views of numerous postmodernists have become popular; the postmodernists have rejected the attitude of looking for a comprehensive image of the world and for absolute, universal values, they have rejected absolute criteria of the truth and good, do not accept the thesis about a universal character of the fundamental concepts and categories of reason. Therefore they think that there is no one objective truth or objective good. Everything is relative. Signs do not express one truth that has been established for all the time. Everybody may understand

and interpret them as he likes. They are empty or open; they mean what someone perceives in them. Postmodernists are convinced that the atomized elements of reality are contingent and episodic. In their opinion diversity, pluralism, immediate albeit short-term satisfaction, are precious values. Hence what is necessary is a constantly open attitude to everything; and tolerance and looking forward to a change are the basic principles in life. There is no general sense either in the outer world or in man, that is based on constant values and rational cognition; everybody looks for a sense on his own, and the sense is always contextual. There is no continuity of knowledge, or experience, or information; everything is fragmentary, so the real world appears to be a set of chaotically gathered elements, deprived of roots, foundations or stability<sup>21</sup>.

This type of attitudes is popularized by today's media. People of modern media react to everything that is going on anywhere, and popularize it. A great lot of information is offered, it is supplied immediately, fragmentarily and its pieces are mixed with one another. This forces a hasty perception in the recipients. Neither the ones who send the information, nor the ones who receive it, have time for reflection on it or for evaluating it. Everything is moving, in full flight. Moreover, events, problems, or people are not shown in a comprehensive way, but without any context, fragmentarily. And the fragments are selected not according to their importance, but to their attractiveness for the recipient. This makes it difficult, as Jerzy Mikułowski Pomorski says, to find the proper meaning of messages and it depraves one of the feeling of his proper place<sup>22</sup>. A chaotic confusion of events, objects, people or meanings does not constitute a comprehensive narration, does not make up a whole, does not present a defined hierarchy of values. It hinders, or even makes impossible, taking root in a particular circle and locating oneself in a particular worldview, in defined religious beliefs.

Zygmunt Bauman, presenting this cultural situation of contemporary man, compares him to a tourist, who does not belong to any place he visits; everywhere he is but a temporary guest; he is always "outside"<sup>23</sup> what he sees. Visiting many places he does not have a permanent place for himself; seeing many things he does not use any of them; meeting many people he does not have a personal

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. B. Baran. *Postmodernizm (Postmodernism)*. Kraków 1992; W. J. Burszta, K. Piątkowski. *O czym opowiada antropologiczna opowieść (What does the anthropological story tell)*. Warszawa 1994; *Dokąd zmierza współczesna humanistyka? (Where are contemporary humanities heading?)* Warszawa 1994; W. Welsch. *Unsere postmoderne Moderne*. Berlin 1993; *Postmodernizm. Wyzwanie dla chrześcijaństwa (Postmodernism. A challenge for Christianity)*. Ed. Rev. Z. Sareło SAC. Poznań: Pallotinum 1995; Z. Bauman. *Ponowoczesność jako źródło cierpienia (Postmodernism as a source of suffering)*. Warszawa 2000; Z. Bauman. *Płynna nowoczesność (Liquid modernity)*. Kraków 2000.

<sup>22</sup> J. Mikułowski Pomorski. *Więź społeczna w warunkach fragmentaryzacji (Social bond under the conditions of fragmentation)*. In: *Kultura, media, społeczeństwo... (Culture, media, society...)*, pp. 203-204.

<sup>23</sup> Z. Bauman. *Ponowoczesne wzory osobowe (Postmodernist personal models)*. "Studia Socjologiczne" 1993 no 2, pp. 7-31.

relation with anyone. And one more immensely important thing: a tourist feels free from responsibility for everything he visits, everything he cognizes and experiences. In the places he visits he is only a temporary guest, and for his stay he pays in various forms: with an entrance ticket, with a dinner eaten at the local restaurant, with the hotel fee, etc. He pays, and leaving he does not have a feeling of responsibility for anything in the space he visited.

In cognizing the world as well as oneself contemporary people are accompanied by such phenomena as: a great variety, ahistoricity, reductionism, alogicality, fragmentariness, a lack of continuity and of continuation of phenomena, mixing the sacred and the profane, shaking the hierarchy of values, relativism. They make it difficult to form a whole, to find the meaning of the world and to define one's own place in it, as well as to build a coherent system of values.

#### **2.6. The dominance of consumerism and pleasure**

The globalization processes supply a great lot of products and services of ever better quality. All this is subject to the principle of profit, and all cultural products are ruled by the law of demand and supply. Commerciality has also taken control of such areas of life as: science, education, culture, sport, or even religion. Sport, until recently perceived as first of all an area of recreation, recuperation, and a plane for establishing interpersonal relations, has become professional and commercial. The media, advertisements and commercials that are put in them, as well as the ideologies propagated by them, persuade recipients that they can achieve complete happiness by buying various goods and using the great offer of modern services. In such a way they stimulate people to buy products and services at any time, anywhere and from anybody. Instead of a good citizen they form a perfect consumer, who is welcome in any corner of a globalizing world.

Media messages popularize such contents and forms that stress the importance of material goods, personal happiness – experienced intensively and with no effort, possibly the best satisfaction of one's needs, pleasure, comfort and entertainment. These values are presented in such a way that makes the recipient think that they satisfy all human needs, and realizing them will let him experience satisfaction with his life. A too intensive expectation of realizing the above values makes it difficult to establish lasting contacts with another man, weakens, or even shatters one's aspiration to achieve developmental values and searching for the meaning of life. The globalization processes, shaping consumer and hedonistic attitudes as the dominant ones, close people in the circle of their

own needs. It is through them that they look at the world, which forms an egoistic attitude in them and leads them to the state of loneliness.

The globalization processes shape the ability to be a consumer, which is manifested not only in a peculiar cult of objects and services, in buying and using them, but also in a peculiar way of cognizing the world and making it familiar. The contemporary man shows a lot of interest in new objects, learns about them and experiences them, but he does it superficially, and he fluently passes from an object that is already well-known, and also owned, to one, which only will be cognized and owned in the future. Catching ever something new he forgets about what he had yesterday. Zygmunt Bauman grasped this state of contemporary man by saying that he learns to forget quickly<sup>24</sup>. And a man without memory makes mistakes and tends to take the wrong ways.

### **2.7. Illusoriness strengthened by experiences**

The modern media, as the main carriers of information and means of communication in the globalized world, do not transmit reality as it really is, even when they relate events taking place in actual places in an actual time. Moreover, in their transmissions they usually create a wealthy, or even luxurious world, forever young and smiling. And when they show human problems and tragedies, it is mainly in order to involve the recipients into looking for solutions to the existing problems, into healing and improving the world.

The modern media in a deliberate way create a virtual world. Although its creators refer to reality, they only take selected fragments from it, often incoherent with each other. They complement them with their own ideas and often give them a different symbolic meaning, inconsistent with the one they had had before. This type of creativity is practiced not only by well-known artists, but also by amateurs using their home computers. Making a film about an event so meaningful for Poles as the defense of Westerplatte according to one's own interpretation may be a contradiction of both the actual course of events and of its symbolic meaning existing in Poles' collective memory. A symbol of heroism may be changed into a symbol of man's degradation.

Today's great possibilities of creating a virtual reality in an excessively individual way allow using the same events, persons, utterances, or signs for construing quite different pictures showing a certain

---

<sup>24</sup> Z. Bauman. *Globalizacja. I co z tego wynika* (Globalization. And what results from it). Warszawa 2000, p. 97.

whole. The disappearance of agreement between the virtual reality and the actual reality is a very disturbing phenomenon in contemporary culture, as there may appear, as is stressed by Jean Baudrillard, operational look-alikes, substituted in place of reality<sup>25</sup>, that may have a great impact on shaping the wrong consciousness – historical, social, religious, etc.

The created virtual reality, usually poor in its cognitive sphere, is intensively satiated with the sphere of experiences. Modern technologies make it possible to use the world of signs and symbols, space, motion, sound and light for evoking strong emotional experiences. Every event and every situation in one's life may be dramatized to the maximum today. And exactly this is done, as a work of art without strong emotional experiences is usually assessed as a failure by today's recipients. Modern culture is so strongly satiated with emotions that in synthetic characteristics it is often described as "culture of emotion", "culture of sensations", "culture of pleasure", or "culture of gratification".

Experiencing something is important in creating culture and in the past always accompanied it. However, then it was subordinated to the truth and good, whereas now it has come to the front and has become the primary value. Jeremy Ryfkin states that for contemporary people the need to experience something is even stronger than the need to own, and it is the realization of that need that decides about the sense of the meaning of one's own life. For a 21<sup>st</sup> century man, Ryfkin writes, the meaning of his own "I" does not depend on the products he has produced, or on the wealth he has gathered, but on the amount of the experienced impressions and relations, to which he has access<sup>26</sup>. Such a clear domination of experience (that contains sensitivity to beauty) over cognition (that contains sensitivity to truth) in today's culture is a phenomenon that is on the one hand interesting, but on the other dangerous. It is a sign of a peculiar break in harmoniously uniting truth, good and beauty in human searches, desires, and actions. And truth is necessary for making the right choices and undertaking sensible actions. Pope Paul VI's warning contained in his encyclical *Populorum progressio*, at the beginning of globalization processes, in the 70's of last century: "people often suffer because they do not think about these things or consider them often enough"<sup>27</sup>, seems absolutely right.

---

<sup>25</sup> J. Baudrillard. *Precesja simulacrów (Simulacra and Simulation)*. In: *Antologia przekładów*. Ed. R. Nycz. Kraków 1997, p. 177.

<sup>26</sup> J. Ryfkin, *Wiek dostępu. Nowa kultura hiperkapitalizmu, w której płaci się za każdą chwilę życia (The Age Of Access: The New Culture of Hypercapitalism, Where All of Life is a Paid-For Experience)*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie 2003, p. 209.

<sup>27</sup> Pope Paul VI, *Populorum progressio*. Rome 1967, p. 85.

### **2.8. Areligiousness**

In globalization processes religious contents and world-view justifications are relatively rarely present. Media transmissions and public behaviors in European culture are devoid of the sacred, of religion. If there are some elements of these domains of life in them, then it is rather some information or a decoration, and not a manifestation of man's bond with the supernatural world, with God. Products of religious culture are peculiar means of enriching the contents and form of media transmissions, but they do not explain religious truths, they do not explain, and the more so they do not evoke religious experiences, and they do not introduce a man into a deep contact with the supernatural world.

Globalization processes in the version presented by European culture carry with them secularization of life and close man in his earthly life reducing the vision of his life to the period of youth and active maturity. The secular conception of man and of social life, secularization of consciousness, shorten the perspective of man's development and existence. Everything comes from man and ends with man.

### **2.9. Overweening individualism**

Individualism has been an important feature of European culture for a long time. It has foundations in Christian philosophy and theology that emphasize the autotelic value and dignity of the human person. However, at present individualism is particularly emphasized and understood in a little different way than in Christian personalism. There are certainly diverse sources of this situation. Some explain it by transferring the focus of interest from social classes and layers, from groups of belonging, to the individual, and they stress that the individual, being liberated from them, freed from their authority, takes care of itself the best he can, for otherwise he will be lost, he will disappear<sup>28</sup>. Also psychologists – for they have too clearly emphasized the right of an individual to self-realization; and the right is incorrectly understood; entrepreneurs and owners of services – as convincing a potential buyer of economic goods that he is free to choose and buy them has multiplied their customers and their profits; leaders of political parties, organizations, associations,

---

<sup>28</sup> Z. Bauman. *Wolność* (Freedom). Warszawa-Kraków: Znak, Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego 1995, pp. 48-49; U. Beck. *Spółczesność ryzyka. W drodze do innej nowoczesności* (Risk society: towards a new modernity). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar 2002, pp. 197-205.

new religious movements – as persuading people that the slogan “freedom not restricted by anything” is right gives them new supporters and members – have contributed to consolidation of individualism in today’s world. The overweening individualism we encounter in the world today may also be explained by the weakening of the Christian orientation to the neighbor, that is expressed in the evangelical postulate “love thy neighbor as yourself”.

Irrespective of how we will explain the fact that in a globalizing world the significance of the individual has increased and his freedom in every respect is constantly emphasized, in today’s people we note considerable openness to ever new objects and services, ideologies and religious beliefs. Probably never before was man so free in making choices, and had such freedom in creating his biography as now. Today he is convinced about his freedom and he has a lot of things to choose from, for the array of offers concerning goods and services, life situations, worldviews and religious beliefs is vast. And although by the long education process he is prepared to make choices, he is still not well enough prepared to perform this task, as has never been the case before. The great variety of phenomena in today’s world, the great pace of changes, the easy life, the rich offer of the outside world, are beyond his capabilities to make choices that have been achieved in the processes of growing mature to be self-reliant. It seems to him that he is free, and in fact he is overpowered by his freedom of choice and often he chooses what is easy to realize and pleasant, and not what is good for his development.

Feeling that he is not tied by any commandments or prohibitions, an individual may realize all his aspirations and dreams, may experiment and test successive options he becomes interested in. He does so being convinced that this is self-realization, that he achieves a success as an individual; and in fact the choices he makes may close him in his own ego, may be unfavorable for his further development and for the common good. As result of such an attitude in a globalizing world, where there are more and more interpersonal contacts, where people indeed physically contact each other, many of them remain spiritually and morally strange to each other; and they lose the sense of responsibility for other people’s fate and for the common good.

## **2. There is no global culture**

The characteristics of culture discussed above, appearing along with globalization processes, are quite often treated as manifestations, or even as elements of a new global culture. Some argue that

it has already been formed (e.g. K. Krzysztofek) as a separate culture and we may characterize it with the help of the above mentioned features. Others think that it is only being formed. And still others believe that it neither exists nor ever will exist. And this last position is right. It is doubtful that a global culture in the sociological meaning will ever be formed. It is a peculiar idea put forward by politicians and journalists, for there are no reasons for stating that a global culture has already been formed, or that it will ever be formed.

It is worth clearly distinguishing two processes: the process of formation of new features of culture in connection with globalization processes and the process of formation of a new culture. Even if we may state that the former one is distinctly seen and we may say that new features of culture occur in the scale of the whole world, with a differentiation of their intensity in particular societies and their cultures, there is no basis for talking about the formation of a global culture in the sociological meaning. What we observe today in the world scale in connection with globalization processes, does not yet form either a global culture or a global society in the sociological meaning.

There are various definitions of culture and various approaches to culture; and two of them are fundamental for our analyses: the anthropological-philosophical one and the sociological one. In the anthropological-philosophical definition culture is everything, in which man as a rational, free, experiencing, creative creature who forms a community with another man, expresses himself. Creativity has a definite meaning for man, it is an important factor of one's own development and of communication with others, it is at the same time a state and a process; a state – because the result of creativity is a definite product (a sign, symbol, object, behavior), and a process – because in a man who creates something and uses something, something is happening (he thinks, experiences, acts). Every new product, or every improvement of an already existing one, giving it a primary meaning or adding a new meaning to an already functioning one, is a man's creative process. The richer in its content and form a product is, the more difficult and longer is the process of its creation.

Such an anthropological-philosophical understanding of culture connects it with human nature and with man as an individual being. And this understanding of culture very well corresponds to globalization processes. It may be said that a globalizing world favors the development of culture in the anthropological-philosophical meaning. Participating in globalization processes individuals may enrich themselves and the existing culture in new products and in new ways of using the already existing ones they may understand and use them in their own way, and in connection with this something is happening in them. We may only ask about the quality of these products and the

meanings accompanying them; whether and to what degree they serve the development of their creators and users, and through them, serve different social groups.

The problem is not so simple if we take the relation: globalization and culture in the sociological definition. In this definition culture is connected closely and clearly with a community, with a social group, with the society. It is true that particular cultural artifacts are initiated and created by particular people, but others take them over, consolidate their use and pass them to others; they become an object of interest, desire and ownership of many people. Hence in producing and using cultural products an actual community, a social group, an actual society is manifested and retained. It is owing to culture that they last and develop. It is culture that determines their dimensions, borders, and differentiates them. Hence we are dealing with the culture of bigger and smaller social groups, for example with the culture of the Kowalski family, of the community of the Jastków district near Lublin, with the culture of the Kashubian region, with the Polish, American, Chinese, French or German culture. The definitions of culture formulated by ethnographers, sociologists, social anthropologists emphasize this close connection between culture and a definite community of people. They do so in their definitions of culture; and among them are Edward Taylor, Ralph Linton, Ferdinand de Saussure, Umberto Eco. "Culture or civilization, Taylor writes, is a complex whole, comprising knowledge, beliefs, art, law morality, customs and all the other abilities and habits acquired by man as a member of the society"<sup>29</sup>. Similarly Linton stresses that "Culture is a configuration of learned behaviors and their results, whose components are shared and transmitted by members of a given society"<sup>30</sup>. And de Saussure and Eco say briefly: "/.../ culture is a system of signs serving interpersonal communication"<sup>31</sup>.

The authors of the above definitions, like many other sociologists, stress that culture creates a peculiar system of elements that are mutually linked and that influence each other, and the system is shaped for years in an actual community. In Leslie A. White and Bethem Dillingham's opinion, it is not the very elements, as first of all the links between them that distinguish one culture from another<sup>32</sup>. They call this phenomenon the principle of relativity. It constitutes the basic feature of the culture of every society. It protects it from reducing its culture to the sum of its elements and gives it a peculiar quality. Hence it is not the multitude of elements or their originality that decides about the

---

<sup>29</sup> E. Taylor. *Primitive Culture*, quotation after: A. Kłosowska. *Socjologia kultury (Sociology of culture)*. Warszawa 1981, pp. 19-20.

<sup>30</sup> R. Linton. *Kulturowe podstawy osobowości (The Cultural Background of Personality)*. Warszawa 1975, p. 44.

<sup>31</sup> F. de Saussure. *Kurs językoznawstwa ogólnego (A course in general linguistics)*. Warszawa 1961, p. 31; U. Eco. *Pejzaż semiotyczny (The Absent Structure)*. Warszawa 1972, p. 29.

<sup>32</sup> A. White, B. Dillingham. *The Concept of Culture*. Minneapolis 1973, p. 45.

peculiarity and separateness of the culture of a society, but it is the links between them, their structural form, the “cultural order” or “axio-normative order”, as Florian Znaniecki calls this phenomenon<sup>33</sup>. The relative character of elements of culture, their ordering according to definite rules, were also stressed by Stanisław Ossowski<sup>34</sup>.

However, the most important thing for particular cultures is what meaning those who use them in their mutual communication give to individual elements and their sets. It is exactly the links between particular elements and their meaning that decide that although in many cultures identical elements occur, they have different meanings, evoke different emotions and desires, stimulate one to behave in different ways. The links between the elements form peculiar meaning codes, which means that individual elements and their sets are comprehensible only for those who give them a meaning and use them; i.e. they serve their interpersonal communication. Such an understanding of culture is inextricably linked with interpersonal communication. Hence culture is a definite set of elements linked with one another in a particular way; and both the very elements and the links between them having been formed and being acquired in a particular community have a definite meaning for its members who use them.

Elements of a given culture take their content and form, the way they are linked and their meanings from the people who form them and use them. The personal character of culture that no culture can reject, is derived from the dependence of the elements of culture on the people who form them and use them. This is why the culture of every society, every group, is such as its members are, and, in turn, their personal traits are such as their culture is. This is the semiotic understanding of culture. Its precursor may be considered Florian Znaniecki who stressed that elements of culture or even the links between them should not be studied alone, but the point is how they are understood and what role they play in motivating people’s actions; that is, how they appear to the participants of a given social situation.

Every society forms then a system of elements of its culture that is peculiar for it, and is fully comprehensible only for its members. For people who are outside this society even objects and actions playing an important part in it may have no meaning or may be only partly comprehensible. This can be perfectly well exemplified by the Polish custom of sharing a wafer during the Christmas

---

<sup>33</sup> F. Znaniecki. *Nauki o kulturze. Narodziny i rozwój* (Sciences studying culture. Birth and development). Warszawa 1971, pp. 563-564.

<sup>34</sup> S. Ossowski. *O osobliwościach nauk społecznych* (On the peculiarities of social sciences). *Dzieła* (Works) T. 4 (Vol. 4); Warszawa 1967, pp. 173-193.

Eve. During this ritual Poles express their kindness, they offer best wishes to each other, they forgive all wrongs and grudges, deepen the feeling of brotherhood between them, as well as with all the people and with all creatures. If they are Christians they connect this custom with Jesus' breaking of the bread and they consolidate their conviction that one should share everything with the neighbor. This ritual is accompanied by a strong emotional experience, often bringing tears of joy and happiness to the eyes. Breaking the wafer is not known by Germans who are Poles' neighbors. For them, even if they introduced this custom into their celebrations, it will not have such a meaning in interpersonal communication as it does for Poles, as in this ritual such values, events and experiences are contained, which are precious and understandable only for Poles.

Culture in this understanding constitutes a peculiar symbolic universe for the members of any group, any society. Everybody who belongs to this group, this society, grows up in it and lives in it. It encompasses them in all the ways: it determines values and norms for them, shapes the way they perceive themselves and the world, their emotional reactions and behaviors, their assessment of the past and their visions of the future, their forms of creating and using cultural products. It stimulates them to ask questions about the meaning of individual lives and of social life; about the meaning of culture itself. Every symbolic universe is the work of all its members: the greatest creators of art and average individuals, as all of them are realized in it as people.

Culture understood as a system, and first of all as a system of symbolic communication, assumes the existence of subjects of this communication. Culture is always somebody's culture. It is human subjects who create it, who communicate through it and express themselves in it. They enter various kinds of dependences with each other (Robert K. Merton<sup>35</sup>), interactions (Talcott Parsons<sup>36</sup>), or these subjects are actors, and acting they enter various relations with one another (Florian Znaniecki<sup>37</sup>). In one word, subjects of communication, that is persons, are connected with one another in various ways and form a peculiar social system, also called a social group or a social structure. Culture constitutes the "platform of social contact"<sup>38</sup> for them, or, as Clifford Geertz says, its "context"<sup>39</sup>. It facilitates and gives content to human interactions; it directs human actions and evaluates them. Without culture interactions between people would not occur, people would not be actors.

---

<sup>35</sup> R. K. Merton. *Teoria socjologiczna i struktura społeczna (Social Theory and Social Structure)*. Warszawa 1982, p. 225.

<sup>36</sup> T. Parsons. *The Social System*. Free Press. New York 1951; id: *Struktura społeczna a osobowość (Social Structure and Personality)*. PWE. Warszawa 1969.

<sup>37</sup> F. Znaniecki. *Social Actions*. New York 1936.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid*, p. 46.

<sup>39</sup> C. Geertz. *Ritual and Social Change. A Javanese Example*. In: C. Geertz. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York 1973, p. 14.

Therefore the system of culture has a corresponding social system. Between these two systems there is a close interdependence, and although ontologically the system of culture is secondary in relation to the social system, this latter would not be able to exist without the former one. They always occur together. Adam Rodziński defines this interdependence in the following way: "A person as a subject of actions is not secondary to what he exists in. A person in relation to culture is the basic and primary point of departure. There is no person who would not create culture, but there is no person who could develop without culture, either."<sup>40</sup> This is why Znaniecki defines persons forming the social system as "primary values"<sup>41</sup>, whereas cultural products and the links between them are "secondary values", that is they are not equal to "human beings". They are "only people's products or natural objects that are given value by people's attitudes". In individuals' and groups' actions "primary and secondary values mesh"<sup>42</sup>, that is human subjects and culture mesh.

Interdependence of the system of culture and the social system is strongly stressed by Parsons and Merton. They both ascribe to the system of culture the uniting, orienting, and normative function in relation to the social system. This is the relation of dynamic interdependence. Changes in one system carry with them changes in the other one. Hence the system of culture corresponds to a definite social system and vice versa. This is emphasized by Meyer Fortes when he writes: "culture is a whole only inasmuch as it is connected with the distinctly separated (from others) social structure"<sup>43</sup>. So every social system has its culture, and conversely, every culture is connected with a particular social system. The overlapping of these two systems strengthens the peculiarity and separateness of them both. It makes them sufficient for the individuals and groups existing within them. The same individuals at the same time belong to the social system and to its system of culture, which together form a social-cultural system.

We refer here the concept of social-cultural system to such social groups that for their members are rich and creative enough, and in which the members may develop in all the directions. So what we are talking here about are great and pluralist social-cultural systems that we most often call societies, for instance the Polish, German, Ukrainian or American society. In their formation various factors and

---

<sup>40</sup> A. Rodziński. *Osoba, moralność, kultura* (Person, morality, culture). Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL. Lublin 1989, p. 27.

<sup>41</sup> A. Kłoskowska. *Systemy kultury w kulturalistycznej teorii socjologicznej Floriana Znanieckiego*. "Kultura i Społeczeństwo" 3 (1988) p.45.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid*, p. 56

<sup>43</sup> M. Fortes. *The Structure of Unilateral Descent Groups*. "American Anthropologist" 55 (1953)22-23.

various groups play a role, and among them ethnic (most often one nation), religious or state-building groups<sup>44</sup> are most frequently mentioned.

Culture understood in this way, assuming the existence of a corresponding social system, unambiguously allows putting forward the thesis that in the present state of globalization a global society, or a corresponding global culture have not been formed yet; and hence we cannot talk about a global culture. What is more, it seems that there are no chances for forming it, with such a great world population that is so vastly spread, with such a great ecological, social and religious diversity, as well as the diversity concerning the world-view. On the other hand we can talk about characteristic features of culture that are shaped in globalization processes. They occur in different regions, in particular societies of today's globalized world, with a greater or lesser intensity. Then, although we do have globalization processes that are present in the whole world, and in connection with which specific cultural features are shaped, we still do not have a global culture or a global society in the sociological meaning. The concepts "global community" and "global culture" are analogous concepts. The contents we ascribe to them are not verified in the existing reality. There are still separate societies and there are still numerous and different cultures, and at the same time new cultural characteristics are formed that to a larger or lesser degree permeate the cultures of particular societies and are present in the whole world.

Globalization processes do not engulf national, ethnic, religious cultures, or regional or local communities. Moreover, the stronger globalization processes are, the more universal geographically they become and the more branches of life they comprise, the stronger the tendencies are both in great and in small nations, in local and regional communities, to maintain their own culture. Mechanisms are activated to defend their own cultural identity; the rule being that this is relatively easy for strong and great nations and communities, whereas weaker and smaller nations, ethnic or religious groups, in order to maintain their culture and to continue developing it, have to make great efforts. However, in this way particular members of those groups are more conscious of their cultural identity. Therefore globalization leads some people to cosmopolitanism, and others towards a more conscious cultural identity and towards more creativity within their own culture. The variety of cultures is necessary, for it is an important indicator of the personal development of an individual as well as of the culture of every society. If as result of globalization processes and of the unification of

---

<sup>44</sup> Cf. F. Znaniecki. *Socjologia wychowania. T. 1: Wychowujące społeczeństwo* (Sociology of education. Vol. 1: The educating society). Warszawa 1928; *Social Groups as Products of Participating Individuals*. "American Journal of Sociology" 44 (1939)799-804; *Social Groups in the Modern World*. In: M. Berger, T. Abel, Ch. H. Page (eds.). *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*. New York 1954, pp. 125-140; M. Pacholski. F. Znaniecki. *Spółeczna dynamika kultury* (Social dynamics of culture). PWN. Warszawa 1977, pp. 140-191.

Europe cultural differences vanished, Europe would become a dull and uninteresting crowd of about 800 million people who think in an identical way, aspire to identical aims, live in the same way, and – which is worse – there is an underlying “Americanism” in it, that is shaped by satellite television. It is in the individual and social, national and international interest that there should exist other cultures, apart from our own one, and this is both in the international scale and within the same national community.