

Challenges for Ideology and the Politics of Multiculturalism



TADEUSZ PALECZNY*

In recent years, there has been a retreat from the idea and policy of multiculturalism seen as a process of integrating, merging and the politically unifying the political diversity of cultural groups within civil society. While this phenomenon is constantly present in the dimension of the social structure, it has intensified particularly in the area of values and norms, leading to growing tensions and cultural conflicts. The crisis of ideology and multiculturalism has various causes and leads to various consequences. Multiculturalism seen as a real, concrete model of shaping relationships between different racial, religious, and ethnic groups has been increasingly questioned in recent years. There is a withdrawal from the policy of assimilating foreigners, mainly post-migration communities, and growing reluctance may be observed as regards including refugees and newcomers from other cultural areas in social structures. The principle of cultural equality of groups, the freedom to cultivate one's own religious or linguistic distinctiveness is questioned, while the rights of individuals are violated because of a different system of values. Criticisms and modifications are applied to the established and applied models of American and European multiculturalism. These phenomena appear at an intensified scale in the face of the growing threat of radical religious fundamentalist groups, ultranationalist-oriented representatives of the cultural

* Jagiellonian University in Kraków; e-mail: tadeusz.paleczny@uj.edu.pl.

majority, the resistance of members of minority groups against growing reluctance, intolerance, discrimination and exclusion. On the one hand, the European model of multiculturalism – the axiological and legal basis for the functioning of the European Union – is being questioned by some member states. On the other hand, there is growing dislike towards foreigners and the threats that they pose in societies of colonial and migratory origin and pluralistic social and cultural orientation. The tendencies for cultural and social exclusion, as well as isolation are increasing together with the rising feeling of danger and decreasing security of individuals, resulting from the instability and rapid dynamics of social change, terrorist attacks, migration, and the discourse of political elites. The clash of civilizations, which was announced to the world by Samuel Huntington¹ and whose existence has been proved by the hybrid war on terror which has lasted at least since the attack on the World Trade Centre, has become the cause of the global abandonment of the principles of integration, tolerance, and interculturalism. The fundamental determinants of multiculturalism's ideology and policy such as heterogeneity, polycentrism and cultural universalism have been displaced by homogeneity, monocentrism and particularism.

The fundamental contemporary challenges of ideology and the policy of multiculturalism (against the background of exponentially growing immigration and population transfers) are terrorism, populism, revitalized nationalism and religious fundamentalism. The dangers carried by socially, legally, ideologically and politically established multicultural models in the countries of the European Union, the United States, Canada, Australia, but also in South America, Asia and Africa lead to a clear formulation of social demands for them to be changed. This is the direction of the policy of Great Britain, Hungary, Poland, but also other EU Member States. The same demands are put forward towards the political elites and raised by the election-winning politicians in the United States. Hence, the social resistance against the principles of integration and assimilation is on the increase. This resistance appears against the growing opposition towards liberal tendencies of globalization, leading to the approval of institutional restrictions on civil rights and the freedom of individuals.

¹ S. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York 1996.

The voice of right-wing and extremist religious groups and national political movements is becoming more audible, dominating over the voice of civil social movements which defend democracy, freedom and equality.

In this melting pot of opposing expectations and aspirations of diverse social and political circles, a climate has emerged that challenges the ideological principles of multiculturalism. This situation may also be seen in Poland, where the slogan of 'good change' carries the political doctrine of retreating from the principles of the European model of multiculturalism. There is also an ongoing debate, as well as a conflict between supporters and opponents of different concepts of pluralism and multiculturalism. Hence, the question arises not only of what this new model of multiculturalism and pluralism is to be, but also on what values and principles it is to be based. The key to the proper implementation of any ideology and policy of multiculturalism is the issue of freedom and dignity. As Jadwiga Staniszkis writes in her introduction to the well-known monograph by Paweł Jasienica, *it is not the (Polish-Lithuanian) union and not Grunwald that made the Commonwealth of Both Nations famous. 'But what did this was the freedom under the rule of the last of the Jagiellonians'*.² Furthermore, she writes: *Today's return to those threads of Polish tradition that separate dignity from freedom (treating the latter as suspect, requiring justification and clear boundaries, and forgetting that this freedom decides the moral character of the act is not only the factor that bewilders [...] but threatens, similarly to what Jasienica says, with destruction in the sphere of public communication.*³

Multiculturalism as a consequence of diversity does not come out of nowhere. It stems from historical processes as a consequence of conquests, annexations, colonisation and migration. It is born and is formed in the long chain of human substrate, which consists of groups of a different origin, language, religion or skin colour. Polish society went through various developmental phases. The nation-building process since the Piast dynasty was based on the increasing universalisation of pre-national groups. While the Piast political system sought to homogenise and unify the various constituent elements around the monarch, the next phase of the nation-building process under the rule of the Jagiellonian

² J. Staniszkis, 'Wstęp', in: P. Jasienica, *Polska anarchia*, Warszawa 2008, p. 5.

³ Ibid., pp. 5–6.

dynasty was based on the principle of polycentrism and the integration of many distinct cultural groups. Polonisation, considered as a process of assimilation and universalisation of distinct ethnic groups, consisted of the creation of a political and religious institutions binding society together which, at the same time, allowed the freedom of religion and protected the cultural distinctiveness of the king's subjects, including their linguistic and ethnic diversity.

The ideas of Jagiellonian multiculturalism in the two-tier, union political system were for more than a century innovative and leading principles of integration and acculturation in Europe. The multicultural Polish society under the authority of the Jagiellonians created conditions for the functioning and development of diverse cultures – Polish, Lithuanian, Jewish or German – and also encouraged the autonomy of regional groups. In the context of Europe's growing religious conflicts, dynastic conflicts, tensions and ethnic antagonisms, wars and the continent's weakening against the growing aspirations of oligarchic families, multiculturalism began to transform into anarchy. Nevertheless, at the climax of the times, the Jagiellonian model of multiculturalism was the most mature and well-developed political project, leading to the integration and integration of diverse cultural groups into society, while introducing the principles of freedom, equality, tolerance and responsibility before the king. Later, this noble freedom ended, in contrast to state freedom.

The foundation of the idea of multiculturalism is the principle of the freedom of individuals and groups to cultivate their own cultural traditions and to draw satisfaction from this fact. This is the case when the principles of freedom for the protection of one's own dignity are respected, dignity stemming from cultural identity, including religious and linguistic identity. Although nobody questions the need for multiculturalism, a political battle is underway for its model and the political shape of pluralism. This raises the question of the kind of multiculturalism that is desired. Patterns that may be cultivated and applied in the search for social *consensus* may be provided the idea and policy of the Jagiellonian union's state of 'both nations'.

Multiculturalism – but what kind of multiculturalism?

Multiculturalism is both a state of affairs and its reflection in the minds of people and social groups. Multiculturalism is a social fact, as is culture, religion, civilization, state or nation. It occurs in a multitude of cultures

of varying size, outreach, genesis, range of distinctiveness and originality. It is an inalienable component of social reality, which manifests itself in many ways and on different levels of human activity. On the one hand, it is based on the diversity of languages, customs and identities and, on the other hand, is associated with a multitude of material and non-material goods, products made by hands and thoughts, adapted to the needs of human beings that made them. Multiculturalism functions in the cultural products on offer daily. It is made up of both agricultural crops from different climates, the products of various technologies present in the markets as commodities, as well as products in the form of websites, films, theatrical plays and musical works. Multiculturalism is the living, pulsating social fabric in which various components and elements move, mix, combine or divide. The diversity, multiplicity and distinctiveness of human forms and cultural creations is a fact that shapes human consciousness and generates a variety of emotional and axiological responses. Around this diversity, myths, ideologies, concepts and theories that form the basis of social, economic and political activities are formed and consolidated. Multiculturalism also has an economic, mercantile dimension, consisting of the necessary and continuous exchange of diverse goods from the spiritual, intellectual and material spheres.

Diversity is the genetic basis of multiculturalism and is a mere continuation of the historical processes of settlement and displacement as a result of migrations, resettlement and voluntary and forced population transfers. It is a natural derivative of complex historical processes which locate within one territory people and groups of different religions, languages, skin colours or ethnic origin. The dimension of multiculturalism combines and mixes objective and subjective criteria of distinctness. It is a very complex, real dimension of functioning of individuals and groups in different economic, political and social settings.

One of the first observers and commentators of multiculturalism was the Greek traveller, historian, and philosopher, Herodotus. According to Ryszard Kapuściński, *for Herodotus, the multicultural world is a living, pulsating tissue in which nothing is given and defined once and for all, but continually transforms, changes and creates new relationships and contexts*.⁴ He further states: *The centre of this world was the Aegean Sea, its coast and*

⁴ R. Kapuściński, *Podróże z Herodotem*, Kraków 2004, p. 107.

*islands. This is where all Herodotus' journeys begin. The further he moves towards the ends of the world, the more often he encounters something new. He is the first one to discover the multicultural nature of the world, the first one who argues that every culture requires acceptance and understanding. And to understand it, one has to get to know it first.*⁵

Furthermore, the necessary consequence of multiculturalism and diversity and their simultaneous occurrence in both the normative and spatial context are various strategies and models of mutual reference and the adaptation of various cultural groups. Diversity criteria may be multiple, and they may overlap, creating religious, racial, ethnic, linguistic, mental or social barriers. The consequences of these diverse models are both conflict and division, as well as integration and cooperation. At one end, we may find monocentric models, based on exclusivism and the superiority of certain groups over others. These models lead to phenomena of monocentrism, prejudice and lack of tolerance of differences. At the other end of the spectrum there are integrative, unifying, standardizing and universalizing models, forming polycentric structures, introducing the principles of cultural equality, tolerance and integration. Their consequence is the phenomenon of acculturation, leading to syncretization, hybridization, creolization and amalgamation.

Multiculturalism generates a new dimension in relations, namely intercultural relations. Interculturality is an area of events, facts, and activities appearing at the meeting point of two or more cultural groups. Interculturality is an extensive cultural, social and economic space, where meetings, coexistence and communication between different cultures take place. Intercultural space is created spontaneously, in a bottom-up fashion, following interactions between people who migrate or move individually or in groups. It may also be designed, intentionally, in a top-down fashion by groups, organizations, social institutions, including those which are economic and political.

⁵ Ibid., p. 81.

Pluralism or ethnocentrism?

Pluralism is a structurally, legally, constitutionally and institutionally structured form of multiculturalism. Cultural pluralism has social, religious, racial, ethnic or linguistic background and is, or should be, resistant to current threats and challenges. Pluralism is a fixed, concrete model of intercultural relations, adapted to a historical background, the presence of diverse cultural groups in civil society and their mutual configuration against each other. We may speak of pluralism only in the context of the political model of multiculturalism, with regard to the real, functioning principles that constitute the structure of civil society. Pluralism is based on equality of all cultural groups, the freedom to cultivate traditions and preserve one's heritage and ensure the protection of one's language and religion. Its ideological basis is the acceptance of distinctiveness and absence of discrimination on grounds of cultural origin. When these principles are questioned, one deals with false pluralism, its caricature and an ideological mystification. Full pluralism, tailored to the needs of a specific civil society, takes account of all dimensions and components basing it on the notion of equality of rights, democracy and a right to cultural autonomy.

There are different types of pluralism, each of which reflects ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic and regional compositions. Pluralism adapts relations between people and groups to the actual multicultural population substrate, functioning in several perspectives and at several levels, namely: local, national and international. Pluralism is a structural, axiological and normative ordering of diversity and multiculturalism. It functions as long as none of the groups operating within this model aspire to a particular, unique, dominant and hegemonic role. Then pluralism loses its natural foundations, transforming itself into an anti-democratic, ethnocultural, nationalist or theocratic, fundamentalist monocentric model.

The claims of one (usually national) group to occupy a privileged position in the structures of power and prestige are a threat to the pluralist model which integrates all members of civil society socially, legally and politically, while preserving their ethnic, racial, regional or religious separateness.

In the real world, there are different models of pluralism that can be narrowed down to three which are actually implemented and encountered in different countries and societies. What refers back to pluralism is the scope of democratic freedoms for individuals and groups.

The table below presents three types of pluralism in civil societies: the first of which can be called the mechanical; the second, the compromise model; and the third, the discursive model.⁶

Table 1. Models of pluralism

	monocentrism	polycentrism	interculturalism
HEGEMONIC (MECHANICAL) MODEL	homogenization, hegemony of the sovereign, exclusivism, exclusion mechanical democracy	minority/majority relations, limited biculturalism	limited communication and intercultural competence, reluctance to integrate and assimilate
CONSOCIATE (CONCILIATORY) MODEL	lack of cultural dominance, acceptance of distinctiveness, protection of the rights of all cultural groups	lack of cultural hegemony, multiculturalism and diversity	integration
DELIBERATIVE (DISCOURSE) MODEL	civil society, protection of minority rights	protection of individual rights	assimilation universalisation, dialogue

In principle, the first model means a limited, conditional, and relative pluralism, although in concrete, real terms it may be more or less similar to the deliberative model. The consociate model is the foundation of parliamentary, proportionate democracy in which cultural groups participate in power relative to their size. The deliberative model, based on continuous discourse, negotiates the principles of protecting the rights of individuals and groups. It is the basis for the functioning of complex, large, multicultural, international civil societies such as the European Community. The European Union has created and implemented the latest, most democratic and complex model of pluralism, to which member states adapt their civic pluralisms. Under the influence of terrorist threats, religious and ethnic conflicts, increasing labour and political migration,

⁶ See: J. Habermas, *Obywatelstwo a tożsamość narodowa. Rozważania nad przyszłością Europy*, transl. B. Markiewicz, Warszawa 1993.

this model is being questioned by consociate systems. The consociate model is, in most cases, a constitutional, parliamentary, state and a civic way of functioning of more or less homogeneous societies. On the grounds of tradition, historical processes, wars, treaties, conflicts, and agreements most countries have formulated constitutional rules for ordering and observing the rules of intercultural relations in all dimensions of their functioning. The mutual adaptation of different models of pluralism in the European Union has recently been questioned by political elites inclined towards right-wing populism, religious fundamentalism and nationalist ethnocentrism. There is a tendency to violate EU agreements, to move away from constitutional rights, to return to the idea of a monocentric state in which the sovereign is not the civil society – i.e. all the people – but one cultural group, which is the nation dominating in a linguistic, national and religious way.

The issue of the sovereign – a nation or a civil society?

Constructing social order, including the designation of the boundaries and the scope of intercultural space, involves diverse entities, people and groups and structures which they create. In the historical process of the functioning of societies, two principles have competed, namely that of community and union. The first is genetic, natural, based on origin, kinship, physical and cultural similarity. The second is based on the sense of belonging, membership and citizenship. The first one may be called ethnic, community-oriented, national or cultural, and the other, political, state or civic. These principles, complementary or alternative, depending on the ideological perspective, coexist in constructing different social orders. Contained in the old Enlightenment and Romantic concepts, formulated in the ideologies and political doctrines of nation states, these principles have defined modern models of the functioning of European and world societies for many centuries. Apart from the historical role of great religious and class groups, ethnic communities – including those which are national – are a fundamental, constitutive element and the foundation of all multicultural societies.

There is, however, the inseparable issue of the sovereign, the hegemon, the most important cultural group connected with the existence of a nation. This group designates the axiological and normative basis for the functioning of the state, the emergence of the authorities and

participation in the structures of civil society.

In classical 19th and 20th century nation-state concepts, linguistically, religiously and territorially homogeneous nations became natural hegemons. Nationalism in its different versions became the basis for the functioning of separate cultures, articulating different economic and political interests of states, protecting the collective right of the sovereign, i.e., the nation, and not a heterogeneous set of citizens. In modern times, nations have become the most important, main subject of intercultural relations, central to legal, political and economic structures, the centre of all concepts, theories, political doctrines that confer the status of sovereign to a nation instead of a monarchy, papacy, class or race. The concept of a collective, group sovereign in the form of a national community dominated the model of the institution of modern state. It was in the name of the nation that wars were fought, conflicts and antagonisms were born, alliances, unions and federations were formed. All models of multiculturalism started to be guaranteed by international law referring to the historically necessary will of the sovereign, i.e., the nation, in its relations with other cultural groups. In the background there were other pre-national cultural groups, namely regional, family or tribal groups, as well as multicultural civilizations. The nation was, and still is a basic collective being, the greatest real community, assuming the political shape of civil society in its own state. Statehood has become a factor distinguishing nations as sovereigns and communities which are autonomous and independent of other groups, pursuing their interests through their own political institutions.⁷ The nation as a cultural community and hegemon of a state has become a sovereign, giving legislative power to those that exercise power on its behalf. This law is intended to protect its internal and external interests. External interests are the protection of borders and security in relations with other countries and cultural groups. Internal interests consist primarily in ensuring that all citizens are equal before the law and ensuring their security.⁸

⁷ M. Weber, *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo*, transl. D. Lachowska, Warszawa 2002.

⁸ B. Anderson, *Wspólnoty wyobrażone. Rozważania o źródłach i rozprzestrzenianiu się nacjonalizmu*, transl. S. Amsterdamski, Kraków 1997; A.D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford: Blackwell 1986; E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca, New York 1983; E. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, Cambridge 1990; E. Hobsbawm, T. Ranger, (ed.) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge 2003.

The problems of maintaining a proper multicultural policy arise in all cases where the concept of national sovereign does not coincide with the understanding of what is called civil society. Separation, even partial, of these two entities leads to the emergence and functioning of many antinomies which are contradictory in the pursuit of group and individual interests. Human rights might become subordinate to group interests, defined by the political establishment and people in power.

Recently we have witnessed a 'nationalist turn' in right-wing, conservatively oriented centres of political power. This turn is a kind of critical reaction to the exceedingly fast pace of change of multicultural societies, excessive individualism and social liberalism, as well as relativism in the sphere of values and ideology. Nationalist rhetoric leads to an increased discourse over the directions and forms of development of modern civil societies. It leads to global discourse and polarization of opposing political orientations. Public debate is taking place in all environments, involving primarily theorists and politicians. Resistance to Europeanization and Americanization consists mainly in the criticism of cultural assimilation processes, leading, according to the opponents of the above phenomena, to uprooting the identity, the disappearance of tradition and erosion of the cultural heritage of indigenous national cultures. Scientific and political discourse is gaining momentum. It is accompanied by social phenomena such as mobilizing supporters and opponents of one or other political party. On the one side there are defenders of national unity, the principle of hegemony of the sovereign nation, supporters of collectivism and, on the other, advocates of heterogenisation, interculturalism and individualist liberalism. This is not a simple division between liberals and conservatives, as the issue concerns a question which goes deeper and is more important for the shape of multiculturalism in Europe and in the world, namely the role of the national state. Defenders of the traditional, historical role of the nation insist on preserving the cultural foundations of identity and separateness, defending particular values, languages, religions and institutions legitimizing the sense of ideological identity. They favour a unitary, centralist state that supports and actively contributes to national unity and solidarity through historical and cultural policies. Such policies lead in many cases to ethnic, racial and religious exclusivism, and consequently, to isolationism, the exclusion of culturally distinct groups and individuals and the closure of borders to immigrants and refugees. They also entail radicalization of some environments towards

ultra-nationalism, and manifest themselves through increased ethnic or religious mobilization, leading to discrimination, prejudice and, in extreme cases, terrorism. The idea and politics of integration is treated by ultra-nationalists as a Trojan horse, devised to capture the fortress of monoethnicity and national unity.

One of the instruments for constructing ideology and the policy of national unity and social solidarity is present in different varieties of populism.

Populism

Populism is the sort of ideology, doctrine, and socio-political movement which means governing on behalf of the people and for the people. In neo-populist versions, the term 'people' refers to civil society, excluding the elites. Populism is often not only egalitarian, but even anti-elitist. It collides with the interests and aspirations of those that dominate the economy, culture and society. In many cases, populism becomes a doctrine of real policy on behalf of the 'handicapped' majority against the liberal elites. It is connected with the concept of social solidarity and political unity and it is based on tradition and patriotism. Populism is accompanied by grassroots contesting and oppositional social movements, bringing to power people who are critical of the already-existing centres of power. Populism is opposed to the political and social establishment, seeking allies in the lower social classes and religious institutions.

New populist tendencies are both a collective, political, but also individual, psychological, emotional and dramatic response to the anxieties triggered by globalization. A populist turn in state policy has various consequences.

Firstly, new political populism perceives technological development and the rapid leap of communication capabilities as a natural and beneficial phenomenon. Mass communication is dominated by the mass media, which populists aptly use, achieving huge response from the public and support of the 'silent' majority, which becomes politically active. Participants and leaders of new populist movements always use all of the available means of modern communication technology in order to take over power or wield control over it.⁹

⁹ More extensive information on these phenomena may be found in: M. Castells, *Sila*

Secondly, populism is not only a consequence, but it also contributes to greater and faster spatial and social mobility of people. They occupy public places, attracting the attention of public opinion and demonstrate in order to attract interest. In a word, they use mass media just as populist politicians do to increase their popularity. Thus, neopopulism is becoming a product of globalization, as well as an important element of its self-regulation and self-control.

Thirdly, the policy of populist leaders is highly correlated with the existence and operation of international governmental and non-governmental organizations. What is particularly clear is their relationship with the non-governmental sector. This means a growing activity of populists in the international arena and their influence on the policies not only of their own countries, but of the whole of the developing world.

Fourthly, the activities of populists lead to an increase in the feelings of political nationalism and a desire to strengthen the power of the state. This is usually achieved by increasing the size of the army, police and extending the powers of the repressive apparatus. It also means increasing control of state institutions over the citizen.

Particularism or cultural universalism?

The crisis of the existing approaches to multiculturalism and the functioning of their ideological and political models is cantered on several social, as well as cultural dimensions. One of the above is the scale of particularism and universalism imposed on various structural links between cultural groups, their ability to cooperate, adapt and integrate with others, the level of exclusivism, the tendency to homogenise or enter into heterogeneous organizational systems. Particularism implies a tendency to settle in clearly defined territorial, political, cultural, religious and linguistic boundaries. Particularism is a deliberate, conscious pursuit of one's own group interests, and in extreme cases, it takes the form of monocentrism, ethnocentrism, nationalism and cultural exclusivism. Particularism, in its real social shape, leads to religious fundamentalism and belief in the orthodox, dogmatic superiority of one's own culture over others.

tożsamości, transl. S. Szymański, (ed.) M. Marody, Warszawa 2009; C. Offe, 'Nowe ruchy społeczne: Przekraczanie granic polityki instytucjonalnej', transl. P. Karpowicz, in: P. Sztompka, M. Kucia (ed.), *Socjologia. Lektury*, Kraków 2007, pp. 218–224; A. Touraine, *Wprowadzenie do analizy ruchów społecznych*, transl. J. Kubicka-Daab, in: J. Szczupaczyński (ed.), *Władza i społeczeństwo*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1995.

In its moderate versions, particularism is a derivative of group interest, denoting the existence of organizational structures designed to preserve the group's traditions, heritage and cultural identity. Particularism and a retreat from multiculturalism leads to undermining the role of intercultural communication, the disappearance of dialogue and focus on protecting one's own cultural resources. Particularism is a universal feature of any cultural community, and in its natural form it aims at upholding and developing one's own heritage, religion and caring for the wellbeing and satisfying the needs of its own members.

Particularism contributes to maintaining cultural diversity. It increases the scope of pluralistic dependencies, but when it is subordinate to the idea of the superiority of one's own group interest, it becomes a negative phenomenon which disorganizes the social and political order prevailing in civil societies developed in the long historical process. Critics of the theories, ideologies and policies of multiculturalism defending the distinctness of one's own cultural groups (i.e., nations and ethnic and religious groups) see the main threat in universalisation leading to blurring of identities, weakening community bonds, and relocation of power centres outside traditional elites. While proponents of particularism are adamant in their criticism of the processes of universalisation, including Europeanization, Americanization, Westernization or globalization, new attacks from the side of alter-globalists are also emerging. In their opinion, universalisation is happening too fast and threatens not only the stability of the existing structures of national states, but also does not encourage integration of cultural groups. Finding the right, the best, i.e., the most functional model for constructing international intercultural integration systems, such as the European Union, leads to the revitalization and flourishing of polemics and theoretical and political controversies concerning the fundamental principles of their implementation. It turns out that even the best theory does not lead to the realisation of its assumptions in practice. The participants of the new multicultural structure start to resist the scope and character of an intercultural space common to all, in the form of the Schengen zone, the single market or Euro. Individual participants in this intercultural structure defend not so much the principles of economic integration and political unification as the rights of cultural groups to protect their distinctiveness, preserve

their heritage and traditions. Europeanization, just like Americanization, leads to the overlapping of neighbouring cultures (or any other, not only those territorially distant) with one's own culture. In this way, Spaniards accuse the Catalans of overly exposing their own ethnic group's interests at the expense of a wider national-state structure. The French and Germans, like most other European countries, are reluctant towards closed minorities of Islamic immigrants striving to create separate cultural communities. Great Britain is leaving the European Union in the name of protecting its own particular interests. Examples of particularist behaviours of other nationalities like Hungarians, Poles, Swedes or the Dutch show the crisis of the present model of integration, not so much in the political or economic sense, but the cultural one. Europeanization means, in a longer historical process, as in the case of nation-forming processes, a gradual but not necessarily evolutionary way of increasing a common, intercultural and universalised intercultural space. The current crisis around the design of the model of the European Community which would satisfy all its participants has led to an intensification of debates and disputes, as well as questions not only about the state of affairs, but also their theoretical reflection. The scope of these questions is extensive: how will the status of the new civilization – the supranational, intercultural homeland of Europe change as the political and economic ties between the participants grow? To what extent will migration processes, including those occurring within the common economic zone as well as those external, leading to an influx of Asians and Africans, distant in a religious, racial and cultural sense, most often followers of Islam, delay and disrupt the pace and construction of a new European identity? What is the future of national states and elites and the centres of power in the member states? Is there a possibility of European acculturation and how is it supposed to take place in the sphere of language or religion? Beyond the question of whether or not these processes could be approved and possible, there are many contradictory concepts concerning the pace and scope of processes of Europeanization.

The crisis of the European intercultural community model was born as a result of the far too rapid and extensive changes of the composition of civil societies resulting from sudden and massive population transfers not only between member states, but also from the outside.

The construction of a new, transnational, and multicultural identity requires other political, educational and organizational rules and mechanisms shaping not only organizational structures, but also, or above all, human consciousness. The existing models have extensively and unilaterally exposed the positive and inevitable processes of universalisation, not perceiving or neglecting the threats and their negative effects.¹⁰ The optimism of political elites, and the ideologies and theorists of multiculturalism behind them, did not translate into social acceptance for the top-down process of Europeanization. Hence, the resistance and ethnic mobilization of national opponents of universalisation and globalization, which finds its justification in its negative social and cultural consequences.

Conclusion

The policy of multiculturalism is based, according to ideological and theoretical assumptions, on the construction of a legal and social space for the integration of diverse and different cultural groups. It is based on the assumption of equality, freedom in cultivating one's own tradition, language and religion, as well as active participation in civil society. The policy of multiculturalism takes into account the complexity of civil society, with an emphasis on dominant groups, but does not grant the latter any exceptional rights. The policy of multiculturalism is based on the principles of the primacy of the protection of civil rights and participatory democracy. When any of these principles is challenged or its applicability is limited, the policy of multiculturalism is transformed into a monocentric, particularist, ethnophobic model leading to exclusivism, nationalism, and populism. The tradition of cultural freedom, rooted in the Jagiellonian idea of multiculturalism, is deeply embedded in the Polish and European notion of democracy and multiculturalism. On the one hand, the challenges of this tradition are impeded by the

¹⁰ See: also (among others) A. Appadurai, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis 1996; G. Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*, Glasgow 1994; R. Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Sage, London 1992; W. Welsch, 'Transkulturowość. Nowa koncepcja kultury', transl. B. Susła, J. Wieteci, in: R. Kubicki (ed.), *Filozoficzne konteksty rozumienia transwersalnego. Wokół koncepcji Wolfganga Welscha*, Poznań 1994; I. Wallerstein, *The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century*, Minneapolis-London 1999; idem, *World-systems Analysis. An Introduction*, London 2007.

processes of universalisation and transculturation, and on the other, they contribute to the development of a public discourse and to the growth of citizens' political consciousness and culture.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson Benedict. *Wspólnoty wyobrażone. Rozważania o źródłach i rozprzestrzenianiu się nacjonalizmu*. Transl. Stefan Amsterdamski. Kraków 1997.
- Appadurai Arjun. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis 1996.
- Castells Manuel. *The Power of Identity*. Cambridge, MA 1997.
- Gellner Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY 1983.
- Habermas Jürgen. *Obywatelstwo a tożsamość narodowa. Rozważania nad przyszłością Europy*. Transl. Barbara Markiewicz. Warszawa 1993.
- Hobsbawm Eric, Terance Ranger (ed.). *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge 2003.
- Hobsbawm Eric. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. Cambridge 1990.
- Hofstede Geert. *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. Glasgow 1994.
- Huntington Samuel. *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York 1996.
- Kapuściński Ryszard. *Podróże z Herodotem*. Kraków 2004.
- Offe Claus. 'Nowe ruchy społeczne: Przekraczanie granic polityki instytucjonalnej'. Transl. Paweł Karpowicz. In: Piotr Sztompka, Marek Kucia (ed.). *Socjologia. Lektury*. Kraków 2005.
- Robertson Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London 1992.
- Smith Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford 1986.
- Staniszkis Jadwiga. 'Wstęp'. In: Paweł Jasienica. *Polska anarchia*. Warszawa 2008.
- Touraine Alein. 'Wprowadzenie do analizy ruchów społecznych'. Transl. J. Kubicka-Daab. In: Jerzy Szczupaczyński (ed.). *Władza i społeczeństwo. Antologia tekstów z zakresu socjologii polityki*. Vol. 1. Warszawa 1995.
- Wallerstein Immanuel. *The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis-London 1999.
- Wallerstein Immanuel. *World-systems Analysis. An Introduction*. London 2007.
- Weber Max. *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo. Zarys socjologii rozumiejącej*. Transl. and ed. Dorota Lachowska. Warszawa 2002.
- Welsch Wolfgang. 'Transkulturowość. Nowa koncepcja kultury'. Transl. B. Susła, J. Wieteki. In: Roman Kubicki (ed.). *Filozoficzne konteksty rozumienia transwersalnego. Wokół koncepcji Wolfganga Welscha*. Poznań 1994.