
JAGIELLONIAN CULTURAL STUDIES

PREFACE

There is no other sphere of human values, experiences and actions as open and unfathomable in its many guises as the world of culture created by man. Participation in this world is concomitant with the process of understanding it. This is why there are so many approaches and schools, so many research orientations and strategies, which are aimed at bringing us closer to understanding the nature of culture and the ways in which it manifests itself. All this is done in the hope that we can comprehend culture and aid man who is so deeply involved in it. Thus reflection is born, and upon that reflection knowledge is built, and finally the study of culture follows. Regardless of this, the basic, and for the most part still unanswered questions, continue to be valid: How do we understand the subject of these studies? What are the motives behind pursuing them? How do we integrate the reflection, knowledge, and study with the more broadly understood human cognitive and social activity? How will this study allow us to overcome the constraints of time and space of our own cultures, methods, professional roles, canons of sensitivity and imagination, and make it possible to increase the potential and the dynamism of its development?

To even begin answering those questions, we must first observe that all reflection, knowledge and study is at the same time a form of culture. Culture itself has to be understood in the most open and broadest of ways, as this will allow us to capture its diversity, dynamics and changeability. We can easily observe it in the diverse regions of the world, in communities that have never known the term, even though they have created true “wonders of the world” and inspired awe in the finest and most accomplished members of humanity. It is in the ‘human condition’ and the unfathomable forms of the existence and development of culture, the ways in which it overcomes its own limitations, that we must look for the basis of how to comprehend its nature. The process of trying to capture it and define it must necessarily emerge from these fundamental aspects of human nature and human effort, the intentions and desires, the skills and abilities displayed in all spheres of activity, which in fact can often depart from what we might wish to see as typical cultural activity. The most difficult task that cultural studies have to face is the readiness to notice culture itself.

It is, after all, both the product and the potentiality of man, it is both the word and its meaning, both gesture and intention, both the thing and the value. To understand culture is to exist in that ambivalent sphere of contradiction between the rigours of scientific method and the liveliness of human experience, between the logic of generalisations and the expression of detail, between the rationality of language and the mysticism of experience, between that which is visible, and that which is felt, yet still fully immersed in the typically human sphere of reality. No reflection and no study can ignore any of these contradictory sides, for it will lose the identity of man as an individual and community in all the periods of his life, history, and future, in the realities of every context, region, and situation. These contradictions create the life-giving tension which constitutes the meaning of cultural studies, in which man is the most valuable of media, the subject and object of cognition, and this cognition extends beyond purely instrumental goals; it is transgressive and autotelic.

If the ability to comprehend is at the same time the ability to perceive, know and understand, then in cultural studies this ability means a great academic responsibility to aptly situate such a type of activity, whether individual or collective. In light of the second question, in which we asked about motives and goals, and indirectly about the ways in which we will shape many groups and nations, comprehending culture is of primary importance. Those motives and goals will determine the tenets of perception, the methods of research and categories of interpretation which should be followed when interpreting the already-mentioned tension between what is real and what is potential, and the boundaries between the two. In contrast to natural sciences, which are significantly more transcultural, it is the motivations behind cultural studies that will determine the existence of facts and the relations between them, the meanings attributed to those facts, and the accepted rules of rationality. In principle, the responsibility of cultural studies is situated within three spheres of values, which determine their existence and its justification.

The first of the spheres contains utilitarian, instrumental values which can be verified by the measurable consequences of their implementation. Because of the increase in knowledge about the 'soft' aspects of functioning of contemporary organisations, cultural studies are discovering their usefulness and a new calling in this sphere. Those 'soft' aspects are proving to be quite 'hard' when they collide with centuries-old traditions and belief systems, the identity of smaller and larger communities, the patterns of communication and motivation and the manifold 'content' of cultural competences, which are deeply ingrained in the personalities of the participants of each culture and manifest themselves in the various behaviours and attitudes, whether at school or work, whether consumer or civic, whether parental, neighbourly or ethnical. These are pragmatic applications of reflection, knowledge and cultural studies that are becoming increasingly noticeable in the age that witnesses the rise in multiculturalism, mobility, synergy, but also in cultural conflicts. The failure to solve those conflicts will mean that the processes of mental, religious and axiological diversification will be just an unpleasant and dangerous abnormality. The transformation of those conflicts into potentials that can be used in a positive

fashion is currently the object of interest of many new specialisations in applied sciences, although, paradoxically, it requires a departure from their utilitarian purpose. It requires that the key analytical categories be broadened and expanded. Above all, it necessitates a sympathetic and understanding approach to all experiences and the entirety of the world view that the members of the cooperating communities construct in their minds and practices. This is why cultural studies in their primary social and academic responsibility need to take up a far more important and logically anterior type of challenge.

The second sphere, which determines the value of cultural studies, is the ability to interpret in an informed fashion everything that is the object of their study, including the imagination and sensitivity of the scholars. It is not the description and documentation that determines what we are able to see and explain as 'sense' and 'meaning' of human endeavours, intentions and emotions. These are formed through the dynamisms of culture which create *logos* and are rooted in man himself as their fundamental subject. This meaning permeates a much larger sphere of human activity than the one which man himself defines as culture, the sacred, the holy or a codified field of meaning that has a conventional label, name or visualisation.

Owing to this ability, it is then possible to reconstruct motives and meanings behind actions which are built into the divergent social systems, even though they are informed by a perception of their rationality, purpose and value quite different from our own. Cultural studies, tailored for the modern world of great migrations, transnational corporations and a world of media that is without any boundaries, become at the same time the guide, the mediator, and often the lifeguard and therapist in the disaster that sees hostile communities, religions and nations, supported by their military and organisational systems, clash with each other. Modern history of mankind shows clearly that the processes of globalisation do not lead only to the standardisation and assimilation of the ways of thinking, evaluating and behaviour. It is often quite to the contrary. Increasingly, the migration of people, products and information leads to a growing diversification, pluralism, and even chaos. This, in turn, leads to open aggression between many groups in almost every corner of the world. Advanced technologies and management systems which are based on contemporary economic knowledge do not guarantee the necessary level of cooperation, communication and understanding, and sometimes they do not even facilitate it. Shaping empathy, or at least an understanding of the life of co-workers, neighbours or acquaintances who are quite close, but are also ethnically different, is a task that has to be faced by many educational, motivational or training programmes in almost every larger organisation. Only then can we reach a certain minimum of the synergy of multicultural actions, and discuss not only the problems, but the ways of development of these organisations, programmes and people. Thus, we reach the next type of challenges in perceiving the world of culture.

The third sphere of values that cultural studies are concerned with are the ways to learn the dialogue-based forms of communication, transgression and emancipation with regard to the internalised world of culture. To understand what is the in-

tention, meaning and purpose of the actions of members of other communities does not necessarily mean any sort of obligation to accept them or adopt them. This is something of which the xenophobic defenders of the 'purity of race' and group identities, which are understood as a closed system of specific values, are afraid. However, understanding is not immediately followed by the will to learn something new, to expand the boundaries of one's own world, although it is definitely a necessary condition. It requires a significant expansion by adducing the element of volition, which liberates, sets things in motion and is directed by the vision of how the experiences of the future will be shaped. This liberating function of cultural studies transforms dialogue into a real path, imagination into an innovative force, sensitivity into the language of transition, and empathy into the ability to create. Cultural studies are the guiding star to the traveller who might not know the way, may not even reach a predetermined destination, but knows where *not* to go so as not to become lost and run aground. Stimulating the creative potential transforms itself into courage and responsibility to open up to what each culture holds within, and it has the potential to become a bridge between them, and turn this barrier into an element of exchange, complementation and development. This is why cultural studies, understood in this developmental fashion, become intercultural in their nature, and are concerned with the fundamental characteristics of man in the many spheres of his existence, also those which come into contact with one another and communicate with a language that is still being developed.

This newly-formed journal is therefore an invitation to fulfil each and every of the above-mentioned functions or values. It also puts forward an inspiration which emerges from the depths and from a very specific identity, although in its cultural content it is a pluralistic identity. This inspiration arises from the heritage of Poland under the Jagiellonian dynasty (1387-1572), which spans the endeavours of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (1569), a period that saw full multiculturalism, quarrels and tolerance, openness and dialogue, a place where many cultures and religions met and intermingled, times of an unusual awareness of the need to know and create, of art and science, and above all, the times of many interactions, and accomplishments, the times of search. This is how a rich tradition of multiplicity was born and it was accompanied by a desire to attain a unity which would create; a tradition that did not enclose, but opened, did not destroy, but created. Even though it was full of emotions and ambitions, it gave rise to some of the finest treatises in many disciplines. This was when the grounds for the Jagiellonian University were set and its European position developed; this was when the works on the defence of cultural laws were written (Paweł Włodkowic 1370-1435), which contributed to the European thought on subjectivity and dignity of nations, to a dialogue that promises development, learning from each other, and providing a communal, sometimes even universal, dimension to thinking.

From this tradition we wish to select values relevant to contemporary disciplines that study culture, and to do so in a world of many reductions and a technocratic dogma in thinking about the future and human condition, in a world which will be

facing mounting conflicts and contradictions, a world variegated and often lost, in constant search for a new message in thinking and acting. The three 'mega-values', which have proven their historical and contemporary relevance, are therefore an inspiration for the Jagiellonian Cultural Studies. Those values have shown to be useful wherever they have found understanding, for instance in the times of the 'Solidarity' movement, when Poland sought its own rebirth. They will prove indispensable in the future, when the challenge of seeing man and culture fully, without any functional, political or economic reductions, must be taken up.

THE FIRST, PRIMARY AND OPENING VALUE IS:

Man. He is the fundamental subject of culture. Without him culture is no longer understandable, even if it were seen as a set of systems, structures and processes, and even if those were relevant and real in both their modelling and design. It was man who was the inspiration of the Polish Renaissance in the times of the Jagiellonian dynasty, both in science and art, evident in all its richness in the works of Polish writers of the period (Mikołaj Rej 1505-1569, Jan Kochanowski 1530-1584). In most of the traditions of cultural studies in the world to date, especially in Great Britain, the main thrust of analysis was directed at the relation between culture and power. It would be good to shift the attention to the relation between *culture and man* by evoking the Renaissance traditions which are particularly relevant in contemporary times. Cultural studies focus their intellectual sensitivity on the fundamental question of man and this approach is deeply rooted in the most valuable, core ways of thinking about culture in Poland, which was always open to the values of other cultures which manifest themselves in different spheres of life. This approach is based on seeing man from the perspective of the diversity of his accomplishments and the polymorphism of his personality, tradition and creative capabilities. This perspective has the potential to be the best basis for thinking about the contemporary horizon of cultural reflection, which would not be under the pressure and pragmatism of a technological civilisation or the more or less visible market laws.

THE SECOND VALUE:

Dialogue. If we are to look at culture through the prism of man in all his complexity, diversity, polymorphism and the ability to surpass his own limitations, which ability makes the creative process possible, then the next characteristics that is intrinsically linked to this perspective and constitutes all these attributes is the dialogism of human communication and interaction with other people. Not every type of communication fulfils the necessary conditions of dialogism and, in this dimension, may not always be the object of cultural studies. In case of the cultural studies we are currently discussing, this dialogism is one of the most crucial of premises, partly because of the Jagiellonian inspirations and fixed traditions, but also because of the important needs of contemporary culture.

Man and culture would not exist without communication, and communication is much more than just a transmission, a one way transfer of information. If we look

at communication in a correct fashion, it is evident that it is an inter-action, which is a type of reciprocity. The technology of influence, dominant in the times of mass culture, is not based on that reciprocity. Understanding of communication in this reciprocal fashion can be substantiated by the etymological analyses and the original meaning of this term, which refers to the communality of the participants of communication, even in the most minimal of senses. The second element of the two-element compound that defines communication as an inter-action points out to its evident: ***causality, intentional direction, purposefulness of the communicative action***, which is not just a regular type of behaviour. Very often, also in cultural studies, we forget about these attributes of communication, and therefore we must pay particular attention to the fact that communication is in direct opposition to a normal re-action, which is passive, re-constructive and externally motivated. Communication understood in this fashion means that we will have to look for subjective attributes of its participants. These attributes must include ***reciprocity***, then ***empathy, the ability to go outside one's own point of view and the ability to learn***. They are responsible for a very valuable type of communication, that is: dialogue, which is of fundamental importance in every culture, and especially in intercultural relations.

The Jagiellonian tradition clearly emphasises the importance of dialogue in both intra-cultural and intercultural relations. Even though it was by no means ideal, it managed to create a particularly tolerant model of cultural and religious relations and led to the formation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which can be seen to have employed a tangible set of cultural and political practices. What is more, it stimulated the reflection on a sensible cooperation between many newly-forming national groups and created a political body that really mattered in Europe of the time. This tradition introduced a canon of discourse which was in tune with the spirit of the Renaissance and resulted in a political culture that was quite democratic in its time. It was characterised by a true openness to the values of many cultures, a revival of scientific exchange and academic culture. These are important origins of the intellectual climate to which we need to return to provide a model of looking at culture that would be credible in its heritage and its core values, but at the same time would offer a credible solution for our own times that does not lose itself in plurality and in the apparent advantages of ideas for culture, its understanding, study and interpretations that are in fact very short-term.

This sensitivity, which comprises openness and the practice of dialogue, was expanded and exercised in the most eminent of ways by a former student of the Jagiellonian University, John Paul II. The interreligious dialogues are one of the most difficult of fields in which this sensitivity can be implemented and, in this case, it was centred around the condition of man – the first of the values and interests of the Jagiellonian Cultural Studies – that was already very deeply rooted in the entirety of John Paul II's thoughts and actions. Man and dialogue can meet in many different ways, just as the possible planes of the analysis of both can do so in a variety of fashions. It is necessary to model these analyses in a system of multiple and diverse transitions, in which one transforms the other and becomes integrated, but does not reduce cultural studies to

separate dimensions of some disjointed aspect of life. This perspective is proposed by yet another axiom that brings together the Jagiellonian Cultural Studies.

THE THIRD VALUE:

Development. This value is so complex and has so many different aspects that it can be said to integrate all the other values. It is something of a meta-value which synthesises particular values represented by each and every culture on its own. This allows for a much broader outlook on cultural studies, which on the one hand try to discover, reconstruct and study the uniqueness of local cultures, their distinctive and specific nature, but on the other show universal, or at least generic or typological aspects resting within the predetermined boundaries of the cultural reality of man. The developmental aspect of culture amounts to being open to holistic and dynamic processes that connect different potentials of human condition in the multiplicity of the real forms of existence and in diverse types of the modern sphere of culture. The modern cultural studies should take their specific approach to the analysis of the transfer of values as one of their most vital advantage. This transfer is understood not only as taking place between different cultures, but also between their various mega-, mezzo- or micro-structural levels, and also the personal level. Transfers of such nature were, and often are, the content and the activating factor of developmental processes in the intercultural space. However, we cannot understand that fully without an apt methodological orientation of cultural studies, which have the potential of becoming the most synthetic plane of understanding man in the modern world, a world which is becoming more and more divided in so many varied ways. This methodology helps us to understand many particular activities and ways of existence of man in accordance with what has been a long-standing rule in many different disciplines – that the higher principle of synthesis explains in the simplest of ways the principles of the lower orders. This pertains in particular to the principle of cultural development.

Development, as opposed to growth, means not only an increase in quantity, or the increasing technological and functional advancement of culture, which is so often termed as 'progress'. Development is tied to structural or ontological changes that engage with a more multidimensional, or even trans-structural dynamics of how the social levels and the personality and identity of man interlock with each other. These are synthetically referred to as processes which create *logos*, and they reveal the most deeply experienced meaning of the activity of man.

In the Jagiellonian tradition, development meant mutual complementation in diversity; it meant taking up unknown and undefined challenges of real differences, which was done not by restraint, but by stimulating the subjectivity of the participants of the process, both collective and individual. This inspiration clearly shows how important the value of symbolic culture is in social thought and action. But what it also shows is the importance of crucial, pioneering figures who became the icons symbolic of both their time and the challenges to which they responded. One of the most well-known examples is the almost iconic figure of the

Jagiellonian period, whose discoveries were crucial in helping develop an openness to new worlds and the ability to understand them, that is Mikołaj Kopernik (Nicolaus Copernicus, 1473-1543). For to the modern man, the discovery of the intercultural space is similar to the discovery of interplanetary space. For cultural studies it is truly a Copernican revolution, as they must discover many new types of relativities and truths, the already-mentioned principles of transfer and parallel worlds in the new, virtual shape that reality has adopted.

It is important to point out several key premises that will specify and set out the academic profile and the ways in which imagination can be organised to suit their purposes. In selecting those premises, we will be guided by the types of values in the three areas of cognitive engagement of cultural studies that have already been mentioned and discussed.

THE FIRST PREMISE

All cultures are part of the common human heritage which exemplifies the diversity of the developmental potential of man and the many directions taken to realise it.

Seeing things from the perspective of the interaction between cultures allows us to look into those values which, by undergoing the processes of fragmentation, cannot be contained within the whole or generate that, which arises from their accumulation, complementation and amplification. Those values cannot generate that, which teaches with its own history and the reflection upon its continuing existence, or that, which motivates by giving us a lesson on the turning points and changes, the value of what we call **heritage** as a whole. The heritage of every culture cannot be taken simply as the sum of its parts, but serves as a guiding point in the interpretation and the explication of the meanings used in this culture. It is in the cultural heritage, accumulated and present in the collective human consciousness, that people are able to find a grammar of their own values, a way to explain their hierarchies, choices and sentiments, a way to coalesce dispersed behaviours and the consequences of those behaviours into one meaningful whole. These behaviours, shattered into pieces, uprooted and integrated into the technological needs and priorities of modern organisations, could be difficult to understand, could lose their communicative significance, but, what is more, they could lose their symbolic, extra-instrumental purpose. Cultural heritage becomes a source of light that highlights the various configurations and dependencies of these behaviours, and explains how they can contribute to intercultural exchange and dialogue. Heritage is therefore an increasingly conscious interpretative frame of human endeavour, but also a compass of intentions and a generator of new transformed meanings. To a large extent, heritage does not only describe, but also 'problematizes' human reality. Not only does it answer questions that have already been posed, but it finds new questions to ask. They emerge alongside new realities, needs and the necessity for symbolic and cognitive arrangements in a world of multiple interactions and transfers. In this way, cultural heritage becomes an active, not a passive factor that shapes current and future competences

and motivations for dialogue, even though it ultimately depends on the attitudes of its participants and the ways in which they will utilise this dialogue.

Both the development of intercultural communication, which is based on the idea of sharing the legacy of a heritage that has been consciously recognised and selected, and the intercultural dialogue built upon this competence require that many conditions be met. Those conditions depend largely upon the state of education, the way in which intercultural relations and cultural heritage are perceived within each culture, and the plans for and perceptions of the future. In the current phase that sees the increase in the formation of international ties, we tend to see cultural heritage more and more as something from which anyone can benefit, if only they can learn how to communicate and build bridges between the heritages of each culture. This is why intercultural dialogue is not simply a matter between two or several nations. In fact, it creates a system of connections and links between wider constellations of nations. The responsibility to create this system rests on the representatives of each culture through an effective intercultural education.

THE SECOND PREMISE

Synergetic challenges to intercultural spaces

Every culture can complement and enrich many other cultures; it can be their discovery, both through its elements and as a whole, through how it configures its component parts and gives them sense and meaning. Every culture constitutes, therefore, a specific 'grammar', which allows for internal communication that orders the world of its participants, but also enables a translation directed at other worlds, at the same time showing everything that does not fall within this translation and remains in a sphere where meanings are being discovered.

All this becomes visible to the participants of cultural translation only during dynamic inter-action. Intercultural dialogue is an important type of this interaction and it is aided by such features as: a) reciprocity, b) openness, c) readiness to take risks and overcome the stress of communicative unpredictability, d) the willingness to learn, e) cognitive elasticity, f) empathy with the experiences and values of other people, g) respect towards the cultural heritage of other cultures that is being selected according to different formulas and for different purposes, h) creative imagination which makes it possible to distance oneself from the set patterns of thinking within one's own culture, i) the readiness to cooperate and exchange, j) prospective thinking which is combined with the drive to create new things that are meant to function in the near or distant future.

In this way, each cultural configuration is at the same time an arsenal and a historical laboratory. This is where solutions, worth implementing in the realities of other cultures, are developed, especially in the process of adaptation, design and looking for entirely new solutions. This pertains not only to the cultural borderlands and their immediate neighbourhood, but also to every encounter between the parts and the whole of those configurations. Such processes take place in the plane of global relations of organisational cultures, particularly involved in searching for

synergetic solutions that are often based on the values of various national or regional cultures, and even traditions of specific organisations. These cultures can be seen as something of an arsenal of various possibilities, and the task of exploring them is given over to special teams whose goal is to discern the nature and function of specific cultural patterns in various configurations both holistically as separate entities and in particular situations. If not for this approach to the question of cultural heritage, it would not be possible to utilise the ways in which cultures permeate one another, are superimposed upon themselves and “build bridges,” and we must remember that all of this is quite indispensable in the times of globalisation.

‘Cultural design’, which is already being implemented on a large scale to fit the needs of various organisations, is full of potential dangers. They result from an engineering of ‘organisational behaviours’. This engineering is characterised by a far-going reduction in recognising deeper meanings and levels of communication. They are no longer seen as causative **values**, but as **instruments and objects**. This changes the motives behind the transfer and learning of relevant cultural contents, not as heritage, but as objectified resources. The understanding and transfer of values no longer serves to build identity, but becomes just an element of simple identification; it is not a component part of experience. The perspective of observing and understanding the heritage of each culture becomes narrowed down, and the horizon of their complementation and multicultural configuration is lost.

To the modern man every culture becomes an accessible value and thus the results of this complementation are absolutely vital. The cultures become closer to each other in space and, as has been discussed above, it is far easier for them to interact, as well as to move between them. This means that every culture is included as part of the accessible wealth and becomes an element of the legacy of all human beings. Ecology considers climate to be a single integrated system with a common value to all who participate in it and we should aim to consider the arsenal of different cultures in much the same way. They are the human legacy, the environment of man in at various points of his life and development.

Owing to the modern ways of communication and the virtualisation of the cultural space, the distances between cultures become very relative, the access to their content far easier, and the superimposition of one upon the other a much more commonly observed practice. Our awareness of how important human legacy is translates into the effort to comprehend and know it in an informed fashion. There are many values that improve the human condition and we can find them in many cultures that were heretofore unknown to us. We have no way of knowing how exactly the civilisation of the future will develop and how this process will shape man. In several dozens of years, still within the span of a lifetime of one person, we will claim not only the Moon, but also Mars, creating many interplanetary stations. The question about culture will always return to common roots and will treat each and every of its manifestations as a form of a collective human value. Similarly on Earth, one of the most basic social competences of a person capable of development and work in many places and organisations of the world will be to communicate and coexist culturally.

The **intercultural space** will become a fact of everyday life and the ability to use it will be a key competence of every worker, citizen, student and pupil. This is something for which educational programme will strive. The space itself, even today, is recognised as being defined not by the physical parameters of the distances between specific objects, but as a **resource of the ways of existence**, together with all the **variants of transition** from one manner of being into the other and all the accompanying transformations. In the intercultural space, understood as a variant of space *per se*, it is the interactions with others, what happens during that process, and what determines new possibilities and new modes of coming into existence that is more important than just existing within the boundaries set by the canons of a specific culture. What matters in the intercultural space is therefore the ability and ways in which to enter the varied forms of existence and what can be developed from these interactions and changed into innovative, often creative states of a new kind of culture. Interacting is therefore a key component in the social dimension of culture. All this takes place within a process that is of particular interest to analyses taken up by intercultural studies, which focus on the dynamics of mutual interaction, learning, modifying, designing and discarding, but also convergence and conscious choice. This is why intercultural studies, which are aided by the new understanding of intercultural space as based in the dynamics of interaction and change, transitions between levels and forms of existence, will depart so significantly from today's standards of its practice. The most spectacular type of the new form of existence in the cultural and intercultural space at the same time – an integrated type of reality – is, naturally, the virtual space which needs to be discussed separately and in much more detail. It is between this space and the 'real' reality that more and more channels of transition, synergy and completely new, surprising forms of culture, dialogue and man are formed.

THE THIRD PREMISE

The attitude towards 'the other' as a reflection of the attitude towards 'us'

In cultural inter-action the reciprocity of interest and engagement must have real, that is cognitive and emotive, grounds to all of its participants. Social psychologists have long known that the reasons for aggressive, xenophobic attitudes in relations between ethnical or environmental groups are often very well concealed. If we do not know and respect ourselves, we do not respect others. The attitude towards others is simply a consequence of the attitude we have towards ourselves. One of the chief Polish sociologists of culture, Antonina Kłoskowska, has called the process in which we acquire all these attitudes: '**culturalisation**'. It is a process that mirrors somewhat the process of socialisation. This is when we learn to enter the cultural and dialogue space within our own culture and in contacts with other cultures as well. If, however, these cultural competences are shaped in a reduced fashion, are limited to acquiring profiled, instrumental roles in the social 'functioning', then this restriction will be transferred to the attitudes towards other cultures.

One of the most crucial components of the process of culturalisation is the introduction of, as the Polish-Australian sociologist Jerzy Smolicz puts it, **core values**,

into the world of values in general. Those core values determine not only the sphere of knowledge, but also experience that is tied to the specific heritage and cultural relations. This type of experience determines both **empathy** and **cultural imagination**, which is so important in relations with other cultures and, following that, in any intercultural dialogue and the building of bridges. It is through analogy, empathy and transposition, that the open experience and ideas of other people, their collective and cultural world of values and relations are formed.

All these considerations lead us to a somewhat paradoxical conclusion that it is the quality of education *within* a given culture that determines the quality of education and actual relations *between* cultures through primary comparisons, points of reference and ideas. Many of the most basic of experiences and social attitudes are sufficiently universal in character to become the basis for an informed examination of the experiences of other people. Such transculturation has the advantage of cultural transgressions, that is crossing the boundaries of who we are and what is contained in our experience. This principle goes against the commonly-held belief that patriotism in the education of youth is not only not modern enough, but actually dysfunctional in the global community of transitions and that it does not allow for a successful intercultural communication. If we do not mistake jingoism and nationalism with patriotism, it is quite to the contrary.

THE FOURTH PREMISE

Culture as the conscience of civilisation

It was Alfred Weber, and the Polish sociologist Stanisław Ossowski after him, who distinguished culture from civilisation. Both of them pointed to the significant differences between the symbolic worlds, which are full of values and meanings, and the worlds of technical and organisational actions that are essentially utilitarian. It is difficult to describe the former through any quantifiable factors and measurable parameters of 'progress'. We can speak of progress only when things can actually be measured or counted in some fashion, and thus compared, that is to say in the spheres of engineering and technology, in all activities that are instrumental in nature, that have their own praxeology and economics, and whose effectiveness is verifiable. This is what constitutes civilisation. Its contemporary development very often pushes culture into the margins, because a priority is being placed on measurable, material and instrumental values that are integrated into technological and economic necessities, which are of an increasingly universal and global nature. Culture, which is a sphere of experiences, interpretations and meanings that are often highly arbitrary, frequently turns out to be dysfunctional with regard to the fulfilment of those necessities (or what they are considered to be). In this fashion, the sphere of civilisation often standardises many types of behaviours, and sometimes even entire configurations of those behaviours, patterns of action and perception, hierarchies of values and the symbolic expression thereof.

At the same time, the processes of global migrations highlight the opposite consequences of mobility, that is the discovery of the immense variability of those process-

es, which becomes something of a hallmark of transnational organisational systems. **Cultural diversification** is an unexpected, but at the same time highly logical consequence of globalisation. In an indirect fashion, it forces us to acknowledge and even respect it, especially in those places, where there is a particular need for interaction, cooperation, and consequently, communication. This is where the pressing need for intercultural dialogue emerges, a need for a broader outlook on one's own characteristic features and conditioning, on learning, exchange, creativity and innovation. All this, however, is not possible without one primary and necessary condition: to sensitize oneself and respect the dignity of others, even in situations when we do not fully understand their values or goals. In practice, there are many variants of this attitude, and in their collective dimension they create the **culture of dialogue**, and make culture itself the conscience of civilisation.

There are many spheres of life in which we should strive for the development of the culture of dialogue on both small and large scale. One such sphere is a relatively new discipline of social and cultural skills called **intercultural management**. It is a sphere where pragmatic and humanistic values meet, and those values are characterised by the way in which they respect the dignity and uniqueness of human personality. This is a very good example of how the sphere of culture is not only given its due attention, but is also treated as an irremovable aspect of civilisation. It can have both a very motivating, and a very destructive influence. Consequently, civilisation must make sure to not go too far in reducing what is one of its most basic 'resources', and at the same time a completely indispensable sphere of existential awareness in any human culture, concerned both with man as an individual and with his collective experience. A personified culture that is accumulated in the symbolic heritage of each community is something that threads through every type of human activity.

While the terms and notions discussed above may be quite ambiguous, they do refer to real threats to what the British sociologist Anthony Giddens called the **ontological safety** of man in the civilisation of late, or advanced modernity. No matter how differently those notions engage human motivations and how differently they 'manage' them, no matter to which experiences they relate or how they are integrated into the pragmatics of concrete solutions, they always return to them eventually. They constitute the meaning of human activity and search for the confirmation of their power and influence. The discovery of this 'existential wheel' of each and every civilisation is possible through the sharing of images and knowledge about its particular incarnations, about its manifestations in the world of modern organisations, in the meanders of market economy, cultural barriers to development and the implementation of the newest technologies.

THE FIFTH PREMISE

The great importance of small homelands

The paradoxical result of the globalisation processes brought into focus the phenomena and consciously undertaken activities that were a peculiar reaction to the dangerous consequences of unification. Among them is the ever-stronger process of

the **re-territorialisation of cultures**. As a result of migration, those cultures have lost their territorial roots and are attempting to reconstruct them. The discovery of what was once an obvious characteristics of a local positioning of cultures restores the meaning of local heritage of the particular traditions of 'small homelands'. What follows from this process is a very significant qualitative change in the perception of cultural heritage not as a closed, but an open value. Small homelands are finding themselves in relevant positions in the new configurations of cultural contents, in the chaos of constant movements, functional reductions and commercial utilitarianism. They are not culturally isolated and belonging to them does not clash with other types of affiliation, communication and self-realisation of its members. The civilisation of transmissions and mobility, which is just now entering into subsequent phases of its increasingly dynamic and speedy development, can be said to be largely responsible for this state of affairs. The global system of inter-actions is no longer made up of large national cultures and transnational organisations, but also the legacies of local cultures, which 'offer' particular values that are very close to the experiences of the integral human personality integrated into the holistically experienced environment. This is a large-scale process of learning and re-evaluation of the local levels of communication, disintegrated bonds and communities, sharing of the heritage in local and universal perspective by expanding its sphere. This is a 'polyphonic' type of community that has a wide range of recognisable values and is ready to articulate and transfer very varied types of sensitivities.

The need for expanding on the social values of modern nationalities so that they include local cultures creates many new issues that show the need to build new 'bridges', create new abilities of intercultural dialogue. The sphere of dialogue not only becomes larger, but it is also more dense. Dialogue itself becomes at the same time more demanding, but also richer, with multiple threads; it is more real, engaging and creative.

THE SIXTH PREMISE

Intercultural dialogue in the Web community

Communication requires education. Intercultural competences, which also comprise communicative competences, are becoming intertwined with each other like never before. Interaction, communication and education are notions that interlock, and domains that reflect upon one another. Interaction and communication have already become intercultural, but unfortunately education still lags behind, and even though the understanding and achievements of many academic and school institutions is very impressive, they are but the pioneers of these very important activities. Media education may yet become crucial in stimulating these activities, as it initiates into the mysteries of participating in the civilisation of transmissions. Unfortunately, this cannot be achieved solely by concentrating on teaching how to use the modern media resources. Intercultural education requires something much more and that is discussed in the first chapter of this volume. Without it, learning how to be open to the legacy of other cultures is simply not possible. It is worth noticing, however,

that it is the **information culture** in developing media communities that moderates the contemporary world view in a significant way and becomes an important indicator of social inter-actions and the exchange of experiences. Information culture is becoming a strategically relevant component of planning of the future and cooperation on both a local, and global scale. Barriers, and even information wars will constitute a new type of confrontation and manipulation on as yet unknown scale. Information culture will also be shaping the condition of an **open society**, a social infrastructure of becoming open to interaction, the heritage and identity of other cultures, of opening up personalities, but also opening up to conflicting, destructive and dysfunctional elements.

The open society is characterised by three fundamental features which determine many other concomitant features, also those which shape communication, the level of dialogue and intercultural communication:

Firstly, it is a society of **participation**. This includes participation within its structures, resources, processes and changes. The conditions, principles and scale of this participation determine the level of what we wish to call 'openness'. It is this participation that becomes an ulterior value, the postulate and the goal of the vision of individual and collective development.

Secondly, the open society engages in a large number and scope of the already mentioned **transgressions**, which can be cultural, cognitive and spatial. This becomes possible in the age of information and communications technologies and creates necessary conditions for cultural transmissions, reconfigurations and dynamisms of learning.

Thirdly, the open society is characterised by the expansion and utilisation of varied media techniques that are incorporated into very versatile and comprehensive communicative, transformational and modernisation processes. This can be clearly seen in the intensive work aimed at expanding various 'networks', links, and their institutional and legal foundations and the issues concerning jurisdiction.

Despite these features, the open society easily generates its anti-features, or anti-values. They can become a real threat to learning, development and the sharing of cultural heritage, and as a consequences they may result in the closing of the society. These anti-values are:

Exclusion from the web, which for many individuals and groups is a real condition that is caused by the limited access to active participation in information and communications technologies, which means that they can no longer participate in the sphere of social life, communicative processes and the consciously-recognised heritage.

Being enclosed within the web, which usually means an excessive and problematic use (or even abuse) of the networks that may be seen as a form of addiction. It is also a form of alienation and it limits the cultural and life environments of a person. The world of culture and social interactions in which one participates, becomes directly defined through the agency of the media which has its own boundaries and criteria for development. It is a situation in which a serious limitation is imposed, although the millions of people who are enclosed within the virtual space of the

'web' do not fully realise it. It is difficult to diagnose that someone has been enclosed within the 'web' mostly because many people do not recognise that they have lost the possibility of a versatile participation in real life outside of the virtual reality.

Objectification, which means that participation, 'the web', information, knowledge and communicative competences will be treated in a fashion informed by the escalation of consumerism as the functional basis in the environment of market economy. All this opens up, or in other words creates, the potential for development, change and advancement, but may be easily turned into its opposite under the influence of processes that are completely controlled, instrumental and particular.

The new possibilities of shaping intercultural dialogue by using new tools and educational strategies may integrate the various forms of cultural inter-actions, by expanding the ways in which they can be known and their heritage used in the conditions of the civilisation of the Web.

The above-mentioned premises, which are inspired by the three fundamental values of the proposed model of cultural studies, that is: man – dialogue – development, determine the way in which they should be understood, but at the same time they show a general methodology of various research and educational projects and conferences that are based on them. It does not mean that one needs to be constrained by a fixed framework, because the academic space, just as the intercultural space, needs to possess variants that will allow for a migration from one perspective to the other, which approach takes into consideration the various ways in which cultural reality can exist. This makes cultural studies (and that includes intercultural studies as well) a specific sort of academic 'hyperspace' that is characterised by the high levels of integration and synthesis, which allows us to recognise the particular functions of their many variants. At the same time, it does not mean that they cannot have their own, consciously chosen identity. This is a choice that characterises the premises of the Jagiellonian Cultural Studies, described above.

* * *

The first volume of this journal is devoted to the subject of **mobility of cultures**, which is directly relevant to the importance of intercultural space. For many centuries, but particularly now, in the times of the "media civilisation," it has been a phenomenon that forced us to take up a new angle in discussing many fundamental issues surrounding man and the fundamental categories of analysis which are necessary for the understanding of his current reality. This particular dematerialisation of culture that is taking place in the virtual space, makes us question the ways in which culture can exist, but also the ways in which it interacts and mingles, and look for a new meaning of old dilemmas. It inspires us to ask about the meaning of the communication processes, dialogue, cooperation, but also conflict, and pathology in a world that has expanded violently, but bouncing back against its own boundaries, it has returned to man and started penetrating his changed personality and the microworlds.

The subject of cultural mobility was the prime focus of discussion during the meeting of the session on cultural mobility at the 15th Sociological Convention which took place in September 2010 in Kraków. This session saw a discussion between the representatives of academic circles from Poland, Denmark, the Ukraine and the Czech Republic, all of whom take an interest in the subject of the condition of man and culture in the conditions of growing deterritorialisation, the increasing importance of communicative and intercultural competences, dialogue, and the negative and positive consequences of blurring the boundaries and ethnical, environmental and group identities. The concerns with man, dialogue and cultural development – the basic axioms of the Jagiellonian Cultural Studies – became a natural context for the debate whose aim was to point out the challenges that will be faced not only in the process of mobility of cultures, but also by the social sciences (and cultural studies in particular), as one of the most integrating and holistic analyses of modernity.

Leszek Korporowicz