

**Tadeusz PALECZNY**

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

## THE IDENTITY OF CULTURAL TRANSFER

**ABSTRACT** The author of the article discusses the problems of identity of cultural transfer and the division into “world-systems,” taking into consideration several issues, such as: cultural universalization, resulting from the phenomena of acculturation, transgression and pluralism; new types of identity of the globalized societies, that are based on transmissions via television and the Internet as well as on the universal access to the mass audience; types of intercultural identity of transfer (generally divided by the author into monovalent, bivalent and pluralist); the consequences of globalization transformations, such as the sense of being deprived of one’s roots, removal from the home cultural group, relocation, deterritorialization, and increased mobility.

The phenomena of globalization are the most important determinants of the contemporary phase of social life. These phenomena include a complex set of factors and components determining the transformation of the cultural identity of the participants. The cultural changes involve all: those who migrate for work, tourists, commercial TV audiences, as well as Internet users, “surfing” in the virtual space, which is gradually evolving into a more universal, multi-purpose and multi-cultural entity. Participation in social life, especially that which belongs to the realm of cultural activity, is increasingly determined by the availability to the recipient of the content of the message, transmitted continuously by various broadcasters, including those of different ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds. Culture is being transformed into a spectacle with a network structure, in which such categories as mass-audience, audience ratings, accessibility, attractiveness, and popularity are given primary focus. The space “occupied” and dominated by mass media becomes universal. It is an intercultural and multicultural space, composed of the elements that are local (in terms of

both space and time). It is transgressive, populated by active creators as well as passive recipients of the spectacle, the broadcast. In this space the cultural patterns, fashion trends, values, norms and needs are created at an ever-increasing pace, becoming the components incorporated into new types of identity of the participants, creators, and consumers. It is an interactive space, the area of cultural transfer, of complex, temporary, “transformative,” and “liquid” types of identity of the participants. The area of multicultural, universal, globalized world of popular culture naturally gives rise to a new type of “transient,” “liaison,” “transfer” identity, which has two or more groups of reference. This type of identity is characteristic of travellers, migrants, tourists, but also the recipients of the media, television and the Internet. The identity of cultural transfer is a response to the requirements of the postmodern culture. It imposes new forms of participation, but at the same time enables and facilitates intercultural communication, and contributes to new forms of pluralism.

The identity of cultural transfer is the consciousness of the participant who is not located at the end point, but on the way to it – along a road that can lead nowhere in particular. It is the awareness of participation in the processes of transformation, an identity “in motion,” somewhere “between” the source culture and target culture: it is in the process of being designed, created. By wondering whether a Tatra Goral can become an American, or a Silesian a European of German national identity, we draw the scope of the analysis of the identity of transfer similarly to a situation where we try to determine why the Romani do not undergo Germanization or Polonization although they participate in different cultural spaces, including European, Western and global cultural space. The identity of transfer characterizes not only the people on the territorial fringes of cultures, members of cultural minorities, indigenous peoples, residents of cultural reservations, ethnic enclaves, and multinational academic or tourist enclaves,<sup>1</sup> but also active Internet users, who are “at the crossroads” of different cultures.

The identity of cultural transfer involves the phenomena of transgression, individualization, subjectivization, universalization, democratization, and mediatization of the participants’ identities. It is an integral component and a product of globalization, especially in terms of technological development in the field of interpersonal and intercultural communication. The identity of transfer is a response to the changing requirements of postmodern culture, a tactic that allows full functioning in the multicultural social environment, full of alternatives, choices, and changing interactions. It is, as reality itself, fluid, variable, volatile, sensitive and responsive to change, open to the diversity and plurality of cultures. It is the identity of a human being in motion who is located in a world of motion. Such identity is complex, amorphous and polymorphous; it includes various synthetic, syncretic, and hybrid forms. One can never know where it will take its “host” who hurries along the trails of multiculturalism.

---

<sup>1</sup> D. MacCannell, *Turysta. Nowa teoria klasy próżniaczej* [The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class], transl. by E. Klekot, A. Wiczorkiewicz, Warszawa 2002.

Identity is not something given; it is the process of building an image of the world in the consciousness of the individual, a way to adapt to reality that is constantly under construction. According to anthropologists, “identity is now becoming an arduous effort towards self-determination, a life’s task for people-in-motion in a world-in-motion. The world seems, indeed, a more and more unified place and a common domain of all people, but those inhabiting it experience an uncomfortable sense of having no anchor and drifting in the open sea, equally far from the bottom (their roots) and from the shore – a new opportunities.”<sup>2</sup>

The identity of transfer is neither superficial nor deep. This allows its carrier to explore both the phenomena on the surface and in the depths of the substance in which it is immersed. It is a global, immeasurable space of popular culture, mass, universal, available in every place and time for everyone who has access to the Internet, is a user and participant in the channels of mass communication and exchange.

The identity of transfer is a “wandering” identity, characteristic of a man of the road, a traveller, pilgrim, migrant, tourist, nomad of modern airports, *a hacker* and author, an intellectual and a visiting professor, a student participating in international exchange, a middle- or high-school student learning foreign languages. The identity of transfer is the identity of a person involved in intercultural exchange. It is the attribute of a person moving not through space, but through a world of meanings, symbols, values, and their media. As the anthropologists quoted say: “Without a doubt we live in a time of great migration of items that are bought and sold, thrown away by some and picked up by others, exchanged and stolen, abandoned and found. The vast network of bazaars, fairs, markets, and flea markets was joined by the largest marketplace in the history of the exchange – the Internet... Objects live their own nomadic life, less and less frequently providing a sense of permanent attachment or identity. Our everyday ‘accessories’ therefore do not need to tell any simple story, crossing borders is no longer marked with a collection of stamps.”<sup>3</sup>

The identity of transfer leads primarily to crossing the boundaries of one’s own affiliation, to becoming open to other cultures and their carriers. However, it often leads to “nowhere;” it locks a person in a semantic trap, a cultural reservation, in a space not belonging to any community or group. Sometimes, when the existing social and cultural order is shaken, “deconstructed” as a result of globalization, people uprooted from the traditional, well-known cultural area set out on a “journey” in search of a new identity, towards a new “project.” This is a somewhat aimless journey, a journey “to nowhere.”<sup>4</sup> Dispossessed people, deprived of the previous sense of identification with the motherland, which ceases to exist, accept as the dominant one the loyalty to the old hierarchy of values, or become the “neophytes” of the new or-

<sup>2</sup> W.J. Burszta, W. Kuligowski, *Sequel. Dalsze przygody kultury w globalnym świecie* [Sequel. New Adventures of Culture in the Global Village], Warszawa 2005, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> J. Zubrzycki, ‘Żołnierze i chłopci. Socjologia emigracji polskiej’ [Soldiers and Peasants. Sociology of Polish Emigrants], *Przegląd Polonijny*, Vol. 4 (1989), p. 8.

der. In extreme cases, they end up in constant “exile,” with no clear affiliation to the ideological homeland – with a state of mind peculiar to dispossessed individuals and cosmopolitans. Spatial transfer, migration, travelling through the ‘wilderness’ of contemporary culture is in such cases the means to liberating oneself from ideological or moral commitments to a particular ethno-national or citizen community. This leads to the release, breaking free of a person’s identity from the narrow borders of different ideologisms: nationalism, socialism, patriotism, etc., allowing an individual who is conscious of their own self-questioning to permanently abandon their position in the social system and start moving from place to place.

In such cases, there may appear different types of transition identity that is “occasional,” accidental, or just for show. On the one hand, the pressure of the social system, the structural requirements of the role of, for instance, an actor, artist, politician, intellectual, reporter, journalist, lawyer, doctor, but also an economic migrant, member of the anti-globalization movement, trade union activist and student, can lead to putting on various “masks” on the indigenous identity. On the other hand, there is a tendency in contemporary culture to protect the original, authentic sphere of individual personality. Identity is the key to the conflicting requirements of “our postmodern modernity.”

Identity is increasingly becoming a sort of “equipment” and “software” for a man involved in the processes of globalization, and subjected to the influences of cultural universality. The inclusion into the universal network of meanings, symbols, and values, consists in the constant “reinstalling” and updating of one’s own cultural software that allows communication with other network users. We become “compatible” with other participants in mass culture, made universal thanks to the exchange of information and communications, but also meanings, contexts and senses. Identity is based on the constant updating of data and introducing new mechanisms to adapt to the changing requirements of society. We are like a computer hard drive where the original, basic operating system (the cultural identity of the parent cultural group – usually homogeneous and monocentric) has been installed. Social and cultural environments are becoming more heterogeneous, consisting of different components, in which values, symbols, and artefacts of many groups are mixed according to the concept of the “cultural supermarket.”

The identity of transfer inevitably accompanies all those who cross the borders of their own cultures and communities, not only in the spatial sense, but also in the symbolic one. The identity of cultural transfer is the process of updating, and sometimes reinstalling the culture software. The identity of this kind of co-occurs with many phenomena and processes, such as multiculturalism and pluralism, transgression and transculturalism, hybridism and syncretism, assimilation and acculturation, and universalization of culture. It is Castells’ category of “project identity,” the identity of becoming and exchange, created in the process of globalization during the clash of different axiomatic systems both in private and public space, in direct interactions between people as well as in virtual networking, multimedia, indirect communication and transfer. The identity of transfer is a “project identity,” created,

replayed, and updated – adapting individuals and groups taken from their existing social and cultural positions into the new, pluralized mixture that the globalized space has become. This third type of identity, “‘project identity’, occurs when social actors build a new identity that redefines their position in society on the basis of cultural materials available to them, and in so doing, they strive to transform the entire social structure.”<sup>5</sup>

The identity of cultural transfer is a continuous project – a construction process of a new identity, leading to the emergence of liaison identities, cross-cultural identities, complex and mixed identities. These include the identities of a nationalized or universalized, globalized member of an ethnic group – e.g. a Germanized Silesian or a Polonized Kashubian, a bivalent traditionalist or pluralist, a binational Latin American (the *Chicanos* type), as well as an integrated or non-integrated pluralist, e.g. an African-American.

### IDENTITY OF EXCHANGE OR IDENTITY FOR SALE?

Although identity cannot be bought or sold, the phenomena and processes that affect the formation and transformation of identity are becoming increasingly commercialized. Society and culture are subordinate to the mechanisms of exchange. Exchange is losing its ‘cultural diffusion’ character and is taking on the characteristics of product distribution. Those products include not only tangible things, but also values and symbols. Culture, like identity, is becoming a phenomenon “for show”: it is momentary, temporary, ad hoc, tailored to consumer needs and market requirements. The function of culture and identity (which stems from culture) that consists in consumption “or show” leads to satiety. Consumerism in some sectors of society is a kind of obligation that is not necessarily associated with pleasure, relaxation, or joy, but with a laborious, unpleasant effort. The film *La Grande Bouffe* (English: *The Grande Bouffe* or *Blow-Out*) shows in a caricatured form the requirements of Western, seemingly sophisticated consumerism, which has much in common with a feast of the members of a savage tribe from prehistoric times, who, after killing a whale, stuff themselves to the point of losing consciousness. The main difference lies in the fact that modern gluttony and excessive consumption are cultural and social behaviours, while the consumer behaviours of our ancestors were physiological and natural.

The cultural identity of a globalized man – the identity of transfer – is sometimes promoted, offered in various forms in television programmes, websites, magazines, advertisements, and offers of the cultural “supermarket,” as a finished product, but also as a standard, a fashion, the leading trend, an imperative. This is the source of, on the one hand, the extreme forms of participation in culture: from tele-maniacs, ardent film buffs, computer nerds, to full-time quiz-show participants, gamblers,

---

<sup>5</sup> M. Castells, *Siła tożsamości* [The Power of Identity], transl. by S. Szymański, Warszawa 2009, pp. 23-24.

and total viewers, who participate in the real world only via satellite telecommunications network and computers. The product of this era of mass culture and consumerism, bringing together growing audiences (e.g. television viewers), is a specific type of person – one oriented at being entertained.<sup>6</sup>

Cultural universalization, based on the phenomena of acculturation, transgression and pluralism, is the process of multilateral, multiple, ongoing cultural exchange on various levels. Multicultural societies constitute a network for the exchange of information, communications, goods, products of culture, values, norms, and symbols – basically everything that is at the disposal of the cultural groups comprising the network.

Multicultural societies, such as Indian or American societies, can be reproduced as global, hyper-cultural, transcontinental marketplaces where various components of heritage and tradition are exchanged by new arrivals, travellers, colonists, immigrants and tourists who are willing to barter. From the close perspective of individual national stands and regional stalls, that marketplace is in turmoil and chaos. From a broader perspective, however, it is a functional and organized whole, based on very specific principles of order. Best spots and biggest stalls are occupied by the groups whose ‘merchandise’ is the most appealing. Those spots have belonged to them since the inception of this “cultural supermarket.”<sup>7</sup> From the perspective of exchange administrators and participants of exchange, the personalities and behaviours of the “sellers” of cultural heritage become secondary with time. What comes to the fore is the offer itself and the array of ‘cultural goods’ they have for barter. This is the reason why racial and ethnic differences become fuzzy to subsequent generations, while a growing share of participants of the exchange process cease to “specialize” in one “range of goods” and expand their “offer” by drawing on the experiences and achievements of other “sellers” at the marketplace. One of the most important dimensions of the exchange process is the Internet, a network of cross-cultural interpersonal communication, of which the website eBay is becoming a symbol (and permanent component). The basic mechanism and channel of the exchange is the virtual network, where the standard, traditional principles of equivalence based on the parity of money and economic conversion factors are not the only ones that apply. Anything can be subject to exchange – to a varying extent.

Contemporary culture and entertainment are based on the mechanisms of transaction and exchange. Anything can be sold or bought. Participants in culture and recipients of entertainment are divided according to the criteria of the degree of accessibility, measured not only by the level of technological advancement, but also the amount of money. Not only the new social categories of the middle class and single people become important consumers of the culture of entertainment – those in-

---

<sup>6</sup> N. Postman, *Zabawić się na śmierć. Dyskurs publiczny w epoce show-businessu* [Amusing Ourselves to Death. Public Discourse in the age of Show Business], transl. by L. Niedzielski, Warszawa 2006.

<sup>7</sup> G. Mathews, *Supermarket kultury. Kultura globalna a tożsamość jednostki* [Global Culture/Local Identity. Searching for Home in the Cultural Supermarket], transl. by E. Klekot, Warszawa 2005.

creasingly include children, teenagers, and students. “Today, when we move in herds through the vast halls of supermarkets, we keep stumbling over children of both sexes who with flushed cheeks head for the toy department, where they disappear for long minutes, and we have no doubt that children have become a very important part of consumer culture.”<sup>8</sup>

Supermarkets not only serve the function of buying and selling goods – they are also entertainment centres, places where one can spend one’s free time. Family life, too, moves to supermarkets. This phenomenon is made up of multiple components, one of which is the fact that more and more families decide to spend their festive time on Sunday in shopping centres. Community ties are often maintained and solidified through consumption.

### IDENTITY OF “THE SHOW” OR MEDIATIZATION OF IDENTITY?

Culture is becoming more expressive; it is transforming into a text, a narrative, a show. Participation in culture, or identity, like other elements of culture in its “pop” version, becomes a sphere of behaviours, actions, and attitudes “for show” – directed at and calculated for the benefit of the viewer, the recipient, not the other participants. Identity gradually ceases being the attribute of the community, the creation of traditional social bonds, and is transformed into a derivative product of television shows, the multimedia spectacle – often on a global scale. Participation in culture becomes “de-subjectified;” it consists more in observation, reception, consumption of finished products offered on the cultural marketplace, and expression of attitudes and emotions in relation to them. Culture is being transformed into a “product,” delivered to audiences during the prime time, and to a greater and greater extent confined to television, cinema and the Internet.

Identity is inextricably, “for better or for worse,” linked with mass audience – the recipients of communication that is continuously made more and more professional, directed, and addressed to the widest possible audience. Identity, like all postmodern, contemporary popular culture, cannot exist or do without the *mass media*. The necessary equipment of modern man – the participant in and recipient of culture (by and large a consumer) includes nowadays a TV set, a laptop and/or palmtop, an i-pod, an mp3 player – all of them mobile devices undergoing progressive personalization, allowing the bearer to receive the content provided by the broadcasters at any time of day or night, anywhere in the globe. The identity of the modern man cannot exist or be compatible with the other participants of the “network society,” “the world-encompassing system” without mutual identification through the meanings located in the virtual space.<sup>9</sup> The rules of the game in shaping the identity are

<sup>8</sup> W.J. Burszta, W. Kuligowski, *Sequel...*, p. 27.

<sup>9</sup> M. Castells, *Siła tożsamości*; I. Wallerstein *Analiza systemów-światów. Wprowadzenie* [World-systems Analysis. An Introduction], transl. by K. Gawlicz, M. Starnawski, Warszawa 2007.

now determined by the *mass media*, and the scripts and the props-toys, currently referred to as gadgets, are provided by the entertainment industry. The show is based on technology, and culture is based on the show – we come full circle. Today's types of identities cannot exist without the organizers of the show. The *show business* stands for the entire realm of phenomena, not limited solely to the entertainment industry and the sphere of entrepreneurship and marketing. Popular culture is a culture of fun and entertainment. It must have its idols, its heroes – people who entertain us, sometimes even “to death.” “The voracity of the cultural industry, as Theodor Adorno would call popular culture, which in this book we call the meta-culture of novelty, consists also in the fact that the boundary is blurred between the personal life of an idol and the characters they portray/ personae they use on screen, stage, or in music clubs. It is not enough for the audience to have access merely to the official aspect of a celebrity's life – they always want more: to look under an actor's bed, see what he or she is wearing, who they are dating, what their bed and dog, and favourite car look like.”<sup>10</sup>

In the media culture reality becomes fiction – and fiction becomes reality. People are more and more “immersed” in the world of popular culture, in a sea of values and meanings that do not belong to anyone and are not affiliated with any group.

Culture is transferring to the Net, taking with it all the associated identities. Societies are being transformed into network communities, participants of the communication web, which is woven and controlled by “the people of consumption: professionals, actors, singers, comedians, but also politicians, priests, and journalists.”<sup>11</sup>

New types of identity of the globalized societies are based on transmissions via television and the Internet, and on the universal access to the mass audience. An essential component of identity is the “viewability” – that is the knowledge of the principles and content of the show possessed by the mass audience. It governs and enforces the forms of “the show” known from TV. The show is always linked to current events, to what is happening “now,” although not necessarily “here,” in our local world. It's the TV or computer screen that takes us on the journey to the world of the show; it places us in the audience, as viewers, recipients, and consumers. According to Neil Postman, every show has some features of currency, authenticity and reality to it. Even those which, like the famous broadcast of Orson Wells' War of the Worlds, create a world of fiction. The thing is, the show is taking place “here and now”. Each show can gain currency thanks to the immense power of the media. “Television [and, it must be added – especially the Internet – TP] is a speed-of-light medium, a present-centered medium... Everything presented in moving pictures is experienced as happening ‘now’...”<sup>12</sup>

Anything can become a show nowadays: from a volcanic eruption, through the tsunami, to the death and funeral of Princess Diana or Michael Jackson. The stand-

<sup>10</sup> W.J. Burszta, W. Kuligowski, *Sequel...*, p. 24.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>12</sup> N. Postman, *Zabawić się...*, p. 194.



ards of participation and identification in the network are currently determined by television stations and Internet portals, shaping not only the forms of participation, but also the tastes and needs of the mass audiences. As Umberto Eco says, “That is so because it is the masses (I think I can speak of ‘masses’ even though it is not an order of magnitude similar to that of sports and rock masses) attend cultural events, listen (and with rapt attention, at that), speak (and their statements range from a learned and insightful commentary to a scream from the depths of the soul), but behave as if they participated in a collective celebration.”<sup>13</sup>

Pageantry is one of the basic parameters of the universalized identity of cultural transfer. It is the *mass media* that shape contemporary visual arts, and determine the cultural standards of “presence” through access to the network.

“But these are distortions of society, which is called precisely the society of the show. It is not said that the culture as a show, which we have discussed, is the product of the society of the show, it is quite to the contrary: it may be an alternative to such society.”<sup>14</sup>

It is not culture that creates shows today – rather, shows shape cultural phenomena. The participation of the viewer, the “viewability,” and attractiveness to customers constitute the foundation of the show. Entertainment and leisure do not exist today without television or, increasingly, without the Internet. It is no longer enough to “be,” one must “become known” in the media in order to be an attractive “product” – a creation of mass culture. Thus, the numbers of forums, blogs, and web pages multiply exponentially. The purpose they serve is, essentially, is self-promotion and the promotion of personas created by the idols of mass culture.

The identity of transfer is, to a large extent, an identity “for show,” a mask-identity that serves as a label, an ID card, but also as the software enabling people to operate in a present-oriented “network culture,” which has been completely deprived of the past. It is also a contingent identity, in some sense “accidental” and imposed temporarily in the course of intercultural interaction and peregrinations in the physical, but also symbolic, realm of values, meanings, and products – the realm that is an outcome of the daily offer proposed by the *mass media*.

## TYPES OF INTERCULTURAL IDENTITY OF TRANSFER

The identity of transfer type is represented by people who, for various reasons, are at the crossroads of culture, moving physically or virtually between cultural groups, connected with at least two spheres/spaces, representing mixed types of relationships and belonging. This category is filled with a growing number of participants of migrant flows (including tourism): wanderers travelling across virtual intercultural

<sup>13</sup> U. Eco, *Semiologia życia codziennego* [Semiologia quotidiana], transl. by J. Ugniewska, P. Salwa, Warszawa 1998, p. 211.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215.

spaces, participants and users of Internet networks, individuals fleeing from the collective pressures and obligations, computer and video gamers, all of whom are people “trapped” on both spatial and symbolic fringes. I include the following types major, into the identity of cultural transfer category:

A/ *Monovalent pluralist*. This is the type of personality and attitudes of a “liberal,” a member of the dominant cultural group, accepting and tolerant of the cultural diversity of people around him/her. A monovalent pluralist may even enter into marriage with a representative of other ethnic, religious or racial groups, provided that the partner will take on their culture, including language, identity, and religion. A monocentric pluralist is a German, a Frenchman, a Pole, or an American who accepts the existence of members of cultural minorities, but at the same time expects them to be at least bilingual, loyal citizens of the state. People with this type of identity are attached to their own culture, allowing the presence of other cultures in civil society, but on condition that they do not threaten the unique position of the dominant culture. Monovalent pluralists are U.S. citizens declaring solely their *Americanness* and their citizens’ loyalty to the state, and expecting all the “ethnics” to accept the superiority of American culture and civilization as a fact.<sup>15</sup> The same kind of attitudes towards minorities is represented by the French towards the Arab minority, and by the Germans towards Polish or Silesian minorities.

B1/ *Assimilated autochthon*. This category of cultural orientation includes partly assimilated Native Americans, Australian Aborigines, the Inuit of Canada, all the native indigenous people subjected to multigenerational acculturation. Such acculturation was partly forced and partly voluntary. American and Australian indigenous peoples, the so-called *Native people*, saved and preserved in their own tradition of the Australian and American the elements of the native tribal culture. The tribal groups participating in the process of Americanization took over parts of the cultural heritage of the white settlers, abandoning to a greater and greater extent the disappearing tribal traditions. In the long historical process, most people descending from the tribal communities became Americans with complex, syncretic forms of cultural identity, which was hybrid but also universalized. A very similar process applied to the descendants of black slaves from Africa, who in America lost their sense of tribal belonging and identity, taken from them along with their parent languages, religions, and customs. The vast majority of African Americans constitute a highly homogeneous, English-speaking, Christian cultural group, not divided internally by tribal affiliation, but rather by the criteria of membership in class-stratified society.

B2/ *Nationalized ethnic*. The identity type of a Polonized or Germanized Silesian. It is also characteristic of Americanized Poles, Italians, and Irish. Members of ethnic groups of immigrant origin establish types of cultural identity that are specific to the transition process of passing from one cultural identity to the other: from parent identity to the new, American one. The type of ethnic identity, such as a “Polish-American” or an “Irish-Australian” one, is transformed in the third and

<sup>15</sup> E.K. Francis, *Interethnic Relations. An Essay in Sociological Theory*, New York 1976.

fourth generation into a homogeneous type of Australian or American identity. The same pattern was followed when the members of the Slavic, Germanic and Gallic tribal cultures lost, in the process of national homogenization, their regional, ancestral, clan, and ethnic identities.

B3/ *Universalized monist*. A rare type of identity, characterizing a Swede with the dominant identification with Scandinavia, a Spaniard or a Belgian declaring themselves as Europeans. It is a type peculiar also to the syndrome of attitudes that Józef Tischner called *homo sovieticus*. It can also be said that the type universalized monist is represented by an American with a dominant Latin American identity. A universalized monist is usually a resident of large urban agglomerations, an intellectual, a person for whom the present ethnic, cultural, or national boundaries become suffocating. A universalized monist is only slightly different from a universalized pluralist, as they both refer to the same transnational identity. However, a universalized monist dismisses any earlier form of identity and cultural independence (national and pre-national), as merely paving the way for the developed American or European culture. This type identity is still rare, but continues to expand. It is the type of identity of a European or an American who do not identify with any other groups or cultural spaces. In this case there cannot be such thing as an American with French or German origins; it also precludes the identification of a *Polish-American* or *Irish-American* type. It is an assimilationist identity, reducing the concept of "American" or "European" identity to a rather homogeneous identification with the United States or Europe, the civic community, a new form of civilization/ culture, which emerge from a new, multi-ethnic American/ European society. The space of *Americanness*, often difficult to define, is based on the previous stages of the process of culture universalization, referred to as the *White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant*. Americanization processes are to eliminate in this type of identity all the traces of ethnicity, synthesize various cultural influences into a homogeneous canon of attitudes and values, which will lead to the assertion: "I am an American and nothing else."

C1/ *Bivalent traditionalist*. It is a type of partially assimilated member of a pre-national group, such as a tribal or ethnic group undergoing acculturation to a certain degree, discarding the native language and the cultural heritage (including religion), but keeping the traditional customs of the cultural, often family-kin, group. This is the type of identity is represented by members of indigenous groups who have been assimilated to a large extent, and subjected to forced acculturation. 91% of Native Americans do not speak their parent languages and are exclusively English-speaking. A small fraction, no more than 10%, espouse traditional animistic cults, including shamanism. The vast majority of Indians underwent Americanization, i.e. universalized their cultural identity as the result of assimilation effects. A small percentage of them, in spite of an American civic identity, remain culturally "Indian," tribal, declaring as their dominant identification the traditional, indigenous tribal group. A similar type of identity that is not fully universalized, or assimilated, is represented by the Romani in Poland and other European countries. A similar type of identity is common among Silesians, who fix their attitudes on the

three cultural groups: Polish, German, and Silesian. Out of the combination of these three traditions emerge the dominant bivalent identities: Polish-Silesian, Silesian-German and ethnic Silesian with the national orientation gravitating towards Poland or Germany. There are also the extreme types of German or Polish Silesian-centric identity. The regional-ethnic identity is becoming one of the clearest types of mixed identities in Silesia. The Upper Silesian border region cultural identity is only one, although the most conspicuous and uniform, component of the identity of the inhabitants of Upper Silesia and Silesia as a broader cultural region.

C2/ Bivalent pluralist. It is a product of developed, post-colonial, post-immigrant multiethnic societies. This type of identity is relatively common among people of mixed racial and ethnic origin who are embedded in multicultural environments of large urban agglomerations. The bivalent pluralist type can include a Mexican mulatto emigrating to California, or a Brazilian descendant of an Indian woman and an Afro-Brazilian, or a Chinese inhabitant of British (post-British) Hong Kong. Typical for this particular identity is the case of Wong from Hong Kong. Throughout his life he strove to overcome the split of personalities and attitudes that was the result of him operating between the two cultures: Chinese – traditional, indigenous, and local, and British – Western and universal. Gordon Mathews recounts: “Education at the secondary level, which took place entirely in English, meant for him [Wong] – like for almost all Hong Kong students over the past decades – immersion in bicultural reality, or, as he calls it, in schizophrenia – schizophrenia which for most of his young life he regarded as the obvious and natural state of things. At home he felt Chinese, while at school he learned, he says, to write even the love letters in the language of the colonizers. In his youth he ascribed less reality to Europe and America than to China, while the latter was for him not only the place of residence of relatives, but also the country from which stinking corpses of refugees came to Hong Kong waters. China was an alien, bizarre, frightening place. The world that seemed so obvious to young Wong consisted of not one but two cultural homelands, although none of them seemed to him a true homeland. Out of this state of schizophrenia that consisted in having two cultural homelands (which, admittedly, did not match each other particularly well) – a state that, in fact, amounted to a lack of homeland – emerged a new cultural homeland. When Mr. Wong’s generation reached adulthood, an independent Hong Kong identity had already developed that had been unknown to his parents, who saw themselves simply as Chinese people living in Hong Kong. This new identity is referred to by Mr Wong as a practical, pragmatic, eclectic one, with no claims to being the absolute truth.”<sup>16</sup>

In a word, the new pluralistic identity of Mr Wong’s younger generation is a peculiar variant of biculturalism. The new identity of the people of Hong Kong emerged after the return of this island not due to political or economic reasons, but as a consequence of a centuries-long process of attrition, mixing and combining the constituent elements of different cultures. As Gordon Mathews further states: “The new

---

<sup>16</sup> G. Mathews, *Supermarket kultury...*, pp. 193-194.

identity was born also from the cosmopolitan nature of the island: that which is on the periphery of two cultures is necessarily bicultural, and has an eclectic ability to create using the elements of each of them.<sup>17</sup>

The Hong Kong identity is the third, synthetic, component of the bivalent identity of Mr Wong. It may prove to be something temporary, transient, because after the reunification with China the inhabitants of Hong Kong, including Mr Wong, are subjected to a new wave of Sinicization. This happens with the use of television and the Internet, in the new, postmodern space of the multimedia civilization. The question is whether Hong Kong residents will remain double pluralists or will they become a people with a monovalent, universalized Chinese identity, or will they transform into pluralists (not necessarily integrated), is a question about the future of intergroup and intercultural relations in this area of the world.

D/ Pluralist. A type of complex Identity: more than bicultural, racially, ethnically, religiously, and linguistically mixed, diverse in virtually every aspect. The pluralist identity type essentially occurs in pluralistic multi-ethnic societies of colonial and migration origins, such as the United States, Canada, Brazil, and Australia. It also appears frequently in the UK, Switzerland and other countries of Western Europe. Mixing and blending in the personality and attitudes of individuals of elements of more than two cultures most often takes the form of a triple-cultural orientation. Splitting and combining in an individual's consciousness of more than three cultures is a very rare phenomenon for several reasons. Firstly, a person with triple heritage (and above) makes contact with culture through the living family members: grandparents and parents, taking the elements of their traditions, including language, religion and customs directly from them. Secondly, the type of multiple identity requires the necessary intellectual and spiritual predispositions of an individual, not only in the sense of accepting their multicultural heritage, but also in the sense of their capacity for embracing and synthesizing it. Most people with a polyvalent personality type live in Brazil, Hawaii, and the Caribbean, but they are also represented in New York, London and Los Angeles.

D1/ Non-integrated pluralist. People with this type of identity experiencing inner conflict and conflicting attitudes. They cannot clearly define themselves culturally, or combine into an integrated personality the legacies of more than two cultures. It is usually a temporary situation, accompanying the process of acculturation, but can lead to mental deviations, marginalization and alienation. The life story of an emigrant who in Theodor Zeldin's book is known by the name of Sue would seem most unusual to a person with a single and distinct ethnic identity. She was born in the north of England. "That is where she comes from. But she feels at home also in the southern part of Italy and is unhappy when the locals treat her like a foreigner. That is where her husband comes from... At the university she changed her major from English to French when she was hugely impressed by a charismatic leftist teacher who gave *sermons* on existentialism, the cultures of the Third World

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 194.

and organizing everything into specific systems of thought. She became known for her participation in political protests. But the time spent in Paris in 1967-1968 made her realize that it was not easy to break into the French-loving community. And Sue already spoke French so perfectly that no-one could guess that she was not French... She felt rejected by France... Though she did not know any Italians, she went to Italy. It turned out to be the foreign country that suited her tastes... Here is Sue, who knows three foreign languages perfectly, yet does not feel a European to such an extent that she says she does not like to keep international company. All her friends are foreigners, her wedding guests represented seven nationalities, and still she says she feels disgust towards expatriation... Sue is split in two. On one hand, she invariably tries to understand and deeply penetrate the alien psyche, on the other – she is reluctant to socialize, finds herself incapable of enjoying a certain type of company or among certain types of people. She is suspended somewhere between tolerance and alienation... If such a subtle person finds it so difficult to be a European – or even an inhabitant of just one country or city – then what new type of passport should be created for her?”<sup>18</sup>

D2/ *Integrated pluralist*. An integrated pluralist can be an American or a Brazilian who are aware of their multicultural heritage. In the complex, multiple origins of individuals and groups the influences of many different cultural traditions are mixed together in the past and present: white, black and Asian; Native American tribal roots, the Protestant heritage; Polish, Irish, or Hawaiian elements and *Americanness*; Scandinavian or European elements and those of Latin America. In the American cultural “matrix” of many possible combinations of cultural identity, in an ocean of multi-ethnic, racially and religiously complex population, emerge, in addition to many types of monocentricity and bivalence, the dominant forms of pluralistic identities, among which the type of an American (or Brazilian, or Canadian) with the dominance of pluralistic attitudes takes one of the most important places. Integrated pluralists generally identify themselves as American (African-American, Latin American) with multicultural backgrounds. They are characterized by their attitudes of tolerance toward others, accepting others’ differences, and having a positive attitude to cultural diversity. An integrated pluralist is not the product of homogeneous nation-forming processes, but the heterogeneous processes of cultural universality in the conditions of globalization. Generally speaking, this type of identity is promoted in post-national societies by the ongoing processes of Americanization, Westernization, Europeanization, and Latin-Americanization.

D3/ *Universalized pluralist*. An appropriate conceptual equivalent for this type of behaviours, attitudes, and cultural identity is the term “cosmopolitanism.” People equipped with this sort of cultural orientation perceive themselves as citizens of the world and do not identify with any particular, real cultural group. They see themselves in a complex ethno-racial context as not belonging to any group.

<sup>18</sup> T. Zeldin, *Intymna historia ludzkości* [An Intimate History of Humanity], transl. by B. Stokłosa, Warszawa 1998, pp. 282-287.

A good example of the universalized pluralist identity type is the life and psychological development of a woman named Maya, born to an American-Japanese couple. This is a brief outline of the story of the formation of a new type of identity:

“She graduated from a school for girls in Tokyo... Before she turned fifteen she ‘learned to be Japanese’. But not quite. He could be unruly at times, and then her schoolmates would avoid her and call her American. So she went to the United States to learn about the civilization of her father’s country and study music, regardless of its country of origin... When living in Taiwan for two years, she fell in love with an Englishman... In London she realized that the citizens of the world are not necessarily welcome there... Recently, Maya chose Paris as her place of residence. There, ‘whatever she does is right. In France, anything goes’. Of course, this is because she is not trying to be a Frenchwoman. ‘I like to treat myself as a Gypsy... I feel that I’m cast in a different mould. I cannot decide what determines my identity – being Japanese or American. Is the sum of them both that makes a complex whole.’... At first, Maya also believed that she had more Japanese than American qualities because she got to know the life in Japan first. But later on she came to the conclusion that she could no longer live there, because ‘a part of her would have to die. In Japan, I’m too tall and too open. I feel isolated. And the houses are too small’. But maybe for her, all countries would seem too small... She would very much like to reach the Middle East and embrace a new region of the world as her homeland.”<sup>19</sup> A pluralist universalist identity is a specific state of mind: a way of life, a method of existence and operation as well as shaping of the identity. The carrier of this identity is not able to define themselves within the traditional categories of nationality; it would be difficult to assign to them any sort of nationalism or ethnic identity. They are equipped with a new kind of identity, different from the previous types, and resulting directly from their status as emigrants and citizens of the world. Being multilingual and having mixed ethnic backgrounds enables them to share the identities of more than one national culture.

Maya does not belong to a particularly unique or rare category of people living in the world today. She represents this type of universal pluralism which is present in the increasingly international, multicultural urban environments – the great cities like New York, Paris, London, Monaco, Singapore, or Santiago de Chile.

## **PITFALLS OF THE IDENTITY OF TRANSFER**

The identity of cultural transfer accompanies the transformations, upgrades, and conversions of societies undergoing globalization processes. In addition to the positive protective functions, allowing for adaptation to the new conditions of social life in times of technological revolution, deterritorialization and universalization, the postmodern identity – the identity of cultural transfer, brings with it many nega-

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., pp. 54-57.

tive effects. It is the identity of a person that is mobile, permanently “in transit,” universalized, uprooted, torn away from their cultural heritage. It accompanies the phenomena of dispossession, social disorganization, exclusion, marginalization, and alienation. According to Zygmunt Bauman, “an inherent part of the process of globalization is progressive spatial segregation, separation and exclusion. The creation of neo-tribal communities and the fundamentalist tendencies, being the reflection and expression of the experience of globalization, are outcomes of it just as the notorious ‘hybridization’ of culture sitting at its globalized tip.”<sup>20</sup>

Among the many consequences of the globalization and universalization of identity, resulting from the disintegration of the existing community relations, the crisis of nation-state institutions, the movement of individuals and groups in the geographic and symbolic space, there are phenomena such as the sense of being deprived of one’s roots, removal from the home cultural group, relocation, deterritorialization, and increased mobility. The consequences of globalization transformations include universalized enclaves of cultural exclusivism, separated from the community environment, in the forms of security-guarded, closed, isolated ghettos of the rich, in which the culture of fear is born. According to Zygmunt Bauman, “Bridging the temporal and spatial distances through technology did not consolidate the human condition, but rather polarized it. This is because it frees selected individuals from territorial bonds and gives some community-constituting factors an extraterritorial meaning, but in itself it is deprived of the relevance of territory within which people still lead their lives – and as such it is devoid of potential for the determination of human identity... When ‘distances do not mean anything anymore’, the places that used to be separated by those distances lose their meaning, too. Although such a state spells freedom to create new meanings for some, for others it is the harbinger of being pushed into ‘meaninglessness’. Some may now, regardless of their location, move out, while others can only watch as the local reality which they have inhabited until that point disappears from under their feet.”<sup>21</sup>

The experience of the “world” – i.e. reality, which is accompanied by the interpretation at the level of identity, is currently a process that is much more complex and extensive than it used to be in the days when people of oral or literate traditions lived in closed social circles. According to Anthony Giddens, in the late modernity we live “in the world” in a very different sense than in the past epochs. Everyone still lives somewhere, and the limitations of the body always force human beings to be located somewhere in space and time. However, the transformation of the category of place and the displacement of operations and their distant contexts as well as the role of mediated experience all radically change the meaning of what “the world” is.

---

<sup>20</sup> Z. Bauman, *Globalizacja. I co z tego dla ludzi wynika* [Globalization. The Human Consequences], transl. by E. Klekot, Warsaw 2000, p. 7.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.



This is the case both at the level of the “world experienced” by an individual, and at the level of the general environment of social action, where collective social life takes place. Although all of us live in local communities, the worlds experienced by most of us are really global.<sup>22</sup>

Individuals participating in the social life, therefore, experience and adapt in their consciousness the two worlds, two kinds of reality: their own and other people's, direct and indirect, spatially close and distant, “the here” and “the faraway,” local and global, communal, based on personal interactions and received through the use of television or the Internet. The two realities constitute the dimensions of the same, Giddensian “world” that we experience and live in. Expanding through globalization processes of the boundaries of perception and participation in the world entails various dilemmas, tensions and pitfalls awaiting unwary individuals and cultural groups. It also gives rise to a variety of adaptive responses and readaptation strategies.

Closing off of cultural environments that accompanies the disintegration of communities, takes place on the two extremes of the social scale: among the poorest and the richest beneficiaries of globalization. The phenomena of “rootlessness,” “dropping out,” remaining outside of globalization – on the margins of society defined by such notions as urbanization, electricity, computerization, communication infrastructure, are no longer characteristic of single traditional cultures, but entire continents – especially Africa. On one extreme of the globalization process there are the communities struggling against uprooting, being cut off from their home territory, customs, lifestyles – protecting their own, local language, religion, and clinging to their traditions. They are small, local peasant communities: rural and tribal, who, as a result of economic and social pressures, move to large areas of squalor, to African or Latin American ghettos of poverty. Crossing the borders of those closed enclaves of cultural diversity seems to be not so much a risky enterprise, but impossible for someone who does not know the internal codes of communication, language, slang, or dialect, and for whom the symbols, customs, and groups' standards are completely unintelligible.

On the other extreme of globalization there are the cosmopolitan, extraterritorial groups cut off from the sense of territorial communities. These are the social environments of the rich, educated, multilingual professionals, intellectuals, artists, and entrepreneurs – representatives of the alienated, uprooted social category of the “career people,” wanderers moving freely in the intercultural space of the universalized multimedia society. For such people there are no cultural boundaries. There are, however, strong social barriers. They isolate themselves from the rest of society, hidden in closed enclaves of wealth and status, in supervised neighbourhoods walled off from the outside world, mansions and luxury apartment buildings. They build the control zone, form a buffer space, close and isolate themselves not only in the

<sup>22</sup> A. Giddens, *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. “Ja” i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności* [Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age], transl. by A. Szulżycka, Warszawa 2001, pp. 256-257.

private areas of life, but also at work or in public activities. They form an identification network of a new type, filled with security certificates, passes, and gateways enabling entry upon providing a code, a fingerprint or a retina scan. It is a space separated from others, not only personally, but also with IDs that prevent it from entered or trespassed upon by people of a different appearance – for example, skin colour. According to Zygmunt Bauman, these “forbidden spaces” do not serve anything except giving a material form of extraterritoriality to the new supra-local elite, and creating a physical form of isolation from locality. They also seal the fate of the decaying forms of togetherness and community life that used to be rooted in the local reality.<sup>23</sup>

The two extremes of the social scale are divided by an impassable chasm. Regardless of the communication and statutory barriers, the residents of the two spaces are participants in similar social processes: alienation and marginalization. While the poor, local residents of the ghettos of poverty, or members of local communities building their “identity of the resistance,” remain on the “sidelines” of globalization, the “universalized pluralists” are the vanguard of globalization, distanced from the rest of society and separated with very distinct boundaries. Zygmunt Bauman writes: “If the new extraterritoriality of the elites gives a sense of exhilarating freedom, the territorial attachment of the rest feels more and more like imprisonment – and a humiliating one, at that, when compared with the freedom of movement ‘the others’.”<sup>24</sup>

Dispossession, alienation, being deprived of the cultural “homeland” are all a consequence of migration, spatial transfers, and the development of multimedia communication. Those phenomena are true of the “extra-territorial” individuals – people torn from their native environments, subject to the processes of transgression. This category includes an increasing number of residents of intercultural spaces and universalized social environments. People of the identity of transfer include not only migrants, but also members of local, ethnic, and national minorities, Internet users, intellectuals, members of the elites.

Members of minority groups: ideological, mostly local, ethnic and religious ones, subject to collective rejection and exclusion from the native social system, constitute only one category of alienated and marginalized people.

The second category comprises the intellectual elites, artists, scientists, and writers, all of whom are aware of their ill-adjustment. Such people consider the existing social system stifling and do not see chances of further self-realization within it in the existing conditions. Such people knowingly and intentionally emigrate in search of new space where they would be able to fulfil their personal and creative ambitions – not in geographic terms, but rather in social and axiomatic dimensions.

Alienation is the conceptual equivalent of the sense of “loneliness in the crowd.” People are subject to alienation both in the literal and psychological sense.

---

<sup>23</sup> Z. Bauman, *Globalizacja...*, p. 28.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

Objective factors of alienation, ignorance of the universal codes of communication, lack of orientation in semantic codes, inability to interpret the meanings of symbols, ignorance as to the contents of moral or legal codes of conduct – all lead to sealing off of those subjected to alienation within the narrow limits of their own intimate worlds, which stretch out only as far as the borders of the ethnic neighbourhoods that become something akin to cultural ghettos. Alienation leads to the emergence of unique “prisons,” “cages” of identity of people living in the “cultural reservations.”

Mental or psychological alienation, taking place in the sphere of personality and attitudes, is a much deeper form of alienation than the objective one. It leads to long-lasting injuries and complexes, tendencies to isolationism and separatism. It involves a sense of disappointment, bitterness and failure. It turns against the causes of its misery, leads to the damnation of the questioning attitudes, to the depreciation of non-conformism and causes a drastic reduction in the desire to fight for the improvement of its lot.

Marginalization is the result of not only the lack of involvement in the social life of the home cultural community, including the national-citizen one, but also the increasing isolation and increasing distance – not only spatial – from the social system and the culture of origin. This marginalization is sometimes twofold: it occurs both in the “internal” and the “external” cultural spheres. Numerous categories of marginalized individuals: confined in narrow environments of subcultures, trapped in urban socio-cultural enclaves such as ethnic or racial ghettos, sects, gangs, slums, but also in isolated, universalized environments of the employees of multinational corporations, cross-cultural intellectual, economic and political elites, have found themselves in the middle of the “road to nowhere” in the wake of globalization. The transgression that accompanies the phenomena of spatial mobility is not an action, but rather a state of consciousness, a process, a sequence of actions, behaviours, and displays of one’s own attitudes. Therefore, marginalization is sometimes not interrupted even when the participants of the intercultural spaces have reached the level of bilingualism, biculturalism, and dual identity. The feeling of alienation and marginality, the awareness of limited opportunity in the conditions of transgression, have always accompanied people taken out of one sociocultural system and aspiring to taking their place in another.

Marginalization is connected with alienation. It determines the position of individuals and groups stripped of their heritage and deprived of their place in their home cultural communities, ill-adjusted to the principles of the existing order.

Alienated individuals – including emigrants – become the outsiders of the system, outlaws, renegades, “strangers” in the schemes of gradation based on the criteria of prestige and power. Individuals and groups who alienate themselves knowingly and willingly from the rest of society take on the attributes of unwanted elements – the pariahs, rejected and misunderstood both in the motives and goals of their actions. Colin Wilson, the author of a whole cycle of works on the place

of the outsider in contemporary society, identifies this category of rebels mainly as creative individuals, eager to drive the changes in the public awareness. Rebel personality types tend to have marginal, non-standard, original and unique characteristics. Colin Wilson states that the obsessive figure that, for many years, has been referred to as the outsider, became to him the hero-figure of our times. His vision of our civilization was the picture of mediocrity and futility, and the degradation of all intellectual standards. In contrast to this cultural system, the Outsider seems to be a person who, for various reasons, feels lonely and abandoned, of secondary importance in the crowd of other individuals. As Wilson perceives him, he might as well be a maniac carrying a knife in a black bag... he could be a saint and a visionary, not caring about anything, except the state which – in his opinion – allowed him to understand the essence of the world and saw in his heart the true face of God. Wilson admits that the more he deals with the Outsider type, the more he considers him a symbol of our times. In essence, the Outsider seems to be a rebel; what he rebels against is a result of the lack of spiritual power in the materialistically-oriented civilization.<sup>25</sup>

The Outsider becomes alienated because he is a misfit – ill-adjusted to the existing system of norms and values. The Outsider feels shackled and enslaved by the system.

The Outsiders, individuals with marginalized, alienated types of identity, can be found on both sides of social barriers. Using a metaphor, they are residents of places on both sides of the wall. On the one hand, there are the beneficiaries of globalization, separating themselves from the rest with impassable barriers, not only in terms of communication, technology, symbols, and culture, but also in the literal sense. Leaders of globalization, carriers of a universalized identity of transfer, universalized pluralists – build walls that separate them from terrorism, crime, misery and poverty, social awkwardness, social malaise, unemployment, homelessness and many other maladies that plague our modern times. The division into “world-systems” does not run, in my opinion, “along” the lines of conflicting values and ideas and according to the principle of “the mythical axis of evil,” but rather “across” any demarcation lines. Those demarcation lines separate from each other the stragglers and the pioneers of globalization, the achievers and the failures. There is a growing number and percentage of frustrated and dispossessed people: those excluded from the participation in the sharing of the “spoils” of globalization. On one side of the barrier are the owners and managers of large corporations, communication and multimedia networks – the multilingual, multicultural, universalized pluralists who create a new space of unlimited freedom and liberty; on the other side of the barrier the traps are closing around those imprisoned in the narrow sociocultural enclaves.

---

<sup>25</sup> C. Wilson, *Outsider*, transl. by M. Traczewska, Poznan 1992, p. XIII.

---

**Prof. Tadeusz PALECZNY**, sociologist of culture, nation and ethnic relations; specialist in cultural studies; Chair Professor of International Cultural Studies; director of the Institute of Regional Studies at the Jagiellonian University; professor at Andrzej Frycz-Modrzewski Krakow University. He is the author of thirteen monographs, including *Ewolucja ideologii i przemiany tożsamości narodowej Polonii w Stanach Zjednoczonych w latach 1870-1970* (1989) [Evolution of Ideology and Transformations of National Identity of 'Polonia' in the United States, in the Years 1870-1970], *Socjologia stosunków międzynarodowych. Zarys problematyki* (2001) [Sociology of International Relations. An Outline], *Socjologiczne refleksje na temat polskich Romów* (2003) [Sociological Reflections on Polish Gypsies], *Rasa, etniczność i religia w brazylijskim procesie narodotwórczym. Wprowadzenie do badań latynoamerykańskich przemian społecznych* (2004) [Race, Ethnicity and Religion in the Brazilian Nation-creating Process. An Introduction to Research on Latin-American Social Transformations], *Interpersonalne stosunki międzykulturowe* (2007) [Interpersonal Intercultural Relations], *Nowe ruchy społeczne* (2010) [New Social Movements].