

Joanna Rak
nr indeksu: 502252

Streszczenie rozprawy doktorskiej
pt. „Postawy wobec bezpieczeństwa kulturowego
w dyskursie sejmowym w latach 2004-2011”
w języku angielskim

The title of the Ph. D thesis:

“Attitudes toward Cultural Security in the Parliamentary Discourse in the Period of 2004-2011”

Summary

The subject of the Ph. D thesis entitled “Attitudes toward Cultural Security in the Parliamentary Discourse in the Period of 2004-2011” is the intensity of cultural identifications, i.e., nativistic, vitalistic, autonegative, contra-aculturative, which were expressed via attitudes toward cultural security in the parliamentary discourse in the period of 2004-2011. Then, the main aim is to determine how the politicians’ ways of thinking about material and non-material cultural goods were changing in the time. The specific goals are the following: to collate configurations of aims and means which were used by the Members of the Parliament for articulating attitudes toward cultural security; to determine the identifications that were manifested in the types of attitudes reconfigurations, and to establish a diversity extent of speeches delivered on their own behalf as well as on the behalf of the deputies’ clubs or groups, presenting their positions. Last but not the least, the marginal goals are: to create cultural attitudes typologies which are useful for studying political thought of populations influenced by globalization, and to improve the theoretical category of cultural security.

The ideal behavioural types of representatives of a subjugated culture – gradually deteriorating under the control of a dominant culture – are useful when describing those entities and areas influenced by globalization. It is important to indicate that the typology of cultural attitudes toward their own culture is useful too. They provide a broad spectrum of

theoretical structures which are highly applicable in the realm of reflection on political reality. They can be used in the face of methodological difficulties to determine content and structure of social and political cleavages in the contemporary world. Nevertheless, these types are a useful device to describe political thought of all populations influenced by globalization. The set apart types are symptomatic theoretical creations that make up the most important distinctive features which they describe. The types allow identification of various attitudes toward own and foreign cultures and the subsequent correlation of each other.

There are depicted four fundamental types of cultural attitude: nativistic, vitalistic, autonegative, contra-acculturative in the work. Their descriptions within academic literature demand a critical examination and complement because they contain logical and substantive mistakes which reduce their potential cognitive value. In fact, the typology of cultural attitudes toward own and foreign cultures is still an unsolved problem in specialist literature. Therefore, the work contains four studies of individual types of cultural attitudes. Each of them contains description, interpretation and criticism of current theoretical propositions. Those which fallacy had been proven were replaced with new, authorial concepts. Then, they were applied, as the analytical tool, to the empirical study on political attitudes. The typologies of cultural attitudes – nativistic, vitalistic, autonegative, contra-acculturative – were laid out according to the criteria of aim and mean.

According to the criterion of aim the following types of cultural attitudes toward own and foreign cultures were distinguished: revivalistic nativistic, perpetuative nativistic, supremacist nativistic, sacralizing nativistic, inclusive vitalistic, meliorating vitalistic, sacralizing vitalistic, exclusive autonegative, desanctifying autonegative, pejorative autonegative, taboo autonegative, exclusive contra-acculturative, desanctifying contra-acculturative, pejorative contra-acculturative, taboo contra-acculturative.

Then, in accordance with the criterion we have the following types of cultural attitudes toward own and foreign cultures: evoking nativistic, cultivating nativistic, adoring nativistic, maximally-interactive vitalistic, acculturative vitalistic, auto-identity vitalistic, profaning autonegative, exterminating autonegative, renouncing autonegative, silencing autonegative, separative contra-acculturative, exterminating contra-acculturative, escapist contra-acculturative. Mixed types were taken into consideration too.

The first type mentioned is the nativistic cultural attitude. Valuable insight into this attitude was provided by American anthropologist Ralph Linton whose definition of nativistic movement was as follows: 'Any conscious, organized attempt on the part of society's members to revive or perpetuate selected aspects of its culture'. He focused on explaining this

type of attitude toward its own culture which is displayed by those members of the society who completely accept and approve of a native culture and entirely acknowledge their past. Despite the fact that Linton did not centre his attention on the problem of what is the attitude toward foreign cultures he did, however, realize it might have a destructive effect on the indigenous culture.

There are two types of the nativistic cultural attitudes which were distinguished according to the aim criterion. The first is called revivalistic ('to revive') and the second – perpetuative ('to perpetuate'). The type of revivalistic nativistic cultural attitude is a form of nativistic attitude which 'involves an attempt to revive extinct or at least moribund elements of culture'. The type of perpetuative nativistic cultural attitude is a form of nativistic attitude which '[involve an attempt to – [reminded by J. R.]] merely seek to perpetuate current ones'.

The main goal of the revivalistic nativistic cultural attitude is a conscious attempt to improve or revive selected elements of one's culture. It is characterized as reactive one. Not only does a person expressing this attitude disagree with the destruction or atrophy of particular elements of his or her culture but also supports and completely approves of them. Fearing the deterioration of their native culture, people thus make effort to preserve and protect it.

The perpetuative nativistic cultural attitude is characterized by conscious attempts to retain or eternalize selected elements of culture. There exists a collective yearning of society to safeguard all features and values comprising their culture. The fear of cultural degradation drives the people toward immortalizing the native culture and preventing any change from occurring within its boundaries.

However, the aforementioned typology of nativistic attitudes is not complete because it lacks an extremity. In each mentioned type what prevails is an obvious recognition and approval of selected elements of native culture; on the other hand, in none of those attitudes can there be distinguished a maximum level of approval for those elements of culture. In the case of revivalistic nativistic cultural attitude, accepting certain parts manifests itself in a desire to protect them, while the perpetuative nativistic cultural attitude is striving to reinforce them.

None of them stresses the need for an apotheosis of native culture, a glorification of its constituents. That is precisely why it is possible to propose a third attitude, a sacralizing attitude, which would ascribe a religious attribute to non-religious parts of culture. In contrast to the nativistic attitude, it would consciously sanctify chosen aspects of culture, therefore, be bereft of the reactive character of the native relativistic attitude.

Driven by their main aspiration, members of a society are intent on deeming their culture the highest and most admirable. An intrusion into its contents – whether a change of certain features or an introduction of new ones – seems not only impossible; but also unacceptable, reproachable. The current state of native culture, according to the society, is a state of unparalleled perfection. Both the nativistic revivalistic and perpetuative nativistic attitude can precede the engenderment of the nativistic sacralizing attitude.

Anthropologist Simone Clemhout has proposed an entirely different definition of the nativistic movement. She has not referred to Linton's conception directly. Her definition of nativistic movement was as follows: 'Nativistic movements always occur from stress of culture (two different cultures coming in contact with each other). The consequences of such situations must not necessarily be inequality between the societies in contact (exploitation), dominance and submission (frustrate). Nativistic movements may result from the simple contact of culture through the influences on values, needs, world view on individuals in a society'. Unlike Linton, Clemhout made a dominant culture the reference point of defining the nativistic movements. According to Clemhout, it is the contact between two cultures which causes the birth of the nativistic attitudes. However, the weakness of this theory lies not only in its disregard for the issue of a conscious desire of the society to react adequately to the contact with a foreign culture but also in omitting the question of how society perceives its own culture. Clemhout's attempt to classify these movements – appointed from definition – is imperfect too. It is curtailed to an enumerative delineation of three goals of an inter-cultural contact: exploitation, domination and submission. There is one more type, which is an open catalogue of all possibly attainable goals defined by – erroneously depreciated by Clemhout – representatives of the cultures. These types are neither disjunctive nor characteristic exclusively for nativistic stances, which mean that this attempt of defining and classifying nativistic attitudes is useless in the following analysis.

Compared to Linton's typology of nativistic attitudes, the following definition arouses even more doubt, as the author draws a line between magical and rational nativism. Italian anthropologist Vittorio Lanternari claims that thanks to the implementation of this differentiation the Linton's typology of nativistic movements becomes complete and exhaustive: 'This scheme includes all movements which derive from contact or conflict between different cultures or sub-cultures, and Linton saw all of them as conservative movements attempting to preserve socio-cultural identity'. This is worth noting that the categories mentioned by Lanternari comprise a proverbial open catalogue, into which arbitrarily any nativistic attitude can be included. Nevertheless, it is difficult to unequivocally

determine what attitude bears the signs of a magical one, as the individuals expressing it must willfully and deliberately attempt to get in touch with the supernatural. Henceforth it is justifiable to doubt the usefulness of these two ideal types in defining cultural attitudes. It is necessary then to propose a new authorial typology according to the criterion of mean used by members of a society in order to embrace those particular nativistic cultural attitudes, which have been presented according to the criterion of aim.

In the typology of the nativistic cultural attitudes according to the mean criterion, three types of attitudes can be set apart: evoking nativistic, cultivating nativistic, adoring nativistic. Different aims can be realized by using different means.

The essence of the first type mentioned above that is evoking nativistic cultural attitude is the evocation of certain memories and images of elements of native culture and making the society aware of their importance. These activities are deliberate and are subordinated to serve a higher purpose namely the manifestation of the culture, the approval, affirmation and approbation for the past. In this case, the recall relates only to the native culture, not the dominant culture. However, its content is determined by a detailed aim that will be achieved thanks to it. That is why a further division can be introduced: revivalistic-evoking nativistic, perpetuative-evoking nativistic, sacralizing-evoking nativistic.

The cultivating nativistic cultural attitude relies on sustaining and developing elements of the native culture. In this case, sustaining relates only to the native culture, not the dominant culture. There are attitudes: revivalistic-cultivating nativistic, perpetuative-cultivating nativistic, sacralizing-cultivating nativistic.

The adoring nativistic cultural attitude is based on an emphatic display of admiration, reverence and estimation for elements of native culture. These activities are also deliberate and similarly focus on cultivating respect for the past among members of the society. Its key element is the articulation and expression of utter admiration appreciation, and even worship for all the constituents of a native culture.

It is worth noting, however, that typology's content is also determined by a detailed aim for which achievement it is to be used, and thus further division can be presented: revivalistic-adoring nativistic, perpetuative-adoring nativistic, sacralizing-adoring nativistic.

Anthropologist Marian W. Smith proposed a following definition of the vitalistic movement: 'Any conscious, organized attempt on the part of a society's members to incorporate in its culture selected aspects of another culture in contact with it'. She focused on explaining types of attitudes toward both the indigenous and dominant culture. Referring to the first type of attitude, it is worth noticing that it lacks manifestation of approval and

affirmation for the society's own past. Furthermore, a certain opposition to the state of the native culture is also expressed, although far from being a complete negation of it. What can also be observed is the acceptance of the dominant culture. A chief element of this attitude is the disdainful approach toward the indigenous culture, which is combined with effort to replace some of its key elements with those drawn from the dominant culture.

Ex definitione – according to Smith – there is one type of vitalistic cultural attitude – an incorporating attitude. It is called the inclusive vitalistic cultural attitude because the predicate 'inclusive' allows to more accurately delineating the process of inclusion of some elements of the dominant culture into the indigenous culture. The essential part of it is the conscious acquisition of certain parts of the dominant culture, with which contact is established, and the subsequent incorporation of those parts into the fabric of the indigenous culture. It is characterized as a reactive approach which means that the advent of a dominant culture brings about change within the framework of the indigenous culture. The aforementioned attitude is usually a result of disapproval of the indigenous culture or a desire to change it one way or another. What is more, members of the community who are in touch with the dominant culture accept and fully embrace the new status quo.

Smith's presentation is not complete because it does not contain all the possible types of the vitalistic cultural attitudes which were distinguished according to the aim criterion. It is necessary then to supplement that typology with new authorial types. These are: the meliorating vitalistic and the sacralizing vitalistic cultural attitude. Representatives of the former tend to have a rather positive outlook on most elements of the dominant culture; while those taking up the latter are willing to sanctify those elements with sacred, divine qualities.

The essence of the meliorating vitalistic cultural attitude is therefore a conscious manifestation of approval of the dominant culture. It is an indication of dissatisfaction with the content of the native culture. Concurrently, it is an expression of the need to assign a positive meaning to selected elements of the dominant culture. That new meaning can become – as it was a direct consequence – an incentive to include these aspects into the fabric of the native culture and hence give rise to the vitalistic cultural attitude. It should not be overlooked that inclusions might not occur at all, and in that case members of the society would have to be content with just manifesting their approval, which is a direct effect of the meliorating vitalistic attitude. Also, the meliorating vitalistic attitude can provide a fertile ground for the advent of the sacralizing vitalistic attitude.

As outlined, the sacralizing attitude's prompts the society to add a divine quality to certain elements adapted from the dominant culture, henceforth making them cherished icons

of worship. It is an apotheosis of particular elements of the foreign culture; an expression of admiration toward it and a will to glorify its constituents. While the sacralizing attitude, not unlike the meliorating, can also provide an incentive to adapt certain parts of the dominant culture, it may as well at one point become replaced with the meliorating vitalistic cultural attitude, and hence change the primary goal of the attitude embraced by the society.

Another weakness of Smith's theory lies in not taking into consideration the vitalistic cultural attitude types in accordance with the mean criterion. The mean is used by the society to realize the essence of individual types of vitalistic cultural attitudes which emerged according to the aim criterion. As an anthropologist, Smith focused her attention on the explanation of the aim which motivates members of the society to carry out certain actions in relation to culture, not on the depiction of means used for their realization. It is necessary then to propose a new authorial typology according to the criterion of mean used by society members.

In the typology of the vitalistic cultural attitudes according to the mean criterion, three types of attitudes can be set apart: maximally-interactive vitalistic, acculturative vitalistic, auto-identity vitalistic. Different aims can be realized by the use of different means.

The first of the mentioned types – maximally-interactive vitalistic cultural attitude – is based on an articulated acceptance of the dominant culture. It is basically a conscious drive toward undermining most aspects of the native culture by way of initiating a personal response from all society members who decide individually which elements of the dominant culture they prefer. Moreover, those who take up this attitude tend to underestimate the value of their history and are unappreciative of the native culture. The maximum interaction has a conscious nature and is destined to serve a particular aim that is precisely the expression of superiority of the dominant culture over the native culture. However, the attributes of this attitude are determined by a detailed aim for which achievement it is to be used. That is why a further division can be introduced: inclusive-maximally-interactive vitalistic, meliorating-maximally-interactive vitalistic, sacralizing-maximally-interactive vitalistic.

Another type of a vitalistic cultural attitude in accordance with the mean criterion is called the vitalistic acculturative attitude. It primarily consists of a range of activities which primary goal is to instigate a whole series of social interactions aimed at deprecating the native culture. Similar to the previously described attitude, this one is also characterized by a certain lack of appreciation for the past and the native culture, and an almost unanimous praise of the dominant culture. Not unlike in previous instances, these attitudes might be used

to achieve different goals as well thus the differentiation: inclusive-acculturative vitalistic, meliorating-acculturative vitalistic, sacralizing-acculturative vitalistic.

The third type is the auto-identity vitalistic attitude. The communities expressing it are also inclined to undermine the history and present state of their culture and focus on finding suitable elements within the framework of the dominant culture which can then be deemed, paradoxically, as intrinsic, and used to create a new but seemingly native cultural attitude. Consequently, foreign elements are put on the same level as native; therefore, the depreciating of the native culture occurs through a mechanism of auto-identification with certain ideas drawn from the dominant culture. Once again, it cannot remain unnoticed that the aforementioned auto-identification has a conscious nature and is subordinated to a superior aim which is the expression of superiority of the dominant culture over the native culture. However, its content is determined by a detailed aim, for which achievement it is to be used. That is why a further division can be introduced: inclusive-auto-identity vitalistic, meliorating-auto-identity vitalistic, sacralizing-auto-identity vitalistic.

Another type of an attitude toward the native culture is the autonegative cultural attitude. This attitude does not react with any of the foreign cultures. Anthropologist Ewa Nowicka indicated that it is signified by 'a rejection of selected elements of the native culture'. It might be appropriate to expand that definition and add that it is conditioned by any conscious attempt of eliminating certain elements of the native culture created by the members of the society; therefore, this attitude negates the indigenous culture.

In this case – also ex definitione – there is one type of an autonegative attitude associated with the aim criterion that is the autonegative exclusive. The predicate 'exclusive' allows for a more coherent depiction of the exclusion process of certain elements of the native culture from its framework. Those expressing this attitude consciously strive to erase the elements of the native culture that they do not accept. However, those elements do not necessarily have to be replaced by any other, for example drawn from the dominant culture.

Nowicka's presentation is not complete because it does not contain all possible types of the autonegative cultural attitudes which were distinguished according to the aim criterion. It is necessary then to supplement that typology with new authorial types. Those are: desanctifying autonegative, pejorating autonegative and taboo autonegative cultural attitudes. The first of the mentioned types is an extreme attitude which demonizes elements of the native culture. The second one simply chastises those elements and labels them as wrong; finally, the last simply deems some of them as taboo.

The essence of the desanctifying autonegative cultural attitude is an extreme aversion toward the native culture. Not only are those expressing it inclined to condemn the constituents of the native culture, calling them ungodly or unholy, but also show desire to eradicate them. Eventually, the desanctifying attitude may transform into the autonegative exclusive; however, the detailed aim of the society will change with it as well. On the other hand, the exclusion of certain elements of the native culture – baring traits of an almost cathartic activity – might enable the society to create a desirable version of the native culture.

The pejorative autonegative attitude in essence provides a tool for society members to label certain parts of the native culture as unacceptable, reproachable or pernicious. Members taking up this attitude express a certain animosity toward the native culture and pinpoint those constituents of it which in their opinion are harmful or redundant. There is an outside chance it might lead to the advent of a more exclusive autonegative attitude; similarly, there is also a possibility of the society refraining from exclusions and focusing on just manifesting their discontent.

Any community expressing a taboo autonegative attitude tend to consider some elements of the native culture a taboo. Those elements are not so much deemed as negative but anointed with the attribute of a 'taboo', figuratively excluding them of further discussion and casting it into oblivion.

The main weakness of Nowicka's outline is that it does not define those cultural autonegative attitudes which are described by the mean criterion, which is used by society members to achieve the goals of those autonegative attitudes types which were determined using the aim criterion. The author focused more on the aim and not the way of achieving it. That is precisely why it is crucial to set forth an additional typology of autonegative cultural attitudes based on the mean criterion and these are as follows: the autonegative profaning, the autonegative exterminating, the autonegative renouncing and the autonegative silencing.

The first one, the autonegative profaning is characterized by a conscious desire to abuse, shame or disgrace certain constituent of the native culture. Sacrilege is a tool used for rejecting the elements that those expressing the attitude found incompatible with the framework of the native culture. It is an outright rejection and negation of the native, indigenous culture. The realization of this attitude falls under a higher purpose, which is the depiction of inferiority or weakness of the native culture. That is why there are three sub-types of this attitude that can be outlined: the autonegative exclusive-profaning, the autonegative pejorative-profaning, the autonegative taboo-profaning and the autonegative-profaning.

The autonegative exterminating attitude entails the extermination and destruction of particular elements of the native culture and is also an attitude of radical negation of the indigenous culture. In order to reach the goals set about by this attitude it has to be subjugated by a higher purpose which is also the depiction of weaknesses within the framework of the native culture. This attitude can also be divided into three distinct subtypes: the autonegative exclusive-exterminating, the autonegative pejorative-exterminating, the autonegative taboo-exterminating and the autonegative desanctifying-exterminating.

At the very core of the autonegative renouncing attitude lays a conscious longing for expressing dissatisfaction with the current state of culture; rejecting its elements and refusing to accept them as valuable or proper. The displacement of those elements serves as a tool of negation. This attitude might also take on different forms: the autonegative exclusive-renouncing, the autonegative pejorative-renouncing, the autonegative taboo-renouncing and the autonegative desanctifying-renouncing.

Members of the society who take up the last of the autonegative attitudes, the autonegative silencing, are basically focused on deliberately omitting certain cultural topics during discussion; silencing them in the process and making them eventually irrelevant. Once again, the realization of this attitude is inherently bound to a higher purpose and thus three distinct types of this attitude can be distinguished: pejorative-silencing autonegative, exclusive-silencing autonegative, taboo-silencing autonegative and desanctifying-silencing autonegative.

Anthropologist and specialist in African studies, Melville Jean Herskovits has on the other hand distinguished contra-acculturative movements: 'It is essentially out of contacts involving dominance of one people over another that contra-acculturative movements arise – those movements wherein a people come to stress the values in aboriginal ways of life, and to move aggressively, either actually or in fantasy, toward the restoration of those ways, even in the face of obvious evidence of their importance to throw off the power that restricts them.' Herskovits focused on explaining these types of attitudes toward native and dominant cultures. Regarding the first contra-acculturative movement it is critical to notice the explicit appreciation and respect expressed by members of a society toward their own history and culture while aspiring to rejuvenate and restore certain aspects of it. The need to revitalize the native culture stems from the contact with the dominant culture which impedes and limits the native culture. The contra-acculturative attitude is also reactive, occurring in conditions of domination and submission and being a direct result of the society's discontent with the domination of a foreign culture.

The contra-acculturative cultural attitude should not be incorrectly equated with the nativistic cultural attitude. The main distinction between these two is based on the fact that Linton has focused on certain manifestations of types of attitudes toward the native culture which are expressions of affirmation of the past and acceptance for the native culture, while Herskovits concentrated on both the attitudes toward the dominant culture and the attitudes toward the native culture, in other words, on emphasizing how members of a certain society struggle to address elements of a dominant culture which are imposed upon them. While in the case of the nativistic movements what is noticeable is the acceptance, the contra-acculturative movements are characterized by negation. Their common component is the respect for the native culture.

The weakness of Herskovits's presentation lies in the fact that the author distinguishes only one type of a contra-acculturative attitude, in accordance with the aim criterion. It is the throwing-out attitude which shall be called for the purpose of this essay the exclusive contra-acculturative cultural attitude because the predicate 'exclusive' allows for a more accurate description of the exclusion process of certain elements of the native culture. The essence of this type of attitude is a rejection of influences of the foreign culture which the native culture – being fully accepted by the society – comes in touch with. Hence this attitude has a reactive character and those taking it up strive toward restoring the native culture and diminishing the influence of the dominant culture. Members of the society manifest their approval and admiration for their past and applaud their native culture while rejecting all foreign influences and refusing anything that might modify their indigenous culture.

It is necessary then to supplement the typology with new authorial types. Apart from the type which was distinguished by Herskovits, we can categorize: the desanctifying contra-acculturative attitude, the pejorating contra-acculturative attitude and the taboo contra-acculturative attitude. All of them are closely related in their characteristics to the previously mentioned desanctifying, pejorative and taboo attitudes, but are channelled more toward the dominant culture.

The desanctifying contra-acculturative attitude, just like the autonegative desanctifying attitude, is focused on condemning certain aspects of culture as unholy, ungodly and profoundly blasphemous. The only difference is their target. While the former focuses its attention on the native culture, the latter attacks the foreign culture. Once again, the very activity of fighting certain elements of culture is a tool of absolution for the society which struggles to purify its culture and eradicate all foreign elements interfering with it.

While the pejorative contra-acculturative attitude shares common traits with the pejorative autonegative attitude, the difference, just like in the case of the previous attitude, lies in its initial target. Communities espousing this attitude label certain elements of the foreign culture as unfavourable, giving them a negative connotation. It is a sign of discontent and disapproval of the relationship between the native and dominant culture. Consequently, this attitude might lead, not unlike was the case with autonegative attitude, to the engenderment of a contra-acculturative exclusive attitude but the members of the society expressing this attitude may also resort to just manifesting their animosity.

We must pay close attention to the taboo contra-acculturative attitude. Using it, certain communities might consider chosen constituents of the dominant culture taboo and therefore exclude them from future discussions. What separates it from the pejorative contra-acculturative attitude is the fact that those who take up the taboo attitude do not attempt to label parts of a certain culture as pernicious, harmful or negative, but simply deem them inappropriate for discussion which may result in provisions prohibiting any reference to them.

Herskovits typology has a weakness, namely it does not include definitions of contra-acculturative attitudes formulated in accordance with the criterion of mean. That is precisely why a typology of those attitudes is much needed in this work.

Polish political scientist Roman Bäcker has proposed an interesting typology of the contra-acculturative cultural attitudes in accordance with the criterion of mean: 'The contra-acculturative aspirations may consist in separating from the dominant culture (escape), eliminating influences of that culture from the own territory (isolation) or its annihilation, it means a war. That trigrades of contra-acculturative aspirations tension is normally relative toward these movements' nature. The escape is typical of restrained political trends which usually use the type of moral appraisals. Indeed, isolation is characteristic for fundamentalist political trends. Then the strategy on annihilation is typical of pre- and classically totalitarian movements'. He distinguished three types of contra-acculturative cultural attitudes. The first one is called 'escape' and is in short an expression of detachment of some society members from the dominant culture and their subsequent drive toward relieving themselves from its boundaries and regulations. The second, 'isolation', characterizes those communities which actively ward off foreign cultural influence on the territory they control. The last one, 'annihilation', is basically a war between representatives of foreign and native cultures.

Despite the fact that these definitions may seem exhaustive and give the impression of fully depicting the wide range of stances and attitudes expressed within the contra-acculturative orientation, there might be a question raised as to whether the first type

(‘escape’) should not be used in the construction of the second (‘isolation’) for the main purpose of isolation is the security of certain entities in such a way that they are proverbially cordoned off from each other and therefore unable to mutually correspond. However, by combining two separate attitudes’ types they may become less distinctive, so this remark is purely technical and addresses semantic issues.

The authorial typology of the contra-acculturative cultural attitudes in accordance with the mean criterion consists of: the separative contra-acculturative attitude, the exterminating contra-acculturative attitude and the escapist contra-acculturative attitude. Different aims can be realized by the use of different means.

The contra-acculturative separative attitude’s main focus is the elimination of constituents of the foreign culture which have spread into the native culture. A key aspect of it is a positive approach toward the past and the indigenous culture, with a concurrent animosity toward the dominant culture. The need for separation is elicited precisely by the contact with the dominant culture which restrains the native culture. This attitude has a reactive character as well and occurs within societies submitted to a dominant culture. Members of the society thus feel compelled to isolate themselves and their indigenous culture from the influence of the dominant culture. Several goals might be achieved by this attitude, hence this attitude might be divided into sub-types such as: contra-acculturative exclusive-separative attitude, contra-acculturative pejorative-separative attitude, contra-acculturative taboo-separative and the contra-acculturative desanctifying-separative attitude.

Another type is the contra-acculturative exterminating attitude which lays emphasis on active efforts to simply destroy and eliminate constituents of the dominant culture which slipped into the framework of the native culture. This attitude has a reactive character as well and might be used to achieve different goals therefore three distinguishable types might be presented: the contra-acculturative exclusive-exterminating attitude, the contra-acculturative pejorative-exterminating attitude, the contra-acculturative taboo-exterminating attitude and the contra-acculturative desanctifying-exterminating attitude.

The last type, the contra-acculturative escapist attitude, entails an isolation from the influences of the dominant culture. Members of the society express their disapproval of the foreign culture which goes hand in hand with a positive approach toward the native cultural heritage, and try to preserve the native culture by isolating themselves from the dominant one.


As was the case with previous attitudes, this one is also prompted by relationships which arise after a contact with the dominant culture is established, and occurs in situations where a native culture is subjugated by a dominant culture. Not unlike in previous instances,

these attitudes might be used to achieve different goals as well, thus the differentiation: the contra-acculturative exclusive-escapist attitude, the contra-acculturative pejorative-escapist attitude, the contra-acculturative taboo-escapist attitude and the contra-acculturative desanctifying-escapist attitude.

The theoretical category of cultural security is an unsolved problem in specialist literature as well as the theoretical category of cultural attitudes. This thesis contains studies of definitions of cultural security. Each of them contains description, interpretation and criticism of current theoretical propositions. Those which fallacy had been proven were replaced with new, authorial concepts. Importantly, there are proposed and revealed the Weberian behavioural ideal types of cultural security and shortage of cultural security. They provide a broad spectrum of theoretical structures which are highly applicable in the realm of reflection on social reality. They are used in the face of methodological difficulties to determine scopes of thinking about dimensions of security.

These theoretical categories are applied to the analysis to verify main as well as specific hypotheses. Indeed, they are used in accordance with the theoretical and methodological assumptions. The main hypothesis is: between the periods of 1 May, 2004 – 20 December, 2007 and 21 December, 2007 – 31 December, 2011, in the Parliamentary Discourse, the extent of the cultural attitudes toward cultural security changed as follows: in the scope of references to material cultural goods – in a case of: contra-acculturation and vitalism decreased in an average extent; nativism – increased in an average extent; autonegativism – decreased in a low extent; whereas in the scope of references to non-material cultural goods – in a case of: contra-acculturation decreased in a low extent; vitalism and autonegativism – decreased in a very low extent; nativism – increased in an average extent. The specific hypotheses are subordinated to the main hypothesis. Finally, they are verified in the empirical chapters. It is proved that between the periods of 1 May, 2004 – 20 December, 2007 and 21 December, 2007 – 31 December, 2011, in the Parliamentary Discourse, the extent of the cultural attitudes toward cultural security changed as follows: in the scope of references to material cultural goods – in a case of: contra-acculturation and vitalism decreased in a very low extent; nativism – increased in a very low extent; autonegativism – decreased in a very low extent; whereas in the scope of references to non-material cultural goods – in a case of: contra-acculturation decreased in a very low extent; vitalism and autonegativism – decreased in a very low extent; nativism – increased in a very low extent.

The behavioural ideal types mentioned make up the typology which is applied to the study as a useful device for analysing political thought of populations influenced by globalization. Their empirical falsifiability may be as well an interesting challenge for historians who study contemporary political thought. Furthermore, it would be desirable to criticize, modify or supplement these academic presentations and descriptions because they are not definitive and therefore open to interpretation and any discussion revolving around those definitions could expand common knowledge about the political reality.



Joanna Rak