

DOROTA MISIEJUK

University of Białystok, Poland
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8292-2046>
dmisieju@uwb.edu.pl

Tradition under Postmodernity. Reflexive Socialization

Tradycja w warunkach ponowoczesności. Refleksyjna socjalizacja

Abstract: The challenges of the postmodern era also concern the educational system, which in the article is treated in the light of Krzysztof Brozi's theory – as an element of the cultural system of the rank of cultural imperative. The analysis concerns the relationship between culture and tradition, where tradition is defined as the grammar of culture. The challenges concern above all the revaluations in the tradition, while the tradition itself as a system giving meaning and building meanings is inviolable. The postulates of revaluations concern the appreciation of cultural pluralism and basing the processes of creating cultural identity of individuals on creativity and freedom in the scope of inheritance acts. Central to this arrangement, for socialization processes, is competence in reading cultural artifacts, reflexivity, responsibility and imagination as virtues.

Keywords: tradition; intercultural competence; reflexive socialization

Abstrakt: Wyzwania ery ponowoczesności dotyczą także systemu edukacji, który w artykule traktowany jest w świetle teorii Krzysztofa Broziewicza jako element systemu kulturowego rangi imperatywu kulturowego. Analiza dotyczy relacji kultury i tradycji, gdzie tradycja definiowana jest jako gramatyka kultury. Wyzwania dotyczą przede wszystkim przewartościowań w tradycji, natomiast sama tradycja – jako układ dający sensowność i budujący znaczenia – jest nienaruszalna. Postulaty przewartościowań dotyczą dowartościowania pluralizmu kulturowego oraz oparcia procesów kreowania tożsamości kulturowej jednostek na kreatywności i wolności w zakresie aktów dziedziczenia. W tym układzie centralną pozycję dla procesów socjalizacyjnych zajmuje kompetencja w zakresie czytania artefaktów kultury, a także refleksyjność, odpowiedzialność i wyobraźnia jako cnoty.

Słowa kluczowe: tradycja; kompetencje międzykulturowe; refleksyjna socjalizacja

INTRODUCTION

Cultural change, followed by a revolution in communication, places education, as a cultural agenda, before the challenges of a new era – postmodernity. Methodologically, I intend in this text to take the form of a scientific essay rather than a formal article. It attempts to interpret the processes of cultural change in the perspective of the conditions of education and the pedagogical orientation of the educators so as to “open” the traditional socialization system to the challenges of the new cultural era. I base my considerations on the assumption of the importance and universality of education and I develop and discuss the need for changes in the orientation of value and relocation of virtues and social characteristics of the pupils. In my opinion, this process seems to be necessary for education to maintain its cultural functionality in the new era. The educational system, on the one hand, is responsible for the intergenerational transfer of values and aimed at building a community of values, on the other hand, it should be open to the future and promote development. One could say in “capital letters” that the new cultural era needs a reflection on its grammar-tradition. Obviously, this task is beyond the author’s abilities and would break the framework of the article. Therefore, I will develop only two threads: The first concerns the cultural conditions of education, the second – individualism. Hence I develop my deliberations around two theses:

1. The importance and significance of education in culture does not change – the goals and tasks assigned to it for centuries remain to be fulfilled by education. The cultural conditions of its functioning are changing.

2. Individualism as a social phenomenon is recognised and described in various categories. Many researchers take a critical approach to it. However, whereas the social phenomenon is a feature of culture, individualism as a social characteristic of the individual can be shaped.

*

In the changing cultural system, the debate should cover the issue of a cultural standard, on which social and professional competences are to be based, so that they harmonise with the new cultural era and the challenges of the global world. In the theory of Krzysztof Jarosław Brozi (1994), an outstanding philosopher and cultural anthropologist, creator of the theory of cultural standard, education (as a phenomenon in culture) is rooted in the structure of cultural standard and has the status of a cultural imperative. The cultural standard itself can be understood as a list of basic needs (of people) binding in a (given) culture. Overall, the cultural standard is the way and extent to which these needs are met, their structure, arrangement or network, which weigh on the coherence of culture. If the needs are not fulfilled, the culture is

eroded. The cultural standard consists of two groups of needs distinguished by Brozi (a): universal, i.e. globally applicable – such as biological needs, cultural imperatives, integrative needs and psychological needs; (b) and extra-universal needs, which determine the specifics of a particular culture. They result either from the conditions of the natural environment or from the extent of internal diversification of a given culture. The relation between culture and tradition is the relation between cultural facts – customs, rituals or symbols of a given culture and their meaning in the process of meeting human needs. Tradition is the grammar of culture.

Cultural imperative, in Brozi's theory (1998), means the possibilities of meeting people's needs within the cultural system in which they have lived. In the conditions of cultural encounter, the individual does not have the possibility of directly meeting his needs in the triad: impulse – act – satisfaction, which is assumed most primordial culture. The satisfaction of needs always takes place in the context of a certain tradition, the triad: act – norm – value. The individual in the cultural conditions rises to a higher level by attaching new components to the existing grammatical system of culture – tradition. Thus, an internal cultural interrelation between culture and personality is created. This process promotes the development of the autodynamism of culture, i.e. the generation of new needs and the satisfaction of existing ones. Culture, in this system, is seen in an instrumental perspective, but with regard to the intracultural component, namely the human being, and not the external cultural component, which refers to the organism. Culture could not exist if there were no organised interaction of society with each other. As Brozi points out, "(...) organization is a condition for the effectiveness of activity, because only in this form of activity all the elements of the basic cultural product, which is the institution, are present" (Brozi 1994, p. 246).

An institution can be defined as a group of people working together to achieve a common, specified goal, and in compliance with jointly established rules and principles, as well as to implement tasks using specific means. In a very broad way Brozi presents the definition of an institution understood as "(...) a group of people united to perform simple or complex activities, always having material resources and technical equipment, organized in accordance with a certain legal and customary provision, included as a myth, legend, law, rule, and practiced and prepared to fulfill the tasks ahead of it" (*ibid.*). In the intention of this definition the understanding of an institution comes down both to the case of: family, class, political party or education. In the interpretation of institutions, the deepest level of integration determining the understanding of situations and interaction is the value system agreed upon by the tradition of the institution. The institution, otherwise known as the unit of organised action, is a basic element of culture which is commonly encountered, and which can be used to describe people's social reality.

The institutional structure of culture must fulfil certain tasks in order for it to be created, exist and evolve. For this reason, in the theory of Brozi four instrumental imperatives were distinguished, which are part of the cultural standard. The following

cultural imperatives are necessary to maintain culture as a system that organizes people's living environment. Disturbances in this structure, or within the imperatives, can lead to problems of cultural identity or cultural decay, as each imperative responds to a group of specific social needs. All the elements of the imperatives will work in harmony and will be meaningful only when they are transformed into tradition through a system of socialization (upbringing). The cultural imperatives mentioned by the author (*ibid.*, pp. 249–250) are: the economic organization – the production, use and reproduction of consumer goods; the system of social control – regulating in action and sanctioning human behavior in the field of law and moral regulations, as well as technology and customs; the organization of power – defining power within each institution and equipping it with the power and means to follow orders; the system of upbringing – exercising, forming and equipping with the knowledge of tradition of the human material operating in each institution.

In the perspective of this theory, the discussion of tradition in the educational system seems legitimate, especially if we are talking about cultural change.

TRADITION IN THE POSTMODERN ERA – NARRATION OF HISTORY AND CULTURAL IDENTITY OF AN INDIVIDUAL

The era of postmodernism (postmodernity), in contrast to the era of rationalism (modernity or modernism), focuses on the perception of the world on cultural difference and globalization as the leading communication. The question of tradition in postmodernity naturally leads us to consider the relationship between man and culture. Postmodernity as a time, or in other words, a cultural era, or – explaining it in yet another language – the environment of human life, frames its identity through two narratives: the defiance of tradition and individualism. The defiance of tradition is understood as a process that takes place through reinterpretations, changes of accents, different narratives and the evoking of motives in the history of human communities that have so far been covered up, hidden, unrevealed in publicly presented narratives, and do not defy tradition as such. The very concept of tradition and its importance in the human-culture relationship remains unchanged and significant. The status of tradition is described by Anthony Giddens as “the idea of ritual truth” as the source “from where its authority comes – through which tradition can demand obedience” (Giddens 2001, p. 57). Meanwhile, “traditions today need defending, even if not implemented in traditional ways” (*ibid.*, p. 58).

Tradition, in fact, is the grammar of culture as the classicist Clifford Geertz (2005) wanted to define it, pointing out that culture is a way of: thinking, acting, feeling; tradition is an understanding/comprehension of: thinking, acting, feeling.

It was about, as Geertz used to say, discovering the meaning(s) people gave in different practices to objects or states of affairs: "Practicing ethnography is like trying to read a manuscript – a manuscript written in a foreign language (...) Culture, this document that exists through one's actions, is thus something public (...) an action that means something, just like phonation in the head, pigment in painting, line in writing or sonority in music". (*ibid.*, pp. 24–25)

The meanings of artefacts can be read and thus be significant in the ethical dimension of human functioning because we read them in a tradition, and it is only through tradition that we can develop spiritual skills of a human being. The traditional (in the sense of modernism) idea of education, based on loyalty to one's own group, built on trust in the leadership of intellectuals, has become hardly communicative because of the reformulation of the processes of communication in culture, and the appreciation of cultural pluralism. The new idea (postmodern) in this regard is to ground the processes of cultural identity of individuals on innovation, creativity and freedom in the acts of cultural inheritance. It is based on the relation to cultural artefacts. Not the reading of tradition but the training of experiencing an encounter with an artefact of culture becomes the field of socialization of future generations. However, in terms of the transmission of culture, this is an act of inheritance which, in order to be complete or life-giving and thus to construct the ethical relationship of the individual to the world, must be rooted in (some kind of) tradition. Tradition is the guide to the contents of the culture of moral order, it is the grammar of culture. It is a system which allows individuals to order their cultural experiences within a moral perspective. Meanwhile, postmodernism resists the value of an orientation towards cultural artefacts that is interpreted from the perspective of loyalty to one's own group. We seem to lack a grammar that would allow us to judge the meanings of cultural artefacts in this new cultural perspective. This situation is observed by Margaret Archer when she writes that social actors – as she calls people caught up in a cultural context – have a certain amount of freedom in their relationship to the cultural system. They can use this freedom to empower the system – to legitimise it – or to oppose it. Why are people oriented towards either of these strategies? (Archer 2019). It appears, as the author states:

(...) that the main factor that influences the question of whether actors stand on the side of the cultural system or stand against it (back or buck Cultural System) is the extent to which their power and interests fit the situational logic they are confronted with. In other words, when the cultural contexts in which they find themselves are full of inconsistencies and therefore need to be corrected, the power and interests of the actors involved lead them to make adjustments or exploit contradictions. When, on the other hand, actors are confronted with a monolithic, highly coherent set of ideas, then they can use their power to protect this synthesis if it supports their group interests, or, in pursuit of their interests, they can act against this particular configuration of the cultural system. (*ibid.*, pp. 414–415)

On the wave of transformation processes of the cultural era, we can observe many innovative ideas or theoretical proposals which, as far as their intention is concerned, originate precisely from the problems with tradition. I am referring here to the theory of glocalization. The term itself is a combination of two terms: “globalization” and “locality”. Glocalization is the expression of two opposing but simultaneous tendencies: the homogenization of culture – through the spreading of identical content, and the heterogenization of culture – through the expression of this content in ways characteristic of local communities (Grzymała-Moszczyńska 2009). As a result of problems with tradition, we can also perceive a phenomenon described by cultural psychologists and called “hybridization of identities of individuals and social groups”. “Hybridization consists in the formation of new individual and group identities as a result of contact between different cultures” (*ibid.*). Or, finally, the theory of transculturalism by Wolfgang Welsch (1998), a philosopher who finds more and more interpreters and commentators in the related literature.

INDIVIDUALISM – A CATEGORY FOR DESCRIBING CULTURAL IDENTITY

It is also pointed out that in today’s cultural conditions and postmodern times, the foundation of the individual’s causal action is creativity. Creativity itself – as Antonio R. Damasio writes in his book *The Secrets of Consciousness* – “[as] the capacity to produce new ideas and artefacts needs more than consciousness alone could ever provide. It needs an extensive memory of facts and skills, a large working memory, a capacity for subtle understanding, a language” (Damasio 2000, p. 338) and further the author leads the thought by saying that:

(...) interestingly enough, if anything we invent, from ethical and legal norms to music and literature to science and technology, it is made possible by or inspired by the discovery of existence, and this in turn is made possible by consciousness. Moreover, in one way or another, to a greater or lesser extent, the inventions that influence the explored existence change it for better or worse. A closed loop of influences is thus formed: existence, consciousness, creativity. (*ibid.*, p. 339)

I propose that the “loop of influences” highlighted by Damasio should be interpreted in the light of the difficulties with tradition. At the centre of this loop is the causality of the individual. The meaning of the concept of innovation derives from the sources of tradition and its social realizations from people’s reference to these sources. In the tradition of modernism, consciousness was related to education, existence was related to education understood as people’s participation in a formally organized school system; and creativity was assessed in the perspective of the education

received. The creativity of the individual was an image of the effect of the education the individual received. Education itself was based on the basis of the declaration of rationalism and national tradition. It, therefore, took place against the background of a tradition called “European”. The tradition of rationalism told us to see the world logocentrically. At the same time, the term “logocentric” should not be interpreted in an evaluative manner, but rather in terms of emerging cultural patterns. It is only in the causative acts of individuals that it is used in a value-oriented way. Therefore, it is more important to have a general approach than a specific one; universal instead of individual; correctness, regularity, calculability is more important instead of chance, freedom or chaos. We give priority to what is stable, permanent, ordered in relation to what is ephemeral, transient, disorganized (Martens, Schnadelbach 1991 p. 99). As a consequence of these cultural assumptions, the tradition that we read the meanings of cultural artefacts had a specific feature: ethnocentrism. This was of paramount importance for the construction of the figure of the teacher and the construction of the educational relationship. The figure of an adult (teacher/educator) in such outlined cultural conditions is a person who is able to reduce differences to a general category, to categorize cases into broader streams, finding them a common cause or a common quality. The world has changed, and with the opening of the space called the Internet, the communication possibilities associated with it, and the creation of artificial intelligence, new cultural conditions have been established. Unlike in the modern era, we focus our perception of the world on cultural difference and globalization as the leading communication. While it was reasonable to define an individual’s cultural identity within the horizon of national tradition and socio-cultural identity, in the postmodern era the legitimacy of tradition has been questioned and generality and universality as concepts have changed their value. This configuration of conditions resulted in the creation of individualism as a special cultural feature and promotion of human causality. The category of individualism, in pedagogical studies, should be understood in two ways. It is a cultural phenomenon on the one hand and the individual’s causality (his power in relation to culture) on the other. The study of individualism of the philosopher Chantal Delsol led her to the statement that “individualism is an illusion” (Delsol 2018, p. 84). Individualism in this light is the assumption (as cultural as possible) that all adults are mature. As the author writes: “This certainty that all adults are adults” (*ibid.*, p. 93). The delusion of individualism could be understood more as an aspiration rather than a legitimate fitness or attribute of the individual. The problem lies in the lustful, egocentric nature of the individual and the inability to control these emotions, as she writes, “(...) which wants to turn all its whims into rights and avoids all responsibility” (*ibid.*, p. 103). Meanwhile, the legitimation of individualism in culture and its social functionality would require the individual to become a “free subject”:

Who acts by himself, which means he is able to start something, we assume that he alone is responsible for his actions (...) A person is a human being detached from the group, not in the sense that he becomes independent (this is the illusion of excessive individualism), but in the sense that he is considered capable of shaping his own destiny, of taking actions that depend only on him, and of bearing their consequences. Subjectivity means that each person is endowed with a conscience, an inner chasm capable of opposing authority, positive law, public opinion. Therefore, simply to exist, it must have real autonomy, not to be confused with others or with an incredible whole. (*ibid.*, p. 105)

The interpretation of individualism, giving it a meaning in the context of the social actions of individuals, becomes in this light critical in the perspective of tradition. It seems that teachers/educators lack a tradition to which they can refer when raising the next generation.

REFLECTIVE SOCIALIZATION – EXPOSURE TO CULTURAL DIFFERENCE

“To foresee the future, to be guided by it, to be able to make a selection in the course of events into useful and dangerous phenomena, and finally to be able to distinguish good from evil – these are the basic conditions thanks to which human life and activity makes sense” (Pilch 1990, p. 27) – writes Tadeusz Pilch, the author of the book *Spory o szkołę* [*Disputes about School*]. Not only does he emphasize the lack of landmarks for shaping intellectual, emotional and volitional skills of the next generation. The system of education and upbringing based on the ideology of positivism is not adequate to the challenges of postmodern culture. He stresses that “(...) defining the field of searching for values and rules for the future society is more difficult than the same task in relation to the individual. The world of individual aspirations and human needs is more concrete than the aspirations, rules and needs of a polymorphous society” (*ibid.*, p. 29). However, contemporary educational systems and pedagogy should not stop in the search for a system, models or the search for an idea that will define the field of involvement of the system of education and upbringing within postmodern culture. The search for tradition is also a challenge that Wolfgang Brezinka (2005) describes. In his work *Wychowanie i Pedagogika w dobie przemian kulturowych* [*Education and Pedagogy in a Time of Cultural Change*], he writes:

When it comes to useful knowledge and professional activity, it is still believed that no one can become an expert unless they have become thoroughly familiar with past achievements and base their thinking and actions on them. Knowledge that interprets the world and provides guidance as well as normative: religious, ethical, political and aesthetic elements of culture should be treated differently. In this realm, we have been observing a crisis of tradition in Europe for three hundred years now. (...) We are collapsing under the weight of cultural chaos.

It contains various traditions that do not fit together: religious and atheistic, work-oriented and pleasure-oriented, elite and egalitarian, regional and national or supranational. Many are mutually exclusive, all recruit to each other, all change with the spirit of the times. (Brezinka 2005, pp. 9–11)

Debates and critical accounts of the emerging new cultural determinants are still alive in the literature. Defining teacher/educator landmarks are slowly being forged. Nevertheless, there are demands and comments – it seems – that are building the foundations of a new tradition of education.

A researcher of the problem, working for the construction of a new tradition is certainly Marta Nussbaum (2016), the author of the book *Nie dla zysku. Dlaczego demokracja potrzebuje humanistów* [Not for Profit. Why Democracy Needs Humanists]. She confronts, on the pages of the work, the problem of the model of education in the context of global culture. Nussbaum's main postulate to education is the need to oppose mass culture in education. By mass culture in education, the author means education outside tradition – according to mass culture. It is in mass culture that she sees a number of terms causing educational systems to experience a “silent crisis”. Socialization in the conditions of mass culture produces educational effects in the form of individuals who are unreflective, undecided and unaware of their cultural self. Unreflectiveness becomes a normative feature for human behaviour. As she writes: “The problem with people who lead unreflective lives is that they often do not relate to each other with respect” (Nussbaum 2016, p. 69). Indecision as a normative trait means that the quality of arguments is not at the centre of attention and people are persuaded for the sake of fame or prestige, or the fact of gaining popular support. Indecision also results from respect for authority and peer pressure (*ibid.*). In the author's narrative, the cultural self's unconsciousness is called “howling individualism”. A similar position is taken by Delsol, explaining the problematic nature of the cultural identity of the individual of postmodern times, or, to put it differently, of our contemporary times. She begins her argument with a remark that postmodern man, searching for the essence of his existence in the conditions of cultural chaos, has turned to primitive thoughts – feelings. Hence the idea of mass culture: for us to exist is to feel. This turn to feelings has re-evaluated the causal power of the categories that build our relation to the world and construct our identity. It ceased to be the thought contained in cultural texts, it ceased to be custom, and it became feelings. Above all, sensual sensitivity and suffering. It should be stressed, however, that the cultural phenomenon (feelings) has not been interpreted by the category of virtue – as the European tradition would have it – analysed and described in the history of human thought. It has been reduced to the rank of desire. In other words, to say the cited sensual sensitivity and suffering was internalized as a value not in the context of virtue but in the context of subjectivity in analyzing the world (Delsol 2018). The meanings have become confused. “The morality of individual desires and whims seems to have

gained legitimacy, showing only its other side: suffering from unsatisfied desire” (*ibid.*, p. 43). Sensual sensitivity has become the criterion of dignity and suffering the criterion of evil (*ibid.*). Thus, discussion of ideals, objectification of reality has become impossible and certainly difficult.

In the world of mass culture, popular opinion influences individual choices. It is difficult to agree on the principles of general mutual relations in such a situation, it is difficult to define the common good and set community goals towards which we should aim as individuals in culture.

REFLECTIVE SOCIALIZATION – CONDITIONS AND PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION IN POSTMODERNISM

Nussbaum sees her opposition to mass culture in education in a re-reading of Socrates’ teachings. The author calls for, following Socrates, “democratic sensitivity and humility” (Nussbaum 2016, p. 69). The way that can lead societies to overcome the defects of mass culture and overcome the “howling individualism” would be to build “a culture of individual resistance” (*ibid.*, p. 72). The discussed unreflectiveness and indecisiveness as normative features of culture would have to be replaced by imagination and responsibility. The unconscious cultural self, on the other hand, with the autonomy of the person. The educational process should be directed towards making the young person an autonomous individual, capable of independent thinking and solving practical problems independently without having to rely on authorities (*ibid.*). Under circumstances of cultural difference – which is an immanent feature of the coming cultural era – Socratic thinking is important. It is based on the idea that everyone should take responsibility for their own reasoning and exchange thoughts with others in an atmosphere of mutual respect for reason. By emphasizing the importance of each person’s opinion, we also promote a culture of responsibility (*ibid.*). In replacing “howling individualism” with person autonomy, a number of socialization conditions must be fulfilled. An autonomous person is not an independent individual (Delsol 2018). Autonomy grows out of awareness and acceptance of dependence: “to be responsible is to be dependent” (*ibid.*, p. 108). Awareness and acceptance of dependence builds an autonomous identity. However, it is important to emphasize that acceptance is also conditional. Acceptance of dependence builds a person’s autonomy under the condition of “(...) having a conscience followed by the ability to oppose authority, public opinion or a reasonable relationship with authority” (*ibid.*, p. 105). Reflecting on the reflexive socialization of the postmodern times, one might be tempted to state that, firstly: subjectivity in culture is acquired by being inscribed in an order, which gives conditions for responsibility. Socialization should, therefore, acquaint and familiarize the individual with the scope of rights and duties, not in a compulsory and wishful manner, not through the prism of authority and power. This process should be

constructed by making rights and duties meaningful, in a process of critical thinking and consequences for all cultural groups within society. Secondly, subjectivity must be formed under conditions of freedom, but not the freedom of subjective rights. Subjective law in fact fuels the individual's desire and withdraws from consideration the perspective of community building and the communal coexistence of individuals. In the process of reflexive socialization, we need to take into account the assumption that societies are not a collection of isolated individuals with their own freedom, but a mosaic of communities and collectivities that are in interdependence.

In her book mentioned above, Nussbaum (2016), in the face of a new cultural era, new constructions of societies, in the face of new fitness needs and new competences, postulates seven points – educational goals. She herself states that this is an enormous programme. It is also duty-referenced:

- to develop the pupils' ability to see the world from the point of view of other people, especially those whom society presents as inferior or even objectifies,
- to teach an attitude towards human weakness and vulnerability, according to which weakness need not be a cause for shame and the need for support from others is not unmanly; to teach children not to be ashamed of their needs and lack of certain abilities, but to see them as opportunities for cooperation and exchange with others,
- to develop the capacity to genuinely care for others, both those close to us and those we do not know,
- to challenge the tendency to turn away in disgust from minorities of all kinds and to regard them as “inferior” or “defiling” the environment,
- to provide real and truthful information about other groups (ethnic, religious, sexual minorities and people with disabilities) in order to combat stereotypes and the sense of disgust that often accompanies them,
- to promote responsibility by treating each child as a responsible, active individual,
- to intensively foster the critical thinking, skills and courage required to express opposition to dominant opinions. (Nussbaum 2016, p. 64)

Analyzing the aforementioned points, it would be worthwhile to consider the specifics of the competence that will result from the implementation of the objectives. The author herself suggests that self-analysis is the most important. It is a situation when we can realistically assess our own attitude, consciously adopt views and locate real values which guide us in relation to others. The author calls these skills the “mental syndrome”. She says, which needs to be emphasized, that the educational goals she has collected and presented above are aimed at developing a qualitatively new approach to the social world. The knowledge acquired and skills developed in the educational process should be used in the context of active citizenship.

The principle on which the educational process should be based is the principle of self-analysis. Nussbaum understands it as a specific skill of dialoguing. Thus, the

competence of dialogue would consist in the fact that the speaker is in control of his or her own consciousness process, and, thus, knows why he or she takes this or that position on a given issue; knows why he or she uses this or that argument. As a result of this source self-analysis, the utterance is a narrative of a clearly formulated purpose for the expression of thought. The speaker is aware of the intention of the thought being expressed. The thought presented is formulated from the perspective of intention, not purpose. Arguments presented in the process of dialogue result from the awareness of the interests of the group or collectivity on behalf of which the individual speaks or for which the individual fights. The author bases the importance of the concept of self-analysis on the thought of Socrates and, in accordance with his writings, observes that basing a dialogue on self-analysis obviously does not give a guarantee of realization and achievement of a goal. On the other hand, it gives certainty that the connections between the postulate and the argument will be clearly visible, and that the issues essential to the problem will not be overlooked due to hastiness and lack of attention (*ibid.*, p. 68). Self-analysis as a competence, can be defined by the attitude of the speaker. It is not being influenced by external influences and taking care of the quality of the arguments. The attitude of not being influenced allows the structure of the opinion to be exposed. It is then easier to see the opinion or postulate in the light of a logical construction rather than a total, coherent narrative. Therefore, one can find shared assumptions and similarities of arguments, for instance. It is easier for conciliation and mutual understanding.

Another principle emphasized, in the light of reflexive socialization, is global responsibility. One could cite the author's words:

In the process of education, we must all learn to participate effectively in such discussions, to see ourselves as – to use a now classic phrase – “citizens of the world”, and not only as Americans, Indians or Europeans... The schools and universities of the world therefore have an urgent task to perform: to develop in pupils and students the ability to see themselves as members of a diverse nation (for all modern nations are diverse) in an even more diverse world, and to develop the ability to understand, at least in part, the history and character of the groups inhabiting that world. (*ibid.*, p. 99)

For what roots us in the cultural world of the coming era could be called “global responsibility”. The process of socialization is based on and defined by the embeddedness of individuals in a social culture. While our ancestors left us a legacy of socializing into the conditions of national societies, where values such as sovereignty were culturally marked, postmodernism requires global rootedness, and, thus, the value of global responsibility is evoked...

Global rootedness, which could be interpreted in terms of constructing a new tradition – adequate to the cultural processes of postmodernism, and the postulate against mass culture – would require looking at and referring to a theory proposed in

the literature by Archer (2019): the morphogenetic cycle of culture. The author sees three phases of the cycle. Behind each of them we can see the need to work through a particular cultural stage of cultural conditioning. In the pedagogical perspective, it is information about the educational content needed to build the postulated proficiency – innovation.

As individuals, we are culturally conditioned – immersed in an imaginative context that we ourselves have not created (*ibid.*). Multiculturalism as the social standard for intercultural relations in postmodern times requires us to respond to this inherited cultural context and to invoke our own reflexivity as the power to undertake the struggle against cultural conditioning (*ibid.*). To do this,

(...) we need a habitual change of mind set, motivated by curiosity to ask questions, and an open attitude that in effect proclaims: “here is another human being. I wonder what it sees and hears right now” (Kant). This curiosity feeds from facts, because without correct historical and empirical information we cannot answer such a question. It needs something more: a willingness to transcend the self and enter another world. (Nussbaum 2016, p. 216)

Hence, in the light of the stages of the morphogenetic cycle of culture, the first task is to build awareness of the dissimilarity of cultural systems – the dissimilarity of their logics of functioning. The educational effect in this system would be the awareness of the existence of logics different from ours (in the collective sense) and rationalities different from ours (in the collective sense). The second task is the training of cultural interaction, which should be based on different from ethnocentric principles. The most important in this system seems to be the ability to adopt the perspective of the other as a principle for building intercultural relations. Adopting the perspective of the other in pedagogy as a postulate already functions universally, however, Nussbaum’s (2018) position and her reflections carry this postulate into the sphere of educational tasks. First of all, the author emphasizes the numbing power of the fear of the stranger/culturally different and proposes to “dispel it” with the principle of human dignity; as regards the social problems growing out of cultural difference, she proposes to solve them from the perspective of approximating value systems and, through imagination, to oppose “(...) our selfish goals and desires, seeing other people as tools for satisfying desires” (Nussbaum 2016, p. 79), by accomplishing these tasks we will build open attitudes towards cultural diversity. The third educational task resulting from the cycle of cultural morphogenetic development is cultural overwork. As Archer states, it is “(...) a future forged in the present, from materials inherited from the past and with today’s innovation” (Archer 2019, p. 346). Referring to the theory of the morphogenetic cycle of culture as a source of educational tasks will allow us to achieve the postulate of postmodern culture – innovation in relation to tradition or with tradition in the background.

CONCLUSIONS

Referring to the theses of the article, in conclusion, it should be stated that education understood as a cultural imperative has found itself in the centre of cultural chaos. However, the condition of its effective functioning depends on its reliance on tradition. The change of cultural conditions from the era of modernism to the era of postmodernism entails the reformulation of conditions and principles of its functioning. The educational system should be based on the categories of reflexive socialization. It is driven primarily by a change of orientation from loyalty to one's own group, trusting in the guidance of intellectuals, to an appreciation of cultural pluralism and building a culture of individual resistance. The cultural identity processes of individuals are based on innovation, creativity and freedom in acts of cultural inheritance. The concept of individualism in particular needs re-evaluation and attention in the setting of a new tradition. The title reflexive socialization aims to give the power to oppose mass culture. The formation of the virtues of reflexivity, responsibility and imagination will contribute to the realization of this goal. Reflectiveness in socialization means understanding the meaningfulness of rights and duties, limiting desires understood as lust and focusing on the community as the foundation of social activity.

REFERENCES

- Archer M.S. (2019). *Kultura i sprawczość. Miejsce kultury w teorii społecznej*. Warszawa: NCK.
- Brezinka W. (2005). *Wychowanie i pedagogika w dobie przemian kulturowych*. Kraków: Wyd. WAM.
- Brozi K.J. (1994). *Antropologia wartości*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Damasio A.R. (2000). *Tajemnica świadomości. Jak ciało i emocje współtworzą świadomość*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
- Delsol Ch. (2018). *Kamienie węgielne. Na czym nam zależy?* Kraków: Znak.
- Geertz C. (2005). *Interpretacja kultur*. Kraków: Wyd. UJ.
- Giddens A. (2001). *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. „Ja” w społeczeństwie późnej nowoczesności*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Grzymała-Moszczyńska H. (2009). Proces akulturacji. In: J. Królikowska (red.), *Integralnokulturowe badanie kontaktu kulturowego. Wybrane problemy społeczne i prawne* (pp. 33–48). Warszawa: Wyd. UW.
- Martens E., Schnadelbach H. (1991). *Filozofia. Podstawowe pytania*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Nussbaum M. (2016). *Nie dla zysku. Dlaczego demokracja potrzebuje humanistów*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Kultury Liberalnej.
- Nussbaum M. (2018). *Nowa nietolerancja religijna. Przewyciężyć politykę strachu w niespokojnych czasach*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Kultury Liberalnej.
- Pilch T. (1990). *Spory o szkołę*. Warszawa: Wyd. Akademickie Żak.
- Welsch W. (1998). *Nasza postmodernistyczna moderna*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza.