Małgorzata Durzewska

The Multiplicity of Citizenship Models and the Future Vision of the Citizen

Summary. The study aims at the concept of culture in the context of cultural patterns which, in the process of the formation of culture, determine the ways of thinking, behavior and activities of each member of a culture. In the author's opinion, these patterns may lead to the formation of various cultural patterns which frequently contradict one another, and finally to the strangeness which results from the different ideological assumptions within each culture. Such a concept of cultural patterns provides a new approach for studying culture, the creations and manifestations of culture and, last but not least, the functioning of the members of a culture. Contemporary concepts of the citizen usually focus on the liberal model of a civil society and to a lesser degree on communitarianism, while the other concepts are lean towards the cosmopolitan vision of the citizen of the world.

Małgorzata Durzewska, Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań, Institute of Cultural Studies, Szamarzewskiego 89A, 60–568 Poznań, Poland, e-mail: malgorzata.durzewska@amu.edu.pl.

The Notion of Cultural Patterns

The theory of patterns of culture, which can be found in the works of Sapir, Benedict, White and Weber, asserts the existence of general and repetitive elements of

culture, not limited by social structures. According to this theory, the patterns, form, layout and organization of a culture should be examined, instead of analyzing individual characteristics and cultural content, or applying the approach characteristic of cultural anthropology.

> This theory is the basis of the analysis, as are the patterns of art, religion, philosophy, but also the technology and science, they appear and disappear, gain the content and enter into circulation completely independent of individual units. […] All dimensions of the culture are susceptible to patterns, but not all of them to the same extent or at the same level of consciousness.[1]

Those elements therefore define the framework of how the members of a particular culture think and act, and the range of these patterns and their duration are undergoing specific changes. The pattern, as a theoretical category, therefore allows theorists to analyze the common characteristics of different elements of culture; their persistence, variability and complexity. Thus, the theory of cultural patterns facilitates consistency and logical transition in the analysis of culture, for example:

> from religion to food, from policy to dress code, and from the method of production to the artifact, and its object and output hypothesis is the historic grid of patterns, which determines the starting point of the analysis. According to this perspective, if we consider a society as an organized collection of individuals who share a way of life, than a culture is the way of life. Culture emphasizes the accumulated tangible and intangible components, which people inherit, use, transform, understand and pass on.[2]

Every culture has more or less universal patterns, or signposts, which are recognized and shared by its members and passed on from generation to generation, but which, however, are also subject to change – in the course of evolution or revolution.

The Diversity of Cultural Patterns

A specific culture, by having its own patterns, ideological grounds (identified and internalized methods of thinking including the patterns of behavior typical for a given

---

[1] C. Jenks, *Culture*, London-New York 1993.

[2] Ibidem.

community), practical applications and products, is different in its components from other cultures. It can therefore be assumed that the ideas and patterns of behavior that differentiate people in terms of culture are the reason for these contrasts. These distinctive ways of thinking and ways of fulfilling elementary and complex human needs cause a peculiar kind of distance between people, as a result of the distance of cultures and the diversity of cultural patterns. According to R. Benedict, this is caused by the fact, that:

> A culture, like an individual, is a more or less consistent pattern of thought and action. Within each culture there come into being characteristic purposes not necessarily shared by other types of society. In obedience to these purposes, each people further and further consolidates its experience, and in proportion to the urgency of these drives the heterogeneous items of behavior take more and more congruous shape.[3]

Thus, the members of each culture follow common values and standards imperative for the specific community, which shape their way of thinking, behavior and actions. This specific mechanism facilitates the functioning of all the members of a given society, community and culture. R. Benedict says:

> A human society must make for itself some design for living. It approves certain ways of meeting situations, certain ways of sizing them up. People in that society regard these solutions as foundations of the universe. They integrate them, no matter what the difficulties. Men who have accepted a system of values by which to live cannot without courting inefficiency and chaos keep for long a fenced-off portion of their lives where they think and behave according to a contrary set of values.[4]

Patterns of culture, therefore, constitute the ideological facilities which are a determinant and a driving force of actions. Therefore, each participant's actions are conditioned by cultural patterns of thinking, which give meaning to activities and give significance to the symbols used by its members – and/or characteristic of a given community, or those accepted or adopted by an individual as their own.

It can be assumed that, in a sense, one also must deal with some elements of strangeness when a culture is viewed in relation to others. The patterns of culture

---

[3] R. Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, Boston-New York, p. 46.
[4] R. Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, Boston-New York, p. 12.

of a community (society) are slightly or even drastically different to others (i.e. there are no such elements in this culture which are consistent with other cultures), which as a result causes misunderstanding and distance. This distance can be reduced by entering into a relationship and getting to know another culture, another human being. Sometimes this strangeness results from ignorance and at other times from prejudice, because there is no willingness to get to know each other. As R. Benedict suggests:

> not every culture is characterized by a dominant character, but it seems probable that the more intimate our knowledge of the cultural drives that actuate the behavior of the individual, the more we shall find that certain controls of emotion, certain ideals of conduct, prevail that account for what seem to us as abnormal attitudes when viewed from the standpoint of our civilization.[5]

Cultural differences, in effect, may cause a sense of alienation or estrangement from representatives of different cultures, resulting from a lack of understanding of the cultural patterns of thinking and the ways of perceiving the world that guide other individuals. Lack of dialogue and desire to know the other person leads to an exacerbation of antagonisms and a sense of alienation. Even within the same culture there may be variation in patterns of thinking and perceiving the world which prevent any dialogue and understanding. It is difficult to talk about the different patterns of culture within a culture, but when these patterns diverge, then the cultural patterns and their types of thought and action may be so strong that it will be difficult to overcome them.

Selected Models of Citizenship

The dictionary definition of "citizen" emphasizes the citizen's nationality, giving them both rights and duties, defining the citizen as "a member of the country, possessing laws, duties and entitlements specified by the constitution".[6] Edmund Wnuk-Lipinski, inspired by Aristotelian thought, goes further and defines the citizen in the context of the entity which man is in general, and speaks of man (a human) as a citizen. According to Wnuk-Lipinski, "the human as a citizen, is primarily a full-fledged participant of the community, which is often referred to as civil society".[7] It is worth

---

[5] F. Boas, *Introduction*, in R. Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, Boston-New York 2005, p. XXI.

[6] A. Sikorska-Michalak, O. Wojniłko, *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*, Warszawa. 1998, p. 641.

[7] M. Szyszkowska eds., *Człowiek jako obywatel*, Warszawa 1995, p. 5.

mentioning that civil society is generally associated with the concept of citizen and citizenship, understood as a particular moral attitude that characterizes the community of socially involved members of a given society, who respect the rights of others to distinctness. For E. Lipinski, civil society means:

> on the one hand the equality of all citizens before the law, freedom of organization and association, freedom of expression and economic freedoms. On the other hand, these basic rights that determine whether a person is a full-fledged citizen, are associated with what could be called civic responsibility. […] Thus, if we talk about civil rights, we can have in our mind a set of prerogatives which – by definition – each and every member of the community, regardless of his/her ideology, beliefs or origin, is entitled to. If we talk about responsibility, we not only define the individual responsibility within the meaning of the Criminal Code, but rather a concern for the common fate.[8]

This definition seems to refer to features of the citizen (of his/her rights and obligations), characteristic of the liberal approach, which also includes the element of community, in consequence approximating this concept to that of the republican model of a citizen.

Charles Taylor, while describing patterns of active citizenship, points to its competitive, and so – by definition – also exclusive nature. The liberal model of the citizen focuses on the rights of individuals and on them being treated equally, it also focuses on the government taking actions while being considerate of the preferences of citizens. The superior value of this model is the idea that the law must be respected and guarded.[9] "Being a citizen is to the same extent the ability to restore those rights and ensure an equal treatment, as having a real influence on decision-making. These institutions are only instrumental. Participation in government is not a value in itself".[10] However, the second pattern, "considers the participation in self-management as the essence of freedom, as a component of what must be protected. This is an essential element of being a citizen. Full participation in self-management is treated as at least a partial opportunity to participate in shaping a consensus through which one can identify with the others".[11] This model means belonging to a certain self-describing cultural community, while the members of the political community

---

[8] Ibidem.
[9] W. Bokajło, K. Dziubka eds., Społeczeństwo obywatelskie, Wroclaw 2001, p. 192.
[10] Ibidem.
[11] Ibidem.

are integrated with this community, based on common traditions and established political institutions.[12]

Democracy seems to be the preferred order to achieve these objectives, as was recognized by Jürgen Habermas, who stated: "In a democracy, citizens are subject only to those laws which they have given themselves in accordance with a democratic procedure. The legitimizing force of this procedure rests, on the one hand, on the inclusion of all citizens in the political decision-making processes (however this is realized) and, on the other, on the coupling of (if necessary qualified) majority decisions with deliberative will-formation. Such a model of democracy transforms the citizens' use of communicative freedoms into as many productive forces for the legitimate – i.e. both interest-aggregating and effective – self-influencing of a politically organized civil society. If the citizens are to be able to cooperate in influencing social conditions, then the state must have corresponding scope for the political shaping of living conditions".[13] Such organizations exist to serve the citizens by creating the conditions for them to function freely in the social space, ensure the respect for freedom and civil rights, which the citizens can rightfully benefit from, with all the liability related to such freedom. Taking into consideration this theory, one can state, that "… the process of democratization is never complete. As the quest for perfection, it continues uninterruptedly. Continued democratization mainly includes the state of democratic societies and their awareness, or the awareness of individual citizens, and one of the consequences is to improve the system, or in other words – the procedural democracy. Only one of the consequences, because other problems relate to […] such things as inequality, indifference, lack of trust, or the boredom resulting from the alleged termination of the democratization process. Democracy is attractive and meaningful only because it is constantly changing, often for the better, sometimes the opposite. Democracy is therefore continually subjected to democratization, it is always in motion. Therefore all the perfectionistic aspirations should be offset by skepticism, but should not be completely rejected …".[14]

The Cosmopolitan Vision of the Model Citizen

J. Habermas, using the structure and functioning of the European Union as a model – presents a cosmopolitan vision of the future of the world, which can be a real legal and

---

[12] Ibidem, pp. 192–193.

[13] J. Habermas, *The crisis of the European Union a response*, tranls. C. Cronin, Cambridge 2013, pp.14–15.

[14] M. Król, *Pora na demokrację*, Krakow 2015, p. 174.

political construct, serving both the national and global interests of all the members of a worldwide community. He notes, that "The historically unprecedented construct of the EU would fit shamelessly into the contours of a politically constituted world society …"[15], therefore the goal of global society with a democratic system, due to its subjective grounds, requires the constitution of a community created by the citizens of the world. The typical idea of constitutional cooperation between States and citizens, according to Habermas, indicates the completion of an already existing international community of states with a community of countries consisting of the world's citizens, in order to create a cosmopolitan community, which constitutes a kind of supranational bond between citizens and nations. Nation states, however, can be, in addition to the citizens of the world, the second constitutional entity of the world community. Cosmopolitan citizens would therefore retain the right to the constitutive role of their countries at all the transnational levels, creating a plane of certain collective entities. The General Assembly would be composed of global citizens and representatives of the countries guarding their rights to rule, due to both their position as world citizens, and as the citizens-members of these states. The World Parliament would play the role of both the interpreter of the United Nations Charter and the constructor of law, including human rights and international law, which would include the developed minimum standards, including among others: the protection of and attentiveness to human rights by the Security Council, maintenance of world peace and the protection of rules of justice on a global scale; control of nation states in the field of the formulation of fundamental rights of its citizens; and control of the process of competing for power, according to established standards, limiting any redundancy. The United Nations would focus on its main task, namely the introduction of a global respect for human rights and the ban on the use of violence.

> The world organization would be subdivided and built in such a way that it could achieve its limited but fundamental ordering functions, specifically the defence of international peace in the sense of a global, even-handed and effective enforcement of the prohibition of violence; taking constructive measures to protect internal order within failing states; and monitoring the domestic enforcement of human rights throughout the world, as well as actively protecting populations against criminal governments, whereby humanitarian interventions include the obligation to build sustainable and functional infrastructures.[16]

---

[15] J. Habermas, op. cit., p. 57.
[16] Ibidem, p. 60.

The vision of J. Habermas, although utopian, is partially justified in the light of changes taking place in the world, called by Edgar Morin the "mondialisation (globalisation)" of the world, indicating a wider phenomenon of globalization, which includes almost all spheres of human life and activities, and is permanently inscribed in all these spaces. The example of Europe describes the mechanism of the mondialisation of civilization, which is characterized by the fact that, in the course of civilization, the unification of the world appears in various spheres of human life, such as technology, the sphere of useful skills, methods and ways of life based on the same types of consumption, applied technologies and used products. This process relies on the global flow of all goods and services, ideas and people; on mixing, on the equalization and standardization of human activities and products (influencing the whole world), and in consequence it leads to a specific kind of worldwide community.

This happens due to the prevalence of Western universalism, because:

> …before they became universal elements of civilization, science, technology, rationality, secularism were the products of historical Western culture. In turn, the expansion of this civilization, disseminating new ways of living and thinking, creates a total cosmopolitan culture, the culture of the planetary era.[17]

From this time, the human species turn into a human society, and frequent migrations give rise to a new multiethnic societies, multicultural, concentrated in the areas of national states, which becomes an obstacle to the creation of a common homeland for all people, despite the fact that J. Habermas in his concept of the citizen of the world sees hope in an integrated Europe and the rest of the world. According to his assumption, humans, by becoming citizens in two spaces – global and national – should be able to reconcile the particular and the local (national) interests with global (global, human) ones, while preserving both their own rights and freedoms and those of other people – fellow citizens of the world –and the diversity they bring to common national states. The divergence introduced by national states into the common space can enrich it through new visions and proposoed solutions. This process is very difficult and requires a high degree awareness from the world as a whole, and openness and empathy towards others (including environmental awareness), but it is not impossible to implement. However, the vision of Europe as an organization of nations combined, creating a kind of economically, legally and ideologically integrated platform, as a united, secure, rich, tolerant, developing and

---

17 E. Morin A. B. Kern, *Homeland Earth : A Manifesto for the New Millennium*, New York 1999, p. 43.

exemplary community, has unfortunately failed, as evidenced by, for example, the threat of its collapse, or withdrawal of some Member States, e.g. the United Kingdom (the so-called "Brexit"), which could seriously undermine the EU and, consequently, the world order. Also, nationalist movements explicitly deny the principles of unity and understanding for the common good and pose a reasonable cause for worrying about the future of the world.

Another aspect of this phenomenon is the neotribalist vision of Michel Mafesoli, which clearly indicates the transition of modern Western societies: from the modernist vision of the world, of arranging and organizing the life of citizens, towards post-modern society, based on organic relationships instead of the urban system previously in force. "Mafesoli indicates an identity crisis. Its source in the era of rationalism was a class membership – a permanent place in the structure, which clearly determined the objectives to be achieved, giving the individual a sense of meaning and his/her place in the world. Meanwhile postmodernism introduced confusion and alienation in the place of certainty and stability".[18] Uniformity appears as a result of progressive mass production, which encompasses more and more spheres of life, causing the loss of a sense of individualism and self-identification. The communities of interests, lifestyles, feelings, preferences and tastes become a defensive reaction to the process of "massification", as a consequence of a search for community, for an emotional connection with (in most cases) other unrelated individuals and the desire to connect with other people in the new ideological communities. Thereby one can observe the formation of a structure of loose relations – not imposed in any way, but having its source in the roots of human activity and being typically achieved in the local space, but also – through the media – in the global sphere. However, the nature of contemporary forms of association resembles more the model of neotribal organization than the national and identity forms, and membership of these groups does not establish a serious commitment, since joining them is possible on a voluntary basis, and what connects the members of such communities is only the belief in sharing common values and "kindred spirit" – therefore such a relationship is fragile, volatile and spontaneous.

Then who is this citizen of the future? It is difficult to identify, but probably he/she will not be a cosmopolitan citizen of the world, sensitive to the welfare of others and interested in a common peaceful existence; more likely it will be an jndividual oriented towards himself/herself and lost, because the problem lies in the way people themselves approach this issue. They lack a wider perspective, a responsibility and concern for the future. E. Morin attributes this phenomenon to the undermining

---

[18] W. Dohnal, *Plemienność naszych czasów*, „Czas Kultury" 2007, vol. 4–5, pp. 12–13.

of faith in the future and in the development that guided the previous generations, and which is disappearing from the current field of view. The lack of any clear purpose and the return to the past for the projection of new visions – although it may serve as a contribution to change, it rather leads to destruction even sooner than the prospects of building something new and better.

Conclusion

There is not one single vision of the future citizen which can be clearly defined on the basis of the examples of definitions or models of citizenship provided in this essay. Neither the liberal vision of the human being, nor the community nature of national unity, nor the cosmopolitan unity of humanity, nor the spirit of neotribal union spirit indicate the probable development of these forms of citizens' coexistence. The citizen is no longer assigned to a country by his/her nationality, origins and traditions, nor is he/she an open visionary of the future. This multiple post-modernist choice causes confusion for the individual in the world and a confusion of values, and often only emotional factors explain his/her choices, which in theory do not involve any consequences for the person choosing. In fact this is not true, because each and every choice leads in a certain direction, even if we do not seem to realize it. Therefore, in selecting a democratic model, we agree on the development of individualism and respect for the rights of all people regardless of their ideological or religious origin; we thus limit the opportunity to cultivate national and religious traditions, while gaining the development of civil liberties; meanwhile as we lose the sense of national and individual membership, we search for communities in loose association structures, which assure a sense of belonging and participation in social life.

It seems impossible to define a single common model of a citizen, because people have different needs and expectations and the manner of their fulfilment; they also share different values, often have different interests, different sensitivities etc. The need for community, however, is predominant in relations among human beings, but their own interests still prevail over the common good. It is difficult to achieve a consensus in order to create a common model and uniform definition of a citizen, taking into consideration the diversity of values and multitude of human attitudes, aspirations and expectations. What is left is to have hope that in the near future people will be able to give up part of their freedom, their selfishness, attachments, fears and frustrations and, for the common good, according to the suggestion of J. Habermas, once again try to create a better model of coexistence of the cit-

izens of the world, based on broad knowledge and experience. For the future always depends on our present decisions and choices concerning the way which we should follow as "the citizens of the world", understood not as distinguished individuals being worldly-wise or possessing special knowledge, but as people living together in harmony and being aware of their imperfection and of the ability to become a better person. Human progress depends on whether one will be able to recognize and accept the differences between humans and other interlocutors, neighbors and political partners, and whether one will realize that those differences can be managed in a variety of ways.

Literature

Benedict R., *Patterns of Culture*, Boston-New York 2005.

Benedict R., *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, Boston-New York 2005.

W. Bokajło, K. Dziubka eds., Społeczeństwo obywatelskie, Wroclaw 2001.

Dohnal W., *Plemienność naszych czasów*, „Czas Kultury" 2007, vol. 4–5.

Habermas J., *The crisis of the European Union a Response*, transl. C. Cronin, Cambridge 2012.

Jenks C., *Culture*, London and New York 1993.

M. Król, *Pora na demokrację*, Krakow 2015.

E. Morin A. B. Kern, *Homeland Earth : A Manifesto for the New Millennium*, New York 1999.

A. Sikorska-Michalak, O. Wojniłko, *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*, Warszawa 1998.

M. Szyszkowska eds., *Człowiek jako obywatel*, Warszawa 1995.