

AGNIESZKA CYBAL-MICHALSKA

*Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza
w Poznaniu*

GLOBALIZATION AND ALTERNATIVE THINKING: ON THE NEED TO DIRECT THE SOCIETY TOWARDS RESPONSIBLE CO-PARTICIPATION AND COOPERATION

ABSTRACT. Cybal-Michalska Agnieszka, *Globalization and Alternative Thinking: on the Need to Direct the Society Towards Responsible Co-Participation and Cooperation* [Globalizacja i ruchy myślenia alternatywnego – o potrzebie zorientowania społeczeństwa na odpowiedzialne współuczestnictwa i współdziałania]. *Studia Edukacyjne* nr 47, 2018, Poznań 2018, pp. 33-48. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 1233-6688. DOI: 10.14746/se.2018.47.3

Contemporary world has become a global ecumene. The theory of globalization as approached by R. Robertson invokes the world conceptualization which assumes reducing the tension between the dichotomous tendencies. Unification and diversification are complementary processes, they are mutually influential and essential for the contemporary stage of development of the global society. The paradigm of globalization on the social and cultural plane is revealed in the binary scheme of extremes, such as: decontextualization and recontextualization, decomposition and recomposition, deterritorialization and re-territorialization, transculturation and internalization. The contemporary anti-globalist movement is a reflection of ideological opposition. The criticism of globalization remains in close connection to an increasingly lively discussion regarding alternatives to globalization. Specificity of the quality of global cultural ecumene reveals the need to shape and improve the orientation towards responsible participation and cooperation in the changing and co-dependent global society.

Key words: globalization, unification, diversification, anti-globalist movement, alter-globalist movement, orientation towards responsible participation in global society.

Globalization of the contemporary world, which is a consequence of civilization development, is perceived as a final stage, as an advanced or even decadent, and definitely specific, phase of the evolution of social culture. When we place humanistic discourse over globalization in the “post-modern” era, as A. Toynbee approaches it¹, we observe deep changes in social systems, constantly undergoing some transformations, which occurred within a few

¹ P. Tobera, *Niepokojująca nowoczesność*, Kultura i Społeczeństwo, 2000, 3, p. 9.

decades of the modern world order.² The direction of the transformations in social development is reflected by the distinction between different types of society, e.g. pre-industrial, industrial and post-industrial societies described by D. Bell³; agricultural, industrial and post-industrial societies described by Toffler⁴; and the division of states into pre-modern, modern and post-modern ones proposed by R. Cooper.⁵ The following transitions are strictly global: from industrial to information society, from technology of power to high tech/high touch, from national economy to global economy, from short-term planning to long-term planning, from centralization to decentralization, from institutional help to self-help, from representative democracy to participatory democracy, from hierarchies to networking, from North to South, and from either/or to multiple options, all of which are characterised by the major megatrends or directions of changes in the contemporary world distinguished by J. Naisbitt.⁶ It is important to emphasize the concept of shifting away from *Gemeinschaft* (community) to *Gesellschaft* (society) as proposed by T. Tönnies, and then developed by R. Robertson who distinguishes between global *Gemeinschaft* and global *Gesellschaft*.⁷ Civilization of the society of "late modernity" (A. Giddens) is the epoch of the "risk society", proposed by U. Beck⁸, i.e. the society which lives in the conditions of higher risk, unlimited by time and space.

Contemporary world has become a global ecumene. However, it does not entail a tendency for standardization of cultural values which replicate the models characteristic for western societies. For the creators of homogeneous approach to globalization (S. Amin, A. Gunder, I. Wallerstein) "domination of these models means (...) subordinating local particular values to universal processes".⁹ Theoretical bases for the discussed approach can be found in the theory of the world system proposed by I. Wallerstein, which invokes the process of integration and interaction in the world system in the economic dimension, characterized by moving from the crisis of feudalism to the beginning of geographic expansion of capitalism (from 1450 to 1640 - stage I) and then going through the stage of agricultural capitalism (to 1760), early

² The subject matter addressed in the article is a fragment of considerations on the topic of globalization as approached (in the broad theoretical and empirical context) in the work entitled *Tożsamość młodzieży w perspektywie globalnego świata. Studium socjopedagogiczne* (A. Cybal-Michalska, Poznań 2006).

³ See also D. Bell, *Nadejście społeczeństwa postindustrialnego*, Warszawa 1975.

⁴ See also A. Toffler, *Trzecia fala*, Warszawa 1997.

⁵ R. Cooper, *The Post-Modern State and World Order*, London 1997.

⁶ J. Naisbitt, *Megatrendy*, Poznań 1997.

⁷ R. Robertson, *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture*, London 1992, p. 78-79.

⁸ U. Beck, *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*, London 1992.

⁹ M. Kempny, *Globalizacja*, [in:] *Encyklopedia socjologii*, t. I, Warszawa 1998, p. 243.

(to 1917) and well-developed (1960) industrial capitalism, until the stage of post-industrial capitalism typical for modern times (since 1970), which R. Robertson considers as the phase of uncertainty.¹⁰

The synchronisation of economic relationships development (economism) with the dynamics of cultural development (culturalism) was emphasized by such scholars as H.K. Bhabhe, S. Hall and E. Said, who hereby indicated the heterogeneous nature of globalization understood after J.N. Pieterse as “hybridization, or overlapping of phenomena, fragmentation and unification of social forms and cultural practices resulting in the multiplicity of hybrid forms, which takes the form of global intercultural melange”¹¹, where a breakthrough in economy and politics is determined by cultural aspects.

The theory of globalization as approached by R. Robertson invokes the world conceptualization which assumes reducing the tension between the dichotomous tendencies. The essence of social development in global conditions

does not mean the process of eliminating localities, what is more, there is no contradiction between the universal and the local, between the logic of the world system and looking for “settlement” by individuals who function in a local dimension.¹²

In consequence, what becomes a vital issue for highlighting the lack of one-dimensional globalization is the discrimination between two coexisting, interweaving and mutually determined processes proposed by A. Giddens, i.e. globalization and glocalization. Globalization is described as intensification of social relationships on global scale, hence it concerns, as R. Robertson points out, on the one hand, the world’s “shrinking”, and on the other hand, the increasing awareness of the “global character” of the surrounding world.¹³ Thereby, as Z. Bauman emphasizes, “what some understand as globalization, others see only as localization”¹⁴, because as Borges reminds, “the world is a sphere whose centre is everywhere whereas the borders are nowhere”.¹⁵

Another attempt to organize the conceptual apparatus consists in introducing two categories, i.e. “glocalization” and “globalization”. Glocalization can be defined as a mutual permeation of what is global with what is local, which affects various geographic zones. The concept of globalization, a desired companion of the term glocalization, focuses on imperialistic ambitions of the states, corporations and the like, as well as their desire and actually the need to expand in various geographic zones. Their main goal is to observe the

¹⁰ P. Starosta, *Globalizacja i nowy komunitaryzm*, Kultura i Społeczeństwo, 2000, 3, p. 49.

¹¹ M. Kempny, *Globalizacja*, p. 243.

¹² Ibidem, p. 244.

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ Z. Bauman, *Globalizacja*, Warszawa 2000, p. 6.

¹⁵ M. Golka, *Cywilizacja. Europa. Globalizacja*, Poznań 1999, p. 165.

growth (hence the term globalization) of their power, their influence and, in many cases, their profits all over the world. It does not imply any qualitative assessment. After all, glocal issues might have some negative qualities (lack of openness towards some useful global aspects), whereas global ones might have some positive characteristics (e.g. providing new medicines and medicinal technologies).¹⁶

Unification and diversification are complementary processes, they are mutually influential and essential for the contemporary stage of development of the global society. The paradigm of globalization on the social and cultural plane is revealed in the binary scheme of extremes, such as: de-contextualization and re-contextualization (existence out of a context and looking for a new contextual quality), decomposition and re-composition (decomposing cultural structure and establishing new cultural constellations from distilled fragments of cultural reality), deterritorialization and re-territorialization (separation of the cultural content and form from the local context and looking for "settlement" in another culture), transculturation and internalization (culture, as a cluster of phenomena which are interconnected, mutually conditioned and correlated, succumbs to the hybrid transfers of cultural content and form, and the desire to internalize it by an individual, who transforms the existing cultural material, endows it with individual meaning and expresses it in behaviour).¹⁷ In consequence the analytical value of the phenomenon of globalization indicates a necessity to distinguish the dichotomous processes of social and cultural transformation which are characteristic for the experiences of the contemporary world.

In the face of the dynamics of "new locality" and the explosion of the phenomena indicating cultural diversity, their ubiquity and intensity, globalization is a result of the processes of diversification and cultural plurality of the contemporary world. Hence it implies "heterogeneity of intercultural dialogues" (A. Appadurai) on the local and national level and reveals an advancing "arrangement of diversity" (A.D. Smith) rather than replicating the unification.¹⁸ Under this approach globalization addresses a full spectrum of the world issues in the situation of diversity, ambivalence and ambiguity, which impacts the new quality of social and cultural life.

The usefulness of micro-perspective for presenting globalization in terms of a holistic description is difficult to capture, since as M. Golka emphasizes, when analyzing the phenomenon of globalization

¹⁶ G. Ritzer, M. Ryan, *The Globalization of Nothing*, [in:] *The Changing Face of Globalization*, Ed. S. Dasgupta, London 2004, p. 300-301.

¹⁷ L. Korporowicz, *Tożsamość wyobrażona*, [in:] *Róża wiatrów Europy*, Ed. A. Tyszką, Warszawa 1999, p. 90-92.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 90.

we can see the trees but we do not see the forest, we can see some of its symptoms but we can't see it as a whole, and we do not know if we will ever be able to create such means of observation which will enable its cognition.¹⁹

Emphasizing the need to approach globalization holistically as a phenomenon (indicating its processes, structure and function) which would be most fruitful in terms of describing the peculiar character of the processes occurring in the world (their mutual relationships and connections) as well as the difficulty in capturing globalization, due to its dynamic character, induce a permanent reflection on the quality of globalization in the contemporary world and call for a better answer to the question "how to move from «a series of detailed reports» to «a more general description»?"²⁰

In order to understand the essence of hybridization of the contemporary world, one must concentrate on ideological, conceptual, political and ethical alternatives of globalization, which are an indispensable element of the polyphonic discourse, and which are revealed by spokesmen for alter-globalist and anti-globalist initiatives and movements. Globalization as a phenomenon determined by the processes of diversification and cultural pluralism occurring in the contemporary world is revealed according to Z. Bauman by advancing polarization of views within individual societies, and also between societies in the global scale. "Globalization divides and unites to the same extent, and the reasons of the division of the world are the same as the factors which lead to its uniformity".²¹ The presented rhetoric characterizes economic globalization (neoliberal) mostly as a basic source of polarization and growing disproportion between various countries, which results in growing dependence of the world's peripheries on its centre and underdevelopment of the former.²² The above considerations refer to the findings of R. Falk. According to the political scholar, one should distinguish two different visions of globalization: *globalization from above*, generated by huge and often invisible forces, and *globalization from below*, which could be referred to an array of contesting grassroots initiatives. *Globalization from below*, which is shaped by a subjective sense of globalization phenomena (microperspective), is an answer to *globalization from above*, which is identified with inevitability, complexity and unpredictability of globalization tendencies based on neoliberal regulations.²³ The contemporary anti-globalist

¹⁹ M. Golka, *Cywilizacja*, p. 112.

²⁰ E. Tarkowska, *Globalizacja i ubóstwo*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* Ed. S. Amsterdamski, Warszawa 2004, p. 201.

²¹ Z. Bauman, *Globalizacja*, p. 6.

²² A.W. Nowak, *Wobec systemu – wokół teorii Wallersteina*, Lewą Nogą, 2001, 13, p. 158.

²³ R. Falk after: B. Głowacki, *Za fasadą niezrozumienia. Fakty i mity o współczesnym ruchu antyglobalizacyjnym*, [in:] *Kultura w czasach globalizacji*, Eds. M. Jacyno, A. Jawłowska, M. Kempny, Warszawa 2004, p. 345.

movement is a reflection of ideological opposition (which consists of a wide range of resistance movements – *globalization from below*)²⁴, which according to D. Cohen is strongly tempted to “blame globalization for the difficulties encountered also in the situations when more depends on internal changes within a society than on external factors”.²⁵ Opponents of globalization want to manifest the negative feelings of injustice, exploitation, frustration, exclusion and marginalization of individuals, groups and societies (the increasing “gap” between the developed countries and poor countries of the Third World) which have been growing in the world for the past few years.²⁶ Other negative aspects associated with globalization are as follows: the risk of terrorism from separatist and fundamentalist groups (“the war of civilization” – S. Huntington), increasing and deepening economic inequalities leading to shrinking of the labour market (“end of work” – J. Rifkin), mass unemployment and lack of employment stability. Another thing is the emergence of the so called “homo economicus” (A. Zybała), “caste of global people” (Z. Bauman), who are placed in opposition to those who are oppressed by locality²⁷, i.e. the so-called *underclass* (underclass of permanently marginalized people – A. Zybała). Anti-globalist movement is not concentrated on determining whether negative consequences or aspects of globalization are exclusively a derivative of this phenomenon, but on emphasizing such slogans as: “globalization is to blame for the evil in the contemporary world”²⁸, and “the world is not a commodity”.²⁹ It is emphasized that “globalization is not global” (E. Tarkowska), arguing that it includes only 1/3 of the globe population, which indicates that globalization is identified mostly with international economic integration. This integration by offering an economic vision of *prosperity* contributes to the division of the globe into the centre and peripheries. The array of controversies concentrated around the essence and results of neoliberal globalization to all intents and purposes leads to a polarization of opinions within the anti-globalists’ discourse on the global aura of the contemporary world.

Social movements, being a constructive element of the social and cultural reality, constitute an inseparable part of the processual global and social change and they stimulate it. Global society, which is highly urbanized and industrialized, contributes to atomization of communities. “Social capital” (R. Putnam) is a network of spontaneous connections and self-organizations

²⁴ See: K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne – druga fala kontestacji?* [in:] Ibidem, p. 315-335.

²⁵ D. Cohen after: E. Tarkowska, *Globalizacja i ubóstwo*, p. 208.

²⁶ E. Weede, *Rent-Seeking or Dependency as Explanations of Why Poor People Stay Poor*, [in:] *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*, Eds. M. Albrow, E. King, London 1990, p. 174-175.

²⁷ E. Tarkowska, *Globalizacja i ubóstwo*, p. 206-207.

²⁸ See: A. Dylus, *Globalny rynek i jego granice*, Warszawa 2001, p. 17.

²⁹ B. Prejs, *Bunt nie przemija*, Katowice – Warszawa 2004, p. 16.

established by different people creating multiple structures in order to break free from limitations that make it impossible to satisfy human aspirations or in order to pursue goals, important for themselves or for future generations. This capital is expressed, among others, by an internally varied anti-globalist movement which is a response to "the lost community". A lonely individual living in the society of global change, which is increasingly dominated by abstract forces of global economy, starts to feel "a vacuum of values", suffers from "a Lilliput complex" (S. Ossowski) and has some dreams about a resurrection of groups that would be a substitute of personal intimacy, typical for primitive societies. "Learning through common experiences" (L. Goodwyn) can be manifested by multiple and varied, in terms of form and methods, activities and grassroots movements (e.g. mass and global development of non-governmental organizations³⁰ and associations). These reflect liquidity of anti-globalist movement and they are an expression of rising global awareness of the opposition members. New semantic quality within the culture of the opposition, protest and contestation against globalization, which appeared in the wake of global transformations, makes it possible to refer to the opponents of globalization as the "anti-globalist movement". This movement is placed within the counter culture and even alternative culture as a non-institutionalized actor of social change".³¹ Heterogeneous character of anti-globalization contributes to the freedom of interpretation, definition and methodology of the debate regarding anti-globalist movement. K. Klejsa emphasizes that the most constitutive features of anti-globalist movement are voluntarism, autonomy as well as the presence of "ethnocentric" tendencies which in practice can contribute to emergence of new varieties of "iron curtains".³²

The usefulness of the discourse on globalization for the interpretation of the anti-globalist movement, in the face of new challenges of local and global character, consists in a possibility to show its activity by an attempt to describe and interpret a variety of opposing ideas with a pragmatic approach, concentrated mainly on the criticism of dominating neoliberal economic model. The following tendencies should be mentioned when speaking about criticism of neoliberal globalisation: a) culture of opposition against the globalization of the world economy where local and national contexts lose meaning and contribute to the erosion of the state institutions; b) culture of opposition against the cultural expansion of the western world, which aims at unification of the rest of the world to make it a replica of western lifestyle, values, rules, norms and beliefs; c) culture of opposition against the globa-

³⁰ See: R. Pankowski, *Dylematy antyglobalizmu*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* p. 92-94.

³¹ B. Misztal, *Ruch społeczny*, [in:] *Encyklopedia socjologii*, t. III, Warszawa 1998, p. 344.

³² K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 333.

lization as a “machine for exclusion” which is directed by a broadly understood turbo-capitalism, contributing to the division of society into the centre and peripheries, and d) culture of alternative thinking about the need to replace neoliberal globalization with a different type of globalization, i.e. alternative globalization.³³

The opposition is based on emphasizing a contradiction revealed by equalizing the answer to the question: “What is good for a human?” with the answer to the question “What contributes to the increase of the system?”. An assumption that “What serves the development of the system (or even one huge corporation³⁴) serves also the development of a human being”³⁵ was met with a negative reaction of many anti-globalist formations. They saw in it the particular perception of a human nature, according to which a man is by nature selfish, greedy and anti-social. If a human being is perceived as selfish then anti-social character of his behaviours seems quite a “natural consequence” of this, not a response to global capitalism. For *homo economicus* profit is the only thing that counts. It is worth doing anything only if it brings some substantial and calculated benefits “here and now”.³⁶ On the other hand, anti-globalists interpret “technologization of mentality of contemporary man” (H. Lefebvre) in a diametrically different way and emphasize pro-social and pro-normative quality of human nature, but claim that the world which was ordered according to neoliberal rules does not meet human’s expectations³⁷ and takes away the hope for better tomorrow. When apologists of globalization claim that “it is better than it used to be”, then its opponents, interpreting the effects of omnipotent liberalization, ask “why is it so bad?”³⁸ and assure that “the world can be different”.³⁹ Polarization of global society refers to two aspects of growing inequalities, i.e. inside a country and between countries, whereas in the global scale between the richest in developed countries (centre) and the poorest in underprivileged countries (peripheries).⁴⁰ Arguments raised by anti-globalists mostly refer to the last aspect of approaching economic inequalities.

On the outskirts of anti-globalist ideology there is also a protest against cultural expansion of the West, which aims at unifying the world, so that it

³³ R. Kiely, *Neo-Liberal Globalization Meets Global Resistance: The Significance of ‘Anti-Globalization’ Protest*, [in:] *The Changing Face of Globalization*, Ed. S. Dasgupta, London 2004, p. 298.

³⁴ D.C. Korten, *Świat po kapitalizmie. Alternatywy dla globalizacji*, Łódź 2002, p. 85.

³⁵ K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 327.

³⁶ A. Zybała, *Globalna korekta*, Wrocław 2004, p. 22.

³⁷ K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 327-328.

³⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 326.

³⁹ Ch. Grefe, M. Greffrath, H. Schumann, *Czego chcą krytycy globalizacji?* Kraków 2004, p. 13.

⁴⁰ L. Balcerowicz, *Globalizacja rynków*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* p. 33-34.

can become a replica of the western civilization, and at creating one global society of cultural ambiguity.⁴¹

The criticism of globalization remains in close connection to an increasingly lively discussion regarding alternatives to globalization. A significant source of inspiration for alter-globalists is the view, or even a conviction, that globalization is not directed by an “invisible hand of the market”, but by a broadly understood turbo-capitalism, and the train called neoliberal globalization can and should be stopped because we do not know where it is going to take us. Moreover, it is not true that there is no ticket inspector on this train (or even a train manager), quite the contrary, this function is fulfilled mainly by the following institutions: the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).⁴² Quasi-ideology or “ideological myth” (J. Pieter) of anti-globalism lays basis for alternative concepts of globalization because it does not make it possible to articulate globalization as a logically and historically justified process connected with social and cultural transformations of modernity. And after all the inevitability of such neoliberal transformations in the global scale implies a comparison of globalization to a rushing train which has to be embarked because it aims for common prosperity, and who does not take the risk will remain alone on an empty train station.⁴³ On the other hand, inner axiology of alter-globalist assumptions is based on a conviction that economic and political aspects should be balanced by “global respect for human rights and a high level of global sensitivity of emphatic character”.⁴⁴ The source of quasi-ideological inspiration of alter-globalists stems from the slogan “think globally – act locally” which is often quoted in the discourse regarding globalization. Alter-globalists propose strengthening local autonomy with a simultaneous emphasis placed on common (i.e. in global scale) priorities and aspirations.⁴⁵ This point of view, unifying and differentiating at the same time, is reflected by the statement that “one should not be afraid that particular interests of individual societies will gain the upper hand because it is possible to overcome ethnocentric way of thinking provided that a superior rule is adopted, i.e. *unitas multiplex* – varied unity”⁴⁶. Spectacular slogans proclaimed by alter-globalists, which suggest rebuilding the world economy and the world of parliamentary democracy, are rather utopian. Crystallization of the new

⁴¹ Understanding culture in its distributive sense, i.e. indicating the culture of a given community approached either in the typical or typological way, can be considered as a platitude.

⁴² K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 325.

⁴³ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁴ R. Pankowski, *Dylematy antyglobalizmu*, p. 91.

⁴⁵ R. Kiely, *Neo-Liberal Globalization*, p. 273.

⁴⁶ E. Morin after: K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 334.

alter-globalist concept is connected with the belief that “the world did not grow up to its utopia”. Therefore, its implementation should be postponed by some undefined time believing that “sooner or later it will become a coronation of the inevitable progress of History”.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, it does not mean the acceptance of economic, social and cultural *status-quo* and resignation from being sensitive to the existing inequity and injustice in the layout of global powers imposed by the wealthy of the world, i.e. the states belonging to the Group of Eight⁴⁸, international financial institutions and international and transnational corporations. The essential effort of alter-globalists focuses on increasing and even changing social conscience (planetary awareness – Korten), and most of all, on raising awareness of the occurring globalization processes, at the same time indicating the necessity of critical thinking about the current shape of globalization (neoliberal). Such alter-globalist approach entails looking for an answer to the question about the meaning of the world order and thus, it puts pressure on the wealthy of the world to undertake the most beneficial activities to fight with broadly understood marginalization and exclusion, which according to alter-globalists are the results of globalization of neoliberal economics. In conclusion, the inevitable progress towards “a better world” will result from maintaining by alter-globalists and anti-globalists the awareness of public opinion as regards the occurring globalization processes.

Many myths have grown around the rebellious anti-globalist movement which is rather pragmatic (concentrated mainly on criticizing the domination of the neoliberal social model) and reflects, as some say, general social dissatisfaction, or as others say, the need to create a “community of experiences” (after the epoch of communism this niche is filled by anti-Americanism). The above considerations, which are an outline of the phenomenon of anti-globalism, lead to the question about the future of the movement⁴⁹ and its internal axiology. Futuristic ponderings on the evolution of the anti-globalist movement in the face of new challenges on the local and global level lead to a conclusion that qualitative changes will depend on

whether it will primarily be propelled by youthful defiance and commercialized fashion to “fight with the system”, or it will be more self-conscious and emancipating, i.e. able to transform social mentality in the same way as the counter-culture of the 1960s did.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 335.

⁴⁸ The Group of Eight includes the following states: the USA, Japan, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Canada and Russia.

⁴⁹ After B. Głowacki, *Za fasadą niezrozumienia. Fakty i mity o współczesnym ruchu antyglobalizacyjnym*, [in:] *Kultura w czasach globalizacji*, p. 357.

⁵⁰ K. Klejsa, *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne*, p. 335.

Heterogeneous character of anti-globalism is a response to “future shock” (A. Toffler). It is also an expression of searching for a new vision of the world stemming from the conviction that human minds should be infused with the ideal of harmonious development of all societies in the global world. We are witnessing the advent of “international solidarity”, which I. Ramonet, one of the ideologists of the opposition against the contemporary “market tyranny” and the founder of ATTAC organization⁵¹, calls the new form of the “United Nations”, i.e. a formation of “united civil societies”. “Something” is being born on the world arena, but we still do not know what it is, as I. Ramonet claims.⁵² Perhaps this is a new utopia that is being born? Or a new political doctrine? Certainly it is a step towards humanization of global market mechanisms and a sign of rising hope for establishing global responsibility. According to N. Klein, this superior movement emphasizes the development of many worlds because the global world, as Zapatists claim, contains many worlds within. “History isn’t over yet” – as alter-globalists and anti-globalists assure – “because we make it”.⁵³

When discussing the shape of the future society we do not resign from answering the question “What kind of society is contemporary?”, and moreover, we look for an answer to such questions as “What can a society be like?”, indicating several possible scenarios of social development difficult to predict *a priori*⁵⁴, or “What should a society be like?”, basing on the axionormative narration. The development of humanistic reflection on permanent autocreation of the contemporary society indicates an attempt to define a more or less cohesive collection of approaches that society takes towards the surrounding world. These approaches are (both on the social and individual level) generalized tendencies to perceive, evaluate, feel and react towards globalization changes in the world basing on conscious or semi-conscious convictions regarding the social and cultural surroundings on the one hand, and the agent and its inherent possibilities on the other hand.⁵⁵

Specificity of the quality of global cultural ecumene reveals the need to shape and improve the orientation towards responsible participation and cooperation in the changing and co-dependent global society. Anticipation contributes to multifaceted perception of the autonomy

⁵¹ See: H.P. Martin, H. Schumann, *Putapka globalizacji*, Wrocław 1999, p. 288.

⁵² An interview with J. Ramonet, see: A. Domosławski, *Globalizacja i kontestacja*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* p. 77-88.

⁵³ N. Klein, *No Logo*, Izabelin 2004, p. 472.

⁵⁴ A. Giddens, *Nowoczesność i tożsamość*, Warszawa 2001, p. 5.

⁵⁵ See: T. Hejnicka-Bezwińska, *Orientacje życiowe młodzieży*, Bydgoszcz 1991; M. Ziółkowski, *Orientacje indywidualne a system społeczny*, [in:] *Orientacje społeczne jako element mentalności*, Eds. J. Reykowski, K. Skarżyńska, M. Ziółkowski, Poznań 1990; K. Skarżyńska, *Orientacja egalitarna i nieegalitarna*, [in:] *Orientacje społeczne*.

of other individuals, societies and cultures, as it is an activity of mind and enhances social solidarity in time because it has a temporal dimension. On the other hand, participation is a social activity and it enhances solidarity in space because it has a geographic dimension.⁵⁶ The range of innovative activities in the global dimension depends on the extent of active effective and responsible participation and cooperation on local, national, international and global level. When interpreting the quality of social activity, its processual (based on a symbolic interaction) and creative (not quite causatively determined but introducing innovative elements) character is emphasized. "From a narrow either/or society with a limited range of personal choices, we are exploding into a free-wheeling multiple-option society".⁵⁷ The unprecedented diversity of personalized lifestyles leads to the new quality of cultural reality, representing a mosaic of cultural artefacts on material, behavioural, psychological and axiomatic level, which offers multiple options⁵⁸, where the increasing temporariness, instability and diversity do not guarantee any cohesion which is based exclusively on rational standards. Innovativeness must go hand in hand with critical thinking and careful consideration of the global reality as well as internalization and application of extended and multifaceted knowledge in new situational contexts. In the atmosphere of ambiguity the scope of agency, understood as a conviction that one can influence the course of events and is able to move on from anticipation to action aiming at implementing their plans⁵⁹, should not be limited in time or space. The "sense of agency" (P. Sztompka) is revealed in a belief that "challenges and problems, both personal and social, can be solved if people undertake some actions, either individually or collectively".⁶⁰ These actions are organised in a systematic process of innovative character. Development must occur "through" people and "for" people as they are its initiators and beneficiaries.⁶¹ Ascertainment of risk determines cooperation and contributes to changing the quality of togetherness based on identification with "the whole humanity in one global system".⁶² Practical engagement requires "switching to faith" in the success of activities, which stems from trust connected with the immanent and primary need of ontological security. Trust based on faith constitutes a

⁵⁶ J.W. Botkin, M. Elmandijra, M. Malitza, *Uczyć się bez granic. Jak zewrzeć „lukę ludzką”?* Warszawa 1982, p. 82-85.

⁵⁷ J. Naisbitt, *Megatrends*, New York 1986, p. 20.

⁵⁸ See: J. Naisbitt, *Megatrends*, p. 127-129.

⁵⁹ See: T. Zysk, *Orientacja prorozwojowa*, [in:] *Orientacje społeczne*, p. 196-204.

⁶⁰ P. Sztompka, *Socjologia*, Kraków 2002, p. 566.

⁶¹ P. Dasgupta, *Globalization, Altruism and Sociology of Humanity*, [in:] *The Changing Face*, p. 131.

⁶² Z. Melosik, *Edukacja skierowana na świat – ideał wychowawczy XXI wieku*, *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 1989, 3, p. 166.

“protective cocoon” which guards *ego* in its daily activities. “It cancels” potential events which would paralyze free will of an individual and their sense of belonging, if they took them into consideration seriously. More specifically, trust is a platform for interaction with abstract systems, which on the one hand, deprive daily life from traditional meanings and on the other hand, establish globalizing influence.⁶³

Trust platforms in post-modern cultures are found in abstract systems, which do not belong to any locality. A. Giddens distinguishes the following trust platforms: (a) *Personal relationships* based on friendship or sexual intimacy as a way of stabilizing social bonds; (b) *Abstract systems* as a way of stabilizing relationships in nondescript time and space divisions; (c) *Future oriented counterfactual thought*, as a way of combining the past with the present.⁶⁴ Trust promotes constructive relationships between individuals and societies with the globalizing world “anchored” in the phenomena of unification and differentiation, and it facilitates solving the dilemma of “continuity and change” of cultural patterns.

The above propositions are not based on the finding whether globalization refers to global consequences or global enterprises. The answer to this question is given by Z. Bauman, who claims that the term globalization is usually associated with global consequences “continuously unintended and unpredicted”⁶⁵, not with global initiatives and enterprises. Consequently globalization is considered as a process which is mostly uncontrollable, spontaneous and also irreversible, so it difficult to assess the condition of the globalization of the contemporary world whose fate is largely accidental at the level of global activities, dependencies and interests.

The main point of reference for the society of risk and global change is not the present but the future. The most important thing in the transition from short-term thinking in micro-scale to long-term thinking in macro-scale is undertaking a qualitative analysis of the ever-changing global reality which is full of unprecedented tendencies. The citizen of global society is not only an individual capable of anticipating, but most of all the one who perceives the social and cultural reality in “categories of dynamic whole and in the macro-scale”.⁶⁶ The processes of re-conceptualization and reinterpretation of social reality and the reorientation of cultural norms and values should be innovative not conservative, and should harmonize with the vision of “alternative futures” (Z. Melosik) of the global society. Anticipation means not only the ability to predict and choose the desired tendencies or prevent the undesired ones, but also the predisposition to create new varieties of

⁶³ A. Giddens, *Nowoczesność i tożsamość*, Warszawa 2001, p. 6.

⁶⁴ A. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge 2004, p. 102.

⁶⁵ Z. Bauman, *Globalizacja*, p. 71.

⁶⁶ Z. Melosik, *Edukacja skierowana na świat*, p. 167.

participation and activity.⁶⁷ The depth of the dissonance, i.e. the structural distinctiveness of the modern society from the post-modern society, creates a tension that induces innovative undertakings, which in the context of human existence in the world of permanent transformations are identified with a purposeful change, positively qualified as progress, modernization and improvement and as such it should contribute to the development of knowledge and social practice. Multifaceted perception of the dynamics in social and cultural changes of global scope is revealed in the "ability to find, explore and create new contexts".⁶⁸ In the conditions of post-traditionalist order of late modernity, today's platitudes become tomorrow's absurdities.⁶⁹ The essence of the innovative approach to the global world is extending the range of contexts and the ability to compare them and reconcile the conflicts occurring between them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balcerowicz L., *Globalizacja rynków*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* Ed. S. Amsterdamski, Warszawa 2004.
- Bauman Z., *Globalizacja*, Warszawa 2000.
- Bauman Z., *Ponowoczesność jako źródło cierpienia*, Warszawa 2000.
- Beck U., *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*, London 1992.
- Beck U., *Kosmopolityczny makroświat*, „Gazeta Wyborcza”, 2002, 14-15 September.
- Beck U., *Spółeczeństwo ryzyka*, Warszawa 2002.
- Bell D., *Nadejście społeczeństwa postindustrialnego*, Warszawa 1975.
- Botkin J.W., Elmandijra M., Malitza M., *Uczyć się bez granic. Jak zewrzeć „lukę ludzką”?* Warszawa 1982.
- Burszta W.J., *Antropologia kultury*, Poznań 1998.
- Burszta W.J., *Różnorodność i tożsamość. Antropologia jako kulturowa refleksyjność*, Poznań 2004.
- Chirayath V., De Zolt E., *Globalization, Multinational Corporations and White-Collar Crime: Cases and Consequences for Transitional Economies*, [in:] *The Changing Face of Globalization*, Ed. S. Dasgupta, London 2004.
- Cooper R., *The Post-Modern State and World Order*, London 1997.
- Cybal-Michalska A., *Orientacje proeuropejskie młodzieży. Stan i potrzeby edukacyjne*, Poznań 2001.
- Cybal-Michalska A., *Tożsamość młodzieży w perspektywie globalnego świata. Studium socjopedagogiczne*, Poznań 2006.
- Dasgupta S., *Globalization, Altruism and Sociology of Humanity*, [in:] *The Changing Face of Globalization*, Ed. S. Dasgupta, London 2004.
- Domosławski A., *Globalizacja i kontestacja*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* Ed. S. Amsterdamski, Warszawa 2004.

⁶⁷ J.W. Botkin, M. Elmandijra, M. Malitza, *Uczyć się bez granic. Jak zewrzeć „lukę ludzką”?* p. 77.

⁶⁸ Ibidem, p. 75.

⁶⁹ See: P.F. Drucker, *Spółeczeństwo pokapitalistyczne*, Warszawa 1999, p. 51-54.

- Drucker P.F., *Spoleczeństwo pokapitalistyczne*, Warszawa 1999.
- Dylus A., *Globalny rynek i jego granice*, Warszawa 2001.
- Giddens A., *Nowoczesność i tożsamość*, Warszawa 2001.
- Giddens A., *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge 2004.
- Głowacki B., *Za fasadą niezrozumienia. Fakty i mity o współczesnym ruchu antyglobalizacyjnym*, [in:] *Kultura w czasach globalizacji*, Eds. M. Jacyno, A. Jawłowska, M. Kempny, Warszawa 2004.
- Golka M., *Cywilizacja. Europa. Globalizacja*, Poznań 1999.
- Golka M., *Kultura w przestrzeni globalnej*, [in:] *Spoleczne problemy globalizacji*, Ed. Z. Blok, Poznań 2001.
- Golka M., *Oblicza wielokulturowości*, [in:] *U progu wielokulturowości*, Eds. M. Kempny, A. Kapciak, S. Łodziński, Warszawa 1997.
- Grefe Ch., Greffrath M., Schumann H., *Czego chcą krytycy globalizacji?* Kraków 2004.
- Handy Ch., *Głód ducha*, Wrocław 1999.
- Hejnica-Bezwińska T., *Orientacje życiowe młodzieży*, Bydgoszcz 1991.
- Jan Paweł II, *Globalizacja będzie tym, co uczynią z niej ludzie*, *Więź*, 2001, 10.
- Kahn J.S., *Culture, Multiculture, Postculture*, London 1995.
- Kapuściński R., *Revolucja planetarna*, [in:] *Paradoksy globalizacji*, Ed. Z. Nosowski, *Więź*, 2001, 10.
- Kempny M., *Globalizacja*, [in:] *Encyklopedia socjologii*, t. I, Warszawa 1998.
- Kiely R., *Neo-Liberal Globalization Meets Global Resistance: The Significance of 'Anti-Globalization' Protest*, [in:] *The Changing Face of Globalization*, Ed. S. Dasgupta, London 2004.
- Klein N., *No Logo*, Izabelin 2004.
- Klejsa K., *Ruchy antyglobalizacyjne – druga fala kontestacji?* [in:] *Kultura w czasach globalizacji*, Eds. M. Jacyno, A. Jawłowska, M. Kempny, Warszawa 2004.
- Korporowicz L., *Tożsamość wyobrażona*, [in:] *Róża wiatrów Europy*, Ed. A. Tyszka, Warszawa 1999.
- Korten D.C., *Świat po kapitalizmie. Alternatywy dla globalizacji*, Łódź 2002.
- Kwieciński Z., *Edukacja do globalnego przetrwania i rozwoju*, [in:] *Tradycja i wyzwania*, Ed. K. Paćławska, Kraków 1996.
- Martin H.P., Schumann H., *Pułapka globalizacji*, Wrocław 1999.
- Mathews G., *Global Culture / Individual Identity. Searching for home in the cultural supermarket*, London 2000.
- Mead M., *Kultura i tożsamość*, Warszawa 2000.
- Melosik Z., *Edukacja skierowana na świat – ideał wychowawczy XXI wieku*, *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 1989, 3.
- Miształ B., *Ruch społeczny*, [in:] *Encyklopedia socjologii*, t. III, Warszawa 1998.
- Naisbitt J., *Megatrendy*, Poznań 1997.
- Nowak A.W., *Wobec systemu – wokół teorii Wallersteina*, *Lewą Nogą*, 2001, 13.
- Pankowski R., *Dylematy antyglobalizmu*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* Ed. S. Amsterdamski, Warszawa 2004.
- Prejs B., *Bunt nie przemija*, Katowice – Warszawa 2004.
- Ritzer G., Ryan M., *The Globalization of Nothing*, [in:] *The Changing Face of Globalization*, Ed. S. Dasgupta, London 2004.
- Robertson R., *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture*, London 1992.
- Skarżyńska K., *Orientacja egalitarna i nieegalitarna*, [in:] *Orientacje społeczne jako element mentalności*, Eds. J. Reykowski, K. Skarżyńska, M. Ziółkowski, Poznań 1990.
- Starosta P., *Globalizacja i nowy komunitaryzm*, *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 2000, 3.
- Szlendak T., *Rodzina*, [in:] *Encyklopedia socjologii*, tom III, Warszawa 2000.

Sztompka P., *Socjologia*, Kraków 2002

Tarkowska E., *Globalizacja i ubóstwo*, [in:] *Globalizacja i co dalej?* Ed. S. Amsterdamski, Warszawa 2004.

Tobera P., *Niepokojąca nowoczesność*, Kultura i Społeczeństwo, 2000, 3.

Toffler A., *Szok przyszłości*, Warszawa 1974.

Toffler A., *Trzecia fala*, Warszawa 1997.

Weede E., *Rent-Seeking or Dependency as Explanations of Why Poor People Stay Poor*, [in:] *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*, Eds. M. Albrow, E. King, London 1990.

Wielgosz P., *Opium globalizacji*, Lewą Nogą, 2001, 13.

Wnuk-Lipiński E., *Świat międzyepoki*, Kraków 2004.

Zandecki A., *Wykształcenie a jakość życia*, Toruń – Poznań 1999.

Ziółkowski M., *Orientacje indywidualne a system społeczny*, [in:] *Orientacje społeczne jako element mentalności*, Eds. J. Reykowski, K. Skarżyńska, M. Ziółkowski, Poznań 1990.

Zybała A., *Globalna korekta*, Wrocław 2004.

Zysk T., *Orientacja prorozwojowa*, [in:] *Orientacje społeczne jako element mentalności*, Eds. J. Reykowski, K. Skarżyńska, M. Ziółkowski, Poznań 1990.