Colloquium 3(55)/2024
ISSN 2081-3813, e-ISSN 2658-0365
CC BY-NC-ND.4.0
DOI: http://doi.org/10.34813/44coll2024

THREATS TO CULTURAL SECURITY IN THE MODERN ERA

Zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa kulturowego w dobie nowoczesności

Marek Bodziany
The General Kosciuszko Military University of Land Forces, Wroclaw, Poland
e-mail: marek.bodziany@awl.edu.pl
ORCID 0000-0001-8030-3383

Abstract

Cultural security is an interdisciplinary and complex research subject, embedded not only in the security sciences, but above all in cultural sociology, cultural studies, cultural anthropology, ethnography and ethnology, philosophy, as well as legal sciences and history. Its interdisciplinary nature necessitates the analysis of threats to cultural security from a wide variety of scientific perspectives relating to material spiritual and social culture. For the purpose of the analysis, the conventional IGNT/MSS system was adopted, in which I stands for the individual level, G for the group level, N for the national level, T for the transnational level, while M stands for the material dimension, S for the spiritual dimension and S for the social dimension. Within the variables proposed in the system, an analysis of the cultural threats of the contemporary world was carried out. The article is descriptive and exploratory in nature and is based on qualitative research, mainly source analysis and passive observation. It aims to identify the main threats to cultural security and explain their a etiology.

Keywords: cultural security, material, spiritual and social culture, cultural threats, cultural identity.

Streszczenie

Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe to przedmiot badań interdyscyplinarny i złożony, osadzony nie tylko w naukach o bezpieczeństwie ale przede wszystkim w socjologii kultury, kulturoznawstwie, antropologii kulturowej, etnografii i etnologii, filozofii, a także naukach prawnych i historii. Jego interdyscyplinarny charakter wymusza analizę zagrożeń dla bezpieczeństwa kulturowego z wielu różnorodnych perspektyw naukowych, odnoszących się do kultury materialnej duchowej i społecznej. Dla potrzeb analizy przyjęto umowny układ IGNP/MDS (ang. IGNT/MSS), w którym I oznacza poziom indywidualny, G – grupowy, N – narodowy, P – ponadnarodowy, natomiast M – wymiar materialny, D – wymiar duchowy i S – wymiar społeczny. W ramach zmiennych proponowanych w układzie przeprowadzono analizę zagrożeń kulturowych współczesnego świata. Artykuł ma charakter deskrypcyjno-eksplanacyjny i opiera się na badaniach jakościowych, głownie na analizie źródeł oraz obserwacji biernej. Jego celem jest identyfikacja głównych zagrożeń dla bezpieczeństwa kulturowego oraz wyjaśnienie ich etiologii.

Słowa kluczowe: bezpieczeństwo kulturowe, kultura materialna, duchowa i społeczna, zagrożenia kulturowe, tożsamość kulturowa.

Introduction

The complex nature of cultural security is the root cause of all problems in correctly understanding its essence, as well as in defining its interpretative framework, precisely identifying the object of study. The basis for their identification are social phenomena embedded in one of the three, or all at the same time, types of culture: material, spiritual (non-material) and social, which should be considered at different levels of the social structure. To simplify the analysis, the author's IGNT/MSS system based on a fusion of variables occurring in four dimensions and at three levels, was adopted. The letters in the system stand for: I – individual level, G – group level, N – national level, T – transnational level, while M – material dimension, S – spiritual dimension and S – social dimension. Its complement is cultural identity, which should be understood as the common denominator for all types of culture (Bodziany, 2019). The essence of this system is the succinct illustration of the relationship between culture and security at various levels and dimensions, and identification of directions for the search for research subjects for cultural security, including the threats that exist within it.

The rationale for this system is still apparent, despite the significant increase in publications in this field, in the deficit of knowledge on cultural security, which originally focused on the origins and consequences of conflicts and wars. The cultural context of these appears in a number of publications by ancient classics, the most prominent of which is the work of Tukidides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*. In the work, the author presents a detailed account of the impact of cultural differences and national character on the way the war between the Athenians and Spartans was fought (Bagby, 1994, pp. 131–132). The cultural dimension of war is also revealed in the work of the Greek historian and geographer Herodotus of Halicarnassus (c. 485–425 BC), who in his *Histories* focused on describing the consequences of the Persian wars and the cultural achievements of the conquered nations and their influence on Greek culture. Also in ancient Rome, cultural problems were a constant and even inherent feature of the social relations of the time. They became particularly apparent in the 1st c. BC – 2nd c. AD and at the end of the Empire (before 476 BC). Symbolic of the ethnic divisions of the time were the borders called 'limes', clearly separating civilisation and the barbarians. Inside the 'limes' the good law 'ius civile' – for Roman citizens – while outside, the inferior law 'ius gens (ius gentium)' – for foreigners, were in force (Czaja, 2008, p. 114). Ethnic differentiation became the pretext for the creation of an atomised society in Europe, not only during the peak of the Empire, but also after its collapse.

Leaving aside the theme of cultural conflicts in Europe during the Middle Ages and subsequent eras, it should be emphasised that it was only after the Second World War that the need for a scientific debate on the relationship between culture and security in the broadest sense became apparent. The social context of interest in the relationship between culture and war (from the modern perspective) is presented in the

publication *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, by Ruth Benedict. The author includes a description of the hidden, cultural dimension of war, the differences in the mentality of the two extreme cultures, the values and attitudes of American and Japanese soldiers during the war. The most significant result of R. Benedith's research was the emergence of two dichotomous currents in Japanese culture. The first, 'militaristic and aggressive' depicted using the metaphor of the 'sword' and 'peaceful and open' labelled as 'chrysanthemum' (Heyer Young, 2005). The aftermath of the Second World War (including the most drastic, related to the Holocaust) revealed that ethnocultural issues are an important focus of research in the field of conflict and war. It also revealed the problem of war losses, the plundering of cultural goods and heritage, and the uncontrolled movement of members of different cultures. This issue became one of the problems taken up in the debate of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the so-called Review Conferences of 1973–1975. Within the framework of the so-called CSCE Basket III, problems such as the movement of people, ideas, information, thought and cultural products were discussed, and attention was paid to human rights (Przewłocki & Szczepański, 1981). It should be emphasised that most contemporary publications undertaking an analysis of the relationship between culture and security focus on the analysis in political terms embedding it in categories such as strategic culture (Gray, 1984; Johnston, 1995; Lantis & Howlett, 2009; Snyder, 1977), or security culture (Cieślarczyk, 2010; Jarmoszko, 2010; Piwowarski, 2015).

The analysis of the relationship between security and culture imposes the need to look at this concept from a constructivist perspective, embedded in the assumptions of the Copenhagen School (Williams, 2012, p. 68). Its conceptual product is two utilitarian (for cultural security research) concepts: securitisation (Wæver, 1995, pp. 46–89) and regional security complexes (Williams, 2012, p. 68). The first concept refers to Daniel Frej's model of security, whereby securitisation is to be identified with the subjective dimension of security associated with two situations: a real threat, or a state of obsession with imagined, imaginary and invisible threats. Based on the assumption that security is not treated as an objective fact, but is socially constructed, being incorporated – securitised – into it, it should be assumed that culture is not a natural object of security research. Alongside identity and language (according to the five-stage division), it is part of the social factors of security (Czaputowicz, 2008, p. 226). In simple terms, it can be assumed that it is an element 'appropriated' as a result of the emergence of threats institutionally identified as relevant to security in the broadest sense (e.g. migration crisis or regional separatism). Thus, cultural security is the result of the securitisation of cultural problems into national security, making it an area of 'extraordinary' (special) policy (Kulaga, 2016, p. 12).

The links between culture and security have found their place in the ones mentioned earlier Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT). It refers to both the level

of states, the global level, as well as creating a stand-alone level of analysis of phenomena (Pawłuszko, 2015, p. 65). According to this theory, there are four levels of security analysis:

- domestic level (within the states of the region);
- regional level (fundamental to the formation of the region);
- interregional level (the relationship of the region to other regions);
- global level (the relevance of the game of global powers to a region) (Buzan & Waever, 2003, p. 51).

In the study of cultural security (at the national level), the first two levels are relevant, within which there are so-called security areas. These are the areas of meaning in which regionally significant issues are located (Pawłuszko, 2015, p. 65).

Another approach exposed in the literature is the Welsh School developed on the foundations of critical international relations theory. It is a response to the crisis of global security, and its author Ken Booth, manifesting its roots in peace studies, links it to emancipation, which is supposed to allow the creation of 'real' security (Fijałkowski, 2012, p. 61). The author reduces the concept of emancipation to the level of choosing between what can be done without negative consequences and without infringing on other people's freedom (Booth, 1991, pp. 313–326). Cultural security thus refers to the human security associated with the freedom of choice to participate in different contexts of social life, as well as to participate in culture.

The study of cultural security at the national level (taking into account all elements of the social structure) also requires looking at this type of security from the perspective of interdisciplinary approaches embedded in political science, sociology, migration studies, as well as cultural anthropology and ethnography. One such approach is the Paris School represented by the French philosopher and sociologist Pierre Bourdieu – creator of the concepts of 'habitus' and cultural capital. The object of interest of the Paris School is the public debate on non-military threats such as terrorism, migration, human trafficking, which as a whole constitute the security field (McDonald, 2007, pp. 252–259). Other representatives of the Paris School were scholars such as Joris-Karl Huysmans and Diedier Bigo, who focused their attention on the sociological analysis of migration and its impact on European security, as well as research on the new social order. The role of the theory of insecuritisation, referring to the process by which the recognition and reception of 'foreigners' is lowered, should also be highlighted. In the light of this theory, cultural security (in addition to economic and social security) is the result of the lack of acceptance of immigrants in a country. Within this theory, terrorist threats considered as a state of insecurity are also equated with cultural security (Huysmans, 2006, p. 153).

The study of cultural security requires more than the framework of theories discussed above, embedded in international relations. It requires looking at this type of security from the perspective of a human being in the surrounding political, social,

economic and, importantly, cultural reality, in different – static and dynamic – social structures. When one speaks of the static, they are referring to social positions and the associated cultural levels. Dynamics, on the other hand, describe all forms of activity of the social individual, including their interactions with other individuals, primary groups, the fulfilment of social roles (professional and cultural), as well as consumer behaviour, participation in culture, and the formation of cultural circles. Both systems refer to people occupying positions in all areas (elements) of the social structure moving with the baggage of ancestral cultural heritage towards an indefinite future along a trajectory of (social and cultural) change, development and progress, as well as the cultural capital of the state (Bodziany, 2019, p. 151).

For the study of cultural security, the key question seems to be that of culture itself treated as its subject component. Should it be treated as a homogeneous phenomenon referring to cultural universals (attributive approach) or as a set of specific cultural characteristics of large collectivities (distributive approach)? The first approach limits the study of cultural security to the identification of fixed characteristics enshrined in the culture of humanity as a whole (global approach) or in the culture of an individual (individual approach). Adopting this perspective has its limitations in terms of time, space, organisation and society generalised in the form of the non-existence of individual and global cultural universals with the potential to create theory.

A distributive approach seems to be more appropriate for cultural security research, as it does not focus on culture as a whole, but on its specific features (cultural components, lifestyles, cultural diversity, etc.). Consequently, when one speaks of cultural security, one has in mind not only the multiplicity of diverse cultures, but their specific characteristics, dynamics, structure and links with other cultures. Therefore, it should be studied in a 'concrete' way, referring to a particular ethnic group or nation, or in a 'typological' way, referring to a specific collective with specific characteristics (e.g. corporate or gender) (Filipiak, 2000, pp. 21–22). Generalising, the study of cultural security will focus on the relationship between culture and security based on all elements of the social structure having their own culture, creating it or participating in it.

The subject of the research undertaken in this article is cultural security threats embedded in the domestic (national) dimension, consisting of:

– spiritual (non-material) dimension (S), and within them the components of culture: the value systems and beliefs, their connection with tradition, religion, historical memory, national identity (including patriotism and national pride), and national heroes;

– material dimension (M), i.e. material cultural assets and heritage, as well as heritage assets abroad;

– social sphere (S), i.e. the entire area of cultural participation and cultural practices, reduced to one of the foundations of cultural capital.

For the identification of cultural threats in the contemporary world, a research problem aimed at obtaining an answer to the question concerning the aetiology of cultural threats and their typological arrangement was adopted. An attempt to answer this question is the hypothesis supposing that the main source of threats to cultural security is, historically, social change, while today, globalisation processes shaping lifestyles and forms of participation in culture. Its consequence is a departure from traditional cultural practices, the emergence of alternative cultures and so-called 'third dimension' cultures embedded in cyberculture. For the purposes of the research, qualitative methods, based on passive and participatory observation, analysis of sources conducted using the method of content analysis of professional publications, blogs and institutional websites, analysis of secondary data (desk research), as well as comparative and historical analysis, were used. The aforementioned methods provided the basis for the development of the author's IGNT/MSS system, which helped to define cultural security and a typology of threats relating to the variables of this system.

Interpretive framework and the evolution of cultural security

Issues focused on *strictly* national issues, including national and cultural identity and cultural heritage and assets, have found an important place in the debate on the foundation of cultural security. Increasingly, they have begun to be identified, based on an object criterion alongside other types of security: political, military, economic, social, ideological and environmental (Zięba, 2004, p. 31). Nevertheless, this type of security still reveals huge gaps in interpretation and requires constant reconstruction due to the dynamics of social phenomena taking place in the sociosphere. An important premise imposing the necessity of research in this area is the multifaceted nature of cultural security, which results from the dualism based on the combination of the state (state cultural security) and the social (cultural security of individuals and cultural communities – nations, ethnic groups, religious communities) dimensions (Włodkowska-Bagan, 2009, p. 151), as well as non-state participants, i.e. cultural and religious communities, i.e. nations, ethnic groups, or followers of a given religion (Wæver, 1992, p. 212).

It should be noted that most approaches to cultural security have focused on a national and/or transnational view of the relationship between culture and security, often lacking a detailed explication of the components of culture, as well as their dynamics. In fact, cultural security is a category that refers not only to the nation (or institutionally to the state), but also to the entire social structure – from social individuals to social groups (e.g. professional, peer, school), organisations and institutions, local communities, national and ethnic minorities, and even such extreme cases as criminal groups, gangs, sects other 'invisible' elements of the social structure. Thus, cultural security is a category embedded not only in national, group, or individual culture, but on all levels of culture linked to social positions and overt and covert social roles, the

tangible expression of which is manifested by people's cultural activity. This dimension of cultural security relates to the state, its social and institutional structure and – importantly from the point of view of cultural security dynamics – to the cultural practices of society in both the real and virtual so-called 'third dimension' – the 'subworld' of modernity.

Contemporary approaches to cultural security focus on relatively universal issues that more or less clearly capture its essence. Ole Wæver's approach reduces it to the persistence of national cultural traits in the face of the occurrence of threats, while Eric Nemeth directs attention to the preservation of traditions in the process of cultural integration (Ziętek, 2016, p. 76). On the other hand, other approaches point to the autotelic dimension and national identity as a determinant of survival and values (Czaputowicz, 2003, p. 24; Dawidczyk, 2001, p. 16; Kitler, 2011, p. 53). There are also approaches exposing the permanence of national identity and the 'safe' drawing on the achievements of other nations (Michalowska, 1997, p. 132) or pointing to the dangers of losing internal cohesion and the function of national identity guaranteeing the limitation of foreign influence (Włodkowska-Bagan, 2009, p. 152). The motif of defence against the undesirable influence of other cultures also appears in Tadeusz Jemioło's approach, in which the author gave equal importance to the care and multiplication of one's own cultural heritage (2001, p. 20). To emphasise the importance and relevance of the relationship between culture and security in both dimensions, Jan Czaja's thesis, which states that 'culture determines the subjective perception of security and the conditions for its creation, nationally and internationally', will be cited (2013, p. 73). The author directs attention to the bifurcation (directional dispersion) of the perception of the relationship between culture and security into two dimensions: national and transnational, in which, on the one hand, culture with its entire range of components determines the political and doctrinal aspects of national security, while on the other hand, it refers to the protection of one's own material and non-material (spiritual) culture. At the same time, it should be emphasised that cultural security, although it has found its way into the doctrinal documents and strategies of most European states, is still only a postulate. It is particularly unpopular with hard power advocates, which is reflected in low interest even in security and international relations theories. This justifies a number of arguments, the most prominent of which relates to culture itself and its multidimensional (even undefined) understanding. The second argument relates to the scarcity of empirical research on the impact of culture on security, which could give rise to a single coherent theory.

Internally, cultural security should be considered as a type of national security with a heterogeneous structure. In its simplest variant, it expands into categories relating to the material, non-material and social spheres of existence:

- the nation or society as a whole;
- national and ethnic minorities;

- immigrant groups (rotational and permanent);
- assimilated or assimilating foreigners;
- social groups, including informal groups and institutions and organisations;
- exclusive cultural circles;
- social classes and strata (relating to social position and material status);
- local communities (rural, small town and metropolitan residential enclaves);
- social units living not only on the territory of their own country, but also its citizens living outside its borders (different categories of emigrants – historical and contemporary);
- subcultures and alternative cultures.

Based on the material scope of security and the typology of culture, several constant elements of cultural security emerge. These are: the non-material (spiritual), material and social elements of culture, national identity, the operators responsible for its level and their actions, and the links with the international environment.

The consequence of the analysis of previous approaches is an attempt to systematise the fixed operators describing cultural security. Its consequence is the author's definition:

> Cultural security is a permanent and indispensable element of national security embedded in international reality, referring to the non-material (spiritual), material and social sphere of culture considered at all its levels and in all elements of the social structure, as well as to national identity, constituting the essence of the activities of all entities responsible for building the cultural capital of the state and its image in the international arena (Bodziany, 2019, 109).

The proposed definition reveals the static and dynamic nature of cultural security. The static is described by the material and spiritual (non-material) components of culture inscribed in the syntagma of national culture and the permanent elements of individual, group and ethnic culture (the IGMP/MDS system). The dynamic, on the other hand, is expressed not only in human cultural activity (social dimension), but in the change of value systems, customs, traditions, as well as in the perception of symbols (including national symbols) and attitudes towards them, heroes (idols), religions, and the level of knowledge and language. The dynamic of cultural security is a natural process forcing, even commanding, those responsible for cultural security to reconstruct classical approaches to understanding culture and people's cultural activity, as well as to permanently diagnose phenomena that violate the 'cultural order', affecting the future of the nation and the state. When referring to it, one has in mind a set of cultural components shaping not only national identity, but the awareness of people's participation in an endemic and unique national culture, regardless of other identities (ethnic, group, etc.) and forms of cultural participation, shaped in the past.

Threats to cultural security and their sources

The analysis of cultural security threats imposes the need to look at them from the perspective of aetiology. The most popular division is proposed by J. Czaja, according to whom the sources of threats stem from four phenomena: globalisation, regionalism, modernisation and migration (2008). The proposed sources usually do not occur independently, and there are implications between them. It is difficult to rank them, although, in the subjective perception, globalisation ranks highest due to its impact on the other sources of threats and all areas of life. Its product is the concept of the globalisation of culture, understood as a multi-level phenomenon resulting from several important factors: the development and digitalisation of the media, the massification of cultural products, and the contact of cultures resulting from the movement of people. Its product is global culture, which should be associated with two processes, namely 'cultural synthesis' and the 'commercialisation and economisation of culture'. Both concepts reduce global culture to the status of cultural convergence and communicative integration of cultures into a world culture (Schwarz & Mead, 1961, pp. 1–7).

The main area of threat from the globalisation of culture is national identity, which is losing its importance in favour of individual and social identity shaped by new forms of cultural participation. As the importance of national identity declines, attitudes to national culture and to local cultures are also changing. Some of these in many Western European countries, such as religion, tradition and customs, are being replaced by products of globalisation or modified so effectively that they have lost their spiritual value and have become products for sale. The second process with which global culture should be identified is commercialisation and economisation, which have contributed to the creation of a new type of consumer "(...) washed of collective identity and cured of ethnicity – a man with a global mentality – 'homo mundialis'" (Krzysztofek, 2000, p. 69), insatiable and willing to buy anything that will allow him to release a sense of participation to the social elite even at the price of losing the possibility to possess the consumer goods necessary for existence (Bodziany, 2019, p. 114).

The globalisation of culture, is a phenomenon full of contradictions and paradoxes, hiding in its nature both opportunities and threats for nations, ethnic groups and local communities. Threats to material and non-material culture include the classic scenarios proposed by Ulf Hannerz:

– 'global homogenisation' – characterised by the total dominance of Western culture, whereby all societies become more or less successful replicas of Western lifestyles, aspirations, values and norms, consumption patterns, ideas, ideals and beliefs;

– 'cultural saturation' – shows a vision in which peripheral cultures are slowly and reluctantly replacing local cultural ideas and values with unified content coming from the dominant centres over the course of several generations;

– ‘cultural deformation’ – refers to the simplification, impoverishment and even degradation of Western culture in the course of its adaptation by peripheral countries;

– ‘cultural amalgamation’ – implies an equal dialogue and exchange between the cultures of the centre and the periphery, leading to an overall enrichment of both types of culture;

– ‘creolisation’ or ‘cultural hybridity’ – in which stronger cultures mix with weaker ones, but each is modified (Hannerz, 2015).

Within the scenarios proposed by U. Hannerz, there are phenomena that are a permanent feature of cultural and social change. One of these is the phenomenon of the absorption of weaker and smaller cultures by stronger cultures. This phenomenon has been called the process of ‘cultural cannibalism’, involving the integration of absorbed cultures into one's own cultural universe. This process can take place spontaneously at the interface between large (strong) and small (weak) cultures, or it can be the result of planned actions on the part of the state or the dominant group (Tułowiecki, 2016, p. 93). Another phenomenon relevant to the cultural security of a nation and state is ‘cultural genocide’. These usually result in the destruction of a group’s cultural and national distinctiveness as a result of planned actions that result in the abandonment of one's own culture. The effect of these actions is deculturation – the complete abandonment of one's own culture in favour of a foreign culture (Budyta-Budzyńska, 2020, p. 108).

Based on the IGNT/MSS system, threats to cultural security were explicated based on the etiology proposed by J. Czaja: globalization, modernization, regionalism and migration. Table 1 presents the threats to cultural security posed by globalization at the individual, group, national and/or transnational levels with regard to material, spiritual and social culture.

Table 1
Threats resulting from the globalization in the IGNT/MSS system

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
Material culture dimension (M)	– formation of individual value systems based on instrumental values; – disrespect for cultural assets and national memorials – neglect and vandalism; – increase in the consumption of branded products (even at the cost of indebtedness); – surrounding oneself with exclusive cultural artefacts treated as an investment rather than aesthetic and spiritual value; – increased interest in replicas (fakes) of branded products and the creation of an imaginary image of one's own social position; – building a vision of individual success from the optics of standard of living and social position; – treating education as a means to success (position, wealth and prestige); – technological determinism and technophilia; – intensification of consumption-related phenomena: 'snob effect' (shopping for show and for publicity), 'neighbour effect' (manifesting a higher position through a higher standard of living – local rivalry).	– emergence of social groups and cultural circles around fashion styles, symbols of prestige and symbols of well-known brands; – increase in the activity of criminal groups involved in counterfeiting and distribution of products of well-known world brands; – emergence of specialised criminal groups involved in the theft and distribution (including smuggling and counterfeiting) of material cultural assets; – creation of 'redundant' and unproductive organisations and institutions for the support and development of local cultures (e.g. foundations); – emergence of specific political elites changing political culture. – development of 'risk' cultures associated with social inequalities (e.g. the culture of 'poverty', isolated cultures of the so-called 'white spots of civilisation'); – increasingly visible 'glass tower cultures' – hermetic and specific corporate cultures locked into their own culture and world of wealth; – culture of the 'vanity classes' – unrestrained consumers of material assets.	– creation of uniform styles in the arts; – organised crime of national and international scope involved in the trafficking and smuggling of cultural assets; – cultural deformation resulting from the mixing of styles and the influence of mass culture trends; – incapacity of organisations set up to protect cultural assets and heritage; – spoiling material elements of national cultures with elements of mass culture; – creation in the media of a 'cult' of money and success based on wealth; – distortion of the architectural balance between modernity and tradition in urban layout planning; – lack of control over the smuggling of other countries' cultural property through the territory of another country; – lack of legal effectiveness in the recovery of material cultural heritage lost in warfare; – limited influence of international organisations on the protection of memorials (e.g. cemeteries and monuments) located on the territories of other states (so-called symbolic domains); – limited influence of international organisations on the protection of the material cultural heritage of migrant groups living in other countries;

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
Spiritual culture dimension (D)	– rise of youth slang and street language; – formation of one's own negative heroes and idols associated with pop culture; – pauperisation of the importance of individual autotelic values in social life; – language pollution with neologisms and English-language interjections; – decline in the importance of knowledge and education as autotelic values; – loss of interpersonal ties with the environment and the change from real interaction to interaction through mass media (e-communication); – internalisation of symbols associated with global culture into one's own individual symbol systems; – disappearance of the sense of a boundary between good and evil through pop culture (films, computer games and music); – fascination with violence, the brutalisation of life, the so-called 'culture of death' and the perversion of the virtual world; – flight from religion and faith in favour of the consumption of mass culture assets.	– displacement of local cultures by global culture; – spoiling traditional organisational and local cultures with elements of mass culture; – disappearance of local traditions and customs; – emergence of specific and dangerous social groups – creators and consumers of e-culture (sects, e-gambling consumers, computer game players, associations, creators of alternative music and films); – acceptance of dysfunctions in organisations as a fashion and determinant of position; – linguistic imperialism; – replication of global values into organisations; – glocalisation of local cultures; – activities of subcultures and countercultures online and in the real world; – disappearance of regional languages, dialects and dialects; – disappearance of boundaries between corporate and individual culture – the impact of organisations on everyday life; – development of sarcasm and aggression online – 'meme culture'.	– decline of national culture in favour of mass culture and pop culture; – spoiling the ethnic language with foreign language phrases and neologisms; – decline in the importance of and respect for national symbols; – disappearance of national traditions; – decline in the importance of religion and belief in God in everyday life; – decline in cultural competence with an increase in the gross enrolment rate; – loss of society's ties to the state – individualism in favour of products of mass culture; – increasing hermeticism and elitism of high culture; – declining willingness to commemorate the history of the nation and the state and national heroes
Social culture dimension (S)	– increase in the importance of individualism and social egocentrism influencing the formation of a primary dimension culture (moving away	– transnational impact of subcultures; – emergence of transnational group participating in a specific 'third dimension' culture:	– commercialisation of national holidays and celebrations; – marginalisation of the formation of patriotic attitudes and awareness of the existence of threats to

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
	from traditional forms of leisure, play and the celebration of individual holidays); – 'early infectiousness' towards a global culture – the cult of the original label and prestige associated with symbols of position; – disappearance of interpersonal interaction in favour of e-communication; – escape from reality into the virtual world of games, youtubers and social networks; – unlimited access to online dysfunctional elements (pornography, e-gambling, sects, criminal and terrorist organisations, dating sites and other negative phenomena); – unlimited possibilities to create one's own virtual profile accessible to corporations, foreign secret services, criminal organisations, subcultures and sects which pose a threat to the individual; – succumbing to media pressure and uncontrolled modification of world views through propaganda, post-truth and manipulation); – technophilia and technoholism (addiction to technology in everyday life); – participation in new lifestyles and 'dangerous' forms of cultural participation (club culture, cult of tattoos, botox, cosmetic surgery, bodily modifications, etc.).	games, music channels, thematic groups, etc; – replication of lifestyles of some social groups by others; – homogenisation of participation in the culture imposed by the mass market regardless of social position, material status and personal preferences; – emergence from mass culture of closed cultures of a transnational nature linked by common symbols, values, heroes, rituals and customs; – activity of social movements at an international level; – creation of dangerous ideologies online; – unrestricted access to participation in criminal groups online; – extension of the popularity of group e-communication in place of integration and social relations in the real world; – creation of modern extreme fashion and the expansion of its reach regardless of geographical limitations.	the nation and the state in the media and the educational process in favour of a 'global culture'; – too much media coverage of extreme nationalist ideologies; – creation of a negative image of the nation and the state in the world through the activity of opposition interest groups and hostile (usually foreign) media; – media manipulation of historical events to achieve political and economic goals; – emergence of 'temples of consumption' – shopping centres; – emergence of destroyers of the state's cultural capital through the unchecked influence of global culture on participation in national culture.

Source: own elaboration.

The globalisation of culture remains linked to other sources of threat, which include regionalism, modernisation and migration. An analysis of the relationship between the two directs attention to the impact of cultural globalisation on social modernisation and vice versa, as well as the relationship of both sources to transformation. Globalisation (of culture) in combination with modernisation (of society) relates to the theory of social change. Two phenomena are integral to it: structural differentiation and technological determinism. The first concerns the emergence of specialised and autonomous social units as part of progress. The latter, technological determinism, is a phenomenon that imposes on society a way of life based on the coexistence of man and machine in a relative social symbiosis and sometimes in a 'dependency trap' called technophilia. Structural differentiation, thanks to the process of creating increasingly distinct, specific and often hermetic social groups, influences the emergence of diverse cultural circles, 'practising' different lifestyles and participating in culture according to their canons. Technological determinism, although originally identified only with information technologies, nowadays refers to the entire technological sphere affecting human life. Its creator was Marshall McLuhan, who argued that new technologies completely change the way people use their senses, the way they react to phenomena, and thus completely change the form of their lives and the shape of society as a result of social progress and the increasing influence of technology (as well as globalisation) on human life and lifestyles (McLuhan, 2004). The 'soft' version of technological determinism reveals the role of humans using technology to transform the world, in different social contexts. As the authors of the book New Media emphasise, 'soft' technological determinism matters as an effect of social forces rather than their cause (Innis, 2007; Postman, 2004).

The second source of cultural threats is modernisation, which, in addition to influencing cultural change, also affects the *strictly* social, political and economic spheres. Modernisation in tandem with globalisation create a dangerous mix of destroyers (threats) to national (including local) cultures. In addition to negatively affecting value systems, they effectively marginalise traditions and customs or modify them so much that cultural deformations occur. Modernisation also re-evaluates the role of history, national heroes and symbols in favour of the material, non-material and social products of global culture. Two other sources of danger raised by J. Czaja are regionalism and migration. The first phenomenon is regarded as a coordinated system of international cooperation among the states and societies of a region, based on a commonality of needs and interests (Czaja, 2013, p. 51). It manifests itself in the universalism of values and lifestyles, and even in the imposition of a collective identity created by interest groups of stronger states associated in international organisations on other, usually weaker states. Table 2 presents the threats to cultural security

posed by modernization at the individual, group, national and/or transnational levels with regard to material, spiritual and social culture.

Table 2
Threats resulting from the modernization in the IGNT/MSS system

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
Material culture dimension (M)	– low public awareness of the value of cultural heritage and cultural assets in private ownership; – lack of records and control over cultural assets remaining in private ownership; – negligible state support for the maintenance and protection of privately owned historic buildings; – technological leap and related adaptation problems among people; – uncontrolled purchase of historic properties by foreign citizens; – use of privately owned historic buildings contrary to their original purpose (workshops, brothels, discos and clubs); – unconditional internalisation of Western instrumental values as a result of being 'overwhelmed' by prosperity.	– neglect of the maintenance and protection of material cultural assets and heritage at the local level; – increase in the degree of devastation of cemeteries and memorial sites representing memorials of other nationalities; – emergence of cultural circles – victims of modernisation and system transformation (cultures of 'poverty', closed and isolated from civilisation, so-called 'forgotten cultures' (small local communities deprived of access to media and information); – widening of the gap in living standards and well-being between the 'winners' and 'victims' of modernisation and systemic transformation; – emergence of social groups of technological exclusion.	– buy-back and 'privatisation' of national assets; – illegal purchase of works of art by international criminal structures and their smuggling; – economic negligence in the maintenance of cultural assets; – fictitious nature of the law on the protection of cultural property and the punishment of theft, smuggling, counterfeiting and vandalism of cultural property; – unfavourable international regulations on compensation for war damage, including loss of property by citizens of other countries; – widening gap between poverty and wealth due to negligence in access to the labour market, education and culture.
Spiritual culture dimension (D)	– trauma of cultural change resulting from the clash between the cultural contradictions of materialism and post-materialism; – disappearance of traditional values in everyday life – the modern family model (2+1); – formation of a new type of individual culture associated with the diffusion of cultural components of traditional and modern societies; – emergence of homosexual relationships or the	– clash between 'old' value systems and 'new' ones (materialism vs. post-materialism) and the associated intergenerational cultural conflicts; – emergence of specific transformational cultures: the cultures of the 'upstart' and the 'small business' (service sector and trade); – changing value systems in the cultures of the 'new grey area';	– the change in value systems associated with the political transition (transition from a scarcity economy and materialist values to a free market economy and post-materialist values); – uneven distribution of elements of cultural capital in society; – disappearance of traditional universal values in society, such as patriotism, trust in the institutions of the state and the Church, respect

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
	trend of living alone in conformity with consumption.	– turn towards the classical model of primary dimension culture among the 'victims' of modernisation and transformation (communities remaining in civilisational isolation); – atheisation of spiritual life; – acceptance of euthanasia, abortion or leaving elderly family members in the care of the state.	for family or life, among others; – systemic neglect of the formation of cultural competence in education and everyday life; – creation of an aggressive and political culture.
Social culture dimension (S)	– cultural risks associated with the mobility of people and contact between cultures; – clash with new forms of cultural participation; – copying Western lifestyles into individual cultures; – creation of an individual, unique 'kitsch culture'; – manifestation of living standards and the construction of social divisions.	– imbalance of social roles and extreme unification of the sexes – emergence of gender culture; – influence of foreign cultural components on the formation of 'new' organisational cultures (internalisation of modern lifestyles into the organisation); – simultaneous participation in local and global culture; – differences in opportunities to participate in culture related to social position, level of prosperity and occupation.	– formation of a culture of new political elites on the basis of the flow and diffusion of components of local and organisational cultures into politics; – participation of 'oligarchic cultures' – criminal and mafia structures of national and transnational scope in political life and the economy; – construction of a national culture on the basis of the diffusion of traditions and fundamental values with the instrumental values of capitalism.

Source: own elaboration.

Migration as a source of risk is a complex subject of research requiring more in-depth analysis. In the most general terms, they involve a whole range of issues embedded in multiculturalism and cultural pluralism created by the contact of diverse cultures in a single geographical area. Consequently, cultural change needs to be considered from the perspective of the opportunities and threats arising from migration and cultural contact. They are of particular importance because, with the emigration of people, there are flows of cultural components that are necessary to perpetuate traditions through generational exchange and to enrich them with new elements, including elements of global culture. As a result, not only national, but local and individual cultures come into contact with each other, which in the long run leads to the diffusion of their elements. The natural consequence of such encounters is not only cultural conflicts occurring at the interpersonal and group level, but the enrichment of one's

own culture and the acquisition of cultural competence through mutual experience. Within the framework of the analysis of migration, it is also important to highlight another phenomenon related not only to globalisation, but to other sources of threats, called reterritorialisation. This phenomenon is the result of a change in the importance and role of local socio-cultural systems, accompanied by an increasingly strong need to 'regain home', a sense of security, a re-situation in a specific local space (Jawłowska, 2003, pp. 224–227). The sources of this phenomenon should be sought not only in purely economic factors, but precisely and above all in social factors, related to the search or aspiration for the reconstruction of one's own local identity and sentiment for the symbolism of the region or city, as well as autotelic values.

A very significant threat to cultural security is the loss or disruption of national identity. This means that the classical view of not only national culture, but also identity (as the main foundation of cultural security), if not today, then in the near future, must naturally undergo a meaningful reconstruction. Among the dangers of regionalism (and in its correlation with globalisation and modernisation), one might spot the impact on national identity. The starting point of the analysis is the thesis that the world in the classical sense – composed of nation-states with a relatively homogeneous culture – has long ceased to exist. Some authors, represented among others by Edward W. Said, treat such a state of affairs as something inevitable and a fact to be reconciled with. According to the author, "[…] the greatest advance that has been made in contemporary cultural theory is the conviction that cultures are a heterogeneous mixture, interrelated and interdependent. Any creation of barriers dividing them is completely incompatible with historical experience" (Said, 2005, p. 476). Zbyszko Melosik and Tadeusz Szkudlarek introduced postmodern identity into the systematics of concepts, which they placed in opposition to national identity. According to the authors, identity cannot be defined on the basis of universals describing one, clearly dominant identity, as it is changeable (Melosik & Szkudlarek, 1998, pp. 55–56). This identity has been created as a 'product' of the era of postmodernism, also referred to by Z. Bauman as liquid modernity or postmodernity, or by Anthony Giddens as late modernity. Both Z. Bauman and A. Giddens point to the increase in individual autonomy in the sphere of self-creation or, in other words, the constitution of one's identity, filling it with content (Giddens, 1991, p. 54). Identity understood in this way became one of the key concepts of this era, which Z. Melosik and T. Szkudlarek divided into various types, never appearing in the so-called 'pure' form, but overlapping in one person at the same time (Gumiński, 2010). Table 3 presents the threats to cultural security posed by regionalism.

Table 3
Threats resulting from the regionalism in the IGNT/MSS system

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
Material culture dimension (M)	– free acquisition of private material cultural heritage and cultural goods by citizens of Community Member States; – insufficient control over the movement of illegally sourced works of art within the EU (stolen from private owners); – 'junk market for goods and services' for the new Community members – creating a fiction hidden in the same packaging	– uneven redistribution and use of EU funds for the preservation and development of local cultures; – artificial creation of a sense of identification with the EU under the influence of material benefits from investment projects; – unjustified use and misuse of EU funds for culture – embezzlement of public money.	– legal provisions allowing the purchase of national assets by citizens of other EU member states); – access to a variety of goods and services of the same quality; – excessive EU interventionism in regulation in favour of national cultures.
Spiritual culture dimension (D)	– ambivalent attitude towards identification with the nation and the Community; – individual conflicts arising as a result of cultural differences; – feeling of unjustified inferiority in relation to citizens of other Community countries; – emancipatory bondage associated with the imposition of a Community model (style) of life.	– disappearance of autotelic values in favour of community values among members of local cultures; – loss of the fluidity of generational exchange and with it the continuity of culture in regions affected by internal emigration; – movement of cultural components associated with population processes at the local level (urban – rural).	– cultural diversity within the EU; – universalisation of value systems; – misleading programmes for the protection of national cultures and ethnic languages; – imposition of community culture and Western standards of living on other nations – cultural imperialism; – change in national value systems and a decline in the sense of national identification; – loss of ties with cultures remaining in the cultural sphere of a given country; – negative attitude of the Member States' nations towards each other; – arbitrary attitude to and negation of the cultural peculiarities of the Community countries (e.g. political culture and attitudes to other states); – creation of a 'two-speed' Community – ethnic stratification.

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
Social culture dimension (S)	– restrictions on the possibility of extending individual cultural competence in other Community countries.	– ineffective regional cultural programmes dedicated to selected professional and social groups and organisations; – low level of promotion of local cultures and extension of knowledge; – commercialisation of local cultures on the European market; – imposition of English in the area of scientific, economic and political activity.	– the universalisation of intra-community communication – English being the dominant language; – blind imposition of cultural correctness towards other cultures without taking into account internal national circumstances and unresolved issues from the past.

Source: own elaboration

In the background of the aforementioned sources of threats remains migration, which should be considered not only from a social and economic perspective, but also and above all from a cultural perspective. Population flows understood in this way become the root cause of the fluctuation of cultural components at different levels of the social structure and in different sequences of time. Migration is accompanied by a whole range of problems among which cultural conflicts arising from cultural differences, historical legacies, social inequalities and differences in the standard of living of different ethnic groups are of significant importance. They are accompanied by negative attitudes, which include social distance, marginalization, prejudice and stereotypes, intolerance, national chauvinism and xenophobia, as well as extreme attitudes such as nationalism. Table 4 presents the threats to cultural security resulting from migration.

Table 4.
Threats resulting from the migration in the IGNT/MSS system

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
Material culture dimension (M)	– competition in the labour market – cheap labour; – individual costs – taxes and other benefits to immigrants and the associated accumulation of tensions.	– costs of creating and maintaining 'ethnic ghettos' and 'islands' of foreign culture; – perpetuation of a culture of 'poverty' in regions affected by immigration; – increase in housing prices in the region affected by the influx of immigrants;	– external (foreign) emigration and decline in the working-age population; – decline in the cultural capital of Poles through the outflow of educated and skilled people; – social costs associated with the maintenance of immigrants; – influx of foreign elements of material culture (goods and fashion), and

	Individual level (I)	Group level (G)	National and transnational level (N and T)
		– emergence of a new type of crime culture – theft, robbery and the formation of 'foreign' criminal groups; – emergence of 'foreign' memorials and religious worship at the local level.	the mixing of architectural styles (in sacred and usable area architecture).
Spiritual culture dimension (D)	– cultural conflicts with an axiological basis, as well as in the area of differing traditions and customs; – racism, intolerance, xenophobia; – increased sense of ethnicity; – communication conflicts; – lack of cultural competence in cultural encounters; – perpetuation of old and creation of new stereotypes and prejudices against 'foreigners'; – ethnic distance and cultural mistrust.	– culture shock associated with a clash with 'foreigners'; – group cultural conflicts (at local level, organisations and informal groups); – limitations to cultural assimilation; – revival of so-called local ethnicity directed at manifesting its own distinctiveness not only to immigrants but the nation; – emergence of so-called 'third cultures', resulting from the mixing of representatives of different cultures.	– nationalism and racism; – chauvinism; – national megalomania and ethnocentrism; – diffusion of national cultures with immigrant cultures; – emergence of new religions; – artificial multiculturalism.
Social culture dimension (S)	– internalisation of foreign lifestyles and forms of cultural participation; – lexical borrowing; – social divisions and valuing into 'us' and 'them' at school, workplace, restaurants – ethnic stigmatisation.	– language mixing; – hate speech at mass events; – cultural isolationism directed towards 'foreigners' – limiting access to participation in culture (mass, high and even primary dimension).	– unconditional compliance with community rules on the admission of immigrants; – restriction of the rights of immigrant cultures to educate themselves and to cultivate their own traditions and beliefs; – moral panic created by politicians through the media – the vision of the expansion of foreign cultures.

Source: own elaboration

Finally, there are threats to Europe and its identity. Modernity and its pitfalls and cultural heterogeneity are, for now, two of the triad of destroyers of national identity. The third, and equally important, are the integration processes pushing states, and within them nations, towards cultural fusion built through the conclusion of formal agreements, pacts, or unions of a political and economic nature. Integration processes

seem to obscure the picture, not only of identification, but also of national identity itself, as exemplified by identity dualism in the European Union. This reveals a problem with the definition of two concepts: identity of Europe and European identity. It should be emphasised that while the identity of Europe remains linked to history and territoriality, European identity is treated as a psychosocial and cultural phenomenon that transcends geographical boundaries. This is justified by David Lowenthal's thesis, which states: "Europe is not merely a geographical and social entity, but a mental construct" (2000, p. 314). It is based on an identification with Europe as a cultural creation rather than a collection of (politically) integrated states and nations. This thesis is also confirmed by Gerard Delanty's reflection: "Europe has been united, but those elusive citizens, the Europeans, have yet to be invented" (1999, p. 17). The quoted thought vividly conveys the ethnocultural and social reality that the nations co-creating the Community have found themselves in.

In a general sense, identity of Europe should be understood in terms of historical experience and its ethnocultural roots, while European identity should be understood as a subjective identity expressed and declared by the citizens of European states. Axiologically, the former should be regarded as an autotelic value, while the latter as a value expressed by an emotional bond, limited by national identity and oriented towards instrumental elements (material values). In Zygmunt Bauman's book *Europe: An Unfinished Adventure,* a number of issues arise, casting doubt on the existence of a European *supernation*. Z. Bauman (2007) sees Europe as a creation full of divisions and dichotomies, and Europe itself as the 'royalty and monster' of cultures.

Conclusions

The guiding principle of the considerations undertaken in this article is cultural security threats embedded in the author's IGNT/MSS system, in which I stands for the individual level, G for the group level, N for the national level, T for the transnational level, while M stands for the material dimension, S for the spiritual dimension and S for the social dimension. The analysis of the literature and research reports led to conclusions aimed at confirming the hypothesis that the main source of threats to cultural security is the natural and inevitable process of social change and globalisation processes shaping lifestyles and forms of participation in culture, as well as attitudes towards the tangible and intangible world of culture. It is difficult today to determine which of the sources of threats proposed by J. Czaja decisively affects culture, especially with regard to its various levels and dimensions. Undoubtedly, the basic source of threats to culture and its security is globalisation, the product of which are social and economic phenomena that violate the canon of a nation's culture, shattering the axionormative order of individuals and entire communities, and above all modifying

social identity by imposing new lifestyles, traditions and customs, and even value systems, creating a new individual identity for people caught up in social change. The cultural canon is also affected by other sources of threat. Modernisation remains linked to globalisation and is a determinant of the level of modernity. Regionalism uniformises and institutionalises lifestyles, and migration is a major cause of the diffusion of cultural components with all its consequences. The analysis undertaken in this article is only an outline of the issues that make up the threats to cultural security. Each of the sources presented here requires a separate analysis in relation to the proposed IGNT/MSS system.

REFERENCES

Bagby, Johnson, L. M. (1994). The use and abuse of thucydides in international relations. *International Organization*, *48*(1), 131–153.

Bauman, Z. (2007). *Europa niedokończona przygoda*. Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Bodziany, M. (2019). *Wewnętrzne uwarunkowania bezpieczeństwa kulturowego Polski.* Wydawnictwo AWL.

Booth, K. (2007). *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge University Press.

Booth, K. (1991). Security and Emancipation, *Review of International Studies*, *17*(4), 313–326. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500112033

Budyta-Budzyńska, M. (2010). *Socjologia narodu i konfliktów etnicznych*. Warszawa.

Buzan, B., & Waever O. (2003). *Regions and powers. The structure of international security*. Cambridge University Press.

Cieślarczyk, M. (2010). *Kultura bezpieczeństwa i obronności*. Wydawnictwo AP.

Czaja, J. (2008). *Kulturowe czynniki bezpieczeństwa*. Wydawnictwo Krakowskiej Szkoły Wyższej im. Andrzeja Frycza Modrzewskiego.

Czaja, J. (2013). *Kulturowy wymiar bezpieczeństwa. Aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne*. Wydawnictwo Krakowskiej Akademii im. Andrzeja Frycza Modrzewskiego.

Czaputowicz, J. (2003). Kryteria bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego państwa – aspekty teoretyczne. In S. Dębski & B. Górka-Winter (Eds.), *Kryteria bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego państwa*. PISM.

Czaputowicz, J. (2008). *Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych: krytyka i systematyzacja*. Wydawnictwo PWN.

Dawidczyk, A. (2001). *Nowe wyzwania, zagrożenia i szanse dla bezpieczeństwa Polski u progu XXI wieku*. Warszawa.

Delanty, G. (1999). *Odkrywanie Europy. Idea, tożsamość, rzeczywistość*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Fijałkowski, Ł. (2012). „Emancypacja" człowieka jako podstawa bezpieczeństwa światowego. *Kultura – Historia – Globalizacja, 12*, 57–66.

Filipiak, M. (2000). *Socjologia kultury. Zarys zagadnień*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.

Gray, C. S. (1984). Comparative Strategic Culture. *Parameters*, *14*(4).

Gumiński, M. (2010). Geneza ponowoczesnych przygód z tożsamością. *Kultura i Historia, 18.* https://www.kulturaihistoria.umcs.lublin.pl/archives/1892

Hannerz, U. (2015). Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. In *Globalization and identity*. John Wiley & Sons, ebook.

Heyer Young, V. (2005). *Ruth Benedict – Beyond relativity, beyond pattern*. University of Nebraska Press.

Huysmans, J. (2006). *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear and Asylum in the EU*. Abington.

Innis, H. (2007). Nachylenie komunikacyjne. In G. Godlewski et al. (Eds.), *Communicare. Almanach antropologiczny. Temat 2: Oralność/Piśmienność*.Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Jarmoszko, S. (2010). Nowe wzory kultury bezpieczeństwa a procesy deterioracji więzi społecznej. In E. Rekłajtis, R. Wiśniewski, J. Zdanowski (Eds.), *Jedność i różnorodność. Kultura vs. kultury*. Wyd. Aspra J-R.

Jawłowska, A. (2003). Nowe regionalizmy w Polsce. In M. Kempny, G. & Woroniecka (Eds.), *Wymiary globalizacji kulturowej. Wyzwania badawcze*. Wydawnictwo WSIiE TWP.

Jemioło, T. (2001). Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe w warunkach globalizacji i procesów społecznych. In *Kultura narodowa w kształtowaniu świadomości obronnej społeczeństwa i bezpieczeństwa państwa*. „Zeszyt Problemowy TWO", 3(25), s. 20–31.

Johnston, A. I. (1995). Thinking about Strategic Culture. *International Security*, *19*(4), 32–64.

Kitler, W. (2011). *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie. Uwarunkowania. System*. Wyd. AON.

Krzysztofek, K. (2000). Globalna kultura i globalne zarządzanie. *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, *1*, 67–86.

Kułaga, A. (2016). Wyzwania natury gospodarczej w świetle krytycznych studiów nad bezpieczeństwem. *Przegląd Europejski*, *1*(39), 8–27.

Lantis, J. S., & Howlett D. (2009). Kultura strategiczna. In J. Baylis et al. (Ed.), *Strategia we współczesnym świecie* (transl. W. Nowicki). Seria Politico. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagielońskiego.

Lowenthal, D. (2000). European identity: An emerging concept. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, *46*(3), 314–321.

Mach, Z., & Niedźwiedzki D. (Eds.). (2002). *Polska lokalna wobec integracji europejskiej*. Universitas.

McDonald, M. (2007). Emancipation and critical terrorism studies. *European Political Science*, *6*(3), 252–259. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210142

McLuhan, M. (2004). *Zozumieć media: przedłużenia człowieka*. WNT Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Techniczne.

Mead, M. (2000). *Kultura i tożsamość. Studium dystansu międzypokoleniowego*. WN PWN.

Melosik, Z., & Szkudlarek, T. (1998). *Kultura, tożsamość i edukacja. Migotanie znaczeń*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Michałowska, G. (1997). Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe w warunkach globalizacji procesów społecznych. In D. B. Bobrow, E. Haliżak, & R. Zięba (Eds.), *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i międzynarodowe u schyłku XX wieku* (s. 131–145). Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Scholar".

Pawłuszko, T. (2015). Konceptualizacja teorii regionalnych kompleksów bezpieczeństwa, *Rocznik Bezpieczeństwa Międzynarodowego*, *9*(2), 57–70. https://doi.org/10.34862/rbm.2015.2.5

Piwowarski, J. (2015). Trzy filary kultury bezpieczeństwa. *Kultura Bezpieczeństwa. Nauka – Praktyka – Refleksje*, *19*, 21–33.

Postman, N. (2004). *Technopol. Triumf techniki nad kulturą*. Muza.

Przewłocki, J., & Szczepański, W. J. (Eds.). (1981). *Ideologia a współczesne stosunki międzynarodowe*. Uniwersytet Śląski

Said, E. (2005). *Orientalizm.* Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.

Schwarz, T., & Mead, M. (1960). Micro- and Macro-Cultural Models for Cultural Evolution. Uses of Typology in Language or Culture or Both: A Symposium Presented at the 1960

Meetings of the American Anthropological Association (Jan., 1961). *Anthropological Linguistics*, *3*(1), 1–7. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30022288?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [retrieved on 6 November 2018]

Snyder, J. L. (1977). *The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations*. RAND Corporation.

Tułowiecki, D. (2016). Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe a obecność i/lub eliminacja religii w polskim kanonie kultury. *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL*, *59*(4), 89–115.

Wæver, O. (1995). Securitation and Desecuritation. In R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On security* (46–87). Columbia University Press.

Wæver, O. (1993). Societal security – the concept. In O. Wæver, B. Buzan, M. Kelstrup, & S. Lemaitre (Eds.), *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe* (17–40). Pinter.

Weber, C. (1992). Reconsidering statehood: Exemining the sovereignty/intervention boundary. *Interview of International Studies*, *18*(3), 199-216.

Williams, P. D. (Ed.). (2012). *Studia bezpieczeństwa*. Wyd. Uniwersytetu Jegiellońskiego.

Włodkowska-Bagan, A. (2009). Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe. In K. A. Wojtaszczyk, & A. Materska-Sosnowska (Eds.), *Bezpieczeństwo państwa* (143–171). Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA JR.

Wnuk-Lipiński, E. (2004). *Świat międzyepoki. Globalizacja. Demokracja*. *Państwo narodowe*. Wyd. Znak.

Zieba, R. (2004). *Instytucjonalizacja bezpieczeństwa europejskiego. Koncepcje – struktury – funkcjonowanie*. Wyd. SCHOLAR.

Ziętek, A. (2016). *Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe w Europie*. Wyd. UMCS.