

# **A typology of cultural attitudes as a device describing political thought of the populations influenced by globalisation**

**Joanna Rak**

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, j.m.k.rak@wp.pl

## **Abstract**

The typology of cultural attitudes towards native and foreign cultures remains an unsolved problem in specialist literature. This paper contains four studies of individual types of cultural attitudes. Each contains a description, interpretation, and criticism of current theoretical propositions. Those whose fallacy is proven were replaced with new, authorial concepts. The typologies of cultural attitudes (nativistic, vitalistic, autonegative, and contra-aculturative) were laid out according to the criteria of aim and mean. Mixed types were also taken into consideration. They all make up a typology that is a useful device for describing the political thought of populations influenced by globalisation. Their empirical falsifiability is an interesting challenge for anthropologists and historians who study contemporary political thought.

**KEYWORDS:** cultural attitudes, globalisation, political thought, social movements, socio-cultural identities

## **Introduction**

The main purpose of this paper is to reveal that the ideal behavioural types of representatives of a subjugated culture (gradually deteriorating under the control of a dominant culture) are useful when describing those entities and areas influenced by globalisation. It is important to indicate that the typology of cultural attitudes towards their own culture is also useful (Manyoni 1977). They provide a broad spectrum of theoretical structures that are highly applicable in the realm of reflection on political reality. They can be used in the face of methodological difficulties to determine the content and structure of social and political cleavages in the contemporary world.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, these types are a useful device to describe the political thought of all populations influenced by globalisation (Näsström 2003; see also Hellwig 2007). The set-apart types are symptomatic theoretical creations

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example: Bäcker (2013), Bielasiak (2002), Evans (2006), Herskovits, (1942), Kabzińska (2010), Koczanowicz (1997), Lieber, Weisberg (2002), Parisi, Cecconi, Natale (2003), Seleny (1999), Zarycki (2000).

that make up the most important distinctive features that they describe. The types allow identification of various attitudes towards native and foreign cultures and the subsequent correlation of each other (Wax 1993).

There are four fundamental types of cultural attitudes: nativistic, vitalistic, autonegative, contra-aculturative. Their descriptions within academic literature require a critical examination and complement because they contain logical and substantive mistakes that reduce their potential cognitive value (see, e.g., Rose & Willoughby 1958; Dohrenwend & Smith 1962; Wallace 1956; Guariglia 1958: 182). The typology of cultural attitudes towards native and foreign cultures remains an unresolved problem in specialist literature.

This paper contains four studies of individual types of cultural attitudes. Each contains a description, interpretation, and criticism of current theoretical propositions. Those whose fallacy was proven were replaced with new, authorial concepts. The typologies of cultural attitudes (nativistic, vitalistic, autonegative, contra-aculturative) were laid out according to the criteria of aim and mean. Mixed types were also taken into consideration. They all make up a typology that is a useful device for describing the political thought of populations influenced by globalisation. Their empirical falsifiability is an interesting challenge for researchers who study contemporary political thought (Prempeh 2004).

## **Nativistic cultural attitudes**

The first type mentioned is the nativistic cultural attitude. Valuable insight into this attitude was provided by American anthropologist Ralph Linton (1943: 230) whose definition of nativistic movement was as follows: 'Any conscious, organised attempt on the part of society's members to revive or perpetuate selected aspects of its culture.' He focused on explaining this type of attitude towards its own culture that is displayed by those members of a society who completely accept and approve of a native culture and entirely acknowledge their past. Despite the fact that Linton (1943) did not centre his attention on the problem of what the attitude towards foreign cultures is, he did, however, realise it might have a destructive effect on the indigenous culture (also see: Bradley 2008; Thornton 1993).

There are two types of the nativistic cultural attitudes that were distinguished according to the aim criterion. The first is called revivalistic (to revive) (Posern-Zieliński 1967; Wallace 1962; see also Plotnicov 1964) and the second perpetuative (to perpetuate). The type of revivalistic nativistic cultural attitude is a form of nativistic attitude that 'involves an attempt to revive extinct or at least moribund elements of culture.' The type of perpetuative nativistic cultural attitude is a form of nativistic attitude that '[involves an attempt to] merely seek to perpetuate current ones' (Linton 1943: 231; also see: Turner 1971).

The main goal of the revivalistic nativistic cultural attitude is a conscious attempt to improve or revive selected elements of one's culture. It is characterised as a reactive one. Not only does a person expressing this attitude disagree with the destruction or atrophy of particular elements of his or her culture but he/she also supports and

completely approves of them. Fearing the deterioration of their native culture, people thus make effort to preserve and protect it.

The perpetuative nativistic cultural attitude<sup>2</sup> is characterised by conscious attempts to retain or eternalise selected elements of culture. There exists a collective yearning of society to safeguard all features and values comprising their culture. The fear of cultural degradation drives the people towards immortalising the native culture and preventing any change from occurring within its boundaries.

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

Neither of them emphasises the need for an apotheosis of native culture, a glorification of its constituents. That is precisely why it is possible to propose a third attitude, a sacralising attitude, which would ascribe a religious attribute to non-religious parts of culture. In contrast to the nativistic attitude, it would consciously sanctify chosen aspects of culture and, thus, be bereft of the reactive character of the native relativistic attitude.

Driven by their main aspiration, members of a society are intent on deeming their culture the highest and most admirable. An intrusion into its contents – whether a change of certain features or an introduction of new ones – seems not only impossible but also unacceptable, reproachable.

The current state of native culture, according to a society, is a state of unparalleled perfection (Meader Jr. 1967). Both the nativistic revivalistic and perpetuative nativistic attitude can precede the engenderment of the nativistic sacralising attitude.

The anthropologist Simone Clemhout (1964) proposed an entirely different definition of the nativistic movement, without referring to Linton's conception directly. Her definition of nativistic movement was as follows:

Nativistic movements always occur from stress of culture (two different cultures coming in contact with each other). The consequences of such situations must not necessarily be inequality between the societies in contact (exploitation), dominance and submission (frustrate). Nativistic movements may result from the simple contact of culture through the influences on values, needs, world view on individuals in a society (Clemhout 1964: 15).

Unlike Linton (1943), Clemhout made a dominant culture the reference point of defining the nativistic movements.<sup>3</sup> According to Clemhout, it is the contact between two cultures that causes the birth of the nativistic attitudes. However, the weakness of this theory lies not only in its disregard for the issue of a conscious desire of a society to react

---

<sup>2</sup> Anthropologist Harold W. Turner (1967) distinguished nativistic movements from perpetuative movements, but he did not reveal that difference and did not substantiate that point of view.

<sup>3</sup> Regarding Linton's conception as a point to define the culture attitudes, see Fabian 1979.

adequately to the contact with a foreign culture but also in omitting the question of how society perceives its own culture. Clemhout's attempt to classify these movements (appointed from definition) is also imperfect. It is curtailed to an enumerative delineation of three goals of an inter-cultural contact: exploitation, domination, and submission. There is one more type, which is an open catalogue of all possibly attainable goals defined by (erroneously depreciated<sup>4</sup> by Clemhout) representatives of the cultures. These types are neither disjunctive nor characteristic exclusively for nativistic stances, which means that this attempt of defining and classifying nativistic attitudes is useless in the following analysis.

Compared to Linton's typology of nativistic attitudes, the following definition arouses even more doubt, as the author draws a line between magical and rational nativism. The Italian anthropologist Vittorio Lanternari (1974) claims that (thanks to the implementation of this differentiation) Linton's typology of nativistic movements becomes complete and exhaustive: 'This scheme includes all movements which derive from contact or conflict between different cultures or sub-cultures, and Linton saw all of them as conservative movements attempting to preserve socio-cultural identity' (Lanternari 1974: 489). It is noteworthy that the categories mentioned by Lanternari comprise a proverbial open catalogue, into which any nativistic attitude can arbitrarily be included.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, it is difficult to unequivocally determine what attitude bears the signs of a magical one, as the individuals expressing it must wilfully and deliberately attempt to encounter the supernatural (Nowicka 1972; also see Eliade 1961; 1968). Henceforth, it is justifiable to doubt the usefulness of these two ideal types in defining cultural attitudes. It is necessary then to propose a new authorial typology according to the criterion of mean used by members of a society in order to embrace those particular nativistic cultural attitudes, which have been presented according to the criterion of aim.

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

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

The cultivating nativistic cultural attitude relies on sustaining and developing elements of the native culture. In this case, sustaining relates only to the native culture, not the dominant culture. These are further divided into revivalistic-cultivating, perpetuative-cultivating, and sacralising-cultivating nativistic.

---

<sup>4</sup> Regarding a human as a part of a cultural system, see Zachariasz 1999. See also the meaning of representatives of native culture for the nativistic movements; essence in Weisman 2007.

<sup>5</sup> A perfect depiction of that can be found in Marinich 1976: 65.

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

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

## **Vitalistic cultural attitudes**

Anthropologist Marian W. Smith (1954) proposed a following definition of the vitalistic movement: 'Any conscious, organised attempt on the part of a society's members to incorporate in its culture selected aspects of another culture in contact with it' (Smith 1959a: 9; 1954: 122). She focused on explaining types of attitudes towards both the indigenous and dominant cultures. Referring to the first type of attitude, it should be observed that it lacks manifestation of approval and affirmation for a society's own past. Furthermore, a certain opposition to the state of the native culture is also expressed, although far from being a complete negation of it. What can also be observed is the acceptance of the dominant culture. A chief element of this attitude is the disdainful approach towards the indigenous culture, which is combined with effort to replace some of its key elements with those drawn from the dominant culture.

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

Smith's presentation is not complete because it does not contain all the possible types of the vitalistic cultural attitudes that were distinguished according to the aim criterion (Wallace 1959; Voget 1959; Smith 1959b). It is necessary then to supplement that typology with new authorial types. These are: the meliorating vitalistic and the sacralising vitalistic cultural attitude. Representatives of the former tend to have a rather positive outlook on most elements of the dominant culture; while those taking up the latter are willing to sanctify those elements with sacred, divine qualities.

The essence of the meliorating vitalistic cultural attitude is therefore a conscious manifestation of approval of the dominant culture. It is an indication of dissatisfaction with the content of the native culture. Concurrently, it is an expression of the need to as-

sign a positive meaning to selected elements of the dominant culture. That new meaning can become (as it was a direct consequence) an incentive to include these aspects into the fabric of the native culture and hence gives rise to the vitalistic cultural attitude. It should not be overlooked that inclusions might not occur at all, and in that case members of a society would have to be content with merely manifesting their approval, which is a direct effect of the meliorating vitalistic attitude. Furthermore, the meliorating vitalistic attitude can provide fertile ground for the advent of the sacralising vitalistic attitude.

As outlined above, the sacralising attitude prompts a society to add a divine quality to certain elements adapted from the dominant culture, henceforth making them cherished icons of worship. It is an apotheosis of particular elements of the foreign culture; an expression of admiration towards it and a will to glorify its constituents. While the sacralising attitude, not unlike a meliorating one, can also provide an incentive to adapt certain parts of the dominant culture, it may as well at one point become replaced with the meliorating vitalistic cultural attitude, and hence change the primary goal of the attitude embraced by a society.

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

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

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

Another type of a vitalistic cultural attitude in accordance with the mean criterion is called the vitalistic acculturative attitude. It primarily consists of a range of activities whose primary goal is to instigate a whole series of social interactions aimed at deprecating the native culture. Similar to the previously described attitude, this one is also characterised by a certain lack of appreciation for the past and the native culture, and an

almost unanimous praise of the dominant culture. Not unlike in previous instances, these attitudes might also be used to achieve different goals, thus the differentiation: inclusive-acculturative, meliorating-acculturative, and sacralising-acculturative vitalistic.

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

## **Autonegative cultural attitudes**

Another type of an attitude towards the native culture is the autonegative cultural attitude. This attitude does not react to any of the foreign cultures. Anthropologist Ewa Nowicka (1972: 21) indicated that it is signified by ‘a rejection of selected elements of the native culture.’ It might be appropriate to expand that definition and add that it is conditioned by any conscious attempt of eliminating certain elements of the native culture created by the members of a society, therefore this attitude negates the native, indigenous culture.

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

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

The essence of the desanctifying autonegative cultural attitude is an extreme aversion towards the native culture. Not only are those expressing it inclined to condemn the constituents of the native culture, calling them ungodly or unholy, but also show desire to eradicate them. Eventually, the desanctifying attitude may transform into the autonegative exclusive; however, the detailed aim of a society will change with it as well. In contrast, the exclusion of certain elements of the native culture (barring traits of an

almost cathartic activity) might enable a society to create a desirable version of the native culture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Contra-acculturative cultural attitudes**

In contrast, anthropologist and specialist in African studies, Melville Jean Herskovits (1960: 531; 1938: 11) distinguished contra-acculturative movements:

It is essentially out of contacts involving dominance of one people over another that contra-acculturative movements arise – those movements wherein a people come to stress the values in aboriginal ways of life, and to move aggressively, either actually or in fantasy, toward the restoration of those ways, even in the face of obvious evidence of their importance to throw off the power that restricts them.

Herskovits (1960) focused on explaining these types of attitudes towards native and dominant cultures. Regarding the first contra-acculturative movement, it is critical to notice the explicit appreciation and respect expressed by members of a society towards their own history and culture while aspiring to rejuvenate and restore certain aspects of it. The need to revitalise the native culture stems from the contact with the dominant culture that impedes and limits the native culture (Herskovits 1937; 1941). The contra-acculturative attitude is also reactive, occurring in conditions of domination and submission (Voget 1956) and being a direct result of a society's discontent with the domination of a foreign culture.

The contra-acculturative cultural attitude should not be incorrectly equated with the nativistic cultural attitude.<sup>6</sup> The main distinction between these two is based on the fact that Linton has focused on certain manifestations of types of attitudes towards the native culture that are expressions of affirmation of the past and acceptance for the native culture, while Herskovits concentrated on both the attitudes towards the dominant culture and the attitudes towards the native culture, in other words, on emphasising how members of a certain society struggle to address elements of a dominant culture that are imposed upon them. While in the case of the nativistic movements what is noticeable is the acceptance, the contra-acculturative movements are characterised by negation (Leal 2011). Their common component is the respect for the native culture.

The weakness of Herskovits's presentation lies in the fact that the author distinguishes only one type of a contra-acculturative attitude, in accordance with the aim criterion. It is the throwing-out attitude, which shall be called (for the purpose of this essay) the exclusive contra-acculturative cultural attitude because the predicate 'exclusive' allows for a more accurate description of the exclusion process of certain elements

---

<sup>6</sup> Next there is a muddying of the essence of these attitudes, e.g., Lanternari 1974: 489; Edmonson 1960: 193.

of the native culture. The essence of this type of attitude is a rejection of influences of the foreign culture which the native culture (being fully accepted by society) encounters. Hence, this attitude has a reactive character, and those taking it up strive towards restoring the native culture and diminishing the influence of the dominant culture. Members of a society manifest their approval and admiration for their past and applaud their native culture while rejecting all foreign influences and refusing anything that might modify their indigenous culture.

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

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

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

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

The Herskovits typology has a weakness in that it does not include definitions of contra-acculturative attitudes formulated in accordance with the criterion of mean (also see Hess 2007). That is precisely why a typology of those attitudes is much needed in this work.

Polish political scientist Roman Bäcker has proposed an interesting typology of the contra-acculturative cultural attitudes in accordance with the criterion of mean:

The contra-acculturative aspirations may consist in separating from the dominant culture (*escape*), eliminating influences of that culture from the own territory (*isolation*) or its annihilation, it means a war. That trigrades of contra-acculturative aspirations tension is normally relative towards these movements' nature. If the *escape* is typical of restrained political trends which usually use the type of moral appraisals. Isolation is characteristic for fundamentalist political trends. Then the strategy on annihilation is typical of pre- and classically totalitarian movements' (Bäcker 2000: 11–3; 2002: 32; 2005: 150; 2011: 157).

He distinguished three types of contra-acculturative cultural attitudes. The first is called 'escape' and is an expression of the detachment of some society members from the dominant culture and their subsequent drive towards relieving themselves from its boundaries and regulations. The second, 'isolation', characterises those communities that actively ward off foreign cultural influence on the territory they control. The last one, 'annihilation', is basically a war between representatives of foreign and native cultures (Krakowski 2008: 317).<sup>7</sup>

Despite the fact that these definitions may seem exhaustive and give the impression of fully depicting the wide range of stances and attitudes expressed within the contra-acculturative orientation, there might be a question raised as to whether the first type (*escape*) should not be used in the construction of the second (*isolation*) for the main purpose of isolation is the security of certain entities in such a way that they are proverbially cordoned off from each other and, therefore, unable to mutually correspond. However, by combining two separate attitudes' types they may become less distinctive, so this remark is purely technical and addresses semantic issues.

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

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

---

<sup>7</sup> See also Bäcker 2002: 34–36; 40; 2007: 21–25; S. Filipowicz 2000: 120–122 (the motive of separation); 122–124 (the motive of opposition).

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

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

As was the case with previous attitudes, this one is also prompted by relationships that arise after a contact with the dominant culture is established, and occurs in situations in which a native culture is subjugated by a dominant culture. Not unlike the previous instances, these attitudes might also be used to achieve different goals, thus the differentiation: the contra-acculturative exclusive-escapist attitude, the contra-acculturative pejorative-escapist attitude, the contra-acculturative taboo-escapist attitude, and the contra-acculturative desanctifying-escapist attitude.

## **Final remarks**

According to the criterion of aim, the following types of cultural attitudes towards own and foreign cultures were distinguished: revivalistic nativistic, perpetuative nativistic, sacralising nativistic, inclusive vitalistic, meliorating vitalistic, sacralising vitalistic, exclusive autonegative, desanctifying autonegative, pejorative autonegative, taboo autonegative, exclusive contra-acculturative, desanctifying contra-acculturative, pejorative contra-acculturative, taboo contra-acculturative. This typology is also presented in the form of the comparative Table 1.

*Table 1: Typology of cultural attitudes towards own and foreign cultures according to the criterion of aim\**

<b>Nativistic</b>	<b>Vitalistic</b>	<b>Autonegative</b>	<b>Contra-acculturative</b>
revivalistic	inclusive	exclusive	exclusive
perpetuative	meliorating	pejorative	pejorative
sacralising	sacralising	taboo	taboo
	desanctifying	desanctifying	

*\*Source: Own study based on typologies of cultural attitudes: nativistic by Linton, vitalistic by Smith, autonegative by Nowicka, contra-acculturative by Herskovits and authorial typologies.*

Then, in accordance with the criterion of mean, we have the following types of cultural attitudes towards own and foreign cultures: evoking nativistic, cultivating nativistic, adoring nativistic, maximally-interactive vitalistic, acculturative vitalistic, auto-identity vitalistic, profaning autonegative, exterminating autonegative, renouncing autonegative, silencing autonegative, separative contra-acculturative, exterminating contra-acculturative, escapist contra-acculturative. That typology is also presented in the Table 2.

Table 2: Typology of cultural attitudes towards own and foreign cultures according to the criterion of mean\*

Nativistic	Vitalistic	Autonegative	Contra-acculturative
evoking	maximally-interactive	profaning	separative
cultivating	acculturative	exterminating	exterminating
adoring	auto-identity	renouncing	escapist
	silencing		

\*Source: Own study based on authorial typologies.

All the presented typologies constitute a useful device to describe the political thought of all populations influenced by globalisation (also see Edwards 2006). Their empirical falsifiability is an interesting challenge for historians who study the contemporary history of political ideas. Furthermore, it would be desirable to criticise, modify or supplement these academic presentations and descriptions, because they are not definitive and, therefore, open to interpretation, and any discussion revolving around those definitions could expand common knowledge about the political reality.

## References

- Bäcker Roman. 2000. *Międzywojenny eurazjatyzm. Od intelektualnej kontrakulturacji do totalitaryzmu?*. Łódź, PL: Wydawnictwo Ibidem.
- Bäcker Roman. 2002. Społeczne struktury myślenia a terroryzm. In R. Bäcker (ed.), *Od blokad ulicznych do World Trade Center. Taktyka i technika przeciwdziałania zagrożeniom terrorystycznym oraz innym publicznym działaniom pozaprawnym*. Toruń, PL: Wydawnictwo SECRETUM, pp. 30–40.
- Bäcker Roman. 2005. Instrumentarium ideologiczne kontrakulturacyjnych nurtów antyglobalizacyjnych. In: J. Sobczak, R. Bäcker & Sz. Ossowski (eds.), *Europejska myśl polityczna wobec globalizacji. Tradycja i wyzwania współczesności*. Łódź, PL: Wydawnictwo Ibidem: 149–56.
- Bäcker Roman. 2007. *Rosyjskie myślenie polityczne za czasów prezydenta Putina*. Toruń, PL: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Bäcker Roman. 2011. *Nietradycyjna teoria polityki*. Toruń, PL: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Bäcker Roman. 2002. Społeczne struktury myślenia a terroryzm. In: R. Bäcker (ed.), *Od blokad ulicznych do World Trade Center. Taktyka i technika przeciwdziałania zagrożeniom terrorystycznym oraz innym publicznym działaniom pozaprawnym*. Toruń, PL: Wydawnictwo SECRETUM, pp. 30–40.
- Bäcker Roman. 2013. Przedmiot badania politologii w warunkach globalizacji. In: B. Krauz-Mozer, P. Ścigaj (eds.), *Podejścia badawcze i metodologie w nauce o polityce*. Kraków, PL: Księgarnia Akademicka: 227.
- Bielasiak Jack. 2002. Determinants of Public Opinion Differences on EU Accession in Poland. *Europe-Asia Studies* 54(8): 1241–266.
- Bradley A. Bruce. 2008. Pitchers to Mugs: Chacoan Revival at Sand Canyon Pueblo. *Kiva* 74(2): 247–62.

- Clemhout Simone. 1964. Typology of Nativistic Movements. *Man* 64(7): 14–5.
- Dohrenwend P. Bruce & Smith J. Robert. 1962. Toward a Theory of Acculturation. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 18(1): 30–9.
- Edmonson S. Munro. 1960. *Nativism, Syncretism and Anthropological Science*. New Orleans: Middle American Research Institute Publication.
- Edwards S. Martin. 2006. Public Opinion regarding Economic and Cultural Globalization: Evidence from a Cross-National Survey. *Review of International Political Economy* 13(4): 587–608.
- Eliade Mircea. 1961. Recent works on shamanism. A review article. *History of Religions* 1(1): 152–86.
- Eliade Mircea. 1968. Australian Religions. Part V: Death, Eschatology, and Some Conclusions. *History of Religions* 7(3): 244–68.
- Evans Geoffrey. 2006. The Social Bases of Political Divisions in Post-Communist Eastern Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology* 32: 245–70.
- Fabian Johannes. 1979. The Anthropology of Religious Movements: From Explanation to Interpretation. *Social Research* 46(1): 4–35.
- Forestiere Carolyn. 2010. Political Volatility and Governance in East Central Europe. *Slavic Review* 69(4): 903–24.
- Filipowicz Stanisław. 2000. Rosja i Europa – eros i trauma. In S. Filipowicz (ed.), *Historia i geopolityka. Rosja na progu XXI stulecia. Studia Politologiczne*. Warszawa, PL: Dom Wydawniczy ELIPSA: 114–28.
- Guariglia Guglielmo. 1958. Prophetismus und Heilserwartungsbewegungen bei den niedrigen Kulturen. *Numen* 5(3): 180–98.
- Hellwig Timothy. 2007. Globalization and Perceptions of Policy Maker Competence: Evidence from France. *Political Research Quarterly* 60(1): 146–58.
- Herskovits J. Melville. 1937. The Significance of the Study of Acculturation for Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 39(2): 259–64.
- Herskovits J. Melville. 1938. *Acculturation. The study of culture contact*. New York, NY: J. J. Augustin Publisher.
- Herskovits J. Melville. 1941. Some Comments on the Study of Cultural Contact. *American Anthropologist* 43(1), 1–10.
- Herskovits J. Melville. 1942. On the Values in Culture. *The Scientific Monthly* 54(6): 557–60.
- Herskovits J. Melville. 1960. *Man and his works. The science of cultural anthropology*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hess J. David. 2007. Crosscurrents: Social Movements and the Anthropology of Science and Technology. *American Anthropologist* 109(3): 463–72.
- Kabzińska Iwona. 2010. ‘Ludzie się zmienili...’ Z badań nad doświadczeniami postsocjalistycznej transformacji. *Etnografia Polska* 54: 5–22.
- Koczanowicz Leszek. 1997. Memory of Politics and Politics of Memory. Reflections on the Construction of the Past in Post-Totalitarian Poland. *Studies in East European Thought* 49(4): 259–70.
- Krakowski Moshe. 2008. Dynamics of Isolation and Integration in Ultra-Orthodox Schools: The Epistemological Implications of Using Rabbeim as Secular Studies Teachers. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 74(3): 317–42.
- Lanternari Vittorio. 1974. Nativistic and Socio-Religious Movements: A Reconsideration. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 483–503.
- Leal João. 2011. ‘The past is a foreign country’? Acculturation theory and the anthropology of globalization. *Etnográfica: Revista do Centro de Estudos de Antropologia Social* 15(2): 313–36.
- Lieber J. Robert & Weisberg E. Ruth. 2002. Globalization, Culture, and Identities in Crisis. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 16(2): 273–96.
- Linton Ralph. 1943. Nativistic Movements. *American Anthropologist* 45(2): 230-240.
- Manyoni R. Joseph. 1977. Anthropology and the Study of Schism in Africa: A Re-Examination of Some Anthropological Theories (L’anthropologie et l’étude des schismes en Afrique: réexamen de quelques théories). *Cahiers d’Études Africaines* 17(68): 599–631.
- Marinich G. Vladimir. 1976. Revitalization Movements in Kievan Russia. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 15(1): 61–8.
- Näsström Sofia. 2003. What Globalization Overshadows. *Political Theory* 31(6): 808-834.

- Meador Jr. W. Forrest. 1967. Na 'ilde': The Ghost Dance of the White Mountain Apache. *Kiva* 33(1): 15–24.
- Nowicka Ewa. 1972a. *Bunt i ucieczka. Zderzenie kultur i ruchy społeczne*. Warszawa, PL: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Nowicka Ewa. 1972b. Typologia ruchów społecznych wśród ludów pierwotnych. *Etnografia Polska* 16(1): 115–42.
- Parisi Domenico, Cecconi Federico & Natale Francesco. 2003. Cultural Change in Spatial Environments: The Role of Cultural Assimilation and Internal Changes in Cultures. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47(2): 163–79.
- Plotnicov Leonard. 1964. 'Nativism' in Contemporary Nigeria. *Anthropological Quarterly* 37(3): 121–37.
- Posern-Zieliński Aleksander. 1967. Melanezyjskie ruchy millenarystyczne jako przykład współczesnych przeobrażeń kulturowych. *Etnografia Polska* 11: 349–65.
- Prempeh E. Osei Kwadwo. 2004. Anti-Globalization Forces, the Politics of Resistance, and Africa: Promises and Perils. *Journal of Black Studies* 34(4): 580–598.
- Rose Edward & Willoughby Gary. 1958. Culture Profiles and Emphases. *American Journal of Sociology* 63(5): 476–90.
- Seleny Anna. 1999. Old Political Rationalities and New Democracies: Compromise and Confrontation in Hungary and Poland. *World Politics* 51(4): 484–519.
- Smith W. Marian. 1954. Shamanism in the shaker religion of Northwest America. *Man* 54(8): 119–22.
- Smith W. Marian. 1959a. Towards a classification of cult movements. *Man* 59(1): 8–12.
- Smith W. Marian. 1959b. Towards a classification of cult movements: Some Farther Contributions III. *Man* 59(2): 28.
- Thornton Russell. 1993. Boundary Dissolution and Revitalization Movements: The Case of the Nineteenth-Century Cherokees. *Ethnohistory* 40(3): 359–83.
- Turner W. Harold. 1967. A Typology for African Religious Movements. *Journal of Religion in Africa* 1(1): 1–34.
- Turner E. Ronny. 1971. Models of social movements: An analysis of religion and social change. *International Review of Sociology* 1(2): 147–56.
- Voget W. Fred. 1956. The American Indian in Transition: Reformation and Accommodation. *American Anthropologist* 58(2): 249–63.
- Voget W. Fred. 1959. Towards a classification of cult movements: Some Farther Contributions II. *Man* 59(2): 26–8.
- Wallace F. C. Anthony. 1956. Revitalization Movements. *American Anthropologist* 58(2): 264–81.
- Wallace F. C. Anthony. 1959. Towards a classification of cult movements: Some Farther Contributions I. *Man* 59(2): 25–6.
- Wallace F. C. Anthony. 1962. Culture and Cognition. *Science* 135(3501): 351–357.
- Wax L. Murray. 1993. How Culture Misdirects Multiculturalism. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 24(2): 99–115.
- Weisman R. Brent. 2007. Nativism, Resistance, and Ethnogenesis of the Florida Seminole Indian Identity. *Historical Archaeology* 41(4): 198–212.
- Zachariasz L. Andrzej. 1999. *Kultura. Jej status i poznanie. Wprowadzenie do relatywistycznej teorii kultury*. Lublin, PL: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Zarycki Tomasz. 2000. Politics in the Periphery: Political Cleavages in Poland Interpreted in Their Historical and International Context. *Europe-Asia Studies* 52(5): 851–73.

## **Povzetek**

Tipologija kulturnih odnosov do domačih in tujih kultur ostaja nerešen problem v strokovni literaturi. Članek vsebuje štiri študije posameznih vrst kulturnih odnosov. Vsaka vsebuje opis, razlago in kritiko aktualnih teoretskih stališč. Tisti, katerih zmota je dokazana, so nadomeščeni z novimi avtorskimi koncepti. Tipologije kulturnih odnosov (nativističnih, vitalnih, avtonegativnih in proti-akulturacijskih) so bile opredeljene v skladu z merili cilja in sredstva. Upoštevali smo tudi mešane vrste, vse skupaj pa tvorijo tipologijo, ki je koristen pripomoček za opisovanje politične misli prebivalstva pod vplivom globalizacije. Njihova empirična ovrgljivost je zanimiv izziv za antropologe in zgodovinarje, ki preučujejo sodobno politično misel.

**KLUČNE BESEDE:** kulturni odnosi, globalizacija, politična misel, družbena gibanja, socio-kulturne identitete

**CORRESPONDENCE:** JOANNA RAK, Faculty of Political Sciences and International Studies, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń. 87-100 Toruń, ul. Batorego 39L, Poland, e-mail: [j.m.k.rak@wp.pl](mailto:j.m.k.rak@wp.pl)