A d e l a K o ż y c z k o w s k a
ORCID: 0000-0002-7952-1321
University of Gdańsk

"I Felt That Two Cultures Were Competing For My Identity": Bicultural Families as a Space for Discursive Identity Creation

ABSTRACT

The goal of the article is to identify the conditions of identity construction (child/adult) in Kashubian–Polish bicultural families. The argument is based on Michel Foucault's theory of discourse, reinforced by the thinking of Antonio Gramsci, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. The empirical material was obtained by means of biographical research carried out between June and August 2022. In total, eight interviews were conducted with adults who were born and raised in Kashubian–Polish families. For the purpose of the article, one interview was chosen, which the author believes is representative of the others. Discourse analysis made it possible to reconstruct the Polish (represented in this family by the father) and the Kashubian (represented by the mother) discourses, which "compete(d)" for the interviewee's identity.

The material leads to several important conclusions, the most relevant of which are (1) the Communist narrative about Kashubian Poles and the Kashubian region as a folk/peripheral variety of Polish culture is still alive in the social awareness; (2) viewing the Kashubian language as a folk/peripheral variety of Polish is not conducive to creating an intercultural space in Polish–Kashubian relations; (3) viewing it as such may lead to situations in which some people who come from Kashubian–Polish families need to making radical choices: to be Kashubian or to be Polish?

KEYWORDS
identity, discourse, biculturalism, bicultural families, Kashubian culture, Polish culture

SPI Vol. 26, 2023/1
e-ISSN 2450-5366

DOI: 10.12775/SPI.2023.1.002en
Submitted: 30.11.2022
Accepted: 23.01.2023

Introduction

If we assume that the world is multicultural in nature, then bicultural families are the natural manifestation of this cultural diversity. By necessity—already at the level of common-sense knowledge—the bicultural nature of families must lead to many questions concerning children. How should they be brought up: in their mother's culture or in their father's culture? Should we invent "something in between"? Or use the method of "a little of this and a little of that"? These and other questions not only need to be answered by parents, but are also worth considering in pedagogy and other social sciences.

The example I chose for the needs of this article includes Kashubian–Polish families. This choice is a consequence of my personal research interests, as I am interested in the problem of ethnic identification in situations where ethnicity has no state representation. My aim in this text is to identify the conditions of constructing human (child/adult) identity in bicultural families using Kashubian–Polish families as an example. The text consists of five parts: in the first one, I briefly discuss Kashubocentrism and Polonocentrism as cultural areas of Kashubianness which are the result of how Kashubianness is perceived in relation to Polishness (formally, the biculturalism of Kashubian–Polish families exists only if Kashubianness is assumed to be separate from Polishness). In the second part, I present selected methodological aspects related to my discursive research on competing cultures in social space; the third and fourth parts present the results of the discursive analysis, with a description of the discursive structure of biography, followed by a description of the discursive structure of (bi)culturalism. The fifth part is an attempt to summarize these considerations.

Kashubianness and its spaces, Kashubocentric and Polonocentric ones

Within Kashubian culture, two cultural narratives have emerged which are responsible for the production of two variants of Kashubian identity. Both variants are rooted in the 19th century and are based on two competing theses: the first recognizes Kashubian as an

autonomous culture (in relation to Polish culture), while the second maintains that Kashubian culture is a part/variant of Polish culture. In the first case, this means that the Kashubian language is a separate Slavic language, Kashubians have a separate culture, and thus they have a separate social and cultural identity. However, as citizens, they feel Polish and, although they emphasize their ethnic distinctiveness, they remember and cherish their historical and political links with Poland. On the other hand, the second narrative (the Polonocentric one) recognizes that although Kashubian is understood today as an autonomous language, its Polish ancestry is still emphasized, which means that Kashubian is a former dialect of the Polish language or a former Polish dialect that has achieved a certain linguistic status. This, in turn, gives Kashubian culture the status of a peripheral/regional/folk culture, making it a variant of Polish culture and making Kashubian identity a variant of Polish identity. An important feature of this identity narrative is that Kashubians feel both Kashubian and Polish at the same time. The relationship between the Kashubian and Polish identification is complicated in this discourse, as the boundaries of three areas—ethnic, national, and civic—become blurred. In the practice of everyday life, a person does not feel (they do not recognize/realize) any differences between the areas: ethically Kashubian, nationally Polish, and civically Polish. Moreover, in this discourse a person should not feel/recognize/realize these distinctions. Kashubianness is, in this case, a specific negative trace left in Polishness, which was particularly painful for the Kashubians in communist Poland (see Kożyczkowska 2019).

By recognizing both narratives and reconstructing them in the form of cultural and thus identity discourses, it is possible to see that Kashubocentrism and Polonocentrism are not only linguistic dimensions of Kashubianness, but also spaces of social practices appropriate to them. Both language and social practices are, as Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe write, the consequences of the social production of meanings that can be seen in the social world (Laclau, Mouffe 2007: 113). Such consequences, in turn, create discursive structures that "in certain external contexts 'signify' the whole" (Laclau, Mouffe 2007: 112). The Kashubocentric discourse seeks, among other things, to destabilize the elements of what is Kashubian by ascribing to them a greater number of meanings, to lead to an awareness that

Kashubian culture is more than a folk variety of Polish culture, for example (cf. Laclau, Mouffe 2007: 18). The Polonocentric discourse strives to exclude Kashubian culture from the public space (and, in consequence, also from the private space), which can be recognized as the exclusion strategies described by Laclau: the first consists of cutting off and isolating what disturbs the logic of the discourse; the second consists of absorbing and transforming those elements which impede the functioning of the discourse, but cannot be completely eliminated because they constitute its essential foundation (Laclau 2004: 80–87). An example of this is making Kashubian culture a folk culture in the Polonocentric discourse. None of the Kashubian discourses can eliminate language and culture because, without language and culture, Kashubianness does not exist in either the Polonocentric or the Kashubocentric dimension. Thus, Kashubian Polonocentrism can only exist as a discursive structure in which Kashubian culture is reduced to folklore.

Selected methodological issues with discursive research on competing cultures

My long-term research on Kashubian studies, mainly in Foucault's tradition of discursive research (reinforced by the concepts of discourse suggested by Antonio Gramsci, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe), made it possible for me not only to reconstruct the Polonocentric and Kashubocentric discourses in Kashubian culture, but also to reveal the social space as an area of hegemonic struggle in which various cultures (discourses) compete for human identity.

The research on those competing cultural discourses enables us to recognize their identity-creating potentials based on the relationships between knowledge and power that are specific to them. In each discourse, knowledge is produced, sustained, and set in motion by the relevant intellectual elites and political activists. In discursive terms, knowledge is—to refer to Michel Foucault's concept—a system of interrelated contents and, at the same time, a social phenomenon. Knowledge, as that which is social, implies positive and negative effects. The former lead to the production and reproduction of a relatively permanent social structure, while the latter are responsible

for the suppression, separation, processing, and exclusion of certain elements from within the social (actually discursive) structure, leading to a particular control over the culture being produced (Foucault 1993: 30–31). As mentioned above, following Laclau and Mouffe, it would also be about the stabilization of specific elements through the attribution of "single meanings" to them, as a result of which the structure/wholeness reduces the number of relevant differences (Laclau, Mouffe 2007: 18).

Scientific knowledge produced in the social sciences and the humanities exists as a "social phenomenon." This approach to scientific knowledge is relevant to my reflections on Kashubianness (also Polishness) produced in academic environments, as it allows us to understand knowledge/classifications/theories as what values the social and anthropological worlds, determining their ordering. Foucault's focus on the functionality of scientific knowledge results directly from the fact that, in its deeper layers, this knowledge "hides" the human being as an identity, and it is identity that knowledge controls (here, it takes control of the identity constructed in bicultural families). Hence, all classifications that are produced within the social sciences and humanities (re)construct social relationships, although they are linguistic in nature (as Foucault notes) (Foucault 2005: 170 et seq.), and they determine the shape of institutions and social practices. Therefore, all classifications/theories, although linguistic in nature and existing in science, exist as social phenomena at the same time (Foucault 1993: 30–31), since they penetrate social thinking. We are thus speaking of a hegemonic order that functions in the social consciousness as "natural" to understanding and, at the same time, as "arbitrary" to reality. Foucault, however, unmasks its true essence: the methodological nature of any knowledge (including scientific knowledge) amounts to the fact that it is only (!) essential to the understanding that is being constructed, and it is only (!) an interpretation or hypothesis of reality/the world (Foucault 2005: 85–86). On the other hand, however, this "naturalization" is the act of fixing the hegemony of knowledge (i.e., the establishment of discourse) in social consciousness, as knowledge (what the discourse says) is transformed into the truth about the world (how things are) (Mouffe 2005: 25). It is also the moment/act in which the production of individual and community identities begins, and it is the act in which

their "naturalization" takes place (Gramsci 1961: 517). In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault explains that the moment/act of naturalization is of crucial importance to forming and legalizing the discourse order because what has been told in the discourse matches what is seen by individuals (subjects). In practice, this means that discourse naturalizes every social human experience simply because it makes visible what it is talking about. Thus, discourse reveals an initial and wonderfully delightful field of truth (Foucault 1993: 247–248), and its magic includes the fact that it deceptively convinces people that what knowledge says about the world is true. Thus, knowledge that has been produced determines how one should be in the world, how one should function in it, how one should think about it and about oneself in a world that is supposed to appear real. As a consequence, such knowledge takes complete control of one's identity (which the knowledge turns into a subject), and makes this identity the object of a particular politics (Foucault 1993: 32–33). According to Foucault, such power "is not simply imposed, like an obligation or a prohibition, on those who 'do not have it'—it is in them and *b*locks them [emphasis added]; it exists in them and through them, and they support it just as they, in their struggle against it, rely on the approaches the power has imposed on them" (Foucault 1993: 33). The author adds that "we should recognize that power produces knowledge …; that power and knowledge are directly related; that there is no power relation without a knowledge field correlated with them, nor knowledge that does not presuppose and create a power relation" (Foucault 1993: 34). While revealing and unmasking the connections between power and knowledge, Foucault also discovers that it is not the man who creates knowledge that is useful or resistant to power. It is "power-knowledge, processes and fights to which the man is subject that determine possible forms and areas of human cognition" (Foucault 1993: 34–35).

Discursive identities are the result of a particular method of hegemony that Gramsci calls pedagogical practice. It is the result of the hegemonic relationship created in the spaces of a community (Gramsci 1991: 159–160). An essential part of pedagogical practice is knowledge that is instrumental in the production of (discursive) identities, and its task is to provide a person with a particular vision of the world and of the person in the world. The aim of such pedagogy is to

achieve a state in which, as Gramsci writes, "the human masses arrive at a consistent and unambiguous understanding of the contemporary reality" (Gramsci 1991: 214–215). The idea, then, is that people within a particular community are conscious of a certain quality, and that how they think is consistent with the knowledge of the world favored by power. It is only by putting the problem of knowledge in the perspective of its hegemonic involvement that one can see, as Gramsci argues, that knowledge is power, and that it is knowledge that consolidates power. They are inseparable, and to speak of one is to speak simultaneously of the other, and vice versa (Gramsci 1991: 175, 179, 197). The logic of knowledge is not the logic of what it says, but of what it is in general and how it reveals itself in the practice of human life (Gramsci 1991: 37, 455–466, 467–470).

The logic of knowledge and how it produces an answer to the question of "Who am I?"

I carried out field research from July to the end of September 2022. On 30 June 2022, on the closed Facebook group "Jakô mdze Kaszëbskô?," I posted an invitation to participate in the research. I wrote that I was inviting people who (1) were born and raised in Kashubian–Polish families in which one parent was/is an ethnic Kashubian and the other an ethnic Pole and who (2) currently identify as Kashubian, Kashubian–Polish, or Polish–Kashubian. Ten people responded and eight people took part in the research. The interviews were biographical, narrative, and free-form and each biographical narrative was prompted by the question: "What is it like to be born and raised in a Kashubian–Polish family, and what caused you to identify as Kashubian (or Kashubian–Polish or Polish–Kashubian)?" Each interview was audio-recorded and transcribed.

For the purposes of this article, I have selected an interview that I feel is representative of the others. The interviewee was a man aged 25, with a university degree in the humanities, whose mother is a Kashubian from Gdańsk (her family comes from Kashubia and Pomerania) and identifies with the city. His father is a Pole whose family comes from the eastern borderlands (Kresy) and who identifies with the eastern variety of Polishness. Any biographical information

that would allow the interviewee to be identified has been removed or altered. The discursive analysis (preceded by a semiological and structural analysis) made it possible to identify and reconstruct the areas of knowledge-power (Kashubian and Polish of the borderland variety) that determined the construction of the interviewee's cultural identity. In the next part of this article, I present (1) the discursive structure of the interviewee's life (here it is important to highlight the conflicts and frictions between Kashubian and borderland Polish, which were significant for the "final version" of the interviewee's cultural identity); (2) the practical models of Kashubian and borderland Polish discourses, which construct the (bi)culturality of the interviewee's family (here I have identified two areas: the (bi)culture of the interviewee's family and the discursive procedures). Due to the limited form of this text, I only present the most important results of my analysis.

The logic of knowledge and how it answers the question "Who am I?" – discursive structure of the interviewee's biography

In the analysis of the empirical material five stages of the discursive development of identity were distinguished in the interviewee's life: (1) the stage of identity that cannot be perceived, (2) the stage of identity strongly constructed in the conflict of "You are Polish—We are Kashubian," (3) the stage of identity breakthrough as a condition for the construction of a worldview, (4) the stage of the identity question ("Who am I?") and the discovery of a Kashubian–Polish identity, and (5) the stage of identity certainty: "We are Kashubian→I am Kashubian."

Table 1. Discursive biographical structure: constructing identity

Biographical stage	Utterances typical of the given stage
The stage of identity that cannot be perceived	"Because I was not yet able to notice this for my identity." "It was from my mother, this family culture… this Kashubian culture, or the Pomeranian culture (more broadly), because her family actually comes from Pomerania; mostly Kashubia."
The stage of identity strongly constructed in the conflict of "You are Polish—We are Kashubian"	"Because, on the one hand, as a child I already felt that there were two strong cultures that were somehow competing for my identity. I experienced this all the time, which was very often reflected in how I perceived my dad, for example, because of how he instilled his culture in me; my mom, who... somehow showed me elements of her culture. It was a very specific experience for me, because—well, as I can see—there are two elements that clash here." "Later, there was this period when I was in closer contact with my dad's family, who very much emphasized the fact that we were Polish. There were comments … that there is no such thing as a Kashubian identity, because after all they are Poles, too." "You are Polish; you are a Polish child, and this appeared very often. That I must keep that Polish culture."
The stage of identity breakthrough as a condition for the construction of a worldview	"A breakthrough was when I moved to Gdańsk." "So then, somehow, Pomeranian culture, or specifically Kashubian culture..., it entered me somehow. I started to pay attention to some elements that were quite important. So, I was aware that there was a region here, from which some of my family originated. This is a very important source of worldview for me, etc., etc., etc." "I was aware of what Kashubia is, what being Kashubian is; for example, that there is such a thing as the Kashubian language, which I unfortunately did not have the opportunity to learn, and I regret it very much—although I can understand Kashubian, I am not able to say anything in it."

Biographical stage	Utterances typical of the given stage
The stage of the identity question ("Who am I?") and the discovery of a Kashubian–Polish identity	"It's hard to say at what point this identity—in my case, this Kashubian–Polish identity, was discovered…, which is also consistent with my census entry, with how I define myself on a daily basis. I am a Kashubian first and a Pole second." "I had my own way of speaking; it was only after some time that I realized that it could be the fact that I grew up…, I spent such a large part of my conscious youth in Pomerania, in Gdańsk, or in a family that came from Pomerania." "It was the first moment when I started to ask myself who I was." "I had a moment when I asked myself if I was actually Polish." "However, it was the kind of story that, in a way, was alien to me, because I… despite the fact that I had contact with these borderlands through my dad's family, I never, never in my life identified with this story. It was distant to me."
The stage of identity certainty: "We are Kashubian → I am Kashubian"	"It turned out that those people in my family that I spoke to, they all said 'we are from Kashubia, we are Kashubian, we are simply from here.' The identity just started to enter me. This narrative of our identity… I just started to absorb it." "That's how I realized at the time that, see …, this is our flag. Our Kashubian flag. And I said, 'our Kashubian flag'. That was the first time that I said this so directly, in a fully conscious way... In a different way! It was the first time I named my identity 100% consciously. I named my attachment, not even just to a place, but to a particular culture. As I said before, I rather avoided saying that I was Polish or Kashubian; I just said where I was from. This way, I talked about attachment to a region, a regional identity, a local identity. And here, I suddenly said that I am Kashubian. Here I suddenly said that this is a culture that is close to me. And I've consistently stuck to that ever since. It was such a breakthrough."

Source: Own work.

The stage of identity that cannot be perceived covered the first 10 years of the interviewee's life, about which he says: "at first I grew up in Gdańsk." The culture of the school he attended was close to Kashubian culture and it was experienced as a "feeling." It was a culture that the interviewee obtained "from my mother" and, although it is fading in a certain way, its elements appear naturally through the place and the people who are connected to the place, because they are born here, they live here, work here, die here, and rest in their graves here. These are people who speak the Kashubian

language, who have their family history that is strongly connected to the place, to Gdańsk, Kashubia, and—more broadly—to Pomerania, and whose ancestors are buried here. Childhood is an active bonding with a place and people, but in a peculiar, passive way, because it was the culture of the place (Gdańsk, Kashubia, or Pomerania) that intensely "entered" the interviewee. Characteristically for an "early upbringing" in the culture of a place, the interviewee realized years later that "I have not yet been able to perceive this [importance of the place and its people] for my identity."

The stage of identity strongly constructed in the conflict of "You are Polish—We are Kashubian" occurred in the interviewee's case between the ages of 10 and 16 years, after he moved to the city, to the so-called Western Land. This was when the identity was being constructed in the conflict of two cultures: the Kashubian one and the eastern borderland Polish one.

The interviewee talks about the influence of the two narratives on his identity. He explains that a narrative is an "information bubble" that draws on the past and is enriched by the present in constructing itself; hence the importance of family histories (literally: narratives) for identity. However, they are insufficient, as there comes a time when a person needs to get to know the world "already from a slightly different perspective: less as a child." This is when they need to start learning, for example, the history and other information about the region. This is necessary because the knowledge acquired from relatives must first be enriched with knowledge from school, then with scientific knowledge; such kinds of knowledge are provided by other people/teachers, but—as his story later shows—it is also about knowledge that is provided in the process of independent, intensive, in-depth research, or through studying the humanities. This confrontation of "home" knowledge with "public" knowledge is a way of developing consciousness. Also, it is a method for completing family narratives (both the Kashubian and the eastern borderland Polish one) and for demythologizing those narratives and recognizing what is true about the present and the past versus what is just mythology.

Eastern borderland Polish culture and the development of consciousness within this culture are important dimensions of this biographical stage. The interviewee begins to learn a great deal about borderland Polish culture, which is facilitated by his change

of residence. Here, he is "bombarded" (as he puts it) by his father and his family with a narrative of the traumatic history of their displacement from the eastern borderlands. Although it is the father's narrative, the interviewee recognizes that it is "somewhat mythologized." Perhaps this is a consequence of the fact that it is a "secondhand" story, although the descendants of those expelled from the borderlands are still experiencing the effects of the trauma of being removed from their ancestral land. At the same time—as the interviewee points out—in Poland the graves of their ancestors have a short history and borderland graves are difficult to access today. In order to lend stronger credibility to this cultural narrative, the father, together with the interviewee's sister, probably conducted genealogical research, but only on the borderland Polish family. It is from this cultural space that the interviewee hears that he is Polish, that he must maintain Polish culture, and that Kashubian culture does not exist because Kashubians are Polish.

Kashubian culture and the development of consciousness in this culture, which originates "in growing up in Gdańsk," does not disappear at this biographical stage, but gains additional strength from the revealed/experienced power of knowledge of borderland Polish culture which exists in the interviewee's family and social environment. The interviewee's identity, thanks to the tensions/fears/conflicts, becomes polarized in the direction of "We are Kashubian" and, in a way, takes the form of an antithesis to "You are Polish." The work on Kashubian identity takes on a more mature character. It is also strengthened by learning from the perspective of the Polish–Kashubian discourse and by the (paradoxically) positive impact of the thesis that "Kashubians are Poles." In order to prove its falsity, the interviewee must find evidence that supports the thesis that Kashubians are Kashubians.

The stage of identity breakthrough as a condition for the construction of a worldview is a biographical stage covering the period of secondary school education in Gdańsk (from 16 to 18 years of age), to which the interviewee returns with his family. This stage is a consequence of everything that took place in the previous phase of life. The accumulated biographical potential, including the experience of living in two cultures, the learned ways of dealing with cultural narratives, and the learned skills of using knowledge

(both domestic and public) to "explore" cultures further construct a sensitivity to cultural difference in the interviewee. This sensitivity to cultural differences allows the interviewee to appreciate the cultural diversity of Gdańsk and makes it possible for him to immerse himself in and experience this diversity.

This seems to be an important stage of life, as it is when the process of constructing an attitude of openness to social and cultural differences originates. The interviewee is aware—at the time of the interview—that the lack of such an experience closes off a person's identity from social and cultural diversity. During the interview, he says that "from a very young age, I saw that there are very big differences; that someone can be associated with such a culture or with another culture, be somewhere between two cultures. As a kid, I wasn't aware of what I am aware of today. But I, sort of say, I keep my mind open. I can see that because of my experience, I sort of understand that people can be different in many ways. That they can live around each other, with each other; because I have also experienced that. It may sound like a generalization, but it doesn't have to be that way at all." And, at the same time, there are those who have different experiences than the interviewee, and these are "people who are kind of closed, because they haven't experienced a different culture."

At this biographical stage, the awareness of what Kashubia is and what it means to be Kashubian is reinforced. It is also when the awareness of the importance of language for identity emerges and when the not yet realized/verbalized experience of the loss of the Kashubian language (as a speaking skill) emerges as a loss of cultural value. Only in time will the interviewee likely realize the significance of this cultural loss for the experience of being Kashubian.

The stage of the identity question ("Who am I?") and the discovery of a Kashubian–Polish identity is the Warsaw stage of his life, which falls around the age of 18–20 years, beginning when he "leaves the nest" in Gdańsk and continuing through the first part of his stay in Warsaw, which is closely linked to his studies.

This is a time of asking a lot of questions, the nature of which boils down to the question of "Who am I?" This seems to be related to several issues: (1) geographical distance and the possibility of viewing his cultural affairs from the perspective of the capital city,

(2) new friends recognizing him as someone who has a "slightly different accent," (3) taking up humanistic studies and writing a BA thesis on eastern borderland Polishness, and (4) establishing and maintaining contact with people who came to Warsaw from other parts of Poland, as well as from Gdańsk, Kashubia, and Pomerania.

The potential of this phase brings the interviewee to the conclusion, when making a conscious statement about his biography, that the borderland Polish culture, with which his father's family is strongly connected, is distant from him. Here, the interviewee identifies himself as a Kashubian first and a Pole second. In Warsaw, he also becomes acquainted with another variety of Polish culture/narrative, which he describes as "Warsaw-centrism."

The stage of identity certainty ("We are Kashubian → I am Kashubian") is a distinctly Warsaw stage of the interviewee's biography that begins around the age of 20 and continues up to the time of the interview. It is the phase in which the identity process is finalized with the recognition of a "Kashubian identity" in himself. In addition, the linguistic expression "we are Kashubian" was given many new meanings that complemented the knowledge previously acquired through various means, which accelerated the identity work. The surplus of meanings for "we are Kashubian" that was generated this way had to result in a deconstruction of the identity of the place and a renewed reconstruction of identity, but as a cultural identity (based on identification with the culture).

This is the stage of identity coming-out, i.e., publicly admitting to the Kashubian identity. It is a phase in which the rivalry between the two cultures for the identity of the interviewee—the rivalry that began in childhood—ended (perhaps temporarily or perhaps forever) with the "victory" of the Kashubian culture.

The logic of knowledge and how it produces an answer to the question of "Who am I?" – structure of the interviewee's (bi)cultural family

The discursive analysis made it possible to formulate methodological aspects of both practical and discursive models which consist of (1) the area of (bi)culture which is the product of (bi)community

and (2) the area of discursive procedures, constructing the practical pedagogy of including the Kashubian and Polish (the Borderland variant) into discourses.

Table 2. Practical models of the Kashubian and Polish discourses constructing the bi(culturality) of the interviewee's family

Kashubian discourse	**Element constructing the discourse**	**Eastern borderland Polish discourse**
Area of (bi)culture which is the product of (bi)community		
Kashubianness: • close, connected with Gdańsk, Kashubia, or Pomerania • family culture, culture "from the mother" or connected with the mother's family • weaker culture, a culture in decline • culture that enters a person	Experiencing a connection with the community	Borderland Polishness: • distant, related to the eastern borderlands • foreign, the culture of the father or the father's family • stronger culture • a culture that enters a person's head
Methods by which culture enters a person Learning Kashubianness: • affective—through relationships with close people • intellectual—through → knowledge obtained from relatives and one's social environment → knowledge obtained at school → scientific knowledge	Cognition	Methods by which culture enters a person's head Learning Polishness: • intellectual—through: → knowledge obtained from relatives and one's social environment → knowledge obtained at school → scientific knowledge
Creating the community identification of "We are Kashubian → I am Kashubian"	Goal	Creating the community identification of "You are Polish"
Kashubianness is constructed by • people: mother, grandmother, relatives, and ancestors whose graves are in Gdańsk/Kashubia/Pomerania→ they are witnesses to Kashubian culture	Values (elements) of culture	Eastern borderland Polishness is constructed by • people: those who were displaced from the eastern borderlands (grandparents who had died) and their descendants who live(d) in the so-called Western Land and whose graves are here → they are mainly indirect witnesses to the borderland Polish culture

Kashubian discourse	Element constructing the discourse	Eastern borderland Polish discourse
• Kashubian language: passive understanding/non-speaking as the experience of a loss • linguistic differences: an accent or way of speaking, lexis, "Jo" • family history: passed on by direct or indirect witnesses/ participants in events • history of the place: Gdańsk/ Kashubia/Pomerania • regionalism/knowledge of the region in which the family lives • memory as the awareness of a place which has a complex history that in turn determines family and individual biographies • Kashubian traditions • folk culture, including elements of that culture that are important to the interviewee • religiousness and respect for it → typically Kashubian way of celebrating religion • narrative of modernity: Kashubians are not Poles • historical narrative: Kashubians are not Germans • space: as a place of life for contemporaries and a burial place for all ancestors • ancestors' graves: can be visited at any time		• people: more distant (un)known family who now live in another country → no access to their knowledge and experience • people: ancestors whose graves are in the former eastern borderlands, territories which today belong to other countries → they are witnesses to Polish culture (the borderland variant), but it is impossible to access their testimony and graves • the Polish language • family history: passed on by the descendants of those expelled from the eastern borderlands, who were not direct witnesses and know the family history from someone else → the lack of access to a reliable source results in the mythologization of some elements of this account • the history of the borderlands reduced to the family memory → such memory is supported by school knowledge, academic knowledge, and independent research • the history of the eastern borderlands prevailing in Poland: in the Polish historical narrative, the history of the borderlands as such does not actually exist → it is an exclusively Warsaw-centric narrative that the borderlands are what Poland lost • regionalism: knowledge of the region in which descendants of people from the Borderlands now live [the lack of knowledge of the Borderlands as a region of Poland at that time] • Polish tradition: elements of borderland Polish culture and today's Polish culture are mixed here • celebration of public holidays because of the father • Polish culture, so-called high culture, of which there was little in the interviewee's family • attitudes to ethnic and cultural difference: the contemporary narrative of "Kashubians are Poles" and the historical narrative of "Kashubians are Germans" • approach to the land: Poland is where the descendants of people displaced from the borderlands live and their place of burial; people from the borderlands also live(d) and were buried here, while the former eastern borderland is where the ancestors who lived there and created a community there are buried → today this place is not accessible because of the change of borders • graves of ancestors: today they are in other countries, so visiting them requires special procedures

Kashubian discourse	Element constructing the discourse	Eastern borderland Polish discourse
Kashubianness as a culture that binds the community, what is produced by: • the relationships with the land: with Gdańsk, Kashubia, or Pomerania → the place (and the people who live there) where people produce Kashubianness • blood connections: blood is less important, although family is the basic place where Kashubianness is produced	What binds the community	Borderland Polishness as a culture that binds the community, what is produced by • the relationships with the lost land: the eastern borderlands remain in people's memory and are affective and cognitively experienced in collective tragedy; today's Poland is the place of living and celebrating the memory of what was lost • blood connections: blood is an important element that binds the specific diaspora of those who were produced by the memory of the lost borderlands
The discursive procedures for constructing a practical pedagogy of inclusion in Kashubian and borderland Polish discourses		
Based on the following methods: • affective: producing connections with the community (connecting with the place through those who have lived here) • intellectual: non-persuasive methods	Procedures of knowledge transfer	Based on the following methods: • intellectual: persuasive methods
Based on • witnesses, testimonies, and graves • knowledge obtained at school • scientific knowledge obtained at university • scientific knowledge obtained through one's own studies The goal is to verify truth and make a stronger connection with culture.	Procedures of truth	Based on • witnesses, testimonies, and graves • knowledge obtained at school • scientific knowledge obtained at university • scientific knowledge obtained through one's own studies The goal is to verify the truth and separate truth and facts from mythologized elements.
Based on • the knowledge of culture and community provided by members of the community • created and sustained ties to a place (land) • people or ancestors' graves • elements of culture, i.e., everyday life/tradition/ • memory/religion, etc. • passive knowledge of the Kashubian language	Procedures of inclusion into the community	Based on • the knowledge of culture and community provided by the descendants of those who had to leave the eastern borderlands • created and sustained memory of losing the borderlands (land) • the descendants of those who had to leave the eastern borderlands • the graves of those who were displaced from the borderlands • lost access to graves in former Polish territories that are now in other countries • elements of borderland Polish culture, i.e., everyday life/tradition/trauma of being expelled from the borderlands, etc. • elements of Polish culture, cultivation of Polish traditions, and celebration of certain national holidays • the Polish language

Kashubian discourse	Element constructing the discourse	Eastern borderland Polish discourse
Elements of culture are subject to verification because of the associated truth about culture and the community.		lements of culture are subject to verification because of the associated truth about culture and the community; the missing elements of culture are mythologized for the needs of the cultural truth.
The truth about Kashubianness based on arguments: • we are Kashubian • this is our culture • not all of us have to speak Kashubian in order to be a Kashubian	Procedures of binding the community	The truth about Polishness in general, based on arguments: • you are Polish • this is Polish culture • you have to maintain this culture • Kashubians are Polish; there is no such thing as Kashubian identity

Source: Own work.

Table 2 shows two areas of knowledge that participate in the process of producing and reinforcing Kashubian and borderland Polish discourse. In Table 1, the process of constructing/clashing/conflicting of the two kinds of knowledge—Kashubian and borderland Polish—was reconstructed in diachronic terms, while Table 2 shows the cultural processes that produce Kashubian and borderland Polish discourse in synchronic terms. Due to the limited form of the text, I will move on directly to the area of discursive procedures that construct practical pedagogy of inclusion into Kashubian and borderland Polish discourses. Here one can recognize the (1) knowledge procedures of inclusion in discourses and (2) truth procedures. They are pedagogical in nature and their description, as practical pedagogies, deepens the knowledge of the production of discursive identities.

The interviewee emphasizes pedagogical methods which, as Table 1 shows, appeared in childhood and were developed in subsequent biographical stages. These are primarily non-persuasive and persuasive methods, the former of which are specific to the Kashubian discourse and the latter to the Polish discourse. Kashubian Polishness is constructed by means of persuasive methods and the following can be recognized here: (1) persuasive speaking, which the interviewee refers to as being "instilled with culture" and being "bombarded" with family stories ("this culture entered my head very strongly because I was… it wasn't that I was being told—I was being bombarded with this history very strongly"), (2) working on arguments provided in family narratives, some of which have been "mythologized a little,"

and (3) family genealogical research. Kashubianness is produced through non-persuasive methods ("My mother never, sort of, directly communicated to me that, 'listen, you're Kashubian, or, your family is from Pomerania'"), which are here the primary methods of constructing knowledge about Kashubian culture. The most important of these are (1) showing (my mother "showed me elements of her culture"), (2) talking ("I started talking in my family" or "the people from my family whom I talked to"), (3) seeing "from the perspective of others" ("experiences of the war from their perspective"), and (4) seeing "on one's own" ("If there is a family grave somewhere, I want to go and see it" or "all the time I could see some sign that is connected to the Kashubians").

The truth procedures that verify family narratives are ways of making them objective in time and space. The idea is that only ancestors and people living today—their lives, deeds, and graves—can confirm the truth about a culture and a community. The interviewee is a researcher of present and past realities, and this methodological competence begins to emerge by the second stage of his life and systematically develops after that point. Here, a particular sensitivity to cultural difference is awakened, fueled by an almost atavistic need to search for cultural witnesses, testimonies, and evidence in these family narratives. The entirety of the interviewee's narrative is an argument in favor of the thesis that every family history, every family identity narrative, needs authentication—truth constructed through facts/people/graves—and this is what the interviewee is looking for in the cultural discourses (Kashubian and borderland Polish) that construct his biography and into which he is incorporated by those closest to him (his mother and father) in two different ways.

"This is a culture that is close to me. And I consistently stick to it." Final remarks

Antonio Gramsci's texts convince us that human beings are not completely defenseless against the power of knowledge, including the cultural knowledge of their own communities. The investigation/recognition/unmasking of knowledge requires other knowledge, as Gramsci (1991: 448–449, 213–215) or Karl Mannheim (2008: 31 et seq.) argue. Only a researcher, i.e., someone who has

gained methodological consciousness and can deconstruct the hegemonic relationship in a systematic, purposeful way, can use other knowledge to free themselves from the hegemony (Gramsci 1991: 32–33, 145, 230–231, 235). In such a work, however, no one can replace the human being, because it requires "the effort of one's own mind" (Gramsci 1991: 212) and, as one can judge from the interviewee's statements, the realization that two cultures are competing for the identity of the human being.

The reconstruction of identity biography in Table 1 depicts the (un)conscious identity work undertaken by the interviewee, which was carried out in three diachronic dimensions: (1) from being unable to perceive one's own identity to consciously choosing it, (2) from an attachment to place to an attachment to culture, and (3) from the "individual I" to the "community I," the way which leads through the "community We" ("We—Kashubians") since only the "We" allows a person to recognize themselves anew as "I" in the area of cultural identity. In turn, the reconstruction of the methodological aspects of the practical models of the Kashubian and borderland Polish discourse (Table 2) allows us to understand the importance of cultural knowledge/knowledge of culture in the process of identity choices and makes it clear that the construction of an affective relationship with one's community—through the construction of an affective relationship with one's family—is fundamental to unconscious identity choice. However, this type of cultural identity is insufficient for some people, as evidenced by the interviewee's story.

The need to realize who a person is does not appear in every biography. It takes special social, cultural, and psychological conditions (and having a bicultural family fulfills such criteria, as the interviewee's life proves) for such a "necessity" to emerge in a person's consciousness, and for that person, willingly or unwillingly, to begin the process of self-examination/looking at themselves/asking themselves "Who am I?"

The development of identity and the readiness to enter into the conflict of cultural discourses is the effect of developing an awareness and undertaking identity work with the support of both cultures. It is also the effect of realizing and understanding what unites and divides the two practically experienced cultures (here the particular deconstruction of Kashubian culture and its reduction to a variety

of Polish culture in the borderland Polish discourse is noteworthy, which is also a practice of exclusion typical of Kashubian Polonocentrism). It is also awareness of the consequences—positive and negative—for a person whose identity is entangled in conflicts of cultural discourses.

The interviewee's biography proves that a prerequisite for the construction of identity in a bicultural area is the practical cognition of both cultures: affective and rational cognition. However, true cultural cognition is only possible through full participation in the life of the cultural community, which makes it possible to fully experience culture, even if this is done unconsciously. At the same time, understanding culture requires knowledge and research procedures, if only to see what is true and to understand for what purpose certain elements of cultural discourse are mythologized.

Bibliography

Foucault M. (1987). *Historia szaleństwa w dobie klasycyzmu*, trans. H. Kęszycka, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy

Foucault M. (1993). *Nadzorować i karać. Narodziny więzienia*, trans. T. Komendant, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Aletheia.

Foucault M. (1995). *Historia seksualności*, trans. B. Banasiak, T. Komendant, K. Matuszewski, Warszawa: Czytelnik.

Foucault M. (2005). *Słowa i rzeczy. Archeologia nauk humanistycznych*, vol. 1, trans. T. Komendant, Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria.

Gramsci A. (1961). "Nowoczesny książę," in A. Gramsci, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 1, trans. B. Sieroszewska, Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, pp. 488–626.

Gramsci A. (1991). *Zeszyty filozoficzne*, trans. B. Sieroszewska, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Kożyczkowska A. (2019). *Kaszubszczyzna. Pedagogicznie o języku i tożsamości*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

Kożyczkowska A., Młynarczuk-Sokołowska A. (2018). *Kulturowe konteksty dzieciństwa. Szkice antropologiczno-pedagogiczne*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Katedra.

Laclau E. (2004). *Emancypacje*, trans. L. Koczanowicz et al., Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP.

Laclau E., Mouffe Ch. (2007). *Hegemonia i socjalistyczna strategia. Przyczynek do projektu radykalnej polityki demokratycznej*, trans. S. Królak, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP.

Mannheim K. (2008). *Ideologia i utopia*, trans. J. Niziński, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Aletheia.

Mouffe Ch. (2005). *Paradoks demokracji*, trans. W. Jach, M. Kamińska, A. Orzechowski, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE:

Adela Kożyczkowska
University of Gdańsk
Faculty of Social Sciences
e-mail: adela.kozyczkowska@ug.edu.pl