

COMMUNITY – A LOST MYTH...? HUMAN SECURITY IN TIMES OF SEPARATION

ANNA KURKIEWICZ, MIROSŁAW ANDRZEJ MICHALSKI

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59505/IRHNS.22352007.2025.4.06>

¹ University of Security in Poznań

² Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw

Contact:

dr. Anna Kurkiewicz - anna.kurkiewicz@wsb.net.pl
ks. dr hab. Mirosław Andrzej Michalski, Prof. - mamichalsky@wp.pl

Abstract:

The community appears to be a point of reference for man, his orientation and self-determination. The individual finds and perceives himself through what is supra-individual, what is community and social. Through the prism of community, man shapes an essential sense of security, founded on his self-image reflected in the multitude of co-existences. Being among others, being with others becomes a carrier of meaning, the other person

is the one who expresses and tells the world at the same time, creating the world at the same time, in this way a myth is born. Myth (mythos) - a word, a story that foundations a structure recognized by man - a network of mutual connections and references, a relational world known to man, ordered by the power of words: the world of interpersonal relationships and the relationship of man to external reality. Organizing reality through narratives introduced into it also tamed the world, making it a place of safe existence. Over time, the growing story absorbed/subordinated man and people in their relational relationship - it was transformed into a myth of community, a myth necessarily exposed to perdition.

Keywords: community, myth, security, identity

*„The community of interrupted myth,
which is community that in a sense is
without community, or communism
without community, is our destination”
(Nancy, 1991, p. 71).*

Introduction

Thinking about human being is simultaneously thinking about community, and community cannot be thought of without reference to its source foundations. Plato already questioned the essence of social existence, making the question of society an extension of the question of human. Emerging from the mythical organization of the world, dating back to antiquity, reflection attempted to grasp man in its coexistence with others, and simultaneously in the complexity of its relationships to external reality. Understanding human being through community became the foundation of a constitution—based on the need for security, a secure grounding in the world—of identity.

Myth (*mythos*) as a spoken image of the world became the binding agent of interpersonal relations and at the same time a carrier of meaning. The story that structured reality—determining the role and place of human within it—was also a story about the individual as an element of the communal world. Situated in this way (within the community), the individual continually self-defines through reference to the communal entity—the community as a whole and themselves as its constituents. The continuity of identity and self-definition was guaranteed by a narrative, perpetuated and passed down from generation to generation. Its inherent element was a reference to reality as a specific order, the order of the world itself (the novel legitimized the existence of an ordered world

as such; outside of the narrative, the world as a whole of reality lost its *raison d'être*). As Giddens points out in his work *The Constitution of Society*, the basis for the representations of mythical systems was the "cognitive mediatization of existential contradiction" (Giddens, 1984), myth explained the essence of life and death by inscribing human experience into the continuity of the experience of the surrounding reality.

Community as the basis of self-determination

The specific vector of human orientation in the world, stemming from myth and enclosing reality within the framework of ordered structures, turns out to be a culture-forming element not only in archaic times, but constitutes the reality of human life to this day, creating an important bond for what we call community. Kołakowski, focusing on the phenomenon of myth, writes: "The mythical organization of the world (...) is permanently present in culture" (Kołakowski, 2005, p. 15). Its source is the affirmation of the world as a purposeful order, a cosmos that organizes - given as primordial - chaos. Perceiving reality as a relatively coherent, ordered structure is connected, as the philosopher emphasizes, with the human need to ask ultimate – metaphysical – questions; and the very act of asking a question leads one into the field of constant search for answers. (Kołakowski, 2005, p. 14-15). This need gives rise to a parallel "desire to see the world as continuous" (Kołakowski, 2005, p. 16). Continuity in relation to the world itself thus becomes the basis for the continuity of human experience in the world. "The belief in a purposeful order, hidden in the flow of experience, gives us the right to believe that in what passes away, something grows and is preserved that does not pass away; that in the impermanence of events, a directly invisible meaning is capitalized, and that therefore decay and destruction affect only the visible layer of existence, not the other, more resistant to ruin". (Kołakowski, 2005, s. 18), which is a property of the myth itself. The aforementioned "faith in a purposeful order" stems from a disagreement with the randomness of the world itself (see: Kołakowski, 2005, p. 18). Incidentalness is perceived as an attack on human — the reason for its existence in the world. "Myth provides us with a world in which our existence, our thoughts, and our desires are, together with the world, related to an unconditioned order and can therefore not only be known but also understood" (see: Kołakowski, 2005, p. 18).

In this way, human consciousness is born, the awareness of one's own existence, with an ineradicable inclination to make sense of it (as an ordering of the world). "The very presence of a specifically human consciousness in the world creates

an irremovable myth-generating situation in culture, and both the bonding role of myth in collective life and its integrative functions in organizing individual consciousness seem irreplaceable" (Kołakowski, 2005, pp. 174-175). As Kołakowski will say a little later: "Myth in its verbal realizations is an expression of collective experience..." (Kołakowski, 2005, p. 177). Community, then (this particular type of bond) emerges from myth and finds its justification, the reason for its existence in myth. The bonding of individual members of the community is an affirmative bonding in "real and organic life" (Tönnies, 2002, p. 33). Importantly, this emphasizes the durability and intimacy of community bonds, which contrasts with the bonding of members of modern society (associations). At this point, it is important to recall the significant distinction introduced by Tönnies between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (association), which translates into a traditional (traditional community) and a modern understanding of community, which is closer to the concept of society (Tönnies, 2002, p. 33; see also: Nancy, 1991, p. 11).¹ What is significant about the aforementioned distinction, as Tönnies emphasizes, that members of a community remain connected despite separation, members of an association remain separated despite connections (see: Tönnies, 2002, p. 37). While the former are characterized by familiarity, closeness, informality, and durability of relationships, the latter are characterized by the transitory nature of mutual connections while simultaneously formalizing relationships (cf.: Tönnies, 2008, p. 185). We will be particularly interested in this dialectical movement of connection and separation: the emergence of a community as a unity and the cracks and divisions that appear in this unity over time, leading to what Jean-Luc Nancy calls the "the inoperative community".

Man, as a conceptual-aesthetic being, who is both a cognizing subject and an object of cognition for himself, is constituted on the basis of the truth of place and time, which leads to the emergence of significant cultural differences between people, leading to the creation of different systems of thought. As Richard E. Nisbetta emphasizes, systematically instilling certain characteristic ways of thinking from the moment of birth can lead to the emergence of very large cultural differences between people in this regard. Although psychologists assumed a universal nature of human thinking, many scholars from various fields

¹ At this point, let us refer to another distinction made by Giddens, between association, organization, and social movement, with the note that in associations social reproduction occurs as a result of regulated behavior of reflective agents. Organizations and social movements are collectivities in which the reflective regulation of the conditions of system reproduction gives rise to anxiety in the course of everyday practices (Giddens, 2003). Giddens also points to two possible meanings of the term "society" itself: "one of the connotations is 'social association' or interaction; in the second meaning, the term designates a certain whole demarcated from other 'societies'" (Giddens, 2003). Also interesting is the distinction signaled by Lyotard between hegemonic society (perceived as one, coherent whole) and dichotomous society (incorporating an element of contradiction) (see: Lyotard, 1984).

were convinced that for millennia, Westerners (primarily Europeans, Americans, and citizens of the British Commonwealth) and Easterners (primarily Chinese, Korean, and Japanese) had been characterized by different ways of thinking. Human cognition is not the same everywhere; members of different cultures represent different "metaphysics," that is, they have different beliefs about the nature of the world. Since the thought processes of different groups of people differ from each other and are consistent with their beliefs about the nature of the world. People use cognitive tools that make sense to them in the context of their understanding of the world. (Nisbett, 2003).

A community derived from myth

Within this cultural framework, based on a specific metaphysics—the resultant of cognitive processes occurring within it, but also of those processes that create reality—science emerges. Science is understood here as an attempt to describe, understand, and learn about reality and the laws that govern it—first the most general ones, then increasingly more specific ones. A crucial element in this attempt to construct an image, describe reality, and understand its meanings—where the human being is also a reality under study—is undoubtedly myth, a component of this specific metaphysics. Karen Armstrong's research shows that people have always created myths - it resulted from their search for meaning (Armstrong, 2008). As Ian G. Barbour emphasized, myths are stories that express some aspect of the cosmic order. They constitute a tool for a given community to organize its experiences in the present. They make people aware of their identity and the structure of meaning in which they participate. Events—archetypes—that occurred in prehistoric or historical times provide models of behavior for people living today. Myths come to life in rituals that integrate the community on the basis of a shared past and common goals. According to many interpreters, myths are neither true nor false—they are useful fictions fulfilling the aforementioned important social functions. These are meant to be universal stories that – as we read – reflect and shape our lives – revealing desires, fears, longings, and making us realize the meaning of full humanity (Armstrong, 2008).

The author of "The Inoperative Community" will emphasize that community grows out of myth, mythical thinking. With the disruption of myth, as is typical of contemporary societies, community is also disrupted. The French philosopher emphasizes that myth constitutes community through its inherent unifying function. The Greek mythos – speech – the enunciation of the world is also simultaneously the creation of the world (the creation of fiction, illusion – the

production of the world by sanctioning the story – myth). This is directly linked to the totalizing tendency. The appropriation of the created reality and then the expansion of its boundaries to the level of the world as a whole, or rather the appropriation of the world itself through the claim to its creation, or rather its creation (see: Nancy, 1991, p. 56). In this way, the order (cosmos) established along with the image of the world—the world—legitimizes itself (see: Nancy, 1991, p. 50). The world (reality) thus created, besides creating and generating its own truths, transforms itself into truth. After all „essentially, myth communicates itself, and not something else. Communicating itself, it brings into being what it says, it founds its fiction. This efficacious self-communication is will-and will is subjectivity presented (representing itself) as a remainderless totality” (Nancy, 1991, pp. 56-67). By founding reality, myth simultaneously creates a community—a story; myth, as a language expressing the world, becomes the heart, the core of the community, cementing the relationships within it, bringing the community itself into existence. As Nancy points out, outside of myth, which defines the beginning and end of reality in the total vision, there is no community, and there cannot be, because “no community outside of myth. Wherever there has been myth, assuming there has been something of the sort and that we can know what this means, there has been, necessarily, community, and vice versa. The interruption of myth is therefore also, necessarily, the interruption of community. (Nancy, 1991, p. 57). Nancy emphasizes that if we can speak of community today at all, it is only as a “community of interrupted myth”, which translates into the particular “unavowable” of the community itself (see Nancy, 1991, p. 59). Community becomes that which is impossible to totalizing understanding and description, that which is unexplained and, consequently, unspeakable (mythos – speech, by expressing the world, simultaneously explains it; by explaining, it thus expresses community). Myth creates and simultaneously explains, or by creating, explains. The world thus emerges from primordial chaos as a cosmos, and man, being an inseparable part of it, emerges as an element of reality belonging to the community (the community here constitutes a reflection of the constituted order – the cosmos).

A myth condemned to absence

The condition of modern man, however, is characterized by the absence of myth – it “undoes community” (Nancy, 1991, p. 59). The community demands a total element, its absence, fragmentation, fragmentation of reality in the narrative plane (moving away from one narrative that takes exclusive possession of mythos – speaking and at the same time creating the world) It shatters the myth, and

with it the community that grew out of it. However, the shattering of the myth does not result in the disappearance of passion, as Nancy emphasizes, the “the passion of and for community”— the desire to live according to the myth in a world that the myth has condemned to absence (Nancy, 1991, p. 60). The author of “The Inoperative Community” emphasizes that desire stems from the essence of being (an individual), which is “beings in common, it is a privation of being. Being in common means that singular beings are, present themselves, and appear only to the extent that they compare (comparaissent), to the extent that they are exposed, presented, or offered to one another” (Nancy, 1991, p. 57-58; see also: Kwietniewska, 2013, s. 254). Being-together is an irreducible element: While the community is torn apart or “lost” of the myth, being-together as a constant presentation of oneself to oneself and to another, another person, remains an element defining the existence of the individual. This standing before and facing is simultaneously a communication of oneself and a communication with others. A community that is torn apart or separated is therefore “the communication of the community itself” (Nancy, 1991, p. 60). Community ceases to be a binding force, that which both unites and limits through its totality. Its disruption is, in a sense, reaching its limits, a situation where the individual (individuals) stands on its limits—which are simultaneously the limits of the individual itself, the limits at which self-exposure, that is, presentation, occurs. The individual enters the space of communication with others, and by exposing himself, he communicates with others. In this way, community, understood as an interiority (a world surrounded by boundaries, coherent, described by a total narrative), is transferred to the exteriority (to the limits and beyond the limits of the spoken world) — it becomes an exteriority of being-together (see. Nancy, 1991, p. 61). A disrupted community is a community devoid of a total element. Nancy points out that the place of myth is currently taken by literature, becoming a kind of myth of a society without myth (Nancy, 1991, p. 63). Instead of community, being-together enters the arena of history. Literature, by displacing myth, simultaneously—as Nancy points out—disrupts myth, thereby depriving myth of its “being-together.” If there is no longer a single, relatively coherent narrative that creates reality, communication replaces the given and simultaneously sanctioned speech (mythos) of the world. As the author of “The Inoperative Community” points out, we can no longer speak of a myth of communion or a myth of community sanctioned by, or through, literature, but only of a kind of “community.” Being-together refers to the “literary,” to literature understood as “this being in itself ...in itself,” or, in other words, as “being in common” (Nancy, 1991, p. 64).

Community as reaching the boundary

In this way, the place of community as a unity founded on a founding myth (the myth of the founding of the world, the founding of this world and not another) is taken by a separated being. Identity, then, transforms into its inverse, into “everyone's nonidentity, each one's nonidentity to himself and to others” (Nancy, 1991, p. 66). In this way, literature constructs its own myth, a myth that records being-together, whose boundary is death. Death here paradoxically proves to be a reconciliation or a return to unity, as it constitutes the rupture of the rupture (Nancy, 2010b, p. 66). Literature, then, to quote the French philosopher, transforms into “the indefinitely repeated and indefinitely suspended gesture of touching the limit” (Nancy, 2010b, p. 89). The border turns out to be a place where communication—which by its very nature has no borders—is revealed (Nancy, 1997, p. 67). At the border, there is a constant exposure, the exposure of individual persons in a relationship—communication, or communicating themselves to others and to themselves. Community is „... no more than this: to come to the limit of compearance, to that limit to which we are in effect convoked, called, and sent-and whence we are convoked, called, and sent” (Nancy, 1991, p. 71). The border in the shadow of which the drama of a man deprived of community (in its essential sense – the community of one unifying myth) takes place is the human limit – „the end of humanity”. “This is the limit that man is: his exposure-to his death, to others, to his being-in-common. Which is to say, always, in the end, to his singularity: his singular exposure to his singularity” (Nancy, 1991, p. 77). Being “with” others and “among” others, man each time discovers his individuality. In the face of his own finitude, discovered and realized in being in the world, man remains a separate being. Isolation “from among” the world and other beings places him in front of and on the border of his own being. Existentially experienced death (or rather, the awareness of one's own death as the inevitability of the end of individual life) separates and alienates one from the world. It is a property of man, as Heidegger would say, his most own possibility of being (Heidegger, 1994, p. 352), following the philosopher's words: “Death, as the end of Dasein, is Dasein's ownmost possibility – non-relational, certain, and as indefinite, not to be outstripped. Death is, as Dasein's end, in the Being of this entity towards its end” (Heidegger, 2001, s. 303). The awareness of one's own death simultaneously draws an impassable boundary to individual existence. Death, concretized, reduced to the experience of a person's essential mode of being in the world, is always one's own death; in its experience, or in the experience itself, unity remains merely a postulate – in dying, one remains alone – one dies alone. “In a sense, every being is absolutely singular: ... (...the singularity of the singular being endlessly divides Being and beings, or rather divides the Being of

beings, which is only through and as its division into singular/ common) (Nancy, 1991, s. 77). Common insofar as beings communicate with each other, singular because the myth of communion is torn apart, dialogue displaces unity. Humans, constantly standing on the brink of their existence (the end), constantly expose themselves—communicate to others. This is also where the danger of violating the continuity of the identity structure arises. Community, understood as a unity rooted in a common core (the unity of narrative, the created and constructed image of the world), constituted a guarantee of security—offering a solid foundation for a coherent identity. The continuity of the narrative translated into the continuity of identity itself, the identity of an individual as such and the identity of a person as a member of a community. The disruption of narrative continuity also disrupts the foundations for constructing a coherent self-image, danger of constant exposure, the transition from the level of community understood essentially to the level of community as communication also violates the basic sense of security (Kwietniewska, 2013, p. 252-253).²

Relational opening

From now on, man perceives himself not as a pre-defined being – situated in a ready-made narrative determinacy – but as an "open" being, constantly creating himself anew (in exposition – communication), constantly bringing into being his own truth, or rather his own truths (cf. Kurkiewicz, 2018). The narrative established at the foundation of an individual's coherent identity forced to adapt to the variability of external contexts. As Anthony Giddens points out, integrated identity, achieving an authentic self, results from integrating life experiences into the narrative of one's own development and creating one's own belief system (Giddens, 2008). However, in a dynamically changing reality, it is not the result of an extension of a single truth—a mythical narrative—absorbed, but rather constitutes a series of partial truths resulting from a specific opening of the individual himself. The opening of the individual is understood here as the opening of the narrative itself. Lyotard emphasizes that the disintegration of great Narratives results in the dissolution of social bonds and the transition from social collectivities to a state of mass composed of individual atoms set in absurd Brownian motion" (Lyotard, 1984). An individual no longer builds their identity

2 Analysing Nancy's thought, Kwietniewska writes: "Both in Greece and later, throughout medieval and modern Europe, community was conceived in terms of the production of a work when the matter was presented in the practical register of reflection, and in terms of essence (essentia) when its theoretical dimension came into play" (Kwietniewska, 2013, p. 253).

by relating to a community as the foundation of their existence, but rather by relating to the possibility of creating themselves in relationship with others. The relational level is a space of openness not to existing patterns, but to a range of possibilities, assumed as possible, yet unrealized trajectories of one's own fate. Modernity presents an individual with a whole range of different possibilities, and at the same time, due to the lack of fundamentalist tendencies, it does not provide any guidance as to which of them should be chosen (Giddens, 2008).

In this way, the totality of the worldview given in myth, which is simultaneously an appropriation of the world itself—as the single, complex, a priori, unquestionable truth of reality—is supported by the truth of the individual. The truth of the community is transformed into the truth (truth) of the individual. And while the "ideal of perfect harmony" guiding the truth of the community is hypothetical and, moreover, dangerous, because it gives rise to the temptations of intolerance" (Kołakowski, 2005, p. 180), the negation of everything that does not fit within the truth defined by a single narrative, individual truths, arising from individual experiences, undermine the foundations of the individual's identity and, consequently, their sense of relatively secure grounding in the world. The single truth—the truth of total narrative—is replaced by partial truths—the truths of individual narratives, or narratives as literature; a single myth—the founding myth—is replaced by the myth of literary narratives, even if, as Nancy would have it, fragmented. Following Kołakowski, it is important to emphasize "...that in all areas of human culture, mythologies have constituted an important form of communication for centuries, and that there is almost no place in culture where myth is not used as an instrument for organizing human coexistence" (Kołakowski, 2005, p. 181). What distinguishes myth, or rather myths founded on culture, from one another is their totalizing vector, or its inversion. The totality of the image of the world derived from myth makes the world itself and human activity within it a unique creation—an image of reality, and with it, of humanity, founded on the founding myth. Renouncing the total inclination of narrative driven by myth is simultaneously renouncing the holistic image of the world conceived as a specific work. Where myth, in Nancy's view, replaces its division or separation, the community derived from myth is also separated. This separation of the community, expressed in "being-together", is also a severance of the work (opus). In this way, the work, that which is created, is transformed into that which is given – a gift of sorts. As the Nancy points out, the essence of a gift understood in this way is the permanent possibility of transformation, renewal, and not, as in the case of a work, creation (Nancy, 1991, pp. 35-36).

Community as a desire for communion

But is it possible to completely abandon community, this "oldest myth of the West..."? (Nancy, 2010c, p. 19). Community is, after all, a myth born from a deeply rooted human desire for communion—unity. The desire for perfect communion has ignited and ignited the minds of people throughout history. The embodiment of the ideal of perfect unity in a perverted form or shape finds its realization in totalitarian, and ultimately totalitarian, ideas. „Fascism was the grotesque or abject resurgence of an obsession with communion; it aystallized the motif of its supposed loss and the nostalgia for its images of fusion” (Nancy, 1991, p. 17). The masses, hungry for communal unity, or rather a unifying idea, were susceptible to appeals to a narrative that cemented unity – a founding myth, founding the community as such – the reason for its existence. Communism, similarly, with its slogans of building a communal paradise. As Nancy emphasizes, „the word "communism" stands as an emblem of the desire to discover or rediscover a place of community at once beyond social divisions...” (Nancy, 1991, p. 1). The obsessively exalted idea of human reality as a unified mass, devoted to the created world, transformed into its opposite. What was supposed to be a communal paradise turned out to be hell for the individual. What was supposed to bring individual freedom actually brought enslavement. “The justice and freedom-and the equality-included in the communist idea or ideal have in effect been betrayed in so-called real communism is something at once laden with the burden of an intolerable suffering (Nancy, 1991, p. 2). But before the perversion of the system-idea reaches its peak, it has time to create its own myth—a work that devours its own children. Hannah Arendt, in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, emphasizes that the myth of a coherent, total reality is born from the masses' disagreement with the randomness of the existing world and its components. The masses do not want to see that reality is marked by randomness (Arendt, 2024), this gives rise to a tendency to ideologize the world, to take any ideology, even the most absurd one, contrary to common sense, as truth, if this place of randomness is filled with a coherent image of the world that provides ready-made answers. After all human beings have a constant need to transform chaotic and random conditions into relatively permanent arrangements of their own making (Arendt, 2024). Totalitarianisms are rooted in total visions. The obsessive desire for communion has transformed within them into a drive to destroy all opposition to the single vision of reality, recognized as "revealed" truth, and thus to the vision of the community itself. The individual is absorbed into a system built on this exalted vision (a totalitarian system). By becoming a part of the system, they are simultaneously deprived of the right to their own truth and self-expression. The only possible form of expression turns out to be truth of power. Totalitarian

domination reaches all spheres of life, not just the political. Society in a totalitarian system is essentially a monolith. All public manifestations—cultural, artistic, or scientific—and all social institutions, even sports and entertainment, are coordinated. (Arendt, 2003). In a totalitarian system, man becomes part of a passive mass, melting into it. The totality of ideas permeates the fabric of social existence. Incarnate unity, realized communion, turns out to be the negation of humanity, the drowning of the individual in the cogs of a soulless, dehumanized system. The desire for perfect (total) community transforms into the death of the individual.

One of the fundamental modes defining humanity is, after all, the mode of otherness. If community transforms into the loss of what is individual, singular, it simultaneously becomes a judgment passed on humanity itself, on what is most essential – its uniqueness. In man, the otherness that he shares with everything that exists and the difference that he shares with everything that lives become uniqueness and human multiplicity is a paradoxical multiplicity of unique beings (Arendt, 2018). Humanity (the idea of humanity), thus realized in the myth of total community, embodied in reality, is a negation of man as such. Just as in the initial myth (founding myth), community constituted the fundamental reference, the basis for the constitution of human identity, his relationship to himself, others, and the surrounding reality, so the total element transformed into a totalitarian construct determines exclusively the structure itself, constructed upon the myth of community, losing the individual within it. Disrupting the myth itself, as Nancy points out, would thus constitute restoring man to his place in the group, his place among other coexisting entities, creating a space of relational references in mutual coexistence.

Conclusions

But isn't the myth of community an eternally recurring myth? Isn't the disruption of its framework merely an interval on the timeline of human history? By transcending, as Nancy would have it, the essential dimension of thinking about community in favor of the relational dimension, by constructing a work (community as humanity) in favor of a gift (community as gift), do we irreversibly transcend the horizon of myth as a total narrative? Isn't this merely walking in a circle, where transcending is simultaneously entering into something already recognized and named, as a result of gravitating toward a fundamental need for security.

Technological progress, the development of science, civilizational changes,

and the belief in ever better knowledge and understanding of reality lead to the creation of new, contemporary myths. Referring to the works of Alexander MacIntyre and Langdon Gilkey, Ian G. Barbour wrote that some authors speak of contemporary "latent myths" of inevitable progress, human rationality, or technological utopia (Barbour, 1974). In this context, we can also speak of the myth of building a globally secure world based on the principles of inclusiveness, justice, and equal access to resources and natural resources. This world is to be characterized by personal and personalistic security, a place of unthreatened survival and development opportunities for individual citizens and entire nations, regardless of gender, skin color, sexual preference, religion, or other differences (cf. Michalski, Wysoczyńska, 2020, pp. 111-125). But does this Western model, postulated based on the principles of equality, democracy, and proclaimed human rights, have any chance of being realized in today's world, which is, on the one hand, so diverse, unjust, and unequal, and on the other, so evident in its striving for total control and restriction of individual freedom in the name of—paradoxically—freedom, justice, and security? Will the friction and migration of representatives of different cultures, different metaphysics, and bearers of different myths allow for the construction of a safe space for the life and development of diverse individuals? As Nisbett emphasized, if people's thinking systems—their worldviews and cognitive processes—are truly different, then the differences in attitudes and beliefs, and even values and preferences, they exhibit may be more than the result of different inputs or different teachings. They may be the inevitable result of learning about the world through different tools. If this is true, then efforts to achieve better understanding between nations may be less profitable than we think (Nisbett, 2003). The tendency towards unification, towards a single vision of man, of community understood as communion-unity, often turns out to be stronger than the constant attempts to grasp multiplicity and diversity in their entirety. Where a total vision emerges—defining a person through community (their role and place in the group)—then fear or threat is replaced by a relative sense of security. An embodied total vision, realized in total constructs, cementing and unifying the worldview on the one hand, yet on the other, it undermines the very sense of security—leaving no room for individual expression. And where individual expression is impossible, the twilight of humanity begins.

References

Arendt H. (2018), *The Human Condition*, University of Chicago Pr.

- Arendt H. (2024), *The Origins of Totalitarianism: With a New Introduction by Anne Applebaum*, Harper Collins, New York.
- Arendt H. (2003), *Responsibility and Judgment*, Publisher Schocken, Berlin.
- Armstrong K. (2008), *A Short History of Myth*, Canongate Books, Edynburg.
- Barbour Ian G. (1974), *Myths, Models and Paradigms: a comparative study in science and religion*, New York, Harper & Row.
- Giddens A. (2008), *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and society in Late Moder Age*, Cambridge.
- Giddens A. (1984), *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Gilkey L. (1970), *Religion and the Scientific Future*, Harper and Row.
- Heidegger M. (2001), *Being and Time*, translated by J. Macquarrie, E. Robinson, Oxford UK & Cambridge USA.
- Kołakowski L. (2005), *Obecność mitu*, Prószyński i S-ka, Warszawa.
- Kurkiewicz A. (2018), Bezpieczeństwo relacyjne - podstawy konstytucji wspólnoty, in: *Polska- Rosja w świecie globalnych przeobrażeń*, Warszawa-Siedlce.
- Kwietniewska M. (2013), *Dekonstrukcja wobec tradycji*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.
- Liotard J.-F. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by G. Bennington, B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- MacIntyre A. (ed) (1957), *Metaphysical Beliefs*, SCM Press.
- Michalski M.A., Wysoczyńska D., (2020), Personalny i personalistyczny wymiar bezpieczeństwa, in: *Bezpieczeństwo lokalne – wybrane aspekty*, ed. G. Górski, A. Potoczek, Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne AKAPIT oraz Jagielloński Instytut Wydawniczy, Toruń.
- Nancy J.-L. (1991), *The Inoperative Community*, translated by P. Connor, L. Garbus, M. Holland, and S. Sawhney, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and Oxford
- Niesbett R.E. (2003), *The Geography of Thought*, New York.
- Tönnies F. (2002), *Community and society*. Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, translated by Charles P. Loomis, New York.