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Contribution to a discussion on ethnic identity

Abstract:

The main determinant of the Kashubian identity is language. In the main interpretative stream, although it is autonomous today, the Kashubian language still bears the stigma of a dialect and the identity is forms is dependent on the Polish one. On the margin of the mainstream, the reasoning arises that the Kashubian language is autonomous and is accompanied by Kashubian-Polish bilingualism and civility.
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Kaszubszczyzna na marginesie kaszubszczyzny.
Przyczynek to dyskusji nad tożsamością etniczną

Streszczenie:

Głównym wyznacznikiem tożsamości kaszubskiej jest język. W głównym nurcie interpretacyjnym język kaszubski, choć dziś autonomiczny, to jednak nadal niesie w sobie piętno dialektu a tożsamość, którą tworzy jest zależna od polskiej. Na marginesie nurtu głównego rozwija się myślenie, w którym języka
Introduction

For dozens of years, most Kashubians have been convinced that their language is worse than Polish. To some of them, this language appears to be synonymous with a lack of education and low social status. Many believe that Kashubian is the language of everyday, ordinary and domestic events, whereas Polish is the language of festival and public matters. Socially-generated convictions concerning language in the form of the so-called language ideologies rest on a recognition of how language enables educational, social and economic success. Language ideologies are constructed upon the social and unitary valuation of language. If language is viewed by a user not to warrant success, then it becomes a value of low quality to be generally associated with tradition.

Language ideologies work in a subtle manner. The surroundings of language determine its survival and development, for they motivate users (not) to use language in social and cultural situations, whereby they construct the consciousness of its evaluation.

The belief that there is a low value of the Kashubian language is and has been strengthened by a dialectal treatment of the Kashubians’ speech, constructed on an analysis of selected linguistic criteria. The scientific status of Kashubian has been derived from the method adopted, but rather than involving comparisons between dialects, it involves references to a codified version of the Polish language. Retaining in science the dialectal status of Kashubian has prevented the Kashubians’ speech from developing in a way each language does.

1 E. Ochs, B. Schieffelin, The impact of language socialization on grammatical development, In: The Handbook of Child Language, eds. P. Fletcher, B. MacWhinney, Oxford 1994, p. 89–91.
It could not generate its written norm and in not holding a generally accepted codification, the Kashubian language could not generate its literature. Kashubian writers were automatically regarded as folk writers, whilst their art was viewed as that of peasants. The Kashubian culture could, at most, attain the status of a folk culture, which could not be high culture. As a peripheral variant of the Polish language, it could not – as is logical in the theory of dialects – generate its own education system, similarly to how it did not generate its literature. As a consequence, it was unable to generate the Kashubian identity; the only thing it could do was await its destiny prophesised by the theory of dialects, which was polonisation.

Even though it is commonly accepted that the Kashubian language is autonomous, its dialectal treatment still holds. The gist of this concept has been covered with a façade in the form of the thesis that the Kashubian language is autonomous for, as specified by the theory, it acquired linguistic criteria\(^2\). It is, however, inconsistent with the theory of dialects, which holds that the natural destiny of a dialect is unification, that is being absorbed into a language. The first stage of language assimilation is a phonetic breakdown of a dialect. Thus, the Kashubian language would constitute an example of aberration in the theory of dialects, which – to the detriment of itself – the theory of dialects does not account for.

Therefore, the only possibility of identity offered by the main interpretative stream is the possibility of experiencing the (communal/national) Kashubian identity exclusively as the (communal/national) Polish identity. This, in turn, becomes objectivised in the conviction that can be found in Kashubian public space that “Kashubians have one Polish lung and the other Kashubian”.

Yet on the margin of the official stream colloquial reasoning has developed, whereby Kashubian is autonomous to the Polish language. The Kashubian language is autonomous insofar as it generates an autonomous culture and an autonomous identity. Hence, I am intrigued

\(^2\) More: A. Kożyczkowska, *Podręcznik jako (nie)możliwy projekt tożsamościowy. Przypadek jednego podręcznika do edukacji kaszubskiej*, „Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Pedagogika”, 2016, vol. 32.
in the text by the dynamically changing ethnic identity as a social construct. Interestingly, both types of reasoning on the Kashubian language have intellectual representations in the theories of Kashubian. This reasoning can, in turn, reciprocally deconstruct the substantive content of what needs to be called the awareness of identity or the sense of social identity. In the paper, I undertake an attempt to recognise how a change of (social and scientific) knowledge reconstructs the substantive scope of identity, the consequences of which can be recognised as expansion (Erving Goffman\(^3\), Nan M. Sussman\(^4\)) or harm done to identity (Erving Goffman\(^5\)).

**The Kashubian language on the margin of Kashubian**

The ideological core of marginalised Kashubian (Kashubian-centrism) is constructed upon, among other concepts, the panslavism of Ján Kolllár and Pavel Josef Šafařík\(^6\). Panslavism was injected into Kashubian by Florian Ceynowa, which enabled Ceynowa to formulate the first project in the history of Kashubian of ‘language policy’, the grounds of which were two postulates: (1) Retaining the Kashubian language and culture through linguistic and ethnographic studies, (2) Preservation and development of the Kashubian language as a result of actions for the sake of standardisation, (3) Boosting the prestige of the Kashubian language and culture through actions for the benefit of education and writing.

---

\(^3\) E. Goffman, *Piętno. Rozważania o zranionej tożsamości*, przekł. A. Dzierżyńska, J. Tokarska-Bakir, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk 2017, p. 114.

\(^4\) Por. N.M. Sussman, *The Dynamic Nature of Cultural Identity Throughout Cultural Transsitions: Why Home Is Not So Sweet*, „Personality an Social Psychology Review”, 2000, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 355–373.

\(^5\) E. Goffman, *Piętno. Rozważania o zranionej tożsamości*, op.cit.

\(^6\) More: A. Kożyczkowska, „Młodokaszubi” – fenomen kulturowy. Przyczynek do namysłu nad edukacją regionalną, „Edukacja międzykulturowa”, 2013, no. 2; A. Kożyczkowska, *Podręcznik jako (nie)możliwy projekt tożsamościowy. Przypadek jednego podręcznika do edukacji kaszubskiej*, op.cit.
“Researching” the Kashubians’ speech from the perspective of Slavic languages, Ceynowa formulated the thesis that it is autonomous in relation to the speech of Poles. That thesis was/is essential for the entire area of the marginalised Kashubian language, as it necessitates the undertaking of a range of actions – of an educational character – for the sake of the formation of new language awareness in the minds of Kashubians. This is an acknowledgement that the Kashubian language plays not only a communicative function, but is also a cultural and social value, essential for generating a sense of commonwealth. Generating the communal understanding of language is typical of each commonwealth which, owing to its duration, needs to hold such knowledge of its language that will appreciate its prestige. It seems that Ceynowa particularly cared about it, as the aim of his “language policy” was the cultural and social (re)construction of the understanding of the Kashubian language, as I noted earlier, in the consciousness of Kashubians themselves.

Ceynowa also introduced a liberal element into the Kashubian language, constructing the Kashubians’ conscious (rational) civility as a prerequisite for generating a liberating and – as might be said today – symmetrical relationship between Poles and Poland. This approach solidified the autonomy of the both languages and cultures, and outlines the political context of their possible co-existence. Even though, as Ceynowa believed, political equality cannot be attained due to Polish reluctance [mid 20th century – A.K.], it constitutes a prerequisite for the creation and development of Kashubian identity. The identity of Kashubians must be constructed upon a civic element (the idea of Poland as a state) and at the same time an ethnic element (Kashubian

---

7 More: A. Kożyczkowska, Kaszubów dążenia edukacyjne. Szkic z zakresu historii dziejów edukacji kaszubskiej, In: A. Kożyczkowska, T. Rembalski, Literatura kaszubska. Historia Kaszub i Kaszubów. Konteksty edukacyjne, Wydawnictwo Region, Gdynia 2018, p. 10–12.
8 Stanisław [F. Ceynowa], Wuvagi nad móvą kaszebską, In: Stanisław [F. Ceynowa], Trze rosprawe voros. Wojkasen [F. Ceynowa], Kile slov wó Kaszebach e jich zemji, Kraków 1850, p. 38–48; Wójkasin [F. Ceynowa], Kaszebji do Pólochov, „Szkoła Narodowa”, 1850, no. 10, p. 39–40; F.S. Ceynowa, Rozmówa Pólôcha Kaszëbä. Rozmówa Kaszëbê z Pólôchá, ed. J. Treder, Gdańsk 2007.
heritage with language autonomy). The citizen-making of Kashubians and new socialisation of the Kashubian language may lead to the new socialisation of Kashubian identity as a disparate and distinct Polish identity. It is the core of Kashubian-centric knowledge and – following this reasoning – the basis of (re)construction of communal competence and language ideology increasing the prestige of the Kashubian language and culture.

The first decade of the 20th century was hard for Kashubians, in much the same way as it was difficult for Poles. It was a time of political changes, regarding which Kashubians needed to take a decision whether or not to bind their fate to Polish or German statehood under the new sensed European order. In this sense, historically and culturally the Kashubians were assumed to be closer in spirit to Poland. “The burden of choice” was assumed by Young Kashubians, who with the voices of Jan Karnowski and Aleksander Majkowski ‘decided’ to bind the Kashubian to the Polish fate. Kashubian modernists worked out a functional and organic concept of culture, whereby the Kashubian language could develop only as a part of the Polish language. This approach, in turn, significantly energised thinking about the Kashubian-Polish relationship, locating corresponding social convictions (whereby ‘what is Kashubian, is Polish’) and scientific convictions (whereby Kashubian is a dialect of the Polish language). Both were of a political character and have no objective grounding in science, generating only interpretations of reality underlain a specific type of classifications. Accordingly, if political declarations are not backed up in “objective” science, they need to draw on tradition, history, customs or even mythology.

Karnowski was aware of the political salience of making up one’s mind about the Kashubian case for, as he claimed, where one’s ‘own well-being’ is concerned, it is necessary to express ‘one’s own opinion’ on the Kashubian language. The issue here was the unity of the

9 Janowicz [J. Karnowski], Wcielenie idei młodo-kaszubskiej, „Gryf. Pismo dla spraw kaszubskich”, 1909, no. 8, p. 229–231; J. Karnowski, Moja droga kaszub-ska, ed. Józef Borzyszkowski, Gdańsk 1981; Redakcja „GRYFA”, Nasz program, „Gryf. Pismo dla spraw kaszubskich”, 1908, no. 1, s. 1–5. [A. Majkowski], Ruch młodokaszubski, „Gryf. Pismo dla spraw kaszubskich”, 1909, no. 7, p. 192–198.
Kashubian identity and culture with the Polish identity and culture. Karnowski was aware of the political effects of the language-identity relationship. He knew that accepting the distinctiveness of Kashubian from the Polish language also entailed identity disparity. The unity of Kashubian with the Polish language also involved the unity of identity. The distinctiveness of language and identity could, however, bring about political and administrative effects for Kashubians, which they could not or did not want to accept.

Today, only the meaning of that political decision is retained in the social memory of Kashubian with its social and political context is overlooked; it is only remembered that “the Kashubian = the Polish”. Transferred in time, from generation to generation, the reasoning that ‘the Kashubian = the Polish’ has also fed the Kashubian of the mainstream, or, to be precise – what needs to be emphasised again – the interpretation of the Kashubian of the mainstream (Polish-centric) and ‘confirms’ the dialectality of the Kashubian language.

In the 1930s, there occurred a clear turn to Ceynowa’s theses. The formation of established Associates (who published the journal *Zrzesz Kaszubska*), the achievement of which is formulating the political concept of language. Its basis lies in the acknowledgment that a definition of language is a derivative of theoretical classifications used, whilst the language recognition of speech is a political matter following from the political strength of a commonwealth.

The politicality of language affects the political power of cultural attributes of a commonwealth, on the basis of which its autonomy is determined. Linguistic facts presented in a political way become sociological facts and decide the integration of a commonwealth and

---

10 J. Karnowski, *Moja droga kaszubska*, op.cit., p. 33–32.
11 S. Bieszk, *O naukową charakterystykę naszego języka* [part 1 – note A.K.], „Zrzesz Kaszëbskô. Pismo dla Ludu Kaszubskiego”, 1934, no. 8, vol. II, p. 58. S. Bieszk, *O naukową charakterystykę naszego języka* [part 4 – note A.K.], „Zrzesz Kaszëbskô. Pismo dla Ludu Kaszubskiego”, 1934, no. 12, vol. II, p. 90; S. Bieszk, *O naukową charakterystykę naszego języka (dokończenie)*, „Zrzesz Kaszëbskô. Pismo dla Ludu Kaszubskiego”, 1934, nr 5, vol II, p. 34.
subjective-and-objective identity conditions. The ideology of the Associates thus presumed: (1) Inciting the awareness of one’s own cultural-ality through education, literature and practical use of the Kashubian language. (2) Forming the sense of communal affiliation through language regarded as a cultural and communal value. (3) Forming the sense of statehood are the first obligation of a citizen\textsuperscript{12}. It is the third element that opened for the Associates room for constructing the base of bilingualism and biculturalism.

In this respect, symmetricality required equation of the status of Kashubians with that of Poles, but it was possible only on the basis of nationality. The civility enabled equation between the two languages and cultures. It also made it possible to recognise that biculturalism could be the façade of assimilation measures aimed at ‘putting down’ a weaker language. The liberalistic ideology of the Associates saw Kashubians as involved in Polish matters and Kashubian matters. Particularly in the latter case, Kashubians should take active part in reign, yet, very importantly\textsuperscript{13}, only as citizens of the Polish state Kashubians can have full civic rights\textsuperscript{14}.

The works of the Associates encompass after nearly 60 years the environment of young intellectuals, gathered by journal \textit{Tatczëzna}. The ideological foundation was the thesis \textit{ethnically Kashubian, Polish by nationality}\textsuperscript{15}. \textit{Tatczëzna} focused on increasing the prestige of the Kashubian culture by its standarisation, and also providing knowledge that would boost its prestige. Such theoretical concepts, although strongly marginalised, were yet present in science, it was sufficient to recall them. Youngsters from \textit{Tatczëzna} thus postulated that the Kashubian language be acknowledged on scientific grounds. In practice, the recognition of language was to determine the identity of language, culture

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} More: A. Kożyczkowska, \textit{Kaszubów dążenia edukacyjne. Szkic z zakresu historii dziejów edukacji kaszubskiej}, op.cit., s. 15.
\item \textsuperscript{13} [without the author], \textit{Zasady naszej polityki. „Zrzesz Kaszëbskô”, 1933, no. 1, vol. I, p. 1.}
\item \textsuperscript{14} [A. Labuda], \textit{Rola Kaszubów w przyszłych wyborach do sejmu i senatu. Możliwość kompromisu z partią rządową, „Zrzesz Kaszëbskô. Pismo dla Ludu Kaszubskiego”, 1934, no. 14, vol. II, p. 105.}
\item \textsuperscript{15} [F. Grucza], \textit{O języku kaszubskim, „Tatczëzna”, 1990, no. 1, vol. I, p. 2.}
\end{itemize}
The ideational continuation here was the programme of young intellectuals gathered around journal Òdroda to postulate the autonomy of the Kashubian language and culture, alongside the symmetrical multiculturalism of Pomerania. The political nature of the programme related to nationality, which was bound with the right to have rights. The civility postulated began to shed a different light on Kashubian and Kashubian-Polish matters, which were now to be realised on the basis of political freedom, the yardstick of which was access to civic rights. Hence, the possession of one’s own language, culture and education, and also one’s own identity have been seen as a symptom of realisation of civic rights17.

The next stage in the development of the ideology was a programme of Kashubian intellectuals affiliated under the Association of Persons of Kashubian Nationality Kaszëbskô Jednota. It was built upon recognition of Kashubians as a national minority18, inciting their national, civic and cultural awareness19.

Kaszëbskô Jednota rested upon the idea of civility as the detachment of state and nation. The distinctiveness postulated here was the basis

---

16 D. Szymikowski, Z myślą o przyszłości, „Lecëdło. Biuletyn II Kongresu Kaszubskiego”, 1992, no. 1, p. 2–3. E. Pryczkowski, Stanowiszcze młodëch, „Lecëdło. Biuletyn II Kongresu Kaszubskiego”, 1992, no. 3, p. I–II.
17 P. Kąsk, Nie jestem nacjonalistą, „Ódroda”, 2000 no. 1(2). Internet: http://odroda.kaszubia.com/00-01/pk_nie.htm [31.10.2017]. A. Kirk, Uczymy Kaszubów chińskiego, „Ódroda”, 2001 no. 8(12) Internet: http://odroda.kaszubia.com/01-08/chinski.htm [6.11.2017]. T. Żuroch Piechowski, Dlaczego Liga Polskich Rodzin i mniejszość niemiecka w Polsce boją się Kaszubów i Ślązaków?, „Ódroda”, 2003 no. 1 (22). Internet: http://odroda.kaszubia.com/03-01/tavp_jazda.htm [31.10.2017]
18 A. Jabłoński, Kaszubi. Wspólnota narodowa, Gdynia 2013. D. Szymikowski, Głos w dyskusji o statusie prawnym Kaszubów (2). 25.07.2013. Internet: http://kaszebsko.com/index.php?mact=News,cntnt01,detail,0&cntnt01articleid=201&cntnt01returnid=26 [20.09.2017].
19 Deklaracja ideowa stowarzyszenia Kaszëbskô Jednota. [2011]. Internet: http://kaszebsko.com/kim-jestesmy-i-jakie-sa-nasze-cele.html [2.09.2017].
for Kashubians’ claim to be a nation. Its recognition constituted a pre-
requisite of symmetrical cooperation with the Polish nation for the sake
of the Polish state, resulting in the right to protection and to the devel-
opment of one’s identity within the Polish nationality. The Associates’
declaration was founded on the will to belong to the Polish statehood,
yet only as citizens having full rights.

*Kaszëbskô Jednota* assumes that only symmetrical cooperation with
the Polish society guarantees harmonious development and duration
to Kashubian society and, more, that the survival of Kashubian is pos-
sible only within the liberalistically construed Polish state. From this
assertion follows the thesis that Kashubians themselves are responsi-
ble for the preservation of Kashubian. In the ideology of *Kaszëbskô Jed-
noty*, the civic principle can be recognised whereby no civic state will
guarantee cultural rights to minorities directly, as only a civic state
opens up perspectives for this type of actions.

**“Expanded” Kashubian identity. Conclusion attempt**

The Kashubian experience shows that ethnic identity does not need to
be experienced and described in a homogeneous manner. The antago-
nising powers present in the Kashubian culture are an effect of histor-
icality of its course. Particularly harmful was the polonisation of the
period 1945–1989 and it has been sensed and experienced till today.
Polonisation practices permeated deeply into Kashubian structures and
are present in textbooks for Kashubian education in which they have
been retained as less or more subtly exposed dialectal patterns of the
Kashubian-Polish relationships. In their nature, they do not guaran-
tee symmetrical bilingualism and biculturalism, and as the reconstructed
Kashubian-centric idea shows, only symmetrically presented bilin-
gualism and biculturalism are a way of boosting the prestige of the
Kashubian culture in relations to the Polish culture.

The consequence of the Kashubian-centric view on the issue of
Kashubian culture is the necessity to reorganise the substantive con-
tent of the Kashubian identity and the need to recognise it in political
dimensions. This, in turn, prompts the question: “What is changed by
‘this’ social and theoretical knowledge, marginalised for many years, about the Kashubian language?”

First off, this knowledge causes the deconstruction of identity as a theoretical construct, which does not remove the subject from it but radically changes its political condition. If this process were viewed through the reasoning of Goffman or Sussman, then we need to speak of the expansion of the Kashubian identity with fresh content or, speaking differently, new attributes. However, this expansion comes to the fore from the perspective of the Kashubian identity constructed upon the Polish-centric concept. It can even be stated that this expansion is significant as compared to the identity generated by the Polish-centric view. The primary attribute of the Kashubian identity based upon the Polish-centric idea is language. The identity which is aspired under the Kashubian-centric view is expanded with two equally basic attributes – bilingualism and civic virtue. Therefore, the foundations of the Kashubian identity is formed by the triad: “language-bilingualism-civic virtue”.

What is interesting is that although “language-bilingualism-civic virtue” can constitute the structure of Kashubianism, it functions – as can be seen in this paper – in theories and social practice as a margin. Here the identity is constructed not only on the basis of the Kashubian language, but also on the Kashubian-Polish bilingualism and Polish citizenship. Only in such experienced identity is there room for experiencing one’s ethnicity (nationality) as autonomous (liberty-poised). The problem, however, is that the identity currently realised is embedded on a language that is an ex-dialect, which has now gained linguistic criteria. Kashubianism has become equalised with the Polish nature with regards to nationality, whilst its citizenship does not exist. Culture, which is logical in this mode, appears as banal folksiness\(^{20}\) (Kożyczkowska 2017).

---

\(^{20}\) A. Kożyczkowska, *Podręcznik jako (nie)możliwy projekt tożsamościowy. Przypadek jednego podręcznika do edukacji kaszubskiej*, op.cit. A. Kożyczkowska, *Wiedza o przeszłości jako kontekst (de)konstrukcji tożsamości: kaszubska tożsamość zapośredniczona*, „Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Pedagogika”, 2017, vol. 34, p. 33–71.
The second issue is that the expansion of Kashubian identity with new criteria draws attention to yet another question; namely, the expanded Kashubian identity makes it possible to see that the identity constructed upon the dialect-based view of Kashubian appeared as a harmed identity. It starts to function as a Goffman’s stigma, which forces its holder to somehow cope with it. For such a stigma only serves to remove representatives of ethnic minorities (and also national or religious ones) from the area of social, cultural, or even political competition\(^{21}\) (Goffman 2007, p. 182). This exclusion enforces, in turn, a choice between one’s own real and diversionary identity yet it is accepted by the majority. Finally, what may subsequently occur can be even abandonment of one’s identity with regards to the personal image of oneself and one’s ethnic group\(^{22}\).

The third issue is that the expansion of the Kashubian identity with the criteria of bilingualism and civic virtue imposes the necessity to construe anew the Kashubian culture and Kashubians as a community primarily in the political context.

Although these days politics and politicality tend to be the subject of discussion, this takes place on the margin of Kashubianism rather than in its centre. The politicality of the Kashubians was addressed directly by Donald Tusk who, in 1992, outlined two ways of development of the Kashubian-Pomeranian movement: (1) De-politicised, the subject matter of which will be the issues of culture, language and history. (2) Politically, the focal aspect of which will be active participation in reforming the state. The former results in the passivity of Kashubians in public life, while the latter in active involvement in the life of region and the state\(^{23}\). The former path leads directly to resignation from in-

---

\(^{21}\) E. Goffman, *Piętno. Rozważania o zranionej tożsamości*, op. cit., p. 182.

\(^{22}\) N.M. Sussman, *The Dynamic Nature of Cultural Identity Throughout Cultural Transitions: Why Home Is Not So Sweet*, op. cit, p. 358

\(^{23}\) D. Tusk, *Pomorska idea regionalna jako zadanie polityczne*, In: *II Kongres Kaszubski. Przyszłość kaszubszczyzny*. Dokumentacja, eds. J. Łuczkowska, C. Ob- racht-Prondzyński, W. Popiołek, Gdańsk 1992, p. 82–83.
volved civility, the latter imposes the perspective on Kashubians as involved citizens.24

The fourth and final issue is in relation to the expanded Kashubian identity to education where it is recognised that at least it cannot be viewed as solely language education, but earns the status of cultural education. Similarly to each cultural education, it is related to reasoning, knowledge and theories on the identity of a given community. However, in the situation when education is to be realised on the basis of the identity-based postulate ‘language-bilingualism-civic virtue’, its essence should be in the relationships between man and the world, in the provision of knowledge and abilities within cultural competence to participate in the Kashubian culture, and the cultural competence to participate in the Polish culture. For its sense lies in constructing the cultural Kashubian and Polish awareness, and in preparation for conscious identity choices. Hence, the margin of Kashubianism recognised in the paper prompts the reasoning that Kashubian education is cultural in educating critical and involved subjects who are aware of their cultural heritage, ready for identity-related choices and able to realise their citizenship consciously.
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