

Rev. Jacek Jan Pawlik
Faculty of Theology
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

The Catholic Family towards Cultural Diversity

Słowa kluczowe: rodzina, komunikacja, dialog międzykulturowy, odmienność kulturowa, międzykulturowość.

Keywords: family, communication, intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity, interculturality.

It seems unnecessary to recall the definition of the Catholic family. The marital bonds upon which it is founded are sanctified by an inseparable sacramental union. However, we should not focus on the negation that emanates from the word “inseparable”, since this union has a multitude of positive aspects. The Catholic family builds its bonds on the relation with God. Additionally, the inseparability of the union is a guarantee of stability and continuity of the path undertaken together. Both parents and children aim at the same direction, basing their lives on shared faith, and at the same time deepening their communion with God through shared religious experience.

The Catholic family resembles, in some aspects, the Hindu family, built on the model of marriages between gods and therefore based on the inseparable bond between spouses. In other aspects, it can be compared to the Muslim family, the purpose of which is to fulfil God’s kingdom on the Earth. However, by its sacramental nature, the Catholic marriage is unique.

This paper will present a reflection upon the attitude of Catholics living in a family towards followers of other religions and representatives of distinct cultures. It is often the case that both of the above-mentioned occur at the same time. Representatives of foreign cultures are also followers of religions that are closely related to those cultures: Islam,

Hinduism or Buddhism. It should not be forgotten that Christians, including Catholics, also represent rich cultural diversity, and the life in a Christian community of multiple cultures can be a great challenge. In the first place, this paper will analyse documents of the Church which directly determine the direction of relations between families of various denominations and religions. Next, the practical dimension of such relations will be analysed. Finally, the attention will be focused on obstacles impeding the dialogue, particularly at the level of non-verbal communication and taking the form of prejudices and stereotypes.

1. “Dialogue and proclamation”

“Dialogue and proclamation” is the title of the document of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue and the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, published on the day of Pentecost, 19 May 1991, which explains the notions of dialogue and proclaiming, and organises the relations between the former and the latter. Although this document primarily concerns broadly understood missionary work, it also contains important content for all Christians, in particular for those who encounter cultural diversity.

In the context of a meeting with representatives of other religions, what plays an important role is dialogue. The above-mentioned document claims that the term “dialogue” itself can be understood in multiple ways. Next, it enumerates three out of many possibilities. The first meaning concerns a purely human level, on which a dialogue refers to mutual communication, aimed at reaching a common goal, and in the further stage, at establishing interpersonal bonds. The second meaning of the term indicates the attitude of respect and friendship permeating shared activities. The third understanding of the term “dialogue” is related to the context of religious pluralism and stands for: “all positive and constructive international relations with individuals and communities of other faiths which are directed at mutual understanding and enrichment in obedience to truth and respect for everybody’s freedom” (*Dialogue and proclamation*, 1991, No. 9).

Although the Vatican document focuses on the third of the above-mentioned meanings of dialogue, it is also worth examining the two remaining ones. At a purely human level, dialogue means the exchange of thoughts in search of the truth. It assumes a diversity of opinions, as otherwise there is no foundation to hold dialogue. It also assumes outlines of something in common, a starting point, upon which communication

can be initiated. Additionally, it assumes the willingness to communicate. Without the clear will of both parties to “enter” into the dialogue, it cannot exist. A common denominator of dialogue is humanity, therefore it will not be possible to realize the dialogue if the personal integrity of the Other is not recognized. Dialogue means discovering oneself in the meeting with the other person. Therefore, it requires an attitude of openness, which is enrichment-oriented. A dialogue relation develops through experience. The rhythm of meetings, events experienced together and exchange of views affect the dynamics of the dialogue. Real dialogue, as Tzvetan Todorov claims, consists in that “no one has the last word, in which neither voice is reduced to the *status* of a simple *object*, and in which we gain advantage from our externality to the other” (Todorov T., 1984, p. 250). The ideal aim of the dialogue, which would consist in full unanimity of life views and practices, is never reached completely. Therefore dialogue should be understood as a condition that lasts, as an activity.

In dialogue, people get to know each other by recognizing each other as equal, i.e. worthy of respect, since no dialogue is possible without granting the partner the capability of freedom and truth. A dialogue relation leads to social bonds. On one hand, a human being turns to others, while on the other, sympathises with them. It is the search for fraternity. In traditional societies, it is said that breaking the silence is an important step towards mitigating the reaction of hostility and distrust. Openness to dialogue, addressing other people, is an equally important step towards building of social bonds.

A dialogue relation does not mean an exchange in which one party gives and the other receives. To give does not necessarily mean to meet. We can give as much as we wish, remaining anonymous. We believe that in this way we avoid expressions of gratitude and we save time. Entering into real dialogue involves a change, a mutual impact, since the meeting enriches us with a shared experience of being in a dialogue.

Dialogue, resulting from the humanity shared by everybody and manifested through gestures and acts of everyday life, should accompany an approach often described as the “spirit of dialogue”. This attitude is clearly described by Pope Paul VI in his encyclical *Ecclesiam suam* presenting the features of dialogue (Paweł VI, 1964, No. 81–82). These are four characteristics: clarity, meekness, confidence and prudence. Clarity manifests itself first of all in the way of speaking – using an intelligible language, adjusted to the level of listeners. “This fact alone would suffice to make such dialogue rank among the greatest manifestations of human activity and culture. In order to satisfy this first requirement, all of

us who feel the spur of the apostolate should examine closely the kind of speech we use” (No. 81). The second characteristics of dialogue, in the opinion of the Pope, is meekness, which should be combined with humility. “It would indeed be a disgrace if our dialogue were marked by arrogance, the use of bared words or offensive bitterness” (No. 81). Through our meekness, we should made it clear that we need the other, that mutual enrichment is possible, that the difference in living conditions and cultural differences can be reduced to the lowest common denominator, i.e. humanity. The next necessary characteristic is confidence. “Confidence is also necessary; confidence not only in the power of one’s own words, but also in the good will of both parties to the dialogue. Hence, dialogue promotes intimacy and friendship on both sides. It unites them in a mutual adherence to the Good, and thus excludes all self-seeking” (no. 81). The party who places one’s trust in somebody will tell them everything, and the person who is trusted will open their heart to accept the good, which excludes all egoistic attitudes. As the fourth characteristic of dialogue, Paul VI mentions prudence, which is a balanced method for controlling words, which should be adjusted to the listener. “The person who speaks is always at pains to learn the sensitivities of his audience, and if reason demands it, he adapts himself and the manner of his presentation to the susceptibilities and the degree of intelligence of his hearers” (No. 81). Sometimes one should follow a certain internal stimulus, which in some situation requires silence. Those four characteristics, listed *explicite* in the *Ecclesiam suam* encyclical, should be supplemented by the fifth one, namely patience, which results from many other statements. Starting dialogue, we must be aware that it may not end, that it is a continuing process. Patience is always a certain painful experience, a certain type of sacrifice when we resign from looking at the fruit of our dialogue. We hand over the success of our dialogue into God’s hands, since the enterprise will succeed only when God wishes so.

The first meaning of dialogue referred to everyday life, the second one – to a certain internal attitude, while the third one covered a dialogic activity at the institutional level, and in case of religion, it concerns contacts between the responsible Churches and religious organizations. This reality does not directly concern the life of families, but family members derive from the results of those meetings, broadening their knowledge about differences and similarities between religions and the possibilities to lead a shared way of life. It often seems that differences between people coming from different cultures are insurmountable, that they result, first of all, from world view differences based on various models of faith. However, in reality, due to our lack of knowledge, we treat

in the same way religion, social structure, habits and customs, without trying to differentiate one from another. We should look for points of contact where it is really possible. The next paragraph will illustrate the practice of living in the multicultural community.

2. Life sharing practice

When analysing the encounter of a family with cultural diversity, what should be emphasized is its personal character. It is not the family as an institution that encounters different cultural patterns, but members of this family, individual persons: father, mother and children, who meet men and women, also fathers and mothers and children, holding a different concept of a family, a different religion and other customs. To present the possibility of such an encounter, interactions occurring between individual persons must be examined in the first place.

Erwing Goffman points out to the rules governing interactions in everyday life. He considers face saving as the basic rule. Face, according to Goffman, is a positive social value, which a given person expects from others through adoption of a specific attitude during a specific contact. This rule is understood in different ways, depending on the culture. Goffman, focusing on understanding of this rule in western cultures, formulates it as follows: "A person may be said to *have*, or *be in*, or *maintain* face when the line he effectively takes presents an image of him that is internally consistent, that is supported by judgments and evidence conveyed by other participants, and that is confirmed by evidence conveyed through impersonal agencies in the situation" (Goffman E., 1967, p. 6–7).

The difference of cultural norms can lead to misunderstandings resulting from attempts to maintain face by each of the parties. Accepting help may be considered by the recipients to be a loss of face. For a man, it can be a sign or even a proof that he is not able to support his family, that he does not fulfil his basic duties and has to rely on help by other people. For a woman, a refusal can result from cultural norms, which forbid her to take anything from a person who does not belong to her close family.

Goffman indicates some techniques undertaken by an individual in order to maintain face. He describes one of them as follows: "[The person] employs discretion; he leaves unstated facts that might implicitly or explicitly contradict and embarrass the positive claims made by others. He employs circumlocutions and deceptions, phrasing his replies with careful ambiguity so that the others' face is preserved even if their

welfare is not. He employs courtesies, making slight modifications of his demands on or appraisals of the others so that they will be able to define the situation as one in which their self-respect is not threatened” (Goffman E., 1967, p. 16–17).

It is very important to be aware of this technique when meeting representatives of non-European cultures. People from the West are used to formulate direct, straightforward and clear statements, to ask concrete questions, which often evoke a reaction of surprise or even embarrassment of representatives of other culture since they are not used to conversations using such a tone. Their unsure, sometimes evasive, reserved replies will be interpreted as shadiness. Thus, misunderstanding originating from cultural differences leads to the emergence of emotional distrust.

A raised tone of voice expressing irritation can seriously impede the relationship that is developing. Starting a verbal dialogue, we often have specific expectations, we want to convey a message or instructions, to make sure that the message was understood or we want to induce an action or cause discontinuance of behaviour that is unacceptable in our opinion. We want to obtain, by any means, an expected reaction of our interlocutor at a verbal or nonverbal level. It may happen that we will be disappointed, since people from different cultures have other habits and norms for responding in this regard.

In a situation where families from different cultures share the neighbourhood, intercultural interactions are a feature of everyday life. Isolation, mutual ignorance and blindness are impossible. Families of diverse cultural origin experience together various life situations. One of those families may be a Catholic family. It can be surprising that a simple “Good morning” can meet with no response. But has anybody ever asked themselves how to greet in the language of our neighbours in the morning, in the afternoon or in the evening, and what is the expected response to a greeting? Learning their habits, one can better understand their behaviour. Distrust cannot be the platform for common relations as it often leads to slanders and reinforces prejudices. For adults, the only hope seems to be children, who much more easily cross the barriers of distrust, learn the language faster and readily establish contacts – unless it is forbidden by their parents, thus creating a climate of hostility.

It must be emphasized that the closeness of the interpersonal space forces people not to remain indifferent, to bring oneself to openness and risk interaction. This takes place in specific situations, which affect the existing relations. A situational approach has been developed in social

sciences by J. Clyde Mitchell in the context of studies of urban communities (Mitchell J. Clyde, 1987, p. 1–33). A situation can be captured by isolating the events or a set of events to facilitate their consistent analysis. A situation of a social type needs a minimum of the meaning that is *shared by participants*. The actors define the situation and get involved in the emerging interactions. The meaning referred to here can be imposed or agreed upon, depending on the context in which a given situation takes place. This process will be different in a structured space, such as a workplace, school or church, and different in a less structured one (neighbourhood, beach, street). In a multicultural society, what is also important is the cultural background of individuals involved in the relations, which in the given situations can cause unexpected tensions.

Michel Agier distinguishes four types of situations that can be observed in interpersonal relations in the urban environment. These are typical situations, extraordinary situations (occasional or exceptional), transition situations and ritual situations (Agier M. 2015, p. 95). Typical situations introduce two relations: an individual with space and an individual with other persons. They are of a regular nature, they are indispensable and situated (home, office) and concern everyday life. Extraordinary situations, accidental, unexpected or exceptional, concern the relations between the individual and the society. They can mean such events as theft, death, violence, strike or disease. Experienced by every person as a result of coincidence, those situations are of no significance for the society in general, unless they become a subject of a certain minimum of interpretation and communication between persons. A transition situation concerns the movement between home and work, between one's own home and the residence of a member of the family or friends. These are situations of no-places, spaces of solitude, distinguished by the lack of a specific interpersonal relation. On the other hand, ritual situations involve moving away from everyday life, as regulated according to the accepted cultural code. In space that is separated and adjusted for the time of the ritual event, the meeting between individuals and the community is laced with visible and invisible symbols. Generally speaking, such situations can include holidays, dances, carnival or religious rituals – a set of specific relations and identities.

Ritual situations are most favourable in view of carrying out dialogue. Each culture has holidays carrying a strong emotional load and social meaning. Even if a holiday is oriented towards experiencing faith-related events, the social dimension also comes to the fore. During the Muslim Feast of the Sacrifice (*Id al-Adha*), neighbours are given a piece of meat

of the ram killed for this occasion. The neighbours do not have to be Muslims. Christmas for many persons is associated with gifts, which are given to family members. The gesture of sharing the food on the occasion of holiday can be an opportunity to start dialogue. Of course, the Jewish or the Muslim family should not be given sausage or Hindus should not be sent beef, which could be considered a provocation. Therefore, a suggestion arises that it is worth learning the basics of the doctrine and religious practices of our neighbours in order not to commit a blunder. Likewise, it will be easier for us to take a foreign holiday if we know the meaning and the symbolic significance of individual ritual sequences, for instance a racket made by followers of Judaism on the occasion of the Purim holiday is to recall the well-deserved punishment for Haman, prosecutor of the Jews.

Another important ritual situation are feasts related to the lives of individuals. One should not be indifferent to the birth of a child, but also here, we should be sensitive to the cultural code. Even the Polish culture preserves many customs, the heritage of folk beliefs and superstitions, which are aimed at protecting the child against the evil forces, particularly at warding off the evil eye (fastening a red ribbon, refraining from showing the child to strangers, refraining from going out before a baptism, etc.). Similar customs can be practiced by foreigners, and perhaps even with higher intensity. Apart from birth and related events, e.g. circumcision, rituals are necessary during a transition into the adulthood (initiation, bar/bat mitzvah, Jugendweihe, etc.). An important public event is marriage, which can be celebrated even in the company of a few hundred people, who actively participate in preparations for the event. This fact cannot be ignored, but it would be recommended to gather information concerning the expected behaviour of neighbours on such an occasion. Finally, it is worth mentioning the event of death and related ritual situations. In traditional societies, funeral celebrations are of an open, public and obligatory nature. It is impossible to ignore the fact or not to respond according to accepted cultural norms. Expectations on the side of the mourners should be learned, for instance, when to extend one's condolences, before or after the funeral, in the funeral home or at the commentary, whether it should be accompanied with any specific gift, expressions of sympathy in writing, flowers, money, etc.

Typically, any unusual commotion, movement and excitement make us think that something is going on with our foreign neighbours. We seldom make a step forward to find out what has happened, and we hardly ever think about how we should react as good neighbours. Thus, we waste an opportunity to revive dialogue. In view of our seclusion, our ne-

ighbours will not have the courage to approach us and they will not search for an opportunity to establish closer contacts.

Ordinary situations present us with the everyday reality, in which we will try to normally live with neighbours or we will try to reduce our relations to the absolute minimum. They are regarded as polite or not, but nobody asks what politeness means in their culture. Many everyday situations can be bothersome, and apart from that, what is striking is their otherness. It will be evaluated from our point of view through the prism of our sensitivity. As a matter of fact, they would deserve the highest score if they were invisible and inaudible or at least if they behaved as if they were not there. However, we have to realize that the sun shines for every person – and this is only the beginning of a long list of things we share.

One should not be indifferent to extraordinary situations. They require reaction, demand justice and solidarity. A disease or other disasters often have a social dimension. It may be considered God's punishment and become related to a deep sense of guilt. It can also be, depending on the cultural canon, a reason to be ashamed. It is important to realize that although the biological causes of a given disease are the same, regardless of the culture, it can be understood in a totally different way, which has an effect on whether it is regarded as serious or less serious condition. It can be considered ill fate – lot or destiny, out of human control. This determines the manner in which a given person faces the misfortune: with an energetic reaction or indifferent consent. However, in every extraordinary situation one should not refrain from responding – we should remain solidary and act according to expectations, sometimes offering a helpful hand.

Because of their nature, transition situations do not promote dialogue. First of all, their main features are anonymity and flow. Movement is another basic characteristic of such a situation. The absence of attention addressed to the other person, or even sharing the space with different persons, evokes various reactions. This concerns mainly the appearance (for instance, the attire of a Muslim woman walking down the street) and numbers (when more of them gather in one place). Similar situations evoke anxiety, fear of annihilation. Aware of similar reactions, Catholics should primarily see in the other, in his individuality and uniqueness, the other human being, their brother. A small smile, a tiny gesture, a word expressed can relieve the tension and give hope to the possibility of dialogue.

3. Obstacles

The main obstacles for dialogue with others mainly originate from differences at the level of non-verbal communication. In this short article, it is difficult to discuss at least the most fundamental ones. However, I wish to indicate the problem by referring to several examples.

An important element of interpersonal contacts is sensual perception, which can differ depending on the culture. The point is that we usually react spontaneously to sensual experiences, regarding them as familiar or alien, which evoke in us positive or negative associations. They are characterized by a remarkable amount of subjectivity, although some of them can be shared by all members of a given culture.

To be able to accept the other on this basic level, one should acknowledge the difference in sensual experiences and broaden one's own cultural sensitivity. Just like the aesthetic sense can be trained through artistic education, cultural sensitivity should be developed through reflection, experience and will power (See more Pawlik J.J. and Pakuła-Tamou D., 2013, p. 183–196). This is something more than learning the foreign culture. This is about sensitivity to sensual experiences combined with cognition. Contact with a foreign culture provides a perfect opportunity to practice in this regard.

Firstly, we will broaden our visual and auditory abilities. In the first contact, people of other body built and skin colour can distract our attention, or even irritate, yet with deeper cultural sensitivity, they will become "normal", as we cease to pay attention to their external features. They will become legitimate partners of the meeting, as not their appearance, but their thoughts, feelings and concerns will start to matter.

Auditory sensations are also included in the sensitivity domain. A feature of the European culture is clearness of verbal communication, faithfulness to the message, precision of the image. Therefore, it is of high concern to translate important information into all possible languages. Cultural sensitivity manifests itself in responding to sounds. It is not only about understanding, but also about pronunciation, accent, pitch, etc. Some cultures are considered noisy, while a loud response is negatively evaluated by us. Such cultures do not only include African ones, but also Mediterranean cultures, therefore the entire south of Europe. On the other hand, the vibrancy of the Polish language is compared by foreigners to the speech of a child or bird twittering. Nevertheless, we should refrain from making such comparisons, as the boundary between an objective association and the expression of prejudices is very faint.

It is believed that out of all senses, it is most difficult to broaden the smell sensitivity. Although after several minutes the sense of smell does not react to the odour of the environment, getting used to it, yet the initial encounter with the smell of other person can be shocking. Perhaps we will never get used to his smell, but at least it should be remembered that the smell of our body can also be considered by the other person as unpleasant. Differences in smell most frequently originate from the differences in the food consumed. A pungent smell is typically caused by spices and spicy food. It is also worth tasting other cuisines to get acquainted with a broad range of tastes they offer. A lot has been written about the non-verbal communication in various cultures (see e.g. Mikułowski Pomorski J., 2006). although as a matter of fact, each experience, each intercultural contact would deserve a separate study, as it introduces many original elements. A broadened cultural sensitivity is an important condition to maintain and develop dialogue, but, as it has been mentioned, it is just the first step to a fruitful exchange.

The obstacles to dialogue are described in the records of the Roman congregations, quoted at the beginning of the paper and although, as it has been emphasized, the obstacles refer to dialogue as one of the inseparable component of the evangelization of the Church, the remarks presented in the document also apply to the dialogue at the level at which individuals and families belonging to different cultures and/or religions meet. To prove this claim, it is worth quoting the entire fragment of this text:

“Some of the more important obstacles will be mentioned here: [...] a) Insufficient grounding in one’s own faith. b) Insufficient knowledge and understanding of the belief and practices of other religions, leading to a lack of appreciation for their significance and even at times to misrepresentation. d) Socio-political factors or some burdens of the past. e) Wrong understanding of the meaning of terms such as conversion, baptism, dialogue, etc. f) Self-sufficiency, lack of openness leading to defensive or aggressive attitudes. g) A lack of conviction with regard to the value of interreligious dialogue, which some may see as a task reserved to specialists and others as a sign of weakness or even a betrayal of the faith. h) Suspicion about the other’s motives in dialogue. i) A polemical spirit when expressing religious convictions. j) Intolerance, which is often aggravated by association with political, economic, racial and ethnic factors, a lack, of reciprocity in dialogue which can lead to frustration. k) Certain features of the present religious climate, e.g., growing materialism, religious indifference, and the multiplication of religious sects which creates confusion and raises new problems.” (*Dialogue and proclamation*, 1991, No. 53).

The first group of obstacles, i.e. a), b), c) and e) refer to competences. Insufficient grounding in one's own faith gives rise to uncertainty, leads to the reaction of self-defence and rejection, when facing people from different cultures whose faith is strong and who are attached to their religious practices. In everyday situation, this statement applies to the entire domain of culture. Insufficient knowledge of one's own history and national tradition and symbols of culture developed by generations, as well as indifference to related values, make dialogue impossible. In the eyes of the dialogue partners, under cover of the quasi-tolerance, we hide relativism which they do not accept.

Insufficient attachment to one's own culture is paired with unwillingness to meet other cultures, the lack of interest in dissimilarity and stereotypical evaluation of others by using common, negative statements. Such a situation can result from insufficient education, language skills or vocabulary range. Therefore, an important role in promoting and maintaining the dialogue between cultures is played by elites.

The second group of obstacles, i.e. f), g), h), i) i j) concerns attitudes: lack of openness, a defensive and aggressive approach, lack of conviction to the need for dialogue, suspicion, polemical attitude, lack of tolerance, etc. Those inhibitions cannot be overcome without the effort of will and personal involvement. They cannot be eliminated by force. However, a question should be asked whether in the Christian spirit, those negative attitudes should not become an important aim in self-improvement. It is worth emphasizing that a negative attitude towards foreigners cannot be justified by a difficult financial situation, as sharing with those in need results from the great commandment.

Conclusion

When talking about a Catholic family, we have in mind a minimal community directed by evangelical principles. As a domestic Church, it must be ready to take a risk, and the above-mentioned risk is based on a belief that we all are children of God. The appeal of Pope Francis to open doors to refugees results from the great commandment. It is sad to conclude that in such a Catholic country as Poland, it generally draws an insignificant response. Thousands of arguments are given to justify such an approach, yet none of them is stronger than the great commandment. We will remain the anchor of the Church, not by isolating from others, but when, according to the evangelical spirit, we will follow the Apostles and the Samaritan, whom Christ Himself holds up as an example

for us. The solution to the present global situation should be searched for with prudence and sagacity, but what is most alarming, is the attitude of Catholics, which often departs from the spirit of the Gospel.

The issue of intercultural relation presented in this paper shows only chosen examples of meetings based on everyday situations. Each individual contact with foreigners is not only a unique experience, but also an opportunity for enrichment, for verifying one's own cultural beliefs. This does not only refer to knowledge, which can be found in textbooks, but to experience, which will bring results only when the effort of will is involved. Both the features of efficient dialogue (openness, humbleness, spirit of dialogue) and the obstacles (intolerance, suspicion) result from the attitudes exceeding the limits of sheer competence, creating complete, coherent and autonomous personality of a human being. The building of attitudes should result from the belief and, in the case of Catholics, from deep faith.

KATOLICKA RODZINA WOBEC RÓŻNORODNOŚCI KULTUROWEJ

(STRESZCZENIE)

W artykule przedstawiono zagadnienie relacji międzykulturowych na wybranych przez autora przykładach spotkań w codziennych sytuacjach pomiędzy tubylcami żyjącymi w zasadniczo katolickim społeczeństwie, w którym model życia rodzinnego oparty jest o zasady ewangeliczne, a przybyszami, dla których chrześcijańskie wzorce kulturowe są zazwyczaj obce. Autor opracowania dochodzi do wniosku, że każda zachodząca relacja między tymi dwoma podmiotami jest nie tylko wyjątkowym doświadczeniem, ale także okazją do kulturowego wzbogacenia się katolika oraz zweryfikowania przez niego swych przekonań kulturowych. Autor zauważa, że zarówno postawy, które sprzyjają owocnemu kontaktowi (np. otwartość, pokora, duch dialogu), jak i czynniki go utrudniające (np. nietolerancja, podejrzliwość wobec obcych) wynosi się z rodzinnego domu. Stąd należy dołożyć wszelkich możliwych starań, aby młodzi ludzie uczeni byli w rodzinnym domu postaw pożądaných z punktu widzenia właściwie ukształtowanych relacji pomiędzy przedstawicielami różnych kultur. Jednocześnie autor wskazuje, że kierunek działań, jakie powinny zostać podjęte dla ukształtowania przez katolików własnych odniesień do przedstawicieli niekatolickich kultur, wyznacza wiele oficjalnych dokumentów Kościoła rzymskokatolickiego. Jednym z najważniejszych wśród nich jest dokument Papieskiej Rady ds. Dialogu Międzyreligijnego i Kongregacji ds. Ewangelizacji Narodów „Dialog i przepowiadanie” (1991). Sumując przeprowadzone analizy, autor podkreśla, że harmonijne życie w społeczności wielokulturowej nie jest sprawą kompetencji, ale jest uwarunkowane budowaniem – w szczególności już w rodzinnym domu – właściwych postaw, które gwarantują otwartość i empatię wobec innego, a zwłaszcza obcego kulturowo człowieka.

CATHOLIC FAMILY TOWARDS CULTURAL DIVERSITY

(SUMMARY)

The article presents the issue of intercultural relations on, selected by the author, examples of meetings in everyday situations between the natives living in a basically Catholic society, in which the model of family life is based on Gospel principles and visitors for whom Christian cultural patterns are usually foreign. The author of the study concludes that every relationship between these two entities is not only an exceptional experience, but also an opportunity for cultural enrichment of the Catholic and the verification of his cultural convictions. The author notes that attitudes that promote fruitful contact (e.g. openness, humbleness, spirit of dialogue), as well as factors that make it difficult (e.g. intolerance, suspicion towards strangers) have their roots in the family home. Therefore, every effort should be made to ensure that young people are taught at home attitudes desirable from the point of view of well-formed relations between representatives of different cultures. At the same time, the author indicates that the course of action that should be taken to shape Catholics' own references to representatives of non-Catholic cultures, is marked by many official documents of the Roman Catholic Church. One of the most important among them is the document of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue and the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples "Dialogue and Proclamation" (1991). Summing up the analyzes carried out, the author emphasizes that harmonious life in a multicultural community is not a matter of competence, but is conditioned by building up – particularly in the family home – the right attitudes that guarantee openness and empathy towards another, especially a culturally alien person.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agier Michel, 2015, *Anthropologie de la ville*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Dialogue and proclamation. Reflection and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 1991,
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interrelg/documents/rc_pc_interrelg_doc_19051991_dialogue-and-proclamatio_en.html (15.10.2017).
- Goffman Erving, 1967, *Interaction Ritual. Essays on face-to-face behavior*, Aldine Pub. C., Chicago.
- Mikulowski Pomorski Jerzy, 2006, *Jak narody porozumiewają się ze sobą w komunikacji międzykulturowej i komunikowaniu medialnym*, Universitas, Kraków.
- Mitchell J. Clyde, 1987, *The Situational Perspective*, in: J.C. Mitchell, *Cities, Society, and Social Perception. A Central African Perspective*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 1–33.
- Paul VI, 1964, *Ecclesiam suam. Encyclical of Pope Paul VI on the Church*, August 6, 1964, w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam.html (15.10.2017).
- Pawlik Jacek Jan and Dorota Pakuła-Tamou, 2013, *Wychowanie przez sztukę a budowanie wrażliwości międzykulturowej*, in: Jolanta Muszyńska, Tomasz Bajkowski, Wioleta Danilewicz (ed.), *Kompetencje międzykulturowe jako kapitał społeczności wielokulturowych*, Wyd. Akademickie Żak, Warszawa, pp. 183–196.
- Todorov Tzvetan, 1984, *The Conquest of America. The Question of the Other*, Harper and Row, New York.