



LUCJAN KLIMSZA

VŠB-Technical University of Ostrava, Czech Republic

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7514-3813>

## From Pilgrim to Local The Problem of Unity in Postmodern Philosophy

**Abstract:** In this article, the author outlines the problem of unity from the perspective of postmodern philosophy. Basically, unity of the human being is one of the most important problems of philosophy. Ancient philosophers identified human being as identical with citizenship. Man as a citizen of Athens was able to prove his citizenship of Athens by pointing to his ownership of family tombs and fireplace. Medieval philosophy continued the ancient idea but added one new aspect, hope. A medieval man was a citizen of the empire, but at the same time he or she was a citizen of Kingdom of Heaven. He or she was a pilgrim who travelled to God.

Modern philosophy develops unity in an absolutely different way of thinking. First, what we have to know is that unity is a problem. Second, if we would like to solve this problem, it is absolutely necessary to use a new terminology. In this article I emphasize like to highlight the phenomenon of identity through an analysis that the Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman did in the past three decades. He divided a modern man into two categories.

First, Bauman characterized a modern man as a global, very rich and well educated and can invest capital in all countries of the world. The second type is a local. He is a type of modern man who is not necessarily poor, but who is bound to only one place where he resides. The problem of the locals is that they cannot freely travel and invest in their own capital. Locals live in one place, they have not enough power to influence local politics, economy, infrastructure, religions. Globals are able to influence the local community by means of politics, economy, social structures, and religion. Zygmunt Bauman describes the identity of modern man as a tension between locals and globals.

**Keywords:** unity, “global” identity, “local” identity, postmodernity

## Introduction

The ancient idea of *οικουμένη*, developed by Plato, Aristotle, and other philosophers, was a summary of the concept of society's values. It was the idea of a general community of people of different nationalities, cultures, and religions, grouped and unified into a single empire. This idea became an unrealizable illusion at the end of the 4th century AD. Christianity in the Middle Ages tried to revive this idea, yet on a completely different foundation. Christian theology wanted all nations and cultures of Europe to be united by one religion. Only one shepherd was to lead all these nations. However, this shepherd was not to be Christ, but the Holy Church. This medieval idea of a universal and single Christian empire, especially in the Investiture Controversy, proved to be unworkable. Although optimistic at first, these attempts proved to be unfeasible over time. The reason is biblical teaching, at the core of which is embedded an aspect that makes these efforts unworkable.

This aspect can be summarized as follows: The Church has not been established as a political power. Jesus Christ established the Church as a *Communio Sanctorum*. Community of sinners which were saved by the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. There is one more aspect, which characterized medieval human being: awareness of temporality. The medieval man knew that he or she is only a pilgrim on this earth. They were aware they had no permanent place here. Man is here on Earth only temporarily. What applies to the individual can also be applied to supra-individual structures, or empires. Although in this case it was the Christian Kingdom.

The material world, as well as man and his culture, are fleeting. So, the only thing that identifies us as human beings with this place seems to be the old ancient idea of Athens' citizenship: graves and fireplaces. Man is identified with this place of residence, that is, with the graves of his parents and grandparents. Man is identified with this place of residence by his fireplace — the place where he and his descendants live. Neither aspect is sufficient in itself. Graves indicate the origin. They are a testimony of where man came from. Graves and fireplaces unite man with the Earth and society. However, it is not possible to say where one is headed and where one is going. The fireplaces say nothing about where a person came from. Rather, it shows where he is now. However, there is another dimension that old antiquity lacked. Namely, the perspective of hope. In other words, where is one headed.

The Middle Ages and scholastic theology and philosophy brought this perspective. And thus they also gave man a new concept of unity. The size

of a pilgrim has added to the graves and the fireplaces, a man who has his graves, his fireplaces and at the same time is on his way. So, he is heading somewhere. But the idea of direction has changed over time. In the Middle Ages, man turned to God. Following the idea of St. Thomas Aquinas, man is heading for the greatest good, God. That idea conveyed to man awareness where they are from, where they are actually, and where they are going. That idea united man with society, Earth, himself or herself and God.

What has united man as a man in postmodern time? It seems that postmodern man has to be constantly on the move and is also heading somewhere. But that direction is quite different from the medieval movement of the pilgrim who headed for the Kingdom of God. Modernity had purposefully and deliberately many aspects of medieval thought, but what postmodernity really lost is the dimension of hope. Well, at least the eternal hope. No matter how fast a person is, he is still going nowhere. He is moving but he is going nowhere. He is on the trajectory to the point without a goal. Because there is no eternal purpose of life. Only moment in time, relation of pleasantness, only place as geographical points. Without unity and integrity. In the words of Martin Heidegger, man is headed towards death.

## Methodology

In the presented text, we will focus on the paradigm shift, which is characterized by two great periods. We will therefore try to analyze texts, first a scholastic text, and later texts dealing with late modernity. At the same time, we ask ourselves what enabled medieval man to accept the identity of a pilgrim and late-modern man to accept the identity of a local? Therefore, it is an attempt to interpret texts that come from two different periods. Methodologically, we will rely on the analysis of the text and also on the comparison of texts. This comparison, as we assume, will allow us to present two basic paradigms that describe the reality that surrounds us, of which we are a part. It is therefore an interpretation of reality, not a descriptive positivist approach to data collection and analysis.

## Analysis of the pilgrim type

The Middle Ages knew their graves or the places from which man came. He knew his fireplace or the place where it was located. In addition, he knew that he was walking where he was at the time. Christianity has given man a meaningful goal. It could be metaphorically expressed as setting a person in motion. The Kingdom of God became the meaningful destination of the journey. Medieval texts in many forms of this idea seized and worked with it. One of those who expressed this idea comprehensively was St. Anselm of Canterbury. In his work *Proslogion*, he describes God as the highest conceivable good. St. Anselm of Canterbury in his work has written a very important fragment, which draws man's seeking for eternal good:

Alas, I am indeed wretched, one of those wretched sons of Eve, separated from God. What have I begun, and what accomplished? Where was I going and where have I got to? To what did I reach out, for what do I long? I sought after goodness, and lo, here is turmoil; I was going towards God, and I was my own impediment. I sought for peace within myself, and in the depths of my heart I found trouble and sorrow. I wanted to laugh for the joy of my heart, and the pain of my heart made me groan. It was gladness I was hoping for, but sighs came thick, and fast.<sup>1</sup>

In this fragment, St. Anselm of Canterbury unveiled the very fundamental concern of medieval man. Another philosopher and theologian who further developed this idea was Thomas Aquinas, the preeminent representative of scholasticism. In his *opus magnum*, *Summa theologiae*, he reflects on what it means to be a good person and a citizen:

Et quia homo secundum suam naturam est animal politicum, virtutes huiusmodi, prout in homine existunt secundum conditionem suae naturae, politicae vocantur, prout scilicet homo secundum has virtutes recte se habet in rebus humanis gerendis. Secundum quem modum hactenus de his virtutibus locuti sumus.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. CANTENBURY: *Proslogion*. 1, 85—90.

<sup>2</sup> St. T. AQUINO: *Summa Theologica*. [36093] I<sup>a</sup>-IIae q. 61 a. 5 co. The author of the article translated this fragment into English as: "Because man is inherently a social creature, virtues occur in him in harmony with his nature, and they adopt the name of civic virtue, as they allow man to take the right attitude toward society. These virtues differ from each other. Namely, some of them concern pilgrims who want to be like God." Cf. Polish translation: Św. TOMASZ Z ARWINU: *Suma Teologiczna*. 11, p. 93.

The idea of the national identity of man as a member of the nation state, as we understand this idea today, was absolutely unknown to scholastic thought. A member of the nation was understood to have been a member of the Holy Roman Church. However, it would be a mistake to view medieval man as individual who feels uprooted, both socially and economically, let alone religiously. Although, thanks to St. Thomas Aquinas, we can liken a medieval man to a pilgrim, we must say that this pilgrim was deeply united with community in which he lived, to the political and economic relations in which he grew up, and with the religion of his time. He saw himself as a citizen of the world, traveling with the whole Church of Christ to the Kingdom of God. At the same time, he understands the Church as a temporary home, which is still an imperfect type of the eternal one. The pilgrim is led by the desire to pilgrimage with the whole Holy and United Church into the Kingdom of God. Yet, the pilgrim does not become a stranger and alienated from the world. Pilgrim was still a member of society and felt more integrated with society, because society had the same goal as he or she had.

St. Thomas Aquinas refers in this context to St. Augustine and other representatives of the patristic and scholastic tradition. He identifies the man with a member of the Church. Even better, he identifies him with the morality; the morality of a pilgrim who travels with the Holy Church. The identity of medieval man was created by connecting the ethos of a pilgrim who travels the world with the ethos of a citizen or, even better, the ethos of a member of a certain kingdom. However, it can be argued here that the pilgrim does not feel any lasting connection with the world, because what the pilgrim is heading towards is his destination and sees the journey only as a temporary home. However, this objection is unfounded. For a pilgrim who rejected the world, would have to define this world before having rejected the world as a permanent home. He would have to find reasons to reject it. So, he had to justify why he had not considered this world his permanent home and why he was on his way. That is, he had to understand the world and interpret that understanding as well. This presupposes an essential connection to the world. Similarly, St. Aurelius Augustine writes: “We must enjoy this world (*uti*), not enjoy it (*frui*), only then will we be able to understand the invisible things of God (*invivibilia Dei*) and see them through created things, that is, to attain eternal spiritual values through bodily early things.”<sup>3</sup> What reasons led the pilgrim to reject the world as a permanent place to dwell?

The world is not a permanent residence for two reasons. The first is the very nature of the material world, which is impermanent and change-

---

<sup>3</sup> A. AUGUSTINUS: *Křesťanská vzdělanost*. Praha: Kalich, 2004, p. 50.

able. The second reason is human mortality. Therefore, nothing has duration, and nothing in this world is eternal. Therefore, the pilgrim does not reject the world as such. However, he refuses to grant absolute status to this world.

There is another reason why the pilgrim did not find a permanent place in this world. However, this reason is different from the previous ones. This is due to the understanding of the earthly church. St. Thomas Aquinas distinguished the eternal church, which is a type of the earthly church. The Church of the Earth is, in Thomistic philosophy, a traveling church, a church of pilgrims. *Respondeo dicendum quod homo in statu vitae istius constitutus, est quasi in quadam via, qua debet tendere ad patriam.*<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the forerunner of the earthly church is the heavenly church. Thomas Aquinas writes that after the resurrection of all the dead, the earthly church will be united with the church of heaven. We could interpret this fragment as meaning that the church is not connected to the country, culture, and nation. So, it does not fuse with the world in which it lives because it is the church of pilgrims, not the inhabitants or citizens of this world. This interpretation is also hinted on in other places of the *Summa theologiae*. For example, St. Thomas calls the goal of the Christian path the *heavenly homeland*.<sup>5</sup> Homeland, as indicated by St. Thomas, is understood as the Kingdom of God. That is a good, of course, but still not the highest good. The Kingdom of God is good, for the highest good, which is God, dwells in his Kingdom.

The Thomistic philosophy is based on two basic sources. The first is the Holy Scriptures, and the second is Aristotle's philosophy. Let us start with this philosophy. Thomas Aquinas knew Aristotle's work as he interpreted it himself and dedicated many of his works to him. These also include the *Nicomachean Ethics*. St. Thomas dedicated his own work, namely *Sententia libri ethicorum*, to it and therein he commented on Aristotle's book.<sup>6</sup> It follows from Aristotle's introduction to all ethics, confirming that all one's thinking and actions are directed to a certain good.<sup>7</sup> If all human activity is for good, then that good must be the highest good. This is God for Thomas Aquinas. Man's highest wellbeing is looking at God, writes St. Tomas in his greatest work.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> ST. T. AQUINO: *Summa Theologica*. [33158] I<sup>a</sup> q. 113 a. 4 co.: "Man in earthly life is on the path on which he should go to his heavenly homeland." Compare with the Polish translation: Św. TOMASZ z AKWINU. *Suma Teologiczna*. 8, p. 86.

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem,

<sup>6</sup> ST. T. AQUINO: *Corpus Thomisticum. Sententia libri ethicorum*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Ibidem, Lib. 1, 1, 8.

<sup>8</sup> ST. T. AQUINO: *Summa Theologica*. [33158] I<sup>a</sup> q. 113 a. 4 co. Cf. the Polish translation: Św. TOMASZ z AKWINU: *Suma Teologiczna*. 8, p. 86.

If God is the highest good, then it means that whoever follows the good goes to God. Such a person naturally becomes good and lives well. The reason for the pilgrimage to God is the pilgrim's desire to dwell with God. At the same time, St. Thomas mentions the good that comes from this pilgrimage to God. Man becomes virtuous and lives well on Earth.<sup>9</sup> The pilgrimage to God makes man virtuous, but these virtues are not self-serving. In contrast, these virtues mean that man lives well and therefore manages the Earth and completes the Earth. Paradoxically, the pilgrim thus becomes a benefit to the land through which he passes. At the same time, the unity that comes from the desire to dwell with God shapes the pilgrim's unity in a creative way in relation to the land he is walking on. Therefore, we can call this unity an axiological unity. Man is connected to the Earth because the pilgrimage to the Kingdom of God shapes him in the image of God. Although one does not feel at home here, one creates a home. Although he does not feel that he is the master over the world, it is the world that rules. Although he is a guest on this land, he takes care of the land. Although he meets other pilgrims, he is a brother to them. He feels gratitude for everything because everything is his gift.

Thus, we encounter paradoxes. On the one hand, there is a pilgrim in the world, and he desperately needs the world. On the other hand, the pilgrim only goes through this world. On the one hand, the pilgrim is responsible for this world. On the other hand, he is aware that all the values he professes come from the world he is just heading into. On the one hand, he is guided by the love of God. On the other hand, he proves this love to God by his love for this world. Rather, to people, that is, to responsible civic life. The medieval man lived on earth knowing that he was not alone. He lived on earth knowing that God was near him. Therefore, even more intensely and with greater responsibility, he turned to the country where he was walking and was grateful for it. It depended on how he lived on this earth.

## Analysis of the local type

The foundations of the modern society in which we live lie in modern and the Enlightenment philosophy. In the Enlightenment philosophy, man tried to emancipate him- and herself, and in the end, as Friedrich Nietzsche points out, they finally succeeded. Faith and hope died at the

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibidem.

moment of Nietzsche's cry that "God is dead". But the present, as Theodor Adorno indicates, is the opposite of not the Middle Ages, but of the Enlightenment. Although one has lost one's Christian identity in the name of another identity, one cannot clearly define that identity precisely.

Contemporary literature, not only philosophical, but also sociological, economic or political, defines the contemporary world as a *globalized* one. To define a person's identity, we should start with this concept. As soon as we look for an answer to the question of what globalization really is, we immediately face difficulties. One of the first difficulties is the historical definition of the globalization process. The solid historical caesurae of globalization can be established as follows:

- the first period of globalization dates from the first half of the 19th century to the First World War;
- the second period of globalization starts with the second half of the 20th century and is still in progress until now.<sup>10</sup>

Both periods are completely divergent from each other. While the first period of globalization is characterized by the interconnection of world trade, capital markets, and the integration of the transcontinental labour market,<sup>11</sup> the second phase is fundamentally different. It is initially linked to post-World War II reconstruction and trade interconnection, with capital market interconnection reaching pre-World War I levels only in 1980. As Elsenhans claims: "Globalization has not been and is not an ongoing process or form."<sup>12</sup> Additionally, the second phase of globalization can be divided into smaller units. Therefore, we should ask whether it is in fact possible to create a single generalized definition of a globalized world.

Among the definitions that describe globalization from an economic point of view are the following: "It means the introduction of a division of labor on a global scale. It is the result of the oversaturation of domestic markets, which leads to new outlets, the use of new or cheaper material and human resources, and the allocation of capital in the territories that offer the most favourable conditions."<sup>13</sup> This very strict definition takes into account only the production of goods and their exchange. Globalization can be interpreted as a set of economic tools that serve to increase efficiency in the production and distribution of goods. Globalization, as this definition implies, serves humans. This immense advantage is underlined by "such [...] benefits of international trade as cooperation, mutual knowledge, tolerance, the use of capable people, regardless of nationality,

<sup>10</sup> H. ELSENHANS: "Globalizace, nacionalismus a stabilita předválečných systémů." In: W. DEMEL: *Dějiny světa*. Praha 2013, p. 263.

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem, p. 263.

<sup>12</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>13</sup> P. HORVÁTHOVÁ: *Základy managementu*. Ostrava 2013, p. 66.

for foreign investors.”<sup>14</sup> The author is aware of the pros of a globalized world. There are also downsides: “The downsides of globalization, such as the degeneration of national cultures, the unification of countries, the threat to the environment, local unemployment, the weakening of the influence of national cultures, and the emergence of unexpected financial crises.”<sup>15</sup> While the pros can be expressed through economic categories such as trade, cooperation, jobs, then the disadvantages of a globalized world can be captured through non-economic categories such as degeneration of cultures, destruction of the environment, and weakening of cultures.

If we pay attention to the negative aspects of the globalized world, then most of the negative aspects will concern primarily cultures, national minorities, simply put, cultural, religious, nationalities of human identity. At this point, it is necessary to explain why we started talking about human identity, starting with the general concept of globalization. The globalized world cannot escape, this world will overtake every human being, and it is not in the power of an individual to escape the process of globalization. Zygmunt Bauman put it this way: “We are all globalized, regardless of gender, age, race, religion, economic or social security. The only question is whether we are among those for whom globalization means the realization of the ideal of freedom, the so-called globals at the top of today’s world, or, conversely, those for whom the process of globalization has triggered a bleak vision of leaving the local community without being welcome anywhere else — the so-called local.”<sup>16</sup> Bauman admits that globalization affects everyone, without exception.

Let us now turn our attention to the term that Zygmunt Bauman uses — local. It concerns a person who lives in a certain territory to which his house, work, family, friends, and also a certain nationality, tradition, culture bind him. To that extent, it can be stated that such an average person is no different from a person at the beginning of the 20th century. But in a globalized world, this person feels this in a different way. The superpersonal institutions that served man to define his own identity have now lost their influence on the formation of the country’s politics, economy, and culture. Because these roles have been taken over by multinational organizations and companies. Tomá Katrák writes about this in a political science magazine: “In a globalized world, power is far from politics, and politics is far from it. It is a situation in which locals are doomed to choose individual solutions to their problems, even at the cost

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem, p. 66.

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>16</sup> T. KATRÁK: “Rev. of: Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalizace: Důsledky pro člověka.*” *Politologický časopis* 1 (2000), pp. 80—82.

of not being able to pinpoint the causes of their problems and to control the breadth of the context of their solutions, which can bring new problems of a much more threatening nature.”<sup>17</sup> Hence, a local is a person who cannot escape the globalized world but who forms the place of his life that the globalized world offers. Globalization forms the place in which a local resides, without the local being able to influence how this place of his residence will be formed. He is imprisoned in one place, paradoxically at a time that demands mobility. When a local has to leave the place in which he resides, he is forced to do so, he does not leave of his own free will. The local is the opposite of the global, which in turn uses all the possibilities of global time-space interconnection.

This term, time-space interconnection, is a term derived from Anthony Giddens, from the book *Modernity and Self-Identity*. In his book, Giddens points to the rupture of traditional ties to place and time that have shaped local communities and nations for many centuries. With modernity comes a whole new kind of human identity. This identity of modern man is expressed by the financial possibilities of self-realization, regardless of place and time. Bauman describes this paradigm shift as follows: “Our civilization is the first culture in history that does not value the permanent, the first civilization that has been able to cut lives into a series of episodes without any consequences and possible commitments [...]. No people have ever inhabited, in a territory that human civilizations of the past considered uninhabitable.”<sup>18</sup> The movement in space, the use of time compression, the constant change of jobs, the formation of career, all this characterizes the modern person. However, only if he has sufficient education, financial resources, and frees himself from traditional structures. The present, which we can call in various ways, is characterized by the uprooting of all Christian values, without the possibility of rooting. We live in a time of uprooting without the possibility of rooting.

## Conclusions

The Enlightenment, which defined itself in opposition to the Middle Ages by wanting to emancipate man, re-create individuals, and give man a new identity, turned into the opposite of the words of Theodor Adorno. This contrast is modernity, or post-modern society. To define the cur-

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibidem, p. 81.

<sup>18</sup> Z. BAUMAN: *Individualizovaná společnost*. Praha 2004, p. 290.

rent concept of human identity in such a post-modern society, we must describe the paradigm shift.

The medieval man was aware that his life on earth was limited in time. So he invented an identity that gave his life a completely unique meaning. The identity of a medieval man was given his hope for eternal life in the Kingdom of Heaven. However, he could not live only in anticipation of the coming of this kingdom, and therefore all his earthly activity was determined by his belief that whatever good he did on earth would be rewarded in heaven. His relationship with the earth, nature, society, people, and, after all, also with himself was shaped by his faith in eternal life with God. Thomas Aquinas literally says that a person approaching God becomes like God, and his deeds on earth are good. So we are facing a paradox. Although the medieval man is aware of his mortality and his life on this earth can be compared to a pilgrimage, yet this pilgrim feels a strong bond to the earth and lives as well as he can. Because he has hope. He is rooted in it and lives from it. We will characterize such an approach with the words: Being towards life.

Martin Heidegger judged that modern man is best described in terms of being towards death. What led Heidegger to such a radical assessment? In his most famous work, *Being and Time*, he asks what we live on. He answers just as radically; we live on our own, and since we are moving towards death and have no hope as human beings, we are necessarily moving towards a radical end, or death. Heidegger rejects hope. After Heidegger, the modern man is a man uprooted from all the hope.<sup>19</sup>

## Bibliography

- ANSELM OF CANTERBURY: *Proslogion. Harmondsworth*. Penguin, 1983.
- AURELIUS A: *Křesťanská vzdělanost*. Praha: Vyšehrad, 2005.
- BAUMAN Z.: *Individualizovaná společnost*. Trans. M. RITTER. Praha: Mladá fronta, 2004.
- BIBLE, *Písmo svaté Starého a Nového zákona včetně deuterokanonických knih. Český ekumenický překlad*. Praha: Česká biblická společnost, 1996.
- ELSENHANS H.: "Globalizace, nacionalismus a stabilita předválečných systémů." In: *Dějiny světa*. Ed. W. DEMEL. Praha 2013.
- GIDDENS A.: *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self nad Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- HEIDEGGER M.: *Bytí a čas*. Praha: OIKOYMENH, 1996.

<sup>19</sup> M. HEIDEGGER: *Bytí a čas*. Praha 1996.

- HORVÁTHOVÁ P.: *Základy managementu*. Ostrava: VŠB-TU Ostrava, 2013.
- KATRŇÁK T.: “Rev. of: Zygmund BAUMAN *Globalizace: Důsledky pro člověka*.” *Politologický časopis* 1 (2000), pp. 80—82.
- ŚW. TOMASZ Z AKWINU: *Suma teologiczna*. London: Veritas, 1963.

#### Web sources

- SANCTI TOMAE DE AQUINO: *Corpus Thomisticum. Sententia libri ethicorum*. Available at: <http://www.corpusthomicum.org/ctc0104.html> (access: 16.05.2022).

LUCJAN KLIMSZA

### Entre l'idée d'un pèlerin et d'un local. Le problème de l'unité dans la philosophie postmoderne

#### Résumé

Dans cet article, l'auteur souhaite esquisser le problème de l'unité du point de vue de la philosophie. L'unité de l'homme est l'un des problèmes les plus importants de la philosophie en général. Les anciens philosophes identifiaient l'homme à la citoyenneté. Un homme en tant que citoyen d'Athènes a pu prouver qu'il était citoyen d'Athènes, qu'il avait des tombes familiales et des cheminées. La philosophie médiévale a continué l'idée ancienne, mais a ajouté un nouvel aspect - l'espoir. L'homme médiéval était un citoyen de l'empire, mais en même temps, il était un citoyen du Royaume des Cieux. C'était un pèlerin qui se rendait à Dieu. La philosophie contemporaine développe l'unité d'une tout autre façon de penser. Premièrement, nous devons savoir que l'unité est un problème. Deuxièmement, si nous voulons résoudre ce problème, il est absolument nécessaire d'utiliser une nouvelle terminologie. Dans cet article, nous voudrions souligner l'identité du phénomène à travers l'analyse que le sociologue polonais Zygmunt Bauman a menée au cours des trois dernières décennies. Le chercheur divise l'homme moderne en deux catégories : le premier type d'homme moderne caractérisé par Bauman est le type global. C'est un type d'homme moderne très riche et bien éduqué, capable d'investir des capitaux dans tous les pays du monde. Le second est le type local. Un local est un type d'homme moderne, pas nécessairement pauvre, mais attaché à l'endroit où il habite. Le problème des locaux est qu'ils ne peuvent pas voyager librement et investir dans leur propre capital. Les habitants vivent au même endroit, ils n'ont pas assez de pouvoir pour influencer la politique locale, l'économie, les infrastructures, les religions. Les mondialistes peuvent influencer la communauté locale par la politique, l'économie, les structures sociales et la religion. Zygmunt Bauman décrit l'identité de l'homme moderne comme une tension entre le Local et le Global.

**Mots-clés:** unité, identité «globale», identité «locale», postmodernité

---

LUCJAN KLIMSZA

## Tra l'idea di un pellegrino e di un locale. Il problema dell'unità nella filosofia postmoderna

### Abstract

In questo articolo, l'autore vuole delineare il problema dell'unità dal punto di vista della filosofia. L'unità dell'uomo è uno dei problemi più importanti della filosofia in generale. I filosofi antichi identificavano l'identità dell'uomo alla sua cittadinanza. Un uomo come cittadino di Atene fu in grado di dimostrare di essere cittadino di Atene, di avere tombe di famiglia e caminetti. La filosofia medievale ha continuato l'idea antica, ma ha aggiunto un nuovo aspetto - la speranza. L'uomo medievale era cittadino dell'impero, ma allo stesso tempo era anche cittadino del Regno dei Cieli. Era un pellegrino in cammino verso Dio. La filosofia contemporanea sviluppa l'unità nel modo di pensare completamente diverso. Innanzitutto, dobbiamo sapere che l'unità è un problema. In secondo luogo, se vogliamo risolvere questo problema, è assolutamente necessario utilizzare una nuova terminologia. In questo articolo si vorrebbe sottolineare l'identità del fenomeno attraverso l'analisi che il sociologo polacco Zygmunt Bauman ha condotto negli ultimi tre decenni. Lo studioso ha distinto due aspetti dell'identità dell'uomo moderno: il primo tipo di uomo moderno caratterizzato da Bauman è il tipo globale. Questo è il tipo di uomo moderno, molto ricco e ben istruito, capace di investire capitali in tutti i paesi del mondo. Il secondo è il tipo locale. Il locale è un tipo di uomo moderno, non necessariamente povero, ma legato al luogo in cui vive. Il problema dei locali è che non possono viaggiare liberamente e investire nel proprio capitale. Il locale vive in un posto, non ha abbastanza potere per influenzare la politica, l'economia, le infrastrutture, le religioni locali. I globalisti possono influenzare la comunità locale attraverso la politica, l'economia, le strutture sociali e la religione. Zygmunt Bauman descrive l'identità dell'uomo moderno come una tensione tra Locale e Globale.

**Parole chiave:** unità, identità "globale", identità "locale", postmodernità