

Ethical Integration in Global Communication Processes in the Context of John Paul II's Thought

Michał Drożdż, Professor, Pontifical University of John Paul II in Kraków

1. INTRODUCTION

I intend to speak about ethical integration issues in global communication processes in the context of the thought of great Pope John Paul II. John Paul II was a man who re-opened the Church to the media and who – to a very large extent – contributed to the opening of the media to the Church in the contemporary world of global communication. This mutual opening was possible thanks to the basic ethical principles of respect paid to every human being and care for common good. Mention should be made here about the message of the last document by John Paul II, that is, his apostolic letter on the media, *The Rapid Development*, from 24 January 2005. The letter can be interpreted as a special sign making one think of the last will; it is thus a hope message for the future of media civilisation. It emphasizes the opportunity which the media create for development of human civilisation. It shows that the life and activity of the human being in the epoch of global communication must necessarily take into account the fact that the world of the media is also our world in which the world of essential human values must be incessantly built and enhanced. John Paul II would endlessly remind us that ethical reflection in the context of globalization must rest upon two inseparably connected principles. First, upon the inalienable value of the human being, who is the source of all and any human rights and social order. Second, upon the value of all human cultures, which can be ignored or destroyed by no outside authority. Globalization cannot be a new form of colonialism. It must respect the multitude of cultures, which – existing in the framework of universal harmony of nations – provide, as it were, different interpretation keys to human existence.

The title of my paper: *Ethical integration in global communication processes in the context of John Paul II's thought*, approaches the theme of our Conference from the perspective of media ethics. The postulate that in the world of global communication every human being should be treated as subject is the basic postulate

of media ethics, the aim of which is to protect the value and dignity of the human being in the media. Such was John Paul II's basic message to the contemporary media world.

Globalisation processes tend to be perceived as negative phenomena of the contemporary world. It is no doubt that the dynamics of the development and influence of the media is consolidating as well as expanding the processes. They should, however, be perceived as an opportunity for the development of the individual and of society, which provides a perspective that reveals their negative impact. Such perception is possible thanks to the inclusion of the ethical perspective in the evaluation of contemporary phenomena. The basic task of ethics in the technological culture and information society is to show and shape the ethos of human communication and media activities. Ethics demonstrates the media ethos as an appropriate symptom of human rationality. Human rationality is the foundation of the ethics of the media both as a point of departure and as the basic evaluative criterion. It would be difficult to speak about the awareness of action and about ethical responsibility were the rationality platform to be rejected. If ethical judgment is to be genuine, authentic, right and responsible, it must lean upon a certain and solid foundation of the truth about the human being. The truth about the human being provides objective information about his/her rationality; it opens up a passage to get to know his/her interior; last but not least, it creates the foundation of the human being's deeds and actions (cf. Wojtyła 1969, p32). The aim of the present study is to show the integrative role of the ethics of the media in the space of public communication in the face of the challenge posed by globalisation processes. Ethical integration is perceived as an attempt to put together the mediasphere which is understood as a whole of human actions in the media space. An attempt will be made to demonstrate the possibility of personalisation of media globalisation processes via the integrational role of the ethics of the media. In the contemporary culture, the media fulfill various functions, realize various aims, integrating as well as disintegrating social relations and bonds, and the interior world of the human being. The individual undertakes various media activities and fulfills himself in very many media spaces in which there are disintegration, fragmentation, pluralization, destructive globalisation processes and the like. All these processes actively and dynamically shape man's living active environment, positively and negatively affecting the sphere of morality and the human ethos. It seems that the basic task of the ethics of the media is to support any and every process integrating both an individual human being and any community and society. It will be possible only when there is a basic unquestionable integration platform. A thesis will be put forward and substantiated in the present analysis that it is the human being and his value and dignity that may and should be such a universal integrative platform. The human being is and can be the integration plane within various anthropological, social, culture, psychological and technological levels. The axiological-ethical level appears to be the most important from the perspective of man's and community's welfare. At the same time it builds the foundation of all activities related to media education.

2. GLOBALISATION AS INTEGRATIVE „WORLDS MERGER”

In philosophy there is an idea of systemic thought in which diversity of things gets “melted”– via participation – in a culture whole, in one integrated system of the world. In categories of positive integration thinking lies also at the foundation of the ethics of the media, which by its nature is a knowledge and force capable of integrating an individual in media activities. To put it briefly, ethics ought to integrate a person, moral values and norms, thus serving a full development of the human being. This development, however, is impossible without a communicative openness of a human being onto the surrounding world. Communication ought to integrate man with himself and with the world. It is by no means an easy process, since the diversity of the outside world is so immense that the human individual, or better still, whole communities can easily get lost in it. It does not mean, however, that the alternative of such a communicative opening is formed by a self-closure and isolation; on the contrary, the alternative is to shape communication and its conditions in such a way as to make them play the integrative role for man. The functioning of ethics enters the shaping of personal determinants of communication. It should rely upon a genuine picture of the world, in which man acts. Contrary, too, it is ethical normativeness and an accepted world of values that are decisive when it comes to a given “perception of the world.” „Is ethics dependent on or rather independent of a world outlook?” – H. Elzenberg asks – and the question is still up to date. By saying „ethics” I distinctly understand here the content of ethics and not, for instance, a belief in it (strength of conviction, of motivation) or ethics’ authority, or factual morality dependent on sanctions. The content of ethics means the content of professed moral norms and judgments. By saying „world outlook”, I understand it to mean the world we picture to ourselves, our true or false assumptions about the world. Thus, for instance: does the content of ethics become different depending on whether or not one believes in a personal God; or: in the case of a pantheist, whether or not one believes in the evolution according to Spencer and Darwin; or: in a fully deterministic history?” (Elzenberg 1991, p. 270). Needless to say, a world outlook determines the shape of ethics and the foundations of ethical value judgments, and conversely; this mutual interdependence, however, creates an integral activity and evaluation platform inasmuch as it is based upon the truth about reality.

It may be said that every single individual has his inner and outer world (cf. Apel 2003, pp. 24-71).¹ The term „world” possesses a dynamics of generality. The world of man is both the world of nature and of

¹ „Each individual nowadays has a world of their own; he lives by this world, creating it, cognizing it, changing it and using it. An individual enjoying good health has no need to pose questions about the world of suffering. Postmodernist poetry is somewhat a way of looking for relief, counterbalance and escape away from mania of doubt. But the afflicted tend to grow in number, which is why we can, in the interest of health, pose a question: what is the state of affairs when it comes to human thought investigating morality and what are the principles of preserving good in our world?” (Apel 2003, p. 24).

culture. It is the world of technology and strictly connected with it the world of the media, the world of values and duties, the world of communication and relations. It is joined by the interior world of every individual: the world of convictions and beliefs, of accepted values, the world of responsibilities as well as the world of desires, aims and goals, the positive and negative world, the world of illusion, the world of coercion and oppression, the world of evil and the like. This is the world in which an individual makes choice, in which he acts, communicates and participates in media activities. What is more, each of the „worlds” affects the world of the media; and, conversely, the media, which are man-made construct after all, cover the same reality that an individual discovers and communicates to others. The presence and functioning of the media enhances and expands the diversity of images of the world, creating a mosaic of new media worlds. Accordingly, an individual lives at the crossroads of many worlds; what is more, he lives in an area that is shared by and common to a lot of worlds. It is an individual himself that marks out the shared area of many worlds; in a sense, he is the very area. The media are a battlefield of a very sublime struggle for the quality of that human world. In reality, however, it is a struggle for human entity or, to put it in another language, for human souls and control; over them (cf. Howiecki 1993, pp. 103-123). This is a struggle for an individual and his inner world. A fundamental question is thus raised: since every single individual is a „specific world” and since culture comprises a diversity of many „subjective worlds”, is it at all possible to have one „concise world” created out of these elements, or to have at least a universal image of such a world? Answering such questions generates different answers; they have to be different on account of the generality and vagueness of the term „world” as well as the diversity of facets and dimensions of the issue in question. The question brings to mind an aporia around which various attempts at answering are being shaped. Some perceive the world through the prism of unifying processes and speak about globalisation or universalisation of the world. Others show the reality in a fragmentary way and preach the praise of any individualisation, subjectivisation and fragmentation processes as well as regard the tendency to get the reality universalised and objectivised as marks of the dominance of destructive rationality. Regardless of various perspectives of evaluation of the phenomenon of universalisation and objectivisation of the reality, it seems that the very issue of good and evil in the world forces a universal attitude and an attempt at integrating, “bringing together” many worlds within the confines of ethics where good becomes real. Ethics can and has to integrate what is universal in ethics with what is subjective and individual; it can and has to integrate the multiplicity of worlds against the background of the human being and truth concerning reality which is revealed in the conscience of the human being.

The world presented in the media is very rich, diverse and interconnected with a lot of other worlds, the real world, with mental worlds of creators and recipients as well as with worlds of culture that comprise objectified forms of experience, knowledge and convictions (cf. Zajdel 2003, pp. 49-56). An individual participating in the media communication, especially a recipient of media messages, deals with a diversity of worlds, which requires of him good orientation skills so that he will be able to distinguish reality from

illusion, truth from falsehood, objectivity from subjectivity, reality itself from its representation, good from evil, etc. An individual is thus the subject, a sui generis platform where different worlds meet. The unity and integrity of a personal subject enable in the individual a unifying and integrating platform for the diversity of the worlds. It is in that diversity that the individual discovers common elements that he is capable of integrating with his own personal world. Such integration is possible via truth and on account of the good of the individual. The individual cannot consciously and rationally integrate contradictory worlds. A consequence of such activity would always be an interior disintegration of the individual.

The perspective of the truth and good takes us onto the ethical platform, where it is possible to „amalgamate” worlds in consideration of good, their diversity, difference and other conditions of functioning being preserved. It has to be noticed that integration via good within the platform of the value of an individual is by no means a reductionism or isolationism. or neutralisation; neither is it a unification or association or equation. A unity in which one of its elements is reduced to another is destructive, false in its promise of harmony, and it destroys in consequence the integrity of its own components. The integration within the platform of an individual will never become destructive as long as it remains fully personal and rational as it will mean a creation of unity preserving diversity instead of reduction of diversity to unity. Only on the grounds of the rationality of a human being do various media worlds stand a chance of fulfilling their positive roles as carriers of the whole rich amount of values and information. The adjuster of such integration may only be the moral area because the criterion of good which is based on truth is the ultimate determinant of values and usefulness of the integrated worlds for the man. The purpose of the integration is continuously enriching an individual in new values and the cognition of truth.

The ethics of the media which serves enriching an individual by means of “world merger” also contributes to an integration of the whole media culture rather than to its fragmentation, and to an integration of communities rather than their disintegration. The integration of the media culture aims to build a fundamental unity on the plane of good, preserving at the same time the identity, differentiation and autonomy of various worlds that co-create the media culture space. Such integration serves the purpose of enriching various areas of media coverage, of elevating communities and individuals as well as dynamic exchange and communication of positive values. The term „enriching” refers here to the processes of good being carried out, truth and beauty being revealed, various values taking hold and being communicating. The major problem in the integration is the quality and value of the worlds being covered by the media. Their diversity is bound up also with their various ethical value because of the values or anti-values being communicated. A task of ethics is not only to inspire, assist and model the integration processes of various media worlds in an individual, but – above all – to shape individuals’ media activities so that the reality of media coverage that they create can be a carrier of good.

In discussions with various media theories the personalist concept of the media firmly emphasizes the role and the significance of the real world in relation to various media worlds understood as images, reflections and phantoms of reality, and in relation to possible and impossible worlds (Żegleń 1990, pp. 129-135; Zajdel 2003, pp. 49-56).² Possible worlds are either a definite set of language modal expressions (the linguistic aspect), contain elements that can or could have taken place (the elemental aspect) or make up a set of certain possible cognitive situations (the epistemic aspect) (Zajdel 2003, pp. 50-54). Impossible worlds comprise states, elements and cognitive situations that can never take place. Some theoreticians of the media attempt to introduce the term of the current worlds regardless of whether it is a real or media world, possible or impossible; what is important is that it is current, which is to say that states of things that occur in it are given currently, that is, at a given moment. It means that the world of a film during the film's screening is a current world. There is no point asking whether a given state of affairs could actually happen in the real world. It takes place in a world that is entirely legitimate as compared to the real world. What is generated then is not a *universum* of possible but current worlds". The media *de facto* bring up to date all possible worlds using fiction, illusion, simulation or creating a virtual world. Reducing the world only to a current state of affairs and to a current perception of continuously altering and updated media images obliterates the borderline between reality and its image, thus making it difficult for man to uncover the truth about reality.

The introduction of the criterion of being up-to-date as the only criterion to pass judgments concerning the authenticity and reality of the media world is insufficient since it alienates an individual from the real world as well as from the truth about the objective moral order; it also implies and simulates at the same time the authenticity of the media-created values. Meanwhile, the difference between the real and the media worlds is so essential that their genuine integration is possible only on the grounds of the identity and rationality of an individual. Undermining the identity and rationality of an individual *de facto* rids him of the possibility of uncovering the truth about the world and of "merging the worlds" for his own good and the good of society. New media technologies significantly contribute to the destruction of the identity of a subject in the contemporary media culture. By means of a rich repertory of possibilities, they expose "the possibility of identity creation and dispersion as well as the dominant form of its disciplinary measure, that is, the trend functioning in consumption societies in accordance with the following 'rule': 'no principles, choices only, everybody can be everybody else', which is to say that everybody can experience (buy) lots of 'I's', easily intercept the role and views of 'you', disguise one's identity, can not only set up 'the other I' but also play various roles, e.g. social or sexual, at various times and in various places (Miczka 2002, pp. 150-

² Żegleń distinguishes three most representative points of view in possible worlds theories: linguistic, elemental and epistemic. An attempt to apply the possible worlds theory to a theory of the media is connected with the fact that the media reality is of specific character, showing features ascribed to possible worlds (media illusions, images of real reality) and to impossible worlds (virtual world).

151). Such media splitting of identity onto many various subjects or “sub-subjects” performing fictitious roles very often gets carried over to the real world, in which an individual loses also a sense of real duties and moral responsibility. It is so because an individual loses awareness of the borderline between the real world and the world of media images. E. Morin explains it by means of the „projection-identification” principle. According to the concept, while being exposed to a media message, a recipient as it were projects himself in the reality shown, at the same time absorbing the reality into himself (Morin 1975, p. 139). Resulting from it is a double possibility of corrupting one’s identity: firstly, via self-projection into the world of the media and identifying oneself with a fictitious subject and, secondly, via an integration of the media world within oneself together with adjusting oneself to its reality. Connected with all those processes of self-projection into media-generated worlds and of integration of those worlds in oneself is a threat of obliterating the borderlines between truth and falsehood, good and evil as well as downgrading these values to the level of fiction and illusion (Zajdel 2003, pp. 52-53). Therefore, the ethics of the media should be based upon solid criteria of rationality which would make it possible to distinguish between a media current world and the real current world, discover the borderline between the two worlds in order that they will be truly integrated following the ethical sense of responsibility for good and evil.

From the personalist point of view, we can speak about “merging of worlds” – or even their complementary “setting” but only based upon the personal subject and community of individuals. In this context we can even speak about the complementary character of various worlds since the human being *qua* person is “open” and should be open to any and every good; as a rational creature, a human being is capable of recognizing the good and integrate it in his world of action. The „openness” of a human being to various worlds requires appropriate cognitive „equipment” that would guarantee proper orientation in a maze of various worlds. The most fundamental elements of such equipment comprise: openness to truth, acceptance of the objectivity and reality of the world, righteous and real conscience open to the objective moral order, rationality of cognition, freedom of choice and action. When it comes to the moral plane of the integration, acceptance of the truth about conscience, which is not an autonomous and exclusive source establishing what is good and what is evil, but which discovers and promulgates within itself the objective moral order that is the criterion of the rightness of moral choices and actions. It is thanks to his conscience that an individual is a participant in judging the world, to which he opens himself. He does not create in it, or thanks to it, the moral truth, but he can read it and project into his interior thanks to his rationality (Apel 1991, pp. 17-22; Apel 1990, pp. 83-94).³ In this way the awareness of moral responsibility for his actions, including actions connected with integration of various media worlds in himself, is shaped in

³ K.-O. Apel introduces a different, rationalist-pragmatist way of justifying ethical normativeness. Apel rejects the possibility of rational grounding of intersubjectively valid ethics of communication because of ontic arguments and references. He asserts that „if the obligatory reasoning or logic is nothing more than a certain internalised method of communication and as such depends on the structure of perfect communication, then adequate reflection on the conditions of possible perfect communication can also discover and define ethical principles or norms” (Apel 1990, p. 84).

man. With the aid of such dispositions and determinants concerning “self-opening” to the reality of various media worlds, an individual will be morally sure that an attempt to “merge” in himself various elements of media coverage, both those of subjective provenance and those which bring the truth about the objective world, will serve the purpose of good and will make good come true. Looking from a different perspective, such dispositions of the human spirit will prevent an individual from shutting himself off from the world of the media, and from regarding them as a source of potential evil; on the contrary, an individual will actively and rationally engage himself in that world of media diversity, communicating there positive values, making good come true and equipping the media space with human face.

3. INTEGRATION AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO GLOBALISATION

At the time of globalisation of information society multifarious moral changes are taking place. Part of them is positive, part negative. The contemporary media not only reflect the globalisation processes but also considerably contribute to them. Accordingly, the ethics of the media faces new challenges of media globalization. They are particularly connected with certain negative tendencies which comprise such phenomena as: individualisation and subjectivisation of morality mingled with negation of objective normativeness; promotion of the unrestricted freedom and autonomy of an individual; relativism, pragmatism and pluralism of values; secularisation of morality (mariański 2001, p. 27). Such value changes lead in consequence to moral relativism. In the economic sphere globalisation also enhances consumer tendencies as well as orientation of an individual towards material objectives and short-term benefits. Globalisation processes may lead to reductionist views on man, thus posing real threat to the real good of man. Such reductionism demands an ethical *antidotum* since man has his dignity, which is what places him “above” all other socio-economic structures.

Globalisation processes determine not only changes in the sphere of morality but also generate and enhance concepts of ethics that are connected with the changes. One of the basic globalisation products of ethical reflection is the relativisation of ethical values. Emphasising the value of rationalisation and effectiveness of production often takes place at the cost of marginalising and relativising of moral values regarding pragmatic objectives and benefits. “Social modernisation unavoidably as it were leads to destruction of moral values and norms, moral relativism becoming more and more widespread. (...) The importance of norms is rendered relative from temporary and personal perspective, their authority being referred to one’s own judgment and individual needs” (Mariański 2001, pp. 178-179). Another product of the globalised ethical reflection is value commercialisation which is enhanced by the tendency for ethical

utilitarianism. With pluralisation and individualisation of life being on the increase, consumptionist and utilitarian attitudes are being shaped. The utilitarian autonomy, which shapes personal identity in the globalisation era, is based upon making the individual freedom an absolute value and upon the logic of the market in accordance with the scheme: production-consumption (Życiński 2000, pp. 231-244). The basic criterion of man's value is the utilitarian criterion, based on his efficiency and usefulness. „It is through decisions concerning production and consumption that a particular culture is revealed that aspires to be a general concept of life (...). Determining new needs and new ways of fulfilling them, we must necessarily guide ourselves with the integral vision of man, which pertains to and takes in all dimensions of man's existence and which subdues material and instinctive dimensions to interior and spiritual ones” (Jan Paweł II 1991, no. 36).

The ethics of the media notices the dangers which lead to an instrumental and object-like treatment of an individual; it tries to oppose them by discovering in globalisation processes positive planes of ethical integration. Globalisation processes founded on the integral vision of man should affirm the subjectivity of every single human being. Every individual is an absolute value, a unique and unrepeatable being. To be an individual means to derive one's existence from, in and for oneself. It also means that an individual is an autonomous being who is free to decide about oneself, who is capable of turning to himself, which is to say, being capable of oneself and one's actions. The personal subjectivity understood in such a way leads to a conviction that an individual is an aim in himself and cannot be used as a means (cf. Nagórny 1997, p. 179). The human being is and should be the principle, the subject, and the aim of all social solutions since it is within his nature that he needs social life. The value of man's subjectivity cannot be overemphasised, however, since the subjectivity of the human being, capable of self-cognition self-determination, cannot be understood in the spirit of individualism. A human being as a spiritual being, which implies rationality and freedom as well as the ability to build up dialogue, is not self-confined; on the contrary, a human being is capable of self-transcendence and communication, i.e. to communal and social integration alongside with respecting the dignity of all people.

The essence of communication lies in the openness to others and mutual exchange of values. A simple consequence of all communication processes is the increasing network of relations, community ties and social references. This unifying action through communication is nothing else but integration understood in a very broad sense of the word. The integration of „my I” with „other I's” is not and can not be globalisation or universalisation in the sense of tendencies which unite and relativise identities. From the ethical point of view, the personal and interpersonal integration can occur only in the form of participation and co-participation, responsibility and co-responsibility, work and co-work etc. It should be noted that globalisation is most often mentioned in the political, economic, social, cultural and media sense of the word (Stolarczyk 2003; Bogunia-Borowska and Śleboda 2003; Borkowski 2003a; Regiewicz 2003; Lasch 1997); it is quite rare to mention it in the moral sense. At best, the moral aspect of previously listed

globalisation tendencies is mentioned (Kośmicki 2000).⁴ Analyses of the ethical foundations of globalisation contain a mention of a “certain rationality”, of the “need for common safety” or vague “coordination rules” which prefer changeable rules of situational ethics (cf. Apel 2003, p.24; Apel 1990, p. 85; Juros 1983, pp. 90-102; Rosik 1986, p.31). Naturally, such values are preferred as peace, social order, human solidarity – but mostly in isolation from the objective hierarchy of values and the objective moral order. Undoubtedly, these values form a part of the moral and social order of the contemporary world and contribute to creating common good. The statement pertains to the labour, efforts and cooperation of lots of people all over the world in restructuring the social life so that gross social disproportions in worldwide community will be eliminated. Suffice it to recall the harming coexistence of welfare, lavish lifestyle and immense development opportunities with areas of poverty, disease, illiteracy, backwardness, hunger and unemployment. And the fact that as a result of economic globalisation in many regions all over the world people’s material status is changing for good is definitely a positive thing. Nevertheless, the problem of the destruction of those values that are indispensable for the full development of the human being as a human being is still up-to-date. In the world of globalisation it is no longer sufficient to take notice of only those values that serve the overall social order, respect culture differences, ensure safety and efficiency of actions in all walks of life, fulfill the basic consumption needs and human desires while preserving the already existing ecological resources. When from time to time mention is revealingly made of a new “worldwide ethos” of globalisation which stems from these preferences, an impression can be got that until now mankind has not known ethical universals pertaining to all people. And yet, it is not so, because the preferred global principles of social order form only a part of the universal understanding of the value of man. However, the new globalisation ethos treats this personal foundation very selectively, taking from it and emphasising only some dimensions of humanity. Meanwhile, the ethically integral modelling of globalisation processes is possibly only when the whole truth of man and principles of universal character stemming therefrom are taken into account. It seems then urgent at the time of globalisation to take into consideration all of the personal foundations of ethics – only then will it be capable of resisting any threats destructive for man which result from globalisation processes. It is this very integral truth of man that the personalist ethics is based upon which stands the chance of becoming a universal ethics of the media at the time of globalisation. Ethics itself does not need globalisation because it is universal of itself, remaining the same for all people, regardless of their culture roots. The principles are not a fruit of the new „global *ethos*” but, conversely, they form and should form its proper universal foundation.

⁴ The pragmatist point of view is shared by an overwhelming majority of authors dealing with globalisation. They speak a lot about values, but the problem is that the world of those values is usually limited to a circle of the so called values of the social order. E. Kośmicki states: „The need to rely on values in the case of social group processes came into being as early as in the context of the process of European integration. Without values it is difficult to achieve social order (...). it is here that liberal democratic values belong: human rights, division of powers, the state of law, respect for the law, participation in public life, freedom and peace with simultaneous rejection of intolerance, hostility towards others, nationalism and other forms of extremism” (Kośmicki 2000, p. 32).

4. CATALACTIC INTEGRATION AS A CHANCE FOR GLOBALISATION

It means that global changes generated by human action should respect and affirm a particular individual and serve him and only him in every dimension. In this way social development will not be confined to a circle of macrosocial changes only, but it will take note of inalienable rights of man and his moral duties. From the personalistic perspective globalisation is perceived not only through the prism of integrational socio-economic processes, but, above all, in the light of the integration of individuals and their value worlds leaning against the ontic value of man. This integration, however, must not be perceived as the phenomenon of spatial compression of the world or „global village” and an increasing co-dependence of all citizens of the globe connected therewith. If globalisation is to possess truly personalistic dimensions, it must also have the character of a universal “civilisation of truth, good and beauty” as well as values resulting from them (cf. Jan Paweł II, 2002a, pp. 15-19; Malizia 2002, p. 163; Czarnik 1996, pp. 58-60; O solidarność 2002). The catalactic character of globalisation processes which are co-created by subject-oriented media activities should also be taken notice of. “Catalaxis” is a term rediscovered by Hayek and Mises and used to describe free market economic processes (cf. Hayek 1989-1996; Mises 1996; Hayek b.r., p. 49). The term „catalaxis” is closely connected with communication processes, showing the personal aspect of communication and media activities. Very broadly speaking, the term circumscribes anything and everything that takes place between two individuals who interact with each other by means of any act of exchange (primarily it pertained only to acts of exchange of economic character), including the communication of non-material values. Catalaxis shows that communication activities of that sort are something more than exchange of material goods: they communicate spiritual values, they help an individual discover the other individual and, simultaneously, discover himself. An exchange in which all participants have to take into account the other side alters their behaviour and views, squaring different points of views and interests that sometimes seem to be contradictory. “To change an enemy into a friend” – such is the primary and profound sense of *katallaktein* (cf. Hayek b.r., p. 49). Thanks to the catalactic character of communication private interests, which are a point of departure for communication, blend in with each other and, as a result, generate common goods. There is, however, specific catalactic human activity that is behind this social process which seems – in a sense - an unintentional result of human free action. It becomes revealed within the framework of social structures that are based upon respect for man and his freedom. The term “catalaxis” shows the human face of economy and of the processes that occur within its domain. The term may also successfully be used with reference to a description of media communication processes within the area of information society. It can be claimed that the ethics of the media is to uncover and establish the catalactic character of both communication and the media. The

catalactic character of human action makes it possible to understand why communication exchange leads to harmony. In the first place, to exchange catalactically means to open oneself onto others, provide them with certain good while communicating the world of one's values; in a nutshell, to try to serve others, which seems to be a necessary condition for an individual to experience the opening of others and to receive the good that they communicate. Catalaxis demonstrates that taking into account and referring oneself to the spiritual values communicated at the time of reference increases and enhances the usefulness and efficiency of material goods exchange. Catalactic communication, which allows for the presence and value of spiritual goods in exchange processes of economic goods, makes up a new place for integration of individuals. Therefore *homo oeconomicus* and *homo faber* is at the same time *homo communicans*, who serves others by means of the good conferred. These various dimensions of humanity are not contradictory with each other so long as they comply with the fundamental personal and spiritual dimension of man. Based upon such interior harmony of man, all his goods production-oriented activity will be an activity that aims to fulfilling the needs of other people as spiritual and material beings. Such an approach clearly demonstrates that the objective of economic life is not only multiplication of produced goods, profit growth or power. The objective is above all to serve the needs of an individual, other people and a whole community. an individual who serves must necessarily become an individual who undertakes an initiative, discovers new noble motivations for his actions, opens himself onto others and is capable of imparting a human, personified dimension onto production and consumption. „Man does not produce or undertake an initiative for himself, but for others; where there is no customer, there is no profit; where there is no exchange of service, there are no values” (Garello 2002, p. 367). An exchange thus understood is a way of an individual coming true in his rational creativity and freedom. „By means of his work an individual engages not only for the sake of himself but also for the sake of others and with others: by participating, everybody takes part in the labour and good of others. Man works in order to have the needs of his own family and community that he belongs to fulfilled. (...) Moreover, he participates in the work of others, the work of deliverers and in the consumption of customers who are part of a steadily growing solidarity chain” (Jan Paweł II, 1991, no. 43).

Such an approach to communication understood as goods exchange has a special meaning in the context of globalisation processes whose character is primarily that of economic integration. In such a perspective positive dimension of the processes is also revealed. Globalisation and economic integration mean an opportunity, by taking into consideration the catalactic dimension, for the integration of people on the level of their mutual service and mutual multiplication of common good. The ethics of the media is to help to prove that in order to assure oneself that by integration in the world of the media it is possible to find a way of personal development and simultaneously live in harmony with others and serve them by means of the openness of media activities which communicate real values and bring good.

From the personalistic point of view, the participation and community theory is of fundamental significance for the ethical integration in the world of the 'global village'. Having people be and act together is not sufficient. The quality of values that are communicated by them and the quality of community that they set up are much more important. That is why – while considering globality and integration – the fact that man exists and acts "together" with others on a global scale cannot be overestimated. That man exists and acts „together" still does not say too much about the real quality of that community. It says only about the multiplicity of beings, of acting subjects (cf. Cohen 1998, pp. 9-10). „Community is not made by the mere 'material' fact of a lot of people being and acting together or of one individual together with others. Community does not consist in the very multiplicity of subjects, but always in a specific unity of that multiplicity. This unity results from a relation to each and every one member. It is created as a relation or rather as a sum of relations among them (...). It is through the relation itself, or the set of relations, thanks to which a definite multiplicity of people – as subjects – exist as a social quality, which quality qualifies each and every member in the multiplicity; it qualifies taking into account the awareness and experiences of all its members and in a way of each of us" (Wojtyła 1986, p. 22). If it is to be genuine integration, any integration between people must be grounded in respect for the value and dignity of an individual. A community that approves of a negation of the value of man in any way or of violation of personal dignity of any member of its – such a community smites at itself and undergoes moral degradation. Consequently, the integrational function of personalist ethics – while being aware of the entire diversity of culture forms, the multiplicity of processes taking place in the contemporary information society – consists in pointing at the existence of universal values which lie at the foundation of any development and advancement while being able to perceive their negative as well as positive dimensions. These universal values, upon which personalist ethics as a universal ethics of the global media is based, stem from the truth about man, his integrated spiritual and material nature, his ontic value and inalienable dignity. To conclude, it must be stated that "globalisation is not *a priori* good or evil. It will be whatever people will make it. No system is an end in itself, which is why it must be consequently declared that globalisation, just like any other system, must serve man, solidarity, and the common good" (Jan Paweł II 200b, p. 29).

These principles are at the same time the foundation of the personalist ethics of the media at the time of globalisation. That there is a need for such an ethics, a need to make use of it in the space of the contemporary media and globalisation processes enhanced by them, seems to be an urgent challenge of our times, especially in the context of increasingly more and more advanced globalisation processes with their frequently negative effects on man and human community. Ethical reflection must here rely on two inseparably bound principles, that is on the inalienable value of man, which is the source of all human rights and any social order, and on the value of human cultures which no exterior authority has a right to downgrade, let alone destroy. Globalisation should then be based upon moral order which respects human rights and rights of nations. Such moral order is guaranteed by personalist ethics. The system of values

propagated in globalisation processes cannot destroy the vision of man, his nature and dignity, his rights and duties. As a social being, man should unite himself with others on various planes, thus realising his social duties; he cannot, however, shrink from the responsibility for the development of his own, of his family, and of the community in which he exists and acts. Globalisation cannot reject the truth about man, the truth that man is the greatest value on earth and his good and development should be the aim and goal of all and any activities, from the economic through to cultural. The alternative for globalisation, especially when its negative effects are considered, is an integration which affirms the priority of ethics in every space of human structures, relations and actions. "People have to overcome egoism and manifest solidarity with each other. May the present-day mankind, while trying to create more unity, solidarity and peace, be capable of handing over to future generations the good of creation and a hope for a better future" (Jan Paweł II 200b, p. 32). The present analysis is an attempt, and a most essential attempt at that, to form the basic principles of a universal ethics understood as an ethical response to threats and dangers of media globalisation processes. The personalist ethics of the media relies upon such anthropological foundations that can be accepted and carried out in reality in the universal dimension for the good of each human individual and the entire community of the whole world.

5. CONCLUSION

Nowadays, the media are expanding the space and intensity of communication, its quality and speed; however, they do not erase its essence, i.e. human ability to communicate "between minds and hearts". Any communication and media activity are based on the rationality of their sources, and their real sense is the communication of good and positive values. Discovering this dimension of the media and of communication is the basic task of ethics. Hence the more pressing becomes the need for such an ethics of the media based upon human rationality and spiritual dignity that would reduce the sphere of evil and enlarge the media sphere of good. Responsible service to a human being, building a community based on justice and love, telling the truth about human existence and its transcendental destination – these are and will be the central task of media ethics at the time of global communication. John Paul II would incessantly speak about the need to shape such an ethics: "Entering the globalization era, humankind can no longer do without joint code of ethics. The principles of social life must be sought for inside the human being *per se*, in the universal nature of humankind, which resulted from the work of the Creator. Such seeking is necessary if globalization is not to become yet another form of absolute relativisation of values, standardization of lifestyles and cultures. The whole diversity of culture forms notwithstanding, there are universal human values that must be expressed and put to the forefront as the leading force of all development and progress" (John Paul II). Building, developing and using such ethics that suits the

challenges and needs of media civilization is a task for today and for the future, and for all of us. Thank you very much indeed for your attention and patience.

REFERENCES

- Andrzejewski, B (ed.) (1990), *Komunikacja, rozumienie, dialog*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego.
- Apel, K.O. (1990), *Komunikacja a etyka: perspektywa transcendentjno-pragmatyczna*, in: B. Andrzejewski (ed.), *Komunikacja, rozumienie, dialog*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego, pp. 83-94.
- Apel, K.O. (1991), *Semiotyka transcendentjna a prawda*. „Principia”, 4, pp. 17-22.
- Apel, K.-O. (2003), *Etica della comunicazione*. Milano: Jaca Book.
- Bogunia-Borowska, M., Śleboda, M. (2003), *Globalizacja i konsumpcja. Dwa dylematy współczesności*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Borkowski, R. (2003a), *Globalizacja, cywilizacja, ponowoczesność*, in: R. Borkowski (ed.), *Globalopolis. Kosmiczna wioska – szanse i zagrożenia*. Warszawa: Pax, pp. 7-28.
- Borkowski, R. (ed.) (2003b), *Globalopolis. Kosmiczna wioska – szanse i zagrożenia*. Warszawa: Pax.
- Cohen, D. (1998), *Kłopoty dobrobytu*. Kraków: Znak.
- Czarnik, T. (1996), *Status wartości w czasach przemian współczesnych*, w: Z. Sareto (ed.), *Moralność i etyka w ponowoczesności*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, pp. 55-62.
- Elzenberg, H. (1991), *Z filozofii kultury*. Kraków: Znak.
- Garello, J. (2002), *Wolność i uczestnictwo w ujęciu Karola Wojtyły*. „Ethos”, 59-60, pp. 355-369.
- Hayek, F.A. (1989-1996), *The Collected Works of Friedrich August Hayek*. London, New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hayek, F.A. (b.r), *Ład rynkowy czyli katalaksja*, w: *Znak – idee*, 6, *Filozofia wolnego rynku*. Kraków: Znak: pp. s. 48-60.
- Howiecki, M. (1993), *Walka o dusze*. „Ethos”, 24, pp. 103-123.
- Jan Paweł II, (1991), *Encyklika „Centesimus annus”*. Watykan: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Jan Paweł II, (2002a), *Etyka globalizacji musi być etyką solidarności*. „Ethos”, 59-60, pp. 15-19.

- Jan Paweł II, (2002b), *Wychowywać do solidarności. Przemówienie do uczestników VIII Zgromadzenia Ogólnego Papieskiej Akademii Nauk Społecznych 11.IV.2002.* „L'Osservatore Romano”, wyd. pol., 6, s. 29-30.
- Jaskóła, J., Olejarczyk A. (ed.) (2003), *Prawda a metoda. Aporie myśli współczesnej*, part I. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Juros, H. (1983), *Możliwość pluralizmu etycznego.* „Communio”, 14, pp. 90-102.
- Kośmicki, T. (2000), *Ekonomiczny wymiar globalizacji.* „Dziś. Przegląd Społeczny”, 2, pp. 30-41.
- Lasch, Ch. (1997), *Bunt elit.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Platan.
- Malizia, P. (2002), *Forme del comunicare. Teoria e sociologia dell'azione comunicativa.* Roma: Studium.
- Mariański, J. (2001), *Kryzys moralny czy transformacja wartości?.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe KUL.
- Miczka T., (2002), *O zmianie zachowań komunikacyjnych. Konsumenci w nowych sytuacjach audiowizualnych.* Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka.
- Mises, von L. (1996), *Human Action: A Treatise on Economics.* Irvington: Bettina Bien Greaves.
- Morin E., (1975), *Kino i wyobraźnia.* Warszawa: PIW.
- Nagórny, J. (1997), *Postannictwo chrześcijan w świecie.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo RW KUL.
- O solidarność rodziny narodów świata*, (2002). „Ethos”, 59-60.
- Regiewicz, A. (2003), *Globalne doświadczenie tożsamości*, R. Borkowski (ed.), *Globalopolis. Kosmiczna wioska – szanse i zagrożenia.* Warszawa: Pax, pp. 190-217.
- Rosik, S. (1986), *Sytuacjonizm etyczny a chrześcijańska roztropność. Studium teologiczno-moralne.* Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha.
- Sareło, Z. (ed.) (1996), *Moralność i etyka w ponowoczesności.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Stolarczyk, I. (2003), *Dylematy globalizacji*, Tarnów: Biblos.
- Witaszek, G. (ed.) (2000), *Tertio millennio adveniente. U progu trzeciego tysiąclecia.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo RW KUL.
- Wojtyła, K. (1969), *Osoba i czyn.* Kraków: Znak.
- Wojtyła, K. (1976), *Osoba: podmiot i wspólnota.* „Roczniki Filozoficzne”. 24, pp. 5-38.
- Zajdel J. (2003), *Aporie w aplikacjach koncepcji światów możliwych do teorii mediów*, in: J. Jaskóła, A. Olejarczyk (ed.), *Prawda a metoda. Aporie myśli współczesnej*, part I. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 49-56.

Żegleń, U.M. (1990), *Modalność w logice i w filozofii*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne.

Życiński, J. (2000), *Humanizm chrześcijański w obliczu współczesnego kryzysu kultury*, in: G. Witaszek (ed.), *Tertio millennio adveniente. U progu trzeciego tysiąclecia*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo RW KUL, pp. 231-244.