



Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia
Has been issued since 2014
ISSN 1339-6773
E-ISSN 1339-875X

Modern Globalism Versus Traditional Universalism. Freedom or Totalitarian Oppression?

Kazimierz Gryżenia ^a

^aUniversity of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński, Poland

Abstract

The terms used in the title ‘modern globalism’ and ‘traditional universalism’ have been explained in the article. Globalism as a contemporary phenomenon with a worldwide range has a circle of its supporters and opponents. The meetings of prominent globalists are protected by the police and government services, whereas street protests of antiglobalists are pacified. Can we conclude from that, that globalism is a good and demanded phenomenon, whereas antiglobalism is a source of unjustified anxiety? The following study is not a comparison of globalism to universalism, but rather a dispute between globalism and universalism. Supporters of globalism attribute to supporters of universalism totalitarian tendencies and vice versa. The basic question that accompanied the following analysis is: Is globalism a liberating phenomenon, or rather a negative phenomenon, as totalitarianism? In order to achieve that the two mental tendencies have been characterised and criticised. Globalism, contrary to universalism, takes advantage of the doctrine which denies truth, common moral rules or any objective and universal statements as a criterion to resolve the dispute. In case of lack of such criteria, there is a threat of irrational solutions, depending on the opinion of imaginary experts, and finally manipulation of human convictions. Global system of governance, where the dominating role is played by international institutions, banks and various corporations, on which state governments and whole societies are dependant, shows many features of totalitarianism, though not in the known to us forms of fascism or communism.

Keywords: globalism, universalism, freedom, totalitarianism, the philosophy of postmodernism, truth, objective criteria, global governance.

1. Introduction

In the heritage of philosophical culture up to now numerous terms function in pairs, such as for example: rationalism and empirism, transcendency and immanency, variabilism and statism, realism and idealism, monism and pluralism, monotheism and politheism, *fides* and *ratio*, capitalism and socialism, individualism and collectivism or freedom and captivity. In most cases they have opposite meanings.

In the following study we are interested in the combination of universalism and globalism, which at first glance may seem semantically synonymous, not opposite, since both the approaches assume for everyone or the definite majority solutions which are identical and common at many levels of life: economical, political, legal, ethical, informational and communicative, social and cultural. Then, are not the terms ‘globalism’ and ‘universalism’ synonymous?

Globalism in relation to universalism is a newer phenomenon and seems to drive out the other expression from use. In the title of the following reflection globalism was called ‘modern’, whereas universalism ‘traditional’. Do they differ only in that way, different names? Does it mean that the newer is better than the old one? Do their meanings have deeper justification?

The contemporary phenomenon of globalism gains circles of supporters and opponents, there are globalists, antiglobalists and alterglobalists. The meetings of narrow staff of globalists in salons are protected by cordons of police and government services, whereas street protests of hundreds of antiglobalists from all over the world are pacified by the same services. Can we conclude then, that globalism means good and demanded sign of social life, whereas antiglobalism

– an evil one? What is the relation of modern globalism towards traditional universalism? The current situation needs scrutiny of these trends, and the combination and analysis of their features will allow to draw appropriate conclusions, is globalism a similar process and parallelly running to universalism, or is it a sign of objection, and if so is it a positive, liberating phenomenon, or is it a negative phenomenon, such as totalitarianism? In order to achieve that, the meaning of the above-used terms will be scrutinised, starting from the chronologically first mental tendency, that is universalism.

2. Results and discussion

Universalism

Universalism comes from a latin word *universalis*, which means common, general. Universalism aims at uniform whole, it prefers general features to the individual ones, therefore it opposes particularism, individualism. In social and political life it is characterised by the unity of ideals and values, accepted moral norms, personal models as well as a shared vision of a man, the world and God. The standpoint of universalism is associated with classical philosophy, also called aristotelesian-thomistic or realistic, according to which there is an objective, independent of an individual person: truth, good, general and constant rules and norms of acting, worked out with the use of natural condition of human mind. Due to the rationality of this cognition, it is common, omnipresent, embracing the whole world and obliging to accept all people irrespective of their world-view, national status or political option. This cognition aspires also to be the basis and foundation of statutory law and subsequently created social, educational and moral order etc.*.

Andrzej Maryniarczyk, one of the most significant contemporary representatives of realistic philosophy reminds us that the basis and the signpost to human cognition is the realistically existing being, factual and independent of intellect reality. Truth cannot be separated from the being. It is the being, and not the reason or thinking – as it used to be commonly assumed – is the source and guarantor of truth. The world fulfilled with a number of various beings is a book which can be read by a man thanks to their intellect. These beings exist as individual and specific, not as species or kinds. What decides about their individualism and specificity is their individual, different for each being and appropriate only to this particular being its act of existence. This act of existence is never alone, 'bare', 'clear', but it is always connected with its adequate content, various kinds of reasons, imprinted by the Creator or a creator. The Absolute or the manufacturer specified and determined the truth of each created by Him thing, whose cause He is, He decided that the thing is (exists), what it is made of and what it is like, since He wrote in it His earlier purpose, project, idea, thought. Along with the act of existence the truth exists in the thing and is the cause of cognition, where cognition is the result of specific truth, placed in things – *cognitio est quidam veritatis effectus*. The truth along with things was given to a man as a receiver, it was gifted, it knocks them out from cognitive passivity. About each specific thing it can be said that it is placed between 'two intellects'. On one hand it is 'marked' by the intellect of the Creator or a creator, each of them is the source of truth, He established and determined this truth. These are the so called reasons, which in a specific thing are not accidental, e.g. that the house is made of brick, not paper or flour. On the other side of the thing, there is the intellect of the object, who wants to learn it, who attempts to read the truth included in the thing. In the thing there is an intellectual component, thanks to which there is a peculiar dialogue between the Creator or a creator of the thing and the receiver, and to be more precise between the one and the other's intellect. This fact makes the world of people and things intelligible, that is rational, cognizable. Our cognition then can be true, if it is build on things, if it is the derivative from the thing – *veritas sequitur esse rei*. The cognitive truth, that is what is there in our mind, is the consequence of metaphysical truth, that is what was situated and is present in things, what permits and determines the whole of the being. It was expressed in the rule, that the being and the truth are interchangeable – *ens et verum conventurur*. Reason dictated by the truth of the thing becomes rational, it can be said that the reason is 'fed' by the thing, it comes to the thing in a neutral way, it does not attempt to impose anything on it, it does not establish the truth, it only reads it and adjusts to it. Other conduct would

* Com. J. Filipkowski, *Uniwersalizm*, [in:] *Encyklopedia katolicka*, t. 19, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, Lublin 2013, k. 1358-1360; W. Krajewski [WK], *Uniwersalizm*, [in:] *Słownik pojęć filozoficznych*, ed. W. Krajewski, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa 1996, p. 205.

mean allowing deceit. It is very important, because a man as a rational being, through contact with truth, not only updates their rationality, but also perfects as a person*.

In the opinion of the supporters of this philosophy rationality of nature and following it rationality of our cognition is the source of universality of theses. Such solution is confirmed by the basic definitions of philosophy and ethics. It is a fact that there are many terms of philosophy, as many as there are concepts of philosophy, but one of them, which is regarded as universal, that is possible to accept by everyone, says it is a natural cognition pretending to common validity, concerning what is fundamental in the order of a being, cognition and values. Whereas, in the definition of ethics it is stated that it is a philosophical study about human actions as they should be. Ethics as a study determines which behaviour is good and which is wrong. According to these terms, philosophical and ethical statements aspire to a universal rank, because they are rational, determined by the natural strength of human mind, based on the indirect contact with the surrounding us reality. Negation of these statements would be a result of irrationalism, consent to falsehood degrading a man, denial of the fact that a man is a rational being aiming at conclusions consistent with what human sense tells. And probably nobody wants to act senselessly, against the obviousness of logical implication.

It should be noticed that this type of philosophical thought is convergent with the christian doctrine, whose particular and exceptional position is based precisely on rationality, and at the same time on objectivity and universality of suggested statements. Christianity does not allow irrationality of theses, the principles of christian faith, according to the understanding of scholasticism as *fides quaerens intellectum*, are scrutinised rationally as far as possible. *Fides* and *ratio* are not separate, not having common points areas, but they are equally essential factors leading a human spirit to contemplation of truth[†]. For example one can indicate protected by the catholic Church ethical principles – against common conviction- do not follow directly from revelation and are not dependent on it. They were worked out on the basis of rational analysis of reality. Thus the protection of human life from conception until natural death may be conducted not only from religious assumptions, but foremost from settlement of human sense, attempting in the analysis of the world to reach truth, using the principles of incotradiction, identity and excluded means. Therefore norms and rules of human actions are not only the result of confessional convictions, but also the knowledge gained with the use of natural to a man cognitive abilities[‡].

Modern criticism of universalism

Against such understood universalism and objectivism of our cognition strongly object representatives of some contemporary cultural tendencies, among others those from the side of the so called postmodernism or liberal-lay atheism, which in existence of objective, invariable and universal theses see the cause of totalitarianisms and terror, in the form of fascism or communism[§]. In the opinion of Zygmunt Bauman, who expresses this type of thinking, the blame for 20th century totalitarianisms should be put on those mental trends, which confirmed in conviction that human mind is able to objectively get to know reality and set right principles of social life, which was diligently used by rulers with dictatorial approach to get even with people who think in a different way^{**}. In moral area universal and objective principles and norms of behaviour made up for a too tight and stiff corset, they shattered free choice of a human, they imposed something in advance and were connected with avoiding personal responsibility. In the place of established rules Bauman suggested some indefinite, irrational and purely subjective indication of momentary

* Com. A. Maryniarczyk, *W poszukiwaniu źródeł prawdy*, „Człowiek w kulturze” 13 (2000), p. 83-95.

† Com. John Paul II, Encyclical *Fides et ratio* (1998), no 1.

‡ Com. T. Terlikowski, *Sekularyzm prowadzi do śmierci*, „Do rzeczy” no 19/118, 4-10.05.2015, p. 62-63. Such reflection Terlikowski made on the basis of the book R. Brague, *Prawo Boga. Filozoficzna historia przymierza*, translated from French M. Wodzyńska, A. Kocot, Teologia Polityczna, Warszawa 2015.

§ Some elements of the following reflection concerning postmodernism I placed in my two previous works: K. Gryźnia, *Odmienność współczesną normą – wybrane ujęcia filozofii wychowania*, [in:] *Wobec „odmienności...?”*. *Pedagogiczne konotacje*, ed. M. Dycht i L. Marszałek, Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie, Warszawa 2008, p. 37-44; this, *Prawo i etyka czynnikami kształtującymi wolność osoby ludzkiej*, „Logos i Ethos” 2 (37) 2014, p. 77-201.

** Com. Z. Bauman, *Wieloznaczność nowoczesna, nowoczesność wieloznaczna*, trans. J. Bauman, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1995, p. 34-78.

impulse, intuition or even caprice*. Moral, legal or even religious rules are the result of a consensus and therefore they may be changed freely. Objective truth or moral rules binding all people do not exist, any promotion of them should be defied, as they are obstacles in effective functioning, and pose a threat to a man and contemporary society†.

Neoliberal orientations‡ are similar in objective criticism and universal truth as well as any uniform norms, rules and values. Truth is then relative, and the reason is not the ultimate instance of assessment of results of human cognition. The attempts of up to now rationalism, both metaphysical as well as enlightenment-positivistic were subject to devastating criticism. Any solutions or theories have equivalent value, they are put at the same level, there are no grounds to give a privileged position to any standpoint. No solution may become a universal standard to all people. There is no exception to this rule. Cognition of reality must be accompanied by awareness of relativism and subjectivism. Truth to a learning subject is only the one that they acknowledge as sensible and valuable. Everyone themselves decide on truth and norms of their behaviour§.

Therefore, the theoretical ground to objection to universalism is the philosophy of agnosticism, scepticism, relativism, subjectivism, multitude and diversity of standpoints as well as obeying democratic procedures. Traditional and metaphysical universalism along with liberal and lay postmodernism in the contemporary world are observed as the clash of two radically unlike orientations. In terms of traditional universalism, objective truth and moral rules are the conditions and guarantors of authentic freedom and fulfilment of a human, whereas in terms of neoliberal philosophy, truth and other so called objective criteria do not exist, and acknowledging them is an oppressing and captivating factor. Is modern globalism, theoretical background of which is made up of postmodernism, a standpoint criticising universalism and attributing totalitarianism to it?

If postmodernists deny universalism, and support globalism, then the latter in their conviction cannot be totalitarianism. However, from the point of view of supporters of universalism, globalism aiming at unifying solutions at many levels of human life, bears the features of totalitarianism. What exactly is globalism and globalisation and what is the role of postmodernism in them?

Globalism

The name globalism was initially reserved to phenomena of economic area, abolition of state barriers, limiting free flow of goods, services, people, production and financial operations worldwide. In that (economic) sense, terms 'globalism' and 'globalisation' appeared in early sixties of the 20th century. With time the process became popular to such an extent, that since nineties it has not been limited only to economy, but it has become present in many areas of human activity, including politics, aiming at establishing one world government. 'Globalisation' made a stunning career. It is enough to mention, that in 1993 in daily 'Rzeczpospolita' (Commonthing) the word 'globalisation' did not appear even one time, in 1995 – 15 times, and in 2000 they wrote about globalisation over 131 times**. An upward tendency has been noticed, which was demonstrated by the fact, that one periodical 'Wokół współczesności' (Around contemporary life) in 2002 was totally dedicated to the issue of globalisation. As a result of big popularity of processes of global character many aspects of globalism may be distinguished: economic, financial, technological, socio-cultural,

* Com. Z. Bauman, *Etyka ponowoczesna*, trans. J. Bauman, J. Tokarska-Bakir, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1996, p. 9-19, 73, 83.

† Com. R. Ptaszek, *Dlaczego demokracja w post-chrześcijańskiej Europie coraz bardziej przypomina totalitaryzm?*, „Człowiek w kulturze” 25 (2015), p. 233-234.

‡ Expressions: 'neoliberalism', 'postmodernism' or 'liberal-lay trend (atheistic)', due to their synonymy are used interchangeably.

§ Com. R. Rorty, *Obiektywność, relatywizm i prawda*, trans. J. Margański, Fundacja „Aletheia”, Warszawa 1999, p. 120. This standpoint is commented by many authors: P. Czarnecki, *Postmodernizm czyli koniec filozofii?*, „Parerga” 2/2004, p. 18-22; Z. Sareło, *Postmodernizm w pigułce*, Pallottinum, Poznań 1998, p. 3-8; A. Grzegorzczak, *Postmodernizm przeciwko prawdzie*, „Ethos” 9 (1996) no 1-2 (33-34), p. 150-156; H. Kiereś, *Postmodernizm*, [in:] *Z badań nad filozofią najnowszą*, ed. A. Bronk, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, Lublin 1995, p. 265-266.

** Com. J. Zieliński, *Globalizacja. Pocztówki ze światowych rynków*, „Wokół współczesności” 2 (14) 2002, p. 40-41.

military, political, ethical, philosophical, media, educational, ideological etc.*. In ideological aspect Piotr Jaroszyński writes 'contemporary globalism refers to liberalism, and due to its antichristian attitude and giving in to socialism, it is called socliberalism.

The latest expression of intellectual synthesis, constituting the base to globalism is postmodernism[†]. In that moment among other aspects, ideological aspect was distinguished, due to as it may seem, weighty consequences, which will be brought up in the following part of our reflections.

Due to that multiaspectuality, diversity of meanings and various criteria of understanding globalism, many definitions of that phenomenon have been created[‡]. Taking into consideration included in them more important contents, Piotr Sołhaj formed a definition, which he regarded as the most universal one. In his conviction 'Globalisation – totality of processes leading to greater and greater interrelationship and integration of countries, societies, economy, culture, the result of which is creating 'one world', world society, disappearing of the category of a national state, shrinking of social space and growth of pace of interactions through using informational technologies along with the growth of meaning of supranational and international organisations, especially supranational corporations'[§].

In accordance with the wording of the definition globalism would be close to cosmopolitanism or internationalism. Especially in ideological and political aspect globalism takes into account unifying institutional structures, creating one world government, corelation (dependence) and denationalisation of states to the benefit of institutions and international corporations. The world more and more overcome with that kind of processes is determined as 'global village' and entails a number of the following particular features:

- globalisation is the liberalisation and integration of markets,
- globalisation is inevitable, there is no other alternative,
- globalisation is not a guided process, but is mainly the result of work of free-market forces,
- in a long perspective of time everyone will take advantage of globalisation,
- globalisation entails democratisation,
- globalisation requires a fight against terrorism,
- world government is good, it should be aimed at,
- global governance is better than solving problems at the national level,
- there should be harmonisation of legal systems of particular states,
- sovereignty and autonomy of states should be limited to the benefit of international structures,
- international contracts should be concluded from the point of view of global needs, and not the national interest of parties**.

The above characteristics of globalism shows the collection of attitudes and views so symptomatic for the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries. Majority of the enlisted features includes positive connotations, therefore supporters of globalisation notice and underline only the desirable consequences of the taking place processes and transformations. In their opinion the result of

* Com. P. Jaroszyński, *Globalizm*, [in:] *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii*, t. 3, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2002, p. 795-799; tenże, *Globalizm a reforma edukacji w Polsce*, „Człowiek w kulturze” 12 (1999), p. 105-113; A. Maryniarczyk, *Filozoficzno-kulturowe źródła totalitaryzmów XX wieku w ujęciu Jana Pawła II*, „Człowiek w kulturze” 25 (2015), p. 28; J. Symonides, *Spór o kształt. Amerykański a europejski model demokracji*, „Wokół współczesności” 2 (14) 2002, p. 130-131; P. Sołhaj, *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*. Available on the Internet: http://adwokat-solhaj.pl/globalizm_a_totalitaryzm.html [access: 2016.10.25].

[†] P. Jaroszyński, *Globalizm*, op. cit., p. 799.

[‡] Problems with definitions, but also examples of such definitions were presented by many authors, among others: M. Kempny, *Globalizacja*, [in:] *Encyklopedia socjologii*, t. 1, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 1998, p. 241; A. Giddens, *Socjologia*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2004, p. 74-75; P. Sztompka, *Socjologia zmian społecznych*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków, 2005, p. 93-94; B. Smart, *Postmodernizm*, transl. M. Wasilewski, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 1998, p. 178-180; I. Stolarczyk, *Definityjne problemy globalizacji*, „Wokół współczesności” 2 (14) 2002, p. 145-163.

[§] P. Sołhaj, *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*, op. cit.

** Com. there; com. also Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization and Ideology*, [in:] *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*, ed. G. Ritzer, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA - Oxford - Carlton 2007, p. 367-382.

globalisational processes will be growing prosperity, freedom and emancipation of individuals, the area with the rule of democracy and obeying human rights will spread. Globalisation then makes for the right direction, bearing in mind common good and is an unavoidable regulation of the development of societies. The above reflections conclude as follows, globalisational processes should be supported, whereas any reverse tendencies should be fought against and condemned.

There is no doubt that liberalisation and intensification of trade, growth of investments, free flow of capital, growth of sensitivity towards the laws of property and protection of intellectual achievements should receive a positive opinion. However, some of the enlisted features of globalism raise concerns and bring negative feelings, especially the ones talking about limiting autonomy and sovereignty of states as well as diminishing local and national businesses to the benefit of global needs. Structures, corporations and international laws should be dominating. What is more, they say that for globalisational processes there is no other alternative and that is why global system of governance is necessary. Such recommendations sound like slogans of Marxist propaganda, which in turn brings at least ambivalent or definitely negative associations. They become a breeding ground for the opponents of the globalisation of the world. In brief, there is a polarisation of views on the topic of globalism, among both the environment of scientists and average scientists. On one hand speak supporters (optimists), on the other opponents (pessimists)*.

Criticism of globalism

With regard to globalism, negative opinions are written by authors connected with alterglobalistic movement, who consider globalism as the new form of ideology, associated with assumptions of neoliberalism and consolidating American hegemony and the division of the world into rich North and poor South. Domination of the rich in relation to the poor as well as the growing disproportion between them come to light at many levels: economic, informational and communicational, cultural as well as within the scope of sovereignty of particular states[†]. Authoritative opinion of the opponents of globalisation is the statement that 'present formula of globalisation provokes financial crises, favours rather speculation than entrepreneurship, takes place at the cost of slowly developing regions and in long time perspective slows down economic development in the world'[‡].

On the basis of the indicated drawbacks Piotr Sołhaj asks a number of questions at globalism, extremely interesting from the point of view of the topic of the undertaken considerations. Can globalism be identified with totalitarianism, or are these totally different structures? Can we indicate similarities, which justify assertion, that despite their differences, globalism is a certain type of totalitarianism? What is the global system of governance and is not it the factor moving globalism towards totalitarian system?

There is a common conviction, that totalitarian system of authority was disastrous, that is why it was condemned and prohibited. It is so in many countries among others in Poland. The approach of the Polish state towards totalitarianism is expressed in article 13 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, which reads as follows: 'It is forbidden to set political parties and other organisations referring in their programmes to totalitarian methods or practises of activity of Nazism, fascism, or communism as well as those, the programme or activity of which, envisage or allow racial or nationalistic hatred, using violence in order to gain power or impact on the politics of the country or foresees keeping secret structures or membership'[§]. Against the contents of this article Piotr Sołhaj puts forward a delicate but very important problem: 'If globalism is a type of totalitarianism, there is a question of the legality of globalism, of the justification of its existence in legal forms, because it legally functions in the world, there are meetings of the governments representing global businesses of the world and they are protected by

* P. Sołhaj, *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*, op. cit.; J. Symonides, *Spór o kształt*, op. cit., p. 131-133; T. G. Grosse, *Dylematy państwa w obliczu globalizacji*, „Wokół współczesności” 2 (14) 2002, p. 168.

† More on this topic writes J. Symonides, *Spór o kształt*, op. cit., p. 131-141.

* T. G. Grosse, *Dylematy państwa...* op. cit., p. 168.

§ Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej of 2 April 1997, art. 13.

the authorities of the countries, where they are held^{*}. In similar way his doubts and objections against globalism expresses Jacek Zieliński[†].

Comparison of globalism and totalitarianism

To answer the above asked questions and doubts Piotr Solhaj carried out an interesting reflection, concerning relations between globalism and totalitarianism, taking as the criterion of assessment foremost the problem of freedom, economy and cause of the two systems[‡].

Similarities

1. In both structures people in their freedom were limited or even deprived of.
2. Global system of governance, alike in totalitarianism, aims at controlling social life in its all areas.
3. Between economy and politics there is a feedback, the difference is that in globalism economy and economical conditions more affect politics and influence different areas of life. Politics is secondary in relation to economy. Reverse situation is observed in totalitarianism, where the state politics shapes or even determines economy. It is not the economy that decides on the profile of society, but the politics, which was run by the authority's elite. Nevertheless, mutual dependence of economy and politics is common for both the systems.

Differences

1. The basic difference between one and the other system is the fact, that totalitarianism was based on violence, strength of the police and the army. However globalism to take control over the world does not use strength of a military character, but takes advantage of economic relations.
2. Globalism is rather associated with economic system, whereas totalitarianism with socio-political system.
3. The global system of governance is a more common form of ruling than in totalitarianism, where governance took place in closed societies, within the borders of particular states; whereas in globalism it aims at reign and ruling over the whole world.
4. Globalism means freedom of trade, production, exchange of services, movement of human resources. Such understood freedom is the result of natural needs and economic correctness, and it is secured institutionally by appropriate contracts and treaties. Totalitarianism is the lack of this freedom, where trade, production and services were totally subordinated to politics and imposed by political authorities, against the will of the society and often contrary to the logic.
5. Globalism to some extent is the effect of natural social processes, especially under the influence of unusual easiness of the exchange of information (the Internet), technological progress, freedom of movement, rising need of cooperation and correlation. As a result of these processes the world 'shrinks' and there comes to being one world society. Totalitarianism is the phenomenon preimposed by the group of people aiming at taking control, and it has nothing to do with natural and free process of the development of societies.
6. Globalism prefers pluralism of political and world outlooks, totalitarianism uses the monopoly and monoview system, in accordance with the recommendation of the authority.

On the basis of the accomplished specification of similarities and differences between globalism and totalitarianism, Solhaj makes a conclusion that none of the systems is identified with the other one, and one does not make a form of the other. Thus he cannot see the grounds to treat globalism as a negative phenomenon violating the freedom of a man and enthrone their humanity, as it happened in case of the totalitarian system, which was rightly prohibited.

Much more critical are the opponents and sceptics of the undergoing processes and phenomena, they can see in globalism many indications of totalitarianism. They can see such signs at both the economical and ideological levels, but foremost due to the negation of truth and objectivity in every area of life.

^{*} P. Solhaj, *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*, op. cit.

[†] Com. J. Zieliński, *Globalizacja*, op. cit., p. 40-69.

[‡] P. Solhaj gives different understanding of freedom among others by Hegel, Fromm, freedom promoted during Great French Revolution in 1789.

Totalitarian indications of globalism

Globalism as a real phenomenon is regarded by some scientists sceptically or definitely negatively. In their opinion this phenomenon, the effects of which as explicitly positive cannot be foreseen, and quite contrary in it we should notice the cause of growth of new and unpredictable forms of risk and social disproportions at the level of both the whole globe and particular states*. Liberalisation of trade and finances, making easy the flow of capital, the triumph of market economy, growth of privatisation, emphasis on competition which means cuts in social programmes, departing the concept of a caring state and limiting the influence of state on economy. Those processes are often accompanied by the growing sphere of poverty, unemployment, infringing human rights and fair payment. In the name of economic interest and profit, there comes a restriction of the role of trade unions, and the possibilities of protest and strike. Poverty and social exclusion of poor people do not allow them within their own aspirations and expectations to use and participate in scientific, cultural and artistic activity, and in extreme situations they are exposed even to the loss of the right to live. The ability to eliminate extreme poverty and pathological situations connected with it is a kind of a test and a criterion of the assessment of globalisational processes†.

Unfortunately this test is not advantageous. Globalisation in a current form, deprived of control mechanisms, favours the strong and discriminates the weak, deepening the existing property disproportions. In 2000 1/5th of the world's citizens participated in only 1% of the world's income, whereas the other 1/5th of the citizens took advantage of 86% of the income. The biggest part of the citizens of our globe, almost 60% took advantage of 13% of the global income. What is worse, according to the ONZ Human Development Report, the mentioned disproportions deepen‡.

In this context, it is worth mentioning, that the alarming aspect of globalisation is a raised question of the development of 'the two speeds'. And it is not only the division into the rich and poor countries, the exploiting and the exploited, the developed and the underdeveloped, but it is a division taking place also among social groups within particular states. The excluded groups and the dregs of society are a fertile ground for development of xenophobia, the feeling of threat of globalization, excessive need to stress their cultural and religious diversity. These groups of people to the biggest extent are exposed to easy manipulation and provocation. Their signs of revolt, or even acts of terror are nothing to be surprised about, but to feel guilty, since – as Marcin Kula writes – 'contemporary organisation of social life gives them only this way in response to the prospect of drowning. They often choose the worst route, in an extreme version'§.

Apart from economy there is no less concern about the so called global system of governance, which takes control over the world in its all areas. It is a process, in which the dominating role is played by international institutions, banks and various kinds of corporations, on which governments of states and hole societies are dependant. The rule of the connected with one another capital is exercised by a small group of people, being beyond any control, who become the factual 'masters' of the world. They are the ones on whom governments of particular states and their economic level depend. Globalization then is mainly dictated by the USA and western countries, with limited or eliminated decisions of national subjects and local structures. The dominating factor of the world processes are huge corporations, whereas national states are not active actors on the economic and political scene. National governments do not run sovereign policy, they have no influence on the course and development of economy, or many other areas of social life of their own countries, since they are more and more subordinate to international organisations, interference of which may be direct or indirect. It is clearly seen in case of European Union**. One of the symptoms of such interference is the postulate of punishment for the not submissive states (Poland, Czech, Hungary and Slovakia), who attempt to run an independant policy in case of immigrants and do not want to admit the imposed number of people arriving to Europe. The punishment is to be 250 thousand euro for each unadmitted immigrant. However, Angela

* Com. A. Giddens, *Socjologia*, op. cit., p. 81-93.

† Com. J. Symonides, *Spór o kształt*, op. cit., p. 131-133.

‡ Com. there; J. Zieliński, *Globalizacja*, op. cit., p. 48-51.

§ M. Kula, *Uniwersalizm i swoistość...* op. cit., p. 123.

** Com. P. Solhaj, *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*, op. cit.; com. also B. Smart, *Postmodernizm*, op. cit., p. 178-180; P. Jaroszyński, *Globalizm a reforma...*, op. cit., p. 108-110.

Merkel chancellor of Germany, assures that it is not a form of extortion of loyalty or awakening 'European awareness', and Frans Timmermans vice-chairman of European Commission calls this act an indication of European solidarity, then in the opinion of these states this punishment is harsh, even draconian and demonstrating infringement of sovereignty*.

Ignoring treating these problems in axiological categories, as a consequence citizens loose trust in their governments, they feel threatened with the loss of their subjectivity, they are deprived of the real impact on the course of the happening events. Democracy becomes fiction. Therefore, no wonder there are opinions that the doctrine of globalism is dangerous, especially for the countries weaker economically and politically. Liberal rules of global economy sharpen competition, in which less prepared countries loose and against their expectations do not make profit. As a result the diversity between the richest and the poorest countries deepens, and in particular countries among social groups, which in turn destroys the social tissue, weakens the activity of local communities, spreads selfishness and lack of respect for the common good†.

Groups of decision-makers and so called experts use the mechanism of democracy to realise their own particular aims. On one hand, they abuse democracy, on the other hand, they do not apply it. As for the first problem, assuming total relativism, they attempt to solve any disputable questions in a democratic way. Democratic procedures are introduced there, where they should not be applied. Such areas among others are science and morality. The opinion of majority is to be the decisive factor in making law as well as the criterion to decide on what is true or really good. Recalling the opinion of the majority, they set that homosexuality is not a disorder‡, that abortion and euthanasia are not a murder, that *in vitro* is a civilisational achievement supporting spouses etc. The trouble is that the promoted opinions are not sufficiently justified by scientific or philosophical research. Fortunately, they do not yet try to decide by the majority of votes on the moral qualification of rape, theft, pedophilia or that $2+2=4$ §.

Another situation causing anxiety towards democracy is the lack of application of democratic procedures, where the voice of society should be taken into account and listened to. An example of such situation is the rejection of the social motion of a referendum on sending six-year-old children to schools in Poland. Then the most often used argument is referring to the opinions of the alleged professionals and experts**.

Does not this global system of governance as well as the selective application of democracy resemble a totalitarian system, especially after the relatively recent experiences of communism? In that system, power was exercised by a small group of people, called the social elite, which controlled the whole society, but it itself was not controlled by anyone. The control over the society was taken with the help of monoparty, informational monopoly, emphatic propaganda of their own ideology, invigilation and terror against the political opponents. Each crime, even the crime of genocide can be justified with the good of public and future generations. And so in the name of good of mankind particular people were persecuted††.

Although in case of globalisation it is hard to talk about acts of terror, nevertheless, deciding on matters beyond the heads of citizens, and even over the governments of states arouses reluctance and frustration. This situation is well reflected by words of one of the commentators: '... globalisational process, which is to decide on the future of the world, cannot take place without the participation of the states of Middle and Eastern Europe, Third World and western antiglobalists. [...] Social and economic characteristics of former communist countries should also be taken into account. Even if we accept integrational processes – such as membership in European Union or

* Com. W. Dudkiewicz, *Chcę nas karać*, „Niedziela” 20/2016 (12.05.2016), p. 40-41.

† Com. T. G. Grosse, *Dylematy państwa...*, op. cit., p. 167-173.

‡ Members of American Psychiatric Association (APA) in 1974 with the majority of votes 5816 to 3817 removed homosexuality from the list of psychic diseases. Cit. following R. Ptaszek, *Dlaczego demokracja...*, op. cit., p. 221-222.

§ Com. R. Ptaszek, *Dlaczego demokracja...*, op. cit., p. 221-222, 226-227.

** Com. there, p. 222.

†† Com. P. Sołhaj, *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*, op. cit.

globalisational – as necessary, still finalising them should be the result of common settlements, instead of a unilateral dictation^{*}.

When we talk about totalitarianism, we bear in mind fascism and communism. John Paul II, characterising them, emphasises that they were built on ‘ideologies of evil’, and expressed in that those who did not share the world-view chosen by the authority, were deprived of not only the rights they were entitled to, but they were intended directly to elimination in a physical sense or at least the moral one. The subject to extermination were the Jews, the Gypsies, the clergy, peasants in Ukraine, soldiers of AK (the Domestic Army) and representatives of intelligentsia in Poland. The pope immediately adds that although these forms of persecution and brutality stopped, ‘there is still legal extermination of human beings before they are born. This is also extermination decided by democratically voted parliaments and postulated in the name of civilisational progress of societies and whole mankind. There are also other serious forms of violating God’s law. I mean for example strong pressure of European Parliament, to accept homosexual relations as a different form of family, which would be entitled to adoption. We could, or even need to ask, whether it is not a work of another ‘ideology of evil’, in a sense deeper and hidden, attempting to use even the human rights against a human and against family[†].

The author of the book ‘Memory and authority’, making such diagnosis in the form of emerging in the contemporary world another ‘ideology of evil’, refers also to its causes. They are: a) rejection of God as the Creator and the source of determining what is good or wrong; b) rejection of human nature, replacing it with ‘a figment of thinking’; c) rejection of the philosophy of being as a source of rational cognition. He concludes his reflection with a statement that if we do not start from this realistic assumption, that is from reality of Being of God as the Creator as well as the reality of a human being as a created and rational being, then we ‘move in emptiness’[‡].

The new, third ‘ideology of evil’ was not directly called totalitarianism, although it seems certain, since behind each totalitarianism lies characteristic of its ideology, and this ideology John Paul II determined as even more dangerous. Andrzej Maryniarczyk, commenting on the pope’s text defined this type of ideology as liberal-lay totalitarianism, which means atheistic and analogically to the three enlisted causes, he indicated its three signs with the use of a strong word – war. Thus, this form of totalitarianism has the form of war with God, war with a human and their nature, war with a human sense[§]. In brief, it is struggling with truth.

If following Maryniarczyk and other authors, we assume that the discussed by John Paul II ideology of evil is totalitarianism, then there still remains one problem to solve, whether globalism deserves such qualification. It seems so, since globalism takes advantage of exactly this ideology, and one of its elements is negation of truth and any other objective and universal statements as a criterion of solving disputable questions. The issue of truth in discussions on globalism is generally omitted, but it is precisely the truth that became the bone of contention between the supporters of traditional universalism and the main ideologists of globalism.

For John Paul II, objective truth is so important, that it constitutes a condition and a guarantee of freedom, and its lack the risk of totalitarianism. These are some of the elements of his teaching.

The relation of truth and freedom

John Paul II often reminded that ignoring the requirements of truth is the source of totalitarianism, for both dictatorial and regime systems, as well as democratic systems; its lack is dangerous for a man, not only at the level of social life, but also individual. In encyclical *Centessimus Annus* he wrote: ‘Totalitarianism derives from negation of objective truth: if there is no transcendental truth, through obedience to which, a man gains their full identity, then there is

^{*} J. Głuchowski, *Globalizacja rynków finansowych i jej etyczne cele*, „Wokół współczesności” 2 (14) 2002, p. 107.

[†] Jan Paweł II, *Pamięć i tożsamość. Rozmowy na przełomie tysiącleci*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2005, p. 20.

[‡] There, p. 20-21.

[§] Com. A. Maryniarczyk, *Filozoficzno-kulturowe źródła...*, op. cit., p. 27-34. Similar reflection was made by M. Czachorowski, *Współczesna etyka a totalitaryzm. Diagnoza Jana Pawła II*, „Człowiek w kulturze” 25 (2015), p. 99-108.

no certain principle, guaranteeing fair relations among people either. [...] If one does not accept transcendental truth, the power of authority triumphs and everyone aims at maximum use of available to them means, at imposing their own benefit or views, ignoring the rights of others. In such case, a man is respected only to such an extent, to which they may be taken advantage of, for authority's own egoistic purposes. Modern totalitarianism then, derives from negation of transcendental dignity of a human being, being the visible image of an invisible God, and that is why from their nature itself they are subjects to laws, which cannot be infringed by any individual or group, or class, Nation or State*.

Totalitarianism as a dangerous consequence of the lack of objective truth does not avoid democratic states either. John Paul II stressed that: 'Today, everyone claims that philosophy and attitudes corresponding with democratic forms of politics are agnosticism and sceptical relativism, whereas, those who are convinced that they know the truth, and follow it, from the democratic point of view are not trustworthy, since they do not agree with the fact that truth is decided upon by the majority, or that truth changes depending on the changeable political balance. Due to this fact, it should be noticed that in a situation, in which there is no ultimate truth, being a guide for political activity and setting its direction, easy comes instrumentalisation of ideas and views for political purposes, set by the authority. The history shows that democracy without values easily transforms into open or camouflaged totalitarianism†.

In this context, it is worth noticing that supporters of relativism and untied by anything freedom, do not see well references to the Decalogue and religious values. Freedom of European democracy is scared of christianity, the Church and presented by it values. John Paul II warned against freedom without truth in any area: 'Freedom however – as he wrote in *Centesimus annus* – is fully appreciated only through accepting truth: in the world without truth, freedom loses its sense, and a man is left to the fate of their passions as well as open and hidden conditions‡.

The last sentence of John Paul II suggests, that lack of freedom affects and captivates a man not only in an external sense, in particular socio-political systems, but may become a cause of internal captivity, when they are captivated by their own weaknesses and addictions, as a consequence of which they do not control themselves, do not own themselves, do not possess themselves, they are submitted to their weaknesses and directed by them. According to the pope a man who is unable 'to control their own instincts and passions and submit them to themselves through obedience to truth, cannot be free: obedience to the truth about God and a man is the first condition to freedom, it allows a man to order their own needs, their own desires and ways of meeting them, according to the right hierarchy§. This thesis included in *Centesimus annus*, he repeated in encyclical *Veritatis splendor*, that a man in possessing his own freedom is not unlimited, they should accept moral law, given to him by God. Through acceptance of this law a man does not suffer any damage, on the contrary – they receive a guarantee and an ally of their development**.

A similar thought was earlier promoted by among others Erich Fromm, according to which 'Freedom does not mean freedom from any leading principles. Freedom is the freedom of development in accordance with the laws of the structure of human existence. [...] It means obedience to the principles, which rule the optimal development of an individual††.

It results from the above teaching that between truth and freedom there is a close relation, freedom of a man placed before truth and over truth leads to anywhere. Only in the light of truth a man can develop and create appropriate conditions of individual and social life. In contrast to what representatives of postmodernism proclaim, truth does not limit, it is a condition to progress. This need John Paul II formulated as follows: 'No authentic progress is possible without respecting natural and primary right of a man to find truth and be directed by it in their lives'**.

* John Paul II, Encyclical *Centesimus annus* (1991), no 44.

† There, no 46.

‡ There.

§ There, no 41.

** Com. John Paul II, Encyclical *Veritatis splendor* (1993), no 35.

†† E. Fromm, *Ucieczka od wolności*, trans. O. i A. Ziemiński, Czytelnik, Warszawa 1970.

** John Paul II, Encyclical *Centesimus annus* (1991), no 29.

It is not the end of difficulties and hidden traps, lying in wait for a 'liberated' from truth man*. Discussing them profoundly is not possible and exceeds the purpose of this reflection. Presented situations, as it may seem, show the relation of freedom and truth in a sufficient way, and its lack is replaced with ideology, which without profound, rational arguments becomes fundamentalism, close to each totalitarianism. From the point of view of totalitarianism its previous forms, fascism and communism, were defined by John Paul II as utopia of 'justice without freedom', and the risk of new totalitarianism would have the formula of utopia of 'freedom without truth'. Both utopias are for mankind – as the pope writes – a herald of mistakes and horror, the testimony of which gives the latest history of Europe†. As a remedy for the contemporary world he sets the postulate of moral quality. 'It originates from the meeting of biblical address with the reason on one hand, and problems and situations concerning man's life and society on the other‡.

3. Conclusion

It is easy to notice, that the christian doctrine expressed in a small segment of views of John Paul II coincides with traditional universalism of classical philosophy. One may claim, that it is contrary to contemporary globalism, theoretical base of which is liberal-lay postmodernism, foremost due to its unlike approach to rationality of human cognition. Both standpoints attribute to each other totalitarian tendencies. Universalism justifies its standpoint with reference to rationally elaborated statements, therefore it proclaims universality and objectivity of truth, moral principles and many other theses concerning possibilities of getting to know God, human nature, their dignity etc.. On the basis of recognised truth it encourages and mobilises a human to perfect themselves till the appropriate to them height. Acceptance of objective criteria is something fundamental for human freedom. Whereas, globalism is opposite to it, on one hand, relying on the doctrine of total relativism, subjectivism, individualism, it refers to the opinion of majority or so called experts, on the other hand it postulates submitting to legal regulations of supranational institutions. It allows ambiguity, does not point out criteria of perfecting, sanctions egoism and gives consent to human infirmity. As a consequence, instead of universal scientific statements and moral principles, legal settlements become dominating and binding dictation. We could try formulating a conclusion, that the first doctrine (universalism) is closer to the pole marked with a term 'freedom', whereas, the other doctrine (globalism) is closer to the pole 'totalitarianism'. At the same time, it is hard to state univocally that globalism is totalitarianism, at least in the known to us forms of fascism and communism. It is a too wide-spread phenomenon with many aspects. Some of its plots seem to be unavoidable as a result of natural processes of development, others cause anxiety, all the more because they are hidden, hard to notice, since they are changing the meaning of current concepts. As a summary one may use the opinion of Marguerite A. Peters, thorough researcher of globalisational processes taking place. She calls them a revolution, which took place without revolution, quietly, without bloodshed, without violating activity of current institutions, without objection or open discussion on the content of new concepts.

It would not be alarming, if not for the fact that the revolution was made by apparent 'experts', that is wide groups, making endeavours to reach their own aims, who took possession of normative and assessing power, and imposed their minority programme to the majority, without analysis of introduced contents or scrutinising resulting from them consequences. Peeters states straightforwardly, that the institutional facade remains unchanged, but the strangers are already in the middle. 'We should look for an enemy at home: the battlefield is situated inside'§. Peeter's

* About further consequences of lack of truth, among others about ecological and demographical problems I wrote in the article *Religiofobia w procesie destrukcji człowieka*, „Rocznik Komisji Nauk Pedagogicznych” LXVIII (2015), p. 90-91.

† John Paul II, Apostolic Adhortation *Ecclesia in Europa* (2003), no 98.

‡ There.

§ M. A. Peeters, *Nowa etyka w dobie globalizacji. Wyzwania dla Kościoła*, Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek, Warszawa 2009, p. 14. Compare other works of this author, *Globalizacja zachodniej rewolucji kulturowej. Kluczowe pojęcia, mechanizmy działania*, translated from English G. Grygiel, Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek, Warszawa 2010; this, *Gender - światowa norma polityczna i kulturowa. Narzędzie rozeznania*, trans. From French L. Woroniecki SAC, Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek, Warszawa 2013; this, *Polityka globalistów przeciwko rodzinie*, transl. A. Ciborowska, M. Gizmajer, Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek, Warszawa 2013.

estimation is definitely negative, perhaps disputable, but not deprived of arguments and it induces to give it a thorough thought.

References

- Bauman, 1996 – Bauman Z. (1996). *Etyka ponowoczesna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bauman, 1995 – Bauman Z. (1995). *Wieloznaczność nowoczesna, nowoczesność wieloznaczna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Brague, 2015 – Brague R. (2015). *Prawo Boga. Filozoficzna historia przymierza*. Warszawa: Teologia Polityczna.
- Czachorowski, 2015 – Czachorowski M. (2015). *Współczesna etyka a totalitaryzm. Diagnoza Jana Pawła II*. „Człowiek w kulturze”, nr 25, s. 99-108.
- Czarnecki, 2004 – Czarnecki P. (2004). *Postmodernizm czyli koniec filozofii?* „Parerga”, nr 2, s. 17-32.
- Dudkiewicz, 2016 – Dudkiewicz W. (2016). *Chcą nas karać*. „Niedziela”, nr 20, s. 40-41.
- Filipkowski, 2013 – Filipkowski J. (2013). *Uniwersalizm*. W: *Encyklopedia katolicka*. t. 19. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, k. 1358-1360.
- Fromm, 1970 – Fromm E. (1970). *Ucieczka od wolności*. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
- Giddens, 2004 – Giddens A. (2004). *Socjologia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Głuchowski, 2002 – Głuchowski J. (2002). *Globalizacja rynków finansowych i jej etyczne cele*. „Wokół współczesności”, nr 2(14), s. 88-107.
- Grosse, 2002 – Grosse T. G. (2002). *Dylematy państwa w obliczu globalizacji*. „Wokół współczesności”, nr 2(14), s. 164-195.
- Gryżenia, 2008 – Gryżenia K. (2008). *Odmienność współczesną normą – wybrane ujęcia filozofii wychowania*. W: Dycht M., Marszałek L. (red.). *Wobec „odmienności...?”*. Pedagogiczne konotacje. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie, s. 36-48.
- Gryżenia, 2014 – Gryżenia K. (2014). *Prawo i etyka czynnikami kształtującymi wolność osoby ludzkiej*. „Logos i Ethos”, nr 2(37), s. 77-201.
- Gryżenia, 2015 – Gryżenia K. (2015). *Religiofobia w procesie destrukcji człowieka*. „Rocznik Komisji Nauk Pedagogicznych”, LXVIII, s. 75-97.
- Grzegorzczak, 1996 – Grzegorzczak A. (1996). *Postmodernizm przeciwko prawdzie*. „Ethos” 9, nr 1-2 (33-34), s. 150-159.
- Jan Paweł II, 1991 – Jan Paweł II. (1991). Encyklika *Centesimus annus*.
- Jan Paweł II, 1993 – Jan Paweł II. (1993). Encyklika *Veritatis splendor*.
- Jan Paweł II, 1998 – Jan Paweł II (1998). Encyklika *Fides et ratio*.
- Jan Paweł II, 2003 – Jan Paweł II (2003). Adhortacja apostołska *Ecclesia in Europa*.
- Jan Paweł II, 2005 – Jan Paweł II (2005). *Pamięć i tożsamość. Rozmowy na progu tysiącleci*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Jaroszyński, 2002 – Jaroszyński P. (2002). *Globalizm*. W: *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii*. t. 3. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, s. 795-799.
- Jaroszyński, 1999 – Jaroszyński P. (1999). *Globalizm a reforma edukacji w Polsce*. „Człowiek w kulturze”, nr 12, s. 105-113.
- Kempny, 1998 – Kempny M. (1998). *Globalizacja*. W: *Encyklopedia socjologii*. t. 1. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, s. 241-244.
- Kiereś, 1995 – Kiereś H. (1995). *Postmodernizm*. W: Bronk A. (red.). *Z badań nad filozofią najnowszą*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, s. 263-273.
- Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej... – Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 2 kwietnia 1997 roku.
- Krajewski, 1996 – Krajewski W. [WK]. (1996). *Uniwersalizm*. W: Krajewski W. (red.). *Słownik pojęć filozoficznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, s. 205.
- Kula, 2002 – Kula M. (2002). *Uniwersalizm i swoistość kultury narodowej wobec globalizacji*. „Wokół współczesności”, nr 2(14), s. 108-123.
- Maryniarczyk, 2015 – Maryniarczyk A. (2015). *Filozoficzno-kulturowe źródła totalitaryzmów XX wieku w ujęciu Jana Pawła II*. „Człowiek w kulturze”, nr 25, s. 27-41.
- Maryniarczyk, 2000 – Maryniarczyk A. (2000). *W poszukiwaniu źródeł prawdy*. „Człowiek w kulturze”, nr 13, s. 83-95.

- Peeters, 2009 – Peeters M. A. (2009). *Nowa etyka w dobie globalizacji. Wyzwania dla Kościoła*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek.
- Peeters, 2010 – Peeters M. A. (2010). *Globalizacja zachodniej rewolucji kulturowej. Kluczowe pojęcia, mechanizmy działania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek.
- Peeters, 2013 – Peeters M. A. (2013). *Gender - światowa norma polityczna i kulturowa. Narzędzie rozeznania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek.
- Peeters, 2013 – Peeters M. A. (2013). *Polityka globalistów przeciwko rodzinie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek.
- Ptaszek, 2015 – Ptaszek R. (2015). *Dlaczego demokracja w post-chrześcijańskiej Europie coraz bardziej przypomina totalitaryzm?* „Człowiek w kulturze”, nr 25, s. 221-237.
- Rorty, 1999 – Rorty R. (1999). *Obiektywność, relatywizm i prawda*. Warszawa: Fundacja „Aletheia”.
- Sareło, 1998 – Sareło Z. (1998). *Postmodernizm w pigułce*. Poznań: Pallottinum.
- Smart, 1998 – Smart B. (1998). *Postmodernizm*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Solhaj, 2016 – Solhaj P. *Globalizm a totalitaryzm*. Dostępny w internecie: http://adwokat-solhaj.pl/globalizm_a_totalitaryzm.html [dostęp: 2016.10.25].
- Steger, 2007 – Steger M. B. (2007). *Globalization and Ideology*. W: Ritzer G. (ed.). *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*. MA - Oxford – Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, Malden, s. 367-382.
- Stolarczyk, 2002 – Stolarczyk I. (2002). *Definicyjne problemy globalizacji*. „Wokół współczesności”, nr 2(14), s. 145-163.
- Symonides, 2002 – Symonides J. (2002). *Spór o kształt. Amerykański a europejski model demokracji*. „Wokół współczesności”, nr 2(14), s. 124-144.
- Sztompka, 2005 – Sztompka P. (2005). *Socjologia zmian społecznych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Terlikowski, 2015 – Terlikowski T. (2015). *Sekularyzm prowadzi do śmierci*. „Do rzeczy”, nr 19/118, s. 62-63.
- Zieliński, 2002 – Zieliński J. (2002). *Globalizacja. Pocztówki ze światowych rynków*. „Wokół współczesności”, nr 2(14), s. 40-69.