Andrzej Tarnopolski

A Man of Late Modernity and Multimedia Civilization

Andrzej TARNOPOLSKI

A Man of Late Modernity and Multimedia Civilization

Introduction

A man considers himself to be a rational creature. He tries to behave under the commonly accepted (or only accepted by himself) rules of rationality. Science and philosophy play an important role in this system, providing proper knowledge, conceptualized with a spoken language and, first of all, a written one. Throughout the ages, people have been gathering knowledge, decomenting it in the books. This is how the education system functions. We start leaning intensively when we learn how to read and write and this happens, when we acquire the basis of word-logic thinking.

In this sense Plato's understanding of matters is revealed. He broke Socrates' unwillingness for a pen. In the text he revealed and recorded the reason-result picture of reality, specific for a human way of understanding the world and, (what follows it), linear-binary shape of our thinking. Such a picture corresponded with the development of human culture and civilization. Throughout the ages writing has constituted the basis of the development of science, as well as the books that are the direct result of it.

Today the situation has changed significantly. Gutenberg's man (a man of books) is replaced with a picture man – *homo videns*[1]. A reading man withdraws and his place is taken by a watching man (looking, peeping), as well as the writing of civilization a (books) is displayed by the picture of sophistication (civilization of screens). A man thinking in words is replaced with a man thinking in pictures (icons), non-linearly and non-binary i.e. ina non-analogue way. He is

---

[1]   Compare: G. Sartori, *Homo videns. Telewizja i postmyślenie*, compiled by J. Muszyński, WUW Warszawa 2007.

a creator and a user of the formation that is called a multimedia civilization, the phase of the "late modernity"[2]. Besides an impressive technical dimension; the essence is the constantly enlarging amount of information, accessible to modern man without any problems. As we often say, it is an informative bomb[3].

The amount of information (not even mentioning its quality) makes the problem we have to deal with. Rationalization must be based on some kind of reduction or information selection. As I think the basic mechanism of selection that we start in this phase of edificational development is a specific simplification of the picture of the world, lowering intellectual perception level, so that the media picture of the world is closer to the colloquial picture. An electronic form of this picture is to rationalize it, liquidating the defects of colloquialism, allowing the great media creators to manipulate, easy to beget with such a matter and a recipient shaped this way.

Multimedia civilization

It is not unequivocally certain that we live in the times that are by some theorists referred to as "late modernity"[4] and if it is a version of multimedia civilization, maybe it is. The omnipresent domination of mass-media, their dynamic development, compiling cooperation and influence they have on our everyday life, validate the thesis. We think that m u l t i m e d i a c i v i l i z a t i o n – if we are to talk about it – (the projecting definition) should be based on the common and effective influence on life the cooperating media of different types have, in such a way as to make a man who exists within this structure be an enslaved counter who solves all his life functions and tasks with the use or with the share of these tools, not necessarily realizing their considerable and sometimes manipulative character. In connection to the above, I think that the following criteria of multimedia civilization functioning should be fulfilled (after E. Szczęsna who worked out such conditions from multimedia and transmedia advertisement, transporting them for our aims):[5]

1. In the condition of transcendence defined by the, is the

> expansiveness [of advertisements] in the infiltration into other fields of an everyday life and the transcendence is also visible in shaping the social behaviours, interpersonal relations of obligatory scales of values[6].

---

2   Ch. Delsol, *Esej o człowieku późnej nowoczesności*, compiled by M. Kowalska, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2003, p. 10.

3   P. Virillio, *Bomba informacyjna*, compiled by S. Królak, Wydawnictwo Sic! S.c., Warszawa 2006, p. 133–134.

4   A. Giddens, *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. "Ja" i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności*, compiled by E. Szulżycka, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2002, p. 40.

5   Compare: E. Szczęsna, *Poetyka reklamy*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.

6   There, p. 8.

In this meaning, it is about the appropriation by the multimedia system with increasing spheres of reality in such a way that their presence seems to be inevitable and the possibility of their removal – impossible. The consequence is the belief that life without them is inconceivable or, at least, dull and uninteresting.

2. The condition of fiction [of advertisements] that is understood by the author as a frequent and eager detachment from reality, creating unreal virtual worlds, technical representations of the physical world, media realities that are not the exact and true reflection of the real world. Fiction causes the evanescence of the border between the real world and the world manifested on the screen. It may cause such a situation that a man stops differentiating them effectively, confusing the fiction of the screen with realism and sometimes replacing the reality with electronic light of artificial representations. Being in such a situation, he becomes more and more prone to manipulation and less and less resistant to the openly untrue phenomena (artificial, made-up, and manipulated lies).

3. The third condition is hiding this fiction [as]

> it makes the intentionality of the authority […] The authority creates a the media world addressee [advertisement recipient] a deep conviction concerning the existence of the identity presented in the press [in an advertisement], especially a sign, manifested symbol of [an advertised] object with the real world[7].

The essence of this condition is a manipulative thought of controlling people (viewers), advertisement addressees and, which follows it, a more effective authority (control) over them by animators and creators of this civilization. As a consequence (from the analysis of the contents contained in point 1 and 2), it becomes clear that the less a man, the subject of these influences realizes the essence of this influence, the higher the effectiveness of the influence of the world constructed in such a way is. The influence manifested in the evanescence of progressively new areas of reality and replacing them with an electronic representation, frequently deformed.

These conditions specify all the most important features of such a formation: the popularity and omnipresence of the interaction that seems to be a derivative of imperialism of technological men[8]. Hiding this universality and the real reasons for its use, that is the basic condition of conducting all types of manipulation[9]. Also the eagerness to create illusory worlds, substitutive concentration of people on the seeming of things that, in this dimension, appear to be most important.

---

[7] There, p. 8.

[8] S.T. Pinckaers OP, *Źródła moralności chrześcijańskiej. Jej metoda, treść, historia*, compiled by A. Kuryś, W Drodze, Poznań 1994, p. 100.

[9] T. Witkowski, *Psychomanipulacje*, Oficyna Wydawnicza UNUS, Wrocław 2000, p. 25–27.

Writing about technology, Pinckaers says that the danger of imperialism is born among the people using it[10]. The critical vision of technology, and first of all – multimedia – seems to be the effect of a purposeful game, political influences of the interest groups. However, most frequently we approach such a mechanism as a natural effect of the cultural evolution of a man or even the stage of biological evolution (e.g. antagonistic concept of evolution)[11], or the theories explaining the technical development with the mechanisms of the natural augmentation of a human beings. In such a sense, a considerable influence of technology (or some type of it) reveals as something completely natural.

Fiction presented here as a feature of advertisements refers directly and universally to the essence of multimedia civilization. Such a civilization, from its definition, operates with the electronic representations of reality. These representations, being some approximate (and often even manipulative) pictures of en tithes – (due to the tolerant/liberal approach towards the truth in Aristotle's understanding) have a natural inclination of becoming independent and functioning as if they were autonomic, autarkical and objective. It is especially alarming because such a situation refers to the intentional and unconscious demand for such a function – fulfilling some crucial social demands, the need of fulfilling the emptiness – no matter how we understand it – with the substitute picture[12]. The liberal approach towards the truth, strengthening the deficit of the truth (inexact reflection of reality – i.e. accepting some form of ignorance – and sometimes untruth, and deception) is looking for another idea that could be its justification, the idea that could have already proved to be correct as a positive pattern of correctness and can be used to rationalize (in a psychological sense) these electronic representations.

Such an idea is the concept of objectivity that in the contemporary science has dominated other verification rules and is treated, especially in the post-positivism and scientist tradition, as the basic mechanism validating knowledge/information. In the common experience this idea is defined to be the rule of specific understanding. Knowledge/information can be specific, only what is specific counts, only specific things are important. Specific understanding is transferred straight from the common experience, makes the world of virtual reality objective, fulfilling and to some extent, our human search of good, true knowledge. This justifies the fact of hiding the deception of the world of virtual representation before the recipients of symbolic visions. In a consequence we may assume that all types of manipulations (psycho-manipulations and social controls) make a constant element of such a civilization functional. It also means

---

[10] There, p. 100.
[11] W. Sztumski, *Enwiromentalizm i filozofia życia*, Oficyna Res-Type, Katowice 1997, p. 30 and further.
[12] P. Cushman, *Dlaczego "ja" jest puste*, "Nowiny Psychologiczne" 1992/3.

the conscious and intentionally assumed functioning in its meaningful areas of ignorance (as it is the basis of manipulation) – in all meaning for versions[13].

An important issue is thus made by a cultural context, in which a society functions, as it can either strengthen these influences or weaken them. K. Kszysztofek analyses the characteristic features of an informative society and lists the following features: canon liquidation, as well as a very important metacultural relativity of the humane component. He writes about the intellectual devaluation of the notion of a text, the devaluation of the notion of historical memory. It is, according to him, rather a refuse heap of culture than its richness. This is the culture of metaphysics, that is replaced with quasi-metaphysics that is reborn in the marketed primitive magic or astrology"[14]. There is no place for philosophy here. The first feature, as it seems in the conclusions, of such a formation will not only be the impossibility, but also the unwillingness to get to know significant areas of human knowledge, exclusively separated by electronic presentations. In a consequence, marginalization of many important human intellectual achievements, as well as it may be assumed, the realization of human intellectual needs by the pseudo-knowledge[15].

The second feature will be a widely understood individualism based on the idea of spontaneity and obligatory creative attitudes. This unnatural spontaneity and problematic freedom can build in man the feeling of freedom, unrestrained liberty and possibility of being free, agreeing with one's own individual conviction of self-realization. It can also concern the sphere of morality and axiology. In such a world, there are no bad aesthetic or philosophical choices. There are also no bad moral choices, as the system of self-verification does not have the outside and independent criteria of assessment. It refers to the media that are the reason and judge in their own case. In such a world a man considers himself to be an individual, exoneration from autonomic assessment of his own behaviours, does not also find the internal indication for the conduct of behaviour as his individualism is unequivocally bewitched from the outside. Composed of the exaggerated belief in the objective power of the rationalized (specific) technical world[16].

Consequently, it triggers the third feature of the discussed cultural context. It is the constant change of a human identity[17]. This one is not composed of perpetual factors, unchangeable rocks we base the course of our lives on. It is rather

---

[13] Compare:A. Tarnopolski, *Człowiek wobec niewiedzy. Niewiedza jako element ludzkiej racjonalności*, Wydawnictwo AJD, Częstochowa 2010.

[14] K. Kszysztofek, *Kontekst kulturowy społeczeństwa informacyjnego*, [w:] *"Polska w drodze do globalnego społeczeństwa informacyjnego"*, Raport Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. rozwoju Warszawa 2002, p. 119.

[15] A. Tarnopolski, *Człowiek wobec niewiedzy. Niewiedza jako element ludzkiej racjonalności*, Wydawnictwo AJD, Częstochowa 2010, p. 148.

[16] G. Böhme, *Antropologia filozoficzna*, compiled by P. Domański, Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, Warszawa 1998, p. 141 and further.

[17] Compare: P. Cushman, *Dlaczego "ja" jest puste*, "Nowiny Psychologiczne" 1992/3.

a constant, dynamic process of changes. Probably it is the same as in the case of autonomy that, making a vital constituent of identity, must also change and undergo constant modifying influences. Because autonomy is a certain opposition to anomy[18], it may mean that a man, living in such a world and accepting the rules of the game – dynamically and under his will constantly changing (that is to be the measure of his autonomy and independence), is, at the same time, anomic.

It generates the next, fourth feature of such a society. It is the possibility that outside influences can affect the find edifice of individual identity. The fluency of personality and the lack of shaped autonomy causes that a man is prone (like a small child) to the external influences; the task – building of disposition and autonomy – very important for him, will allow him to in the facilitation of self-construction or facilitate him to built himself. The causative agent must be an external stimulus. In such a way, a post-modern man, convinced about his independency, individualism, autonomy and non-repeatability, frequently unconsciously falls into the manipulative excitement of the external factors that used the ideas of freedom, individualism and complete libertarian of him without any punishment[19].

The fifth feature of such a society is the role of consumption, comprehend as a form of fulfillment"[20]. It is this deworming (and the market that stand behind it) that make the biggest determinant, limiting human freedom and killing the individuality. At the same time the method of realizing this idea is based on complicated, complex manipulations in which hiding a real context and participation in the game, accepted by advanced techniques, based on self-references. The best manipulation is the one of which a guided individual has no idea and can be accessed through involving him in construction (participation) of a manipulative situation. As Kszysztofek writes:

> The encouragement to choose from the assortment of real and unrepeatable egos is revealed to the clients of the consumer society as the symbol of freedom […] In such a situation, the identity becomes more and more changeable, faint, difficult to be kept for longer. It encourages the creation of oneself at the times when not many can be sure of their control over the course of their own lives; the identity is the issue of control over one own life[21].

---

[18] A. Woźniak-Krakowian, A. Tarnopolski, *Anomia i człowiek postmodernizmu*, Wydawnictwo WSP, Częstochowa 2003, p. 8.

[19] Ch. Delsol, *Esej o człowieku późnej nowoczesności*, compiled by M. Kowalska, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2003, p. 101.

[20] K. Kszysztofek, *Kontekst kulturowy społeczeństwa informacyjnego*, [w:] *"Polska w drodze do globalnego społeczeństwa informacyjnego"*, Raport Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. Rozwoju, Warszawa 2002, p. 119.

[21] Compare: K. Kszysztofek, *Konsumpcja kultury czyli wdrażanie do ról przez rynek*, "Kultura współczesna" 2–3/1998.

The lack of knowledge becomes the multimedia civilization icon. The exclusive mind[22] receives a very strong technical support for the realization of the concept of separation, in its numerous dimensions. Using own technical supremacy, the multimedia world establishes a characteristic and profitable threshold of reception and conceptualization of information/knowledge. We assume that it is quite low. It responds, in a sense, to the universal and at the same time, on intellectually shallow need of contouring by the people of the common picture of the world, as if the scientific pictures of the world – today more advanced – did not evoke our trust. The low threshold of the knowledge/information conceptualization is equally eagerly accepted by great multimedia creators, probably with the purposeful intention. The common consensus of the world, as the instance of Plato's convictions indicate, is eagerly accepted and not necessarily real. And if it is so, the lack of knowledge that constitutes it, is a perfect reason for any type of manipulation. Such a view of the planet does not cause fear, as we receive it as something easily understandable, natural, universal and, this way, commonly accepted and, of course, righteous. One may assume, however, that this commonness hides its important feature from us. Thus, we accept is not because it is naturally appropriate, understandable and except able, but because it is instrumental and thanks to it, we can easily manipulate with the picture of the world, own attitudes and attitude of others, generating in the area of its relative illegibility important areas of intellectual ignorance. This is the essence of manipulation[23].

Commonness as a threshold of perceptive and intellectual cognitive load

Commonness is often defined in the opposition to science (erudition) and common thinking to scientific deliberating, assuming that scientific deliberation has become some kind of vanquish of bourgeois rational[24].

Władysław Tatarkiewicz wrote about this problem in this way. His considerations, concerning this issue, can be deemed as classics[25]. He called such a picture of the world natural and, describing it, revealed its defects, overpowered by science.

In this respect philosophy starts with a common intelligence, the consequence of which is common knowledge; developing it, abandons its natural

---

[22] O. Marquard, *Szczęście w nieszczęściu. Rozważania filozoficzne*, compiled by K. Krzemieniowa. Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 2001, p. 35.

[23] T. Witkowski, *Psychomanipulacje*, Oficyna Wydawnicza UNUS, Wrocław 2000, p. 27. Also W. Chudy, *Kłamstwo jako metoda. Esej o społeczeństwie i kłamstwie* – 2, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 2007, p. 23.

[24] S. Kamiński, *Nauka i metoda. Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 1992, p. 25.

[25] Compare: W. Tatarkiewicz, *Droga do filozofii*, PWN, Warszawa 1971.

roots, natural thought processes and bases its knowledge on a specialist language (in a consequence – such a way of thinking) and vocational, far from normal considerations. Science and philosophy is then understood as the overcoming of commonness (though not necessarily a common sense)[26].

The accusations of directed at common thinking (in a consequence – common knowledge and, more widely understood, common picture of the world) are grouped in a few categories.

First of all, probably there is no schematic accepted vision of the world or, as we often say, common picture of the world. What is more, we are not able to list the basic thesis of commonness reasonably and systematically, so that they could constitute the basis of such a philosophy of life, as:

> There is nothing as a common vision of the world or the theses of a common ense; they were fabricated by some philosophers for their own use. It is only the collection of superficial, fragmental and non-agreed generalizations that fulfill the need of understanding and ruling over the reality and do not create the wholeness of clearly drawn key ideas[27].

Not fulfilling one of the most basic conditions of acute wisdom, the condition of coherency, such a construct cannot fulfill the requirements of erudition, even the one understood very liberally. This collection cannot also fulfill the condition of generating knowledge, as it does not construct itself in such a meaning as philosophy attributes to this notion[28].

Thus, if we base media broadcasting on such an assumption, it will allow us to construct any visions of electronic reality without the fear of being suspected of propagating untruth (lie). There is no criterion that can verify it, or this criterion is occasionally created and as such can also be arbitrarily changed (exchanged) if only such a need appears.

Secondly, the universal reflection of the planet fulfils some kind of an aim.

> Vague character of these types of uncoordinated "views" allows not only announcing them without the feeling of the lack of coherence; it also allows attributing any theory to them, without the appearance of cognitive dissonance. There are no doctrines, views, attitudes that were *a priori* rejected by the common sense or preferred; these are only illusions of totality who make attempts to provide vague quasi-judgments, with an interpretation convenient for them[29].

It means that customary insight plays an instrumental, short-term, occasionally operative function. All of them fall into the notion of practical activity and within practical efficiency. Many media people understand and use them in such a manner. For a practical – certain from their point of view, analysis of reality.

---

[26] J. Kurowicki, *Wyprawa w krainę oczywistości. Wstęp do rozpoznania zdrowych rozsądków. Szkice*, Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich, Wrocław 1978, p. 25.

[27] T. Hołówka, *Myślenie potoczne*, PIW, Warszawa 1986, p. 53.

[28] F. Savater, *Proste pytania*, compiled by Sz. Jędrusiak, TAiWNP Uniwersitas, Kraków 2000, p. 16.

[29] T. Hołówka, *Myślenie potoczne*, PIW, Warszawa, 1986, p. 53.

Thirdly, the lack of coherence, considered to be one of the most important postulates of rationality (e.g. postulates of the erudition of knowledge) causes further results. Common knowledge does not have to be coherent and common thinking/speaking does not necessarily have to subordinate to the rules of logic. Multimedia scene animators and actors often do that, especially during different types of discussions and polemics – i.e. break the rules of logic, though sometimes probably know them – as the instrumental aims (this particular ones) they follow maybe are more important for them than logical correctness.

Fourthly, from the above one may conclude that the common judgments do not have established logical value. It means that a commonly thinking/spoken man does not have to clearly and decisively specify if certain sentence is true or false. Thus, he uses great freedom in specifying the logical value of statements and judgments. The lack of clear and precise judgments does not have a meaning, when rational is set for an aim and not for an abstract logical view. The effect of common thinking/speaking does not have to be cognition – reaching the truth; – this is not the way people who have common sense think. It is important in reaching the goal – a goal indicates life or a particular situation in which we are and which we have to solve. Reference to the truth in the assessment of electronic visions of the world, even at such a level, is frequently sentenced to failure.

Fifthly, it means the acceptance of any judgments in the system of common knowledge – due to their free and disobliging approach to the limitations of logic. It also concerns the scientific judgments that fall within the structure of multimedia knowledge without any limitations and rules. Most frequently it fulfils the requirements of operational momentarily usefulness. Proper experts are chosen who, without any shame, express their opinion on any matter and support it with the achievements of science as an undisputable verifying argument. They do it, as they think that an average man is not an expert on the matter, and even if he knows what is going on, he will accept untruth if the condition of occasionally usefulness is fulfilled.

Sixthly, it is the domination of receptural thinking/speaking. This condition allows us to answer the question "how?" and determines our activities with it. In a consequence, the knowledge obtained has a 'recipe' character. We know how to solve a particular problem; we do not think why we should solve it. There is no place for the intellectualists' questions in the mass media.

Sometimes in common thinking/speaking algorithms appear – e.g. as fixed recipes concerning solving certain problems. However, this is not an algorithm that dominates in common thinking. We more often come across the knowledge of receptural character, explaining how one had to act in a particular situation, without providing more exact reasons. Common thinking rather avoids algorithms, as with such an occasional quality and readiness to shape insight, an algorithm could limit this process considerably. A formula is safer. It can be used for instructions, ideological transmission, announcing ex chair any judgments,

the listeners, multimedia audience should accept and often do it, as the receptural instrument contains the elements of "substantiality", so essential for a common recipient. It does not require thinking and is operatively easy to use. It can be applied to build mechanical substitutive knowledge[30]. It fashions well with the externally- steered theatralised world of the multimedia, as an agent for building a social position, not stiff enough to fulfill the requirement of natural mechanism[31].

Seventhly, the excessive arrogant self-confidence of recipients of the multi-media reality that such knowledge will provide them with an unequivocal, specific and true representation of the globe. Receptural quality more than satisfies the requirement of theoretical acceptance of wide spread awareness knowledge. Recipe prevents hypothetic quality and conditionality of knowledge and such an operation is often identified with specifying the proficiency. Hypothetical knowledge is not acceptable at the common level.

A common sense is certain, simple and undisputable. It does not accept any degrees of freedom. At the moment, when we use it expressing, for instance, typical judgments in a discussion, we do not express any doubts, we do not hesitate. If there is such a need, we will change our mind and express it with the un-disputable certainty. That is why scientific intellect does not prove itself in mul-timedia broadcasting as it has too many conditions and hypothetical assumptions. Commonness allows announcing certain judgments, not necessarily true and arrogantly indisputable. The actors of multimedia scenes often do this and receive the audience's appreciation. The more certain they are and the more boast fully they express their opinions, the grater chance they have for applause.

Finally, eighthly, common thinking/speaking is characterized of emotions and valuating elements. It undermines one of the basic rules of proper cognition – the rule of objectivism. It does not disrupt the creators and some recipients of the multimedia theater. Emotions strengthen the conveyance; build the convic-tion that it is true and authentic, as the spoken person (probably) believes in what he is advocating. We rarely pay attention to the fact that emotions can serve for manipulation. This is a simple and effective method. The emotions exposed ex-cessively e.g. in an aggressive behaviour of the television programmes discus-sion participants, are often artificially generated. The so-called instrumental ag-gression we can observe in the systems of basic emotional manipulations (stress-ing situations technique)[32]. We often think that the conflict between a scientific knowledge (scientific thinking) and common knowledge, common-thinking makes a real and important conflict. It does not result from methodological or

---

[30] K. Obuchowski, *Przez galaktykę potrzeb*, Zysk i S-ka Wydawnictwo, Poznań 1995, p. 173.

[31] K. Obuchowski considers the mechanical recognition (thus both thinking and speaking) to be the realisation of natural, physiological need of a man, see: K. Obuchowski, *Przez galaktykę potrzeb…*, p. 173.

[32] T. Witkowski, *Psychomanipulacje*, Oficyna Wydawnicza UNUS, Wrocław 2000, p. 110.

theoretical-cognitive differences and from different methods of cognitive experience categorizing. The strategy of rationality that we accept at the level of common knowledge has a different aim and task, than the strategy that is accepted by national rationality. No matter how important were the strategies, the axiological comparison does not make sense. They only reveal the fact that a man is a multidimensional creature. Also our deduction has a multidimensional character and what follows, we can, during our life or even one life experience, use a few (many) strategies of rationality, depending on the situation, external conditions and internal requirements.

> A common sense is better for one range of life, knowledge for the other, philosophical criticism for the third one, but which one is the true one – only God knows that[33].

In such a weekly specified model of universal rational, composing of very rigid elements – there is a certain method and constant rule. Thus, there is no place for the lack of knowledge in the Socratesian meaning. Maybe it is better to say that there is no agreement for the lack of insight. This is a strong exclusion of ignorance. A man of multimedia civilization does not feel the need to speak about the ignorance and take it into consideration. It does not mean that he does not see it within himself and does not admit it if he does not know something. He may do it. It does not change the fact that the lack of knowledge does not seem to be the problem. The essence of such an attitude lies in an exceptionable, unlimited fluency and readiness for changes. Including the annexing into the sphere of his own world of such data (information, scientific knowledge, common knowledge, superstitions etc.) that cannot constitute stable cognitive dissonance within the realm of personality. It is not worth dealing with as such knowledge is not composed of constant elements. This seeming dissonance is also changeable, such as the knowledge that is to be classified. At some satisfactorily high level of uncertainty caused by such a state of things, the dissonance stops acting (we stop taking it into consideration), what paradoxically may be understood as a positive phenomenon. The lack of order that comes out from this state of affairs can be perceived as an advantage[34]. Chaos caused by uncertainty covers (and in the opinion of people it may remove) the cognitive discrepancy, being the result of comparing own knowledge (including also ignorance) and expectations connected with functioning in a real world.

Such a state of affairs does not only result from the above-mentioned reasons. The basic factor determining it is practicality of this type of thinking/speaking. It is a very specific practicality. It can be referred to as the practicality of the immediate usefulness, or the rule of an immediate instrumental pragmatics, occasional practicality etc. The meaningful occasional quality of this

---

[33] T. Hołówka, *Myślenie potoczne*, PIW, Warszawa 1986, p. 63.
[34] E. Morin, *Zagubiony paradygmat – natura ludzka*, compiled by R. Zimand, PIW, Warszawa 1977, p. 151 and further.

type of thinking/speaking suggests unequivocally that within the area of common knowledge one cannot build a uniform, coherent and somehow consolidated picture of the world. This fluency, besides defects, has also some advantages. It allows, without any problems, to accept certain opinions, so that they can be immediately contradicted. In such a fashion, we seemingly remove the in-built degree of freedom. Common knowledge does not accept this degree of freedom and ignorance, being at its basis. There is a common conviction that the degree of freedom (tolerant inaccuracy) is a mistake due to which knowledge is unspecified and unpractical.

One more characteristic of common thinking/speaking can be considered here. This is the feature of the spontaneity of creation. If common judgments are created in a spontaneous way (and we all think like that, and consider it to be a spontaneous, unforced fact, the realization of which, an objective realization as we think, conveys a clearly realized relief and satisfaction), it is a chance that it will be a vital and considerably important indicator of naturalness of such thinking/speaking. This assumption is based on – not completely natural – opinion that basic components of reality and recognizable (at least within a reasonable range) and a common cognitive experience allows to get to know this reality effectively. Such a practice is revealed to anyone in a normal, everyday life as a sequence of nonstop cognitive processes that mutually and constantly verify. This constant verification makes the most important argument speaking for the value and undisputable meaning of this type of thinking/speaking. This proof may sometimes deny the cohesion of our natural picture of the world. This does not disturb us. In a place of empty or absurd spots, a man implements an element of complementary knowledge. In the case of routine perception, these are very standard ready answers, for instance the proverbs, the general character of which (sometimes open internal inconsistency) allows for using them at any place and in any configuration.

Supplementary knowledge. Deleting the excessive degree of freedom with pseudo-knowledge

Using these proverbs makes a good example for a supplementary strategy of dealing in a practical way with the existing once of common thinking/speaking tolerant ignorance (the so-called ignorance understood as a degree of freedom)[35].
As Hałówka writes:

> In the proverbs coexist […] three completely different types of providing the events with sense, the event for which we cannot find any simple explanations; or we make them be

---

[35] A. Tarnopolski, *Człowiek wobec niewiedzy. Niewiedza jako element ludzkiej racjonalności*, Wydawnictwo AJD, Częstochowa 2010, p. 160.

the elements of a great, inflexible mechanism of many unknown factors or we subordinate them to the divine being, the judgments of which are unexplored, or we treat them as the indications of the activity or a magic power that somehow "purposefully" introduces the disorder and waits for the occasion to provide our helplessness[36].

It often causes the acceptance of contradictory proverbs.[37] Such behaviour breaks the rules of logic but the rules of rational are not necessarily most important in common thinking/speaking.

Also the occasional (momentarily) efficiency is vital. It also concerns the multimedia world. The popularity results are more important than the conveyance (of long-term) values. The second feature that has to be mentioned is *eclectics and occasional quality* of the judgments offered by the proverbs. They change their meaning, depending on many factors – on the in context, on the situation in which they are announced, the temporary character of interests, the aim that we want to achieve, reasons for which we announce them, the attitude towards the matter (emotional and axiological). The eclectic character is listed among the features of our times and most paramount quality of e.g. a modern television broadcasting (e.g. the technology of presentation offered by MTV that is so popular nowadays and considered to be modern, the contemporary video clips, programmers for the young people, advertisements etc.).

The third feature is *featurelessness* (non-specific character) of the expressed and used judgments[38]. The reasoning used in such strategies are characterized of such a considerable degree of generality that they may apply and refer to any situation depending on how they are used. They may also be considered as the argument by the people of completely different beliefs and opinions. Their featurelessness then reveals its universality and commonness that is to be considered not totally as their weakness. This is the essence of political correctness that is the biggest axiological standard of contemporary media.

The fourth feature is *"obstinacy that trivializes everything that has the stigma of an original thought"*[39]. What is interesting, as the author thinks, attacking originality is more decisive if the judgment differs from the common philosophy of life that means that complicated scientific theories (e.g. philosophy) will be attacked vehemently and most vulgarly, while a simple, though not necessarily completely understood, instrumental knowledge and, for sure, witty situational jokes, clever sentences, revealing exceptional linguistic and intellectual abilities of an author – all of them will be attacked the least. That is why in the world of contemporary media, the language of youth subcultures or the language of abbreviated symbol language (*Polish: "nara"*, *"spoko"*, *"się ma"* etc.) gain con-

---

[36] T. Hołówka, *Myślenie potoczne*, PIW, Warszawa 1986, p. 135.

[37] K. Mudyń, *O granicach poznania. Między wiedzą, niewiedzą i antywiedzą*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, Kraków 1995, p. 99.

[38] T. Hołówka, *Myślenie potoczne*, PIW, Warszawa 1986, p. 139.

[39] There, p. 137.

siderable popularity. In the studio discussions there are no philosophers and ethicists, though the subject of the programme often concerns their professions.

Summing up, common knowledge offers an important and far from the those presented by science and philosophy – strategy of rationality. The basic difference is the disagreement for any symptoms of tolerant ignorance, responsible for building the degree of freedom, necessary for each picture of the world. Even the one that is most evident e.g. resulting from the lack of acuteness and hypothetical knowledge, incompleteness or even cognitive openness. In effect, the field of common knowledge covers judgments in the cognitive value of which its minor and exclusively rejected range of knowledge is considerable. In a consequence – these judgments can be used for the completion of all intellectual gaps in our knowledge and, at the same time, due to their labile characteristics, are accepted and used by multimedia world animators, as an effective basis for any kind of manipulation.

The commonness is not only the sole opposition to positively scientific understanding, the truth, and, as we most frequently think, rational. An interesting suggestion was worked out by e.g. Cassier, using the notion of symbolic universum[40]. Along with his concept, a man connects with reality with the use of symbols. The common recognition takes place also with the use of very specific symbols, gathered in a kind of a system. Talking about common recognition (common thinking) means explaining what is and how the symbolic universum of commonness. According to Cassier, the categories of commonness are considered to be natural, not acquired, not thought but given to us immediately as a natural feature of our cognitive authority. Analyzing them, we agree for the fact that they are the compilation of different types of elements including different symbolic representations. Such depictions are also elaborated by science, religions, myths, and everyday life practices. Symbolic universum of commonness comes from the lively and unlimited penetration of these collections, taking over all that is needed at a particular moment, what can be considered useful and will be used.

> Symbolic universum a man refers to in his everyday life or, that is to say, the sphere of commonness is composed of the elements of various symbolic systems such as: scientific knowledge, tradition, religion, practical knowledge etc. In other words, the sphere of commonness does not constitute the opposition system, for example towards science, as it could be suggested by some of the existing concepts, but is the source of a construct, deriving from all accessible symbolic sources[41].

In this system, the element of opposition between particular representations disappears (e.g. opposition commonness – science) and we start speaking about

---

[40]   Compare: E. Cassier, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. Das mytische Denken*, Berlin 1925.

[41]   J. Niżnik, *"Potoczność jako kategoria teoretyczna"*, [w:] *Kategoria potoczności. Źródła filozoficzne i zastosowania praktyczne*, red. A. Jawłowska, Warszawa 1991, p. 162.

one world, the world of human symbols. Nothing has to be overcome, con-
quered, liquidated, and completed.

Such a universum, fulfilling the role of bourgeois for all other rational man's
undertakings background, realizes the most important function – realization of
the fundamental needs of a man – the need of having a coherent symbolic repre-
sentation. Such a need, in this concept, seems to play a decisive, key role, ex-
plaining all the features of commonness that are so negatively described above.
Partial, from the definition, restricted to a specified description cognitive meth-
ods that different representations dispose of (especially science) are not able to
realize this need. Maybe the idea of a contemporary modern multimedia broad-
cast should be found, especially a television one. Kaleidoscopic value of it
somehow corresponds with Cassirer's idea, being at the same time compatible with
the personality of a man of late modernity[42]. Thus, it fulfils our expectations.

From these analyses, I think, one can conclude that the common philoso-
phies of life, despite different declarations, always have some unspecified deficit
of knowledge. The vagueness of consequences, uncertainty of applications, non-
defining the aim that commonness has – and these are the features of ignorance
– reveal clearly that, despite the lack of agreement for ignorance – what charac-
terizes the common sense attitudes at the level of acceptance, – in reality a speci-
fied, and in the case of this type of thinking, considerable range of ignorance is
build into this kind of thinking, as a constant element of a rational game. It also
concerns multimedia broadcasting. Inscribing a specified range of ignorance in
it, reveals the area where manipulation can appear. A separate thing is inscribing
the distorted, false, pseudo-scientific knowledge in the area of our own picture
of the world. The one that intentionally denies commonly accepted paradigms of
rationality and was created besides the area of academic institutions or cannot be
verified with the use of the methods accepted in science. One can think that to-
day, in the world that is so unequivocally rational, without any meaning. It
seems that, despite declarations, it has not lost anything and even in some
spheres of our life – e.g. in the world of multimedia presentations – seems to be
quite exceptional fills. It fulfils some importance for *homo sapiens* magical role,
replacing magical thinking/speaking, known as an essential cognitive mecha-
nism of a man with a specific type of pseudo-knowledge. The wisdom in easy to
be acquired and due to its mysteriousness, as we think, difficult and thus cogni-
tively requiring.

An interesting approach is the problem of the so-called third culture and its
representations in the world of media. They are created by the people who, trivi-
alizing scientific achievements, create quasi scientific theories, being the simpli-
fied models of scientific theories. The so-far suspicion of such activities has

---

[42] I am thinking about the idea of homo videns. Compare: G. Sartori, *Homo videns. Telewizja
i postmyślenie*, compiled by J. Muszyński, WUW, Warszawa 2007.

been directed to the humanists (philosophers), using the data and language of the sciences for building the theory of the third culture. Today we know that, on a wide scale, also the scientists and technicians do that, when they smuggle their philosophic theses as hidden – and thus indisputably certain – assumptions of these considerations. In a concealed philosophical conveyance – it is the most common simple form of naïve naturalism. In this sense, the area of the third culture is suitable for building media knowledge and will prove to be correct e.g. in a broadcasted material.

A separate problem is some specific expectation for a science to be understandable for others. It is not true, though the statements of science can be conveyed in an understandable way if there is such a necessity, and the ability of the conveyance of the truths of science, using a clear common language, belongs to the features of proper education[43]. However, a statistical TV viewer in the contact with difficult knowledge, often not admitting his ignorance, makes the exclusion and denies even very well represented knowledge, though insignificant for him from the perspective of everyday life[44].

Finally, I believe that in multimedia civilization, a TV set, as an adequate representation (maybe the definitive technique or euthryphronic toy), presents such a simplified, based on common thinking/speaking model of rationality, fulfilling, in such a way, the expectations of audience, the expectations the aim of which is a simple/rough analysis of reality, fluent enough and non-obliging, trivial and understood effortlessly, receptural and read as "concrete", short, untiring and witty – with the humour of the crowd – read as great gratification – thus not a boring task.

Summary

The author raises the problem of the influence of the so called civilization of multimedia on the way to describing the said world by modern humans. He proposes a thesis that the amount of information that is increasing all the time, available to modern humanity, triggers the mechanisms of the exclusion of intelligence. Rationalisation is to consist in the reduction of information or knowledge. It is believed that the primary mechanism of the selection that is being genetated off at this stage of civilizational development is specific simplification of the image of the world and the lowering of the level of intellectual perception so that the image of the world in the media could satisfy the requirements of a common effigy. The electronic form of this is aimed at its objectivization while getting rid of the disadvantages of commonness, allowing at the same time the great creators of the media to perform manipulations, which is easy to do with such subject and the recipient is molded in this way.

Key words: civilization of the multimedia, anomy, exclusive reason, *homo videns*, empty "I", commonness, exclusion of the lack of knowledge.

---

[43] R. Spaemann, *Granice. O etycznym wymiarze działania*, compiled by J. Merecki, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 2006, p. 540.

[44] A. Tarnopolski, *Człowiek wobec niewiedzy. Niewiedza jako element ludzkiej racjonalności*, Wydawnictwo AJD, Częstochowa 2010, p. 263 and further.

Streszczenie

Człowiek późnej nowoczesności a cywilizacja multimedialna

Autor porusza problem wpływu tzw. cywilizacji multimedialnej na sposób opisywania tegoż świata przez człowieka współczesnego. Stawia tezę, że przyrastająca ciągle ilość informacji, dostępnej człowiekowi współczesnemu uruchamia mechanizmy ekskluzji wiedzy. Racjonalizacja polegać ma na jakiejś redukcji informacji/wiedzy. Sądzi, że podstawowym mechanizmem selekcji uruchamianym w tej fazie cywilizacyjnego rozwoju jest specyficzne upraszczanie światoobrazu, obniżanie poziomu intelektualnej percepcji tak, aby medialny obraz świata spełniał wymogi obrazu potocznego. Elektroniczna forma owego obrazu ma za zadanie obiektywizować go likwidując jakoby wady potoczności, umożliwiając jednocześnie wielkim kreatorom medialnym manipulacje, łatwe do wykonania z taką materią i z tak ukształtowanym odbiorcą.

Słowa kluczowe: cywilizacja multimedialna, anomia, rozum ekskluzywny, *homo videns*, puste „Ja", potoczność, ekskluzja niewiedzy.