

The Paradigm of Unity in the Science and Culture

ABSTRACT

The paradigm of unity is a response to the contemporary needs of society; it shows a new way of looking at social and cultural processes, in positive and creative aspects, giving the hope to solve many problems of the modern world. It constitutes a methodological basis for building both the theoretical models and application schemas, also reveals the directions of the empirical research (Biela, 1996).

The paper presents the importance of the paradigm of unity for science and modern culture, particularly in relation to the social sciences, its characteristics and applications in several disciplines, as well as a chance to emerge from the current crisis of civilization based on this paradigm.

KEYWORDS: paradigm, science, culture of unity, inondation, charism of unity, paradigm of unity

INTRODUCTION

Analyzing the social, economic, political and cultural processes taking place in the contemporary world it is hard to resist the

* Correspondence regarding the paper should be sent to: Stanisław Grochmal, Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Stanisława Pigoń w Krośnie (Public Vocational College of Krosno), Rynek 1, 38-400 Krosno, Poland, e-mail: grochmal@rubikon.pl

impression that there is a great need to overcome disintegration, self-centeredness, excessive consumerism or even greed, leading to conflicts, and often serious antagonisms in almost every aspect of human activity. The culture of unity meets these needs; this culture is built and developed on the basis of the spirituality of unity, the base of behavior and actions of the members of the Focolare Movement.

Adam Biela studying the phenomenon of the Focolare Movement and the work of Chiara Lubich, its Founder and President, saw an opportunity to build unity and social integration, capable of treating and preventing the social pathology, conflicts, psychogenic disorders and overt aggression (Biela 2011). Biela in the laudation pronounced on occasion of awarding the honorary doctorate of the Catholic University of Lublin for Chiara Lubich pointed out the innovative contribution of laureate in the development of social sciences, who presented a new vision of the issues, guidelines for scientific research, ways of interpretation and application of the theory in social life. This new way of looking at the modern world and the social life of the people Biela called as a paradigm of unity and likened its importance to the Copernican revolution, which changed the vision of the world in the years of his age (Biela 1996, p. 197).

Like the Copernican paradigm had to overcome the mentality of his contemporaries, the paradigm of unity had (and often still has) to overcome the practices of egoism, selfishness, striving for comfort and pleasure (hedonism) and maximizing the material wealth (so called a culture of having) deeply rooted in the mentality of modern people.

Lubich proved the truth of the assumptions assumed by the paradigm of unity through empiricism (many testimonies of people who share this lifestyle), and the proper methodology in search and showing the values posed by the spirituality of unity and the paradigm resulting from it (Lubich 2001, Bruni 2000).

Over the twenty years since the introduction of the concept of the paradigm of unity a significant impact on the perception of reality in various fields of science and human life has been noticed. The special significance of this paradigm is visible in the social sciences that study the structure, features and functions of society, as well as their culture and development, seek the truth about man and his social relations.

Why the paradigm of unity can be a new tool for the social sciences? Modern scientific publications in a large part refer to the phenomena and social, economic, political and cultural processes with the negative repercussions, catastrophic visions, advantage of disintegration over integration, pathology over sustainable development, hypertrophy of individual ambitions over concern for the common good (Biela 2006, p. 167).

The paradigm of unity encourages to new way of looking at reality, showing the positive aspects of any situation of man and society, seeing and analyzing the attitudes and behavior of people in the holistic dimension, integrating the physical, intellectual and spiritual aspect.

This paradigm brings a particularly important contribution to the modern science and culture. In many disciplines it gives methodological basis for research in theoretical and practical dimension, taking into account the often overlooked perspectives and mutual interdisciplinary relationships.

PARADIGM AND ITS ROLE IN SCIENCE

The paradigm as a scientific way of the perception and understanding of the reality requires assumptions that allow for proper interpretation. First of all, there are philosophical assumptions: ontological and epistemological. The former refer to questions about the character of being and the nature of things, what is the world which a man recognizes in the experience and

in which mutual relationships are all the elements of this reality. The latter concern questions about the capabilities and reach of human knowledge, about the relationships between man and the knowledge about the world (Marciniak 2008). There are equally important assumptions concerning – as a result of the choices made previously by the investigator – the methodology and purposes of research, ways of collecting knowledge and the rules of interpretation of the results.

The development of science can be divided into two streams: narrow-specialistic and integrative. The former manifests in the creation of new theoretical concepts in the field of the same research subject and in the scientific disciplines which study new areas. This approach enables you to make important discoveries which can be invisible to the researcher looking too general. Sometimes, however, this approach loses the opportunity to observe the interdisciplinary links and notes significant difficulties in communication between scientists of different disciplines. In the case of integrative stream one can say about the consolidating role of the testing regime (methodological) used in one or more disciplines. Sometimes the part of the integration is a subject of study, analyzed from various perspectives including the use of other disciplines (Biela, 2011, p. 9).

Another integrative element in science is a paradigm. Kuhn described the role of paradigm only in the natural sciences, but in the social sciences the opinion on the role and significance of paradigm are divided among scientists. However, there are arguments in favor of the possibility of formulating the paradigm in the social sciences, sometimes restricted to specific disciplines.

PARADIGMS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

Thomas Kuhn didn't see in the social sciences an application of the concept of paradigm, which describes a scientific break-

through, as for example the Copernican revolution in the natural sciences. What's more, he questioned the possibility of creating such a paradigm (Kuhn 1962/1968). The state of the social sciences Kuhn described as ante paradigmatic believing that the fundamental principles and concepts are not yet established and among competing theories no one dominates. Dogan (2001) argued, however, that in the social sciences paradigm cannot be formulated because of their significant fragmentation and the polysemantic nature of the existing concepts. He justified the lack of the heuristic applicability of paradigms in the social sciences with the isolation of researchers in closed scientific communities and with the ignoring of the important discoveries of other scientists (eg. antagonism and mutual ignoring of Weber and Durkheim). Accepting the existence of the word "paradigm" in the terminology of the social sciences, he postulated, however, the particularization of the meaning of this term or its limitation using to special areas (cognitive sciences, international relations, hybrid demography).

In the social sciences are not in force the laws and theories generally accepted as in the natural sciences, it is also impossible an exploratory objectivism so characteristic in the natural sciences. In addition, the study of the social phenomena requires the researcher enters into the object under examination (introspection), what is not practiced in the natural research (Branstetter 2012).

The lack of paradigmatic assumptions in the social sciences was seen sometimes as an argument in favor of increasing the objectivity of research, but now more often it is considered as a methodological error (Jemielniak 2008). Every scientist to discover, explain or describe events surrounding reality must have a certain idea of world order, must know the basic answers to ontological, epistemological and methodological questions. This implies in particular research disciplines of the social sciences to create and use separate assumptions and theories acting as a paradigm for this discipline. Hence, among scientists is more

and more common the belief that also in the social sciences can and should define and apply paradigms (Babbie 2010).

In the natural sciences replacing the old paradigm by the new one displaces the previous recognizing it as unjust or simply false. In the social sciences the paradigms cannot be valued and exchanged; they can only be more or less popular or acceptable due to their greater or lesser utility, but you cannot recognize them as true or false. They are not rebuttable because every analysis, each test or theoretical consideration relates to the core beliefs in the context of which the investigations take place. The paradigm so formulated becomes for himself a frame of reference.

The modern social sciences are characterized not only by the multiplicity and diversity of the various sub-disciplines but also by the great diversity of ways of perceiving the social reality and describing the social life. For each social science one can therefore provide different paradigms offering different perspectives of perception and understanding the social world and the phenomena and processes occurring in it. The creating of a new paradigm in the social discipline, however, does not cause - as is in the case of the natural sciences - the collapse of the existing paradigm considered false and revolutionary transition toward true beliefs (Grochmal 2013, p.180). Often there are several parallel paradigms, each of which can be regarded as reasonable, because it results from differing in fundamental assumptions. The social sciences are therefore considered as poly paradigmatic sciences, because it is difficult to accept one model of human behavior due to the complexity and unpredictability of his behavior. This view was formulated, among others, by Ritzer (1975) arguing that a single paradigm is inadequate to give the richness of social life and only the connection of points of view offered by several paradigms allows you to fully explore the social phenomena (Gwiazda 2010).

The poly paradigmatic understanding of the social sciences can help you spot specific relationships between the different disci-

plines of these sciences, and creates also the basis for research an interdisciplinary paradigm not only for the social sciences. The paradigm of unity presented in this article is precisely such a concept of interdisciplinary paradigm that can provide a foundation for research not only in the social sciences, and also can relate to the classification and evaluation of the culture in its broader sense.

As paradigms in the social sciences there are often presented the generalizations of ontological and epistemological concepts in sociology. Belong to them:

- proposals of Guba and Lincoln (1994) with paradigms: positivist, post positivist, critical theory and constructivist, together with their interesting modification made by Puuronen (2005) (positivism, realism, constructionism),
- Ritzer's concepts (Gray, 2005): Durkheim's social facts, social definition, and social behavior, as well as
- paradigms of Burrell and Morgan (1979): functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist and radical structuralist.

These concepts are different from ontological and epistemological point of view and impose also specific methodological preferences. The classification of these paradigms takes into account two dichotomies: the objective or subjective nature of the science and gradually or radically changes. These paradigms are impossible to connect (incomparable), which means that their acceptance is not an arbitrary choice but is strongly conditioned by the world-view of researcher, his beliefs, preferences and interests.

These paradigms (especially of Burrell and Morgan) aspire according to some scientists to the role of force in the social sciences. However, also in various disciplines of the social sciences the researchers formulate more detailed concepts proposing them as the paradigms for this discipline, for instance in management science (Grochmal 2013; Hatch 2002; Huehn 2008; Sułkowski 2010, 2013), sociology (Babbie 2010; Donati, Colozzi 2006; Sapp 2013),

economics (Bowman 2014; Madej 2011; Palley 2004), pedagogy¹ (Poni 2014), psychology (Buss 2012).

A good example of an interdisciplinary paradigm is evolutionary psychology. It includes the theory of evolution and the basic issues of psychology. An interesting analysis of the relationship between evolutionary psychology and psychology of religion represents Varvatsoulis showing how cognitive science can be a keystone between these two disciplines (Varvatsoulis 2010), allowing you to explore the theory of human evolution under the influence of psychological perspective of the evolution of religion. This paradigm is able to summarize the discovery of the theory of evolution in terms of the importance of religion for the human species and is defined as evolutionary psychology of religion. This paradigm distances itself from the framework of evolution which want to bring the religion under the theory of evolution and which are not able to explain such aspects and concepts as love, sacrifice, morality, aging, suicide, etc.

To summarize the above remarks about paradigms in the social sciences can be repeated after Babbie, that *“paradigms are general frameworks or viewpoints: literally ‘points from which to view’. They provide ways of looking at life and are grounded in sets of assumptions about the nature of reality. Where a paradigm offers a way of looking, a theory aims at explaining what we see. Theories are systematic sets of interrelated statements intended to explain some aspect of social life. Thus, theories flesh out and specify paradigms”* (Babbie 2010).

DO WE NEED A NEW PARADIGM IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES?

Acceptance of the paradigm for the social sciences is much more important than for the natural sciences, as a paradigm for

¹ The paradigm is here understood as a pattern of exploration of educational reality.

the natural sciences has no influence on the world of nature, physical phenomena and nature of the universe (acceptance of the geocentric system or Copernican one did not have the slightest impact on the behavior of the Sun and the Earth). However, in the social sciences, which study the behavior of people and institutions, there are not natural laws as in physics or astronomy. The social “universe” is a subject of constant changes including changes of the validity of the assumptions or hypotheses. The current paradigm considered to be reasonable and applied for the social sciences may soon prove to be inadequate to the reality and become obsolete.

As an example of the impact of assumptions on approbation (or not) the truth about the reality in the social sciences – especially in relation to the essence of the conflict and dialogue – Drucker cites the story of M. Packer Follett (1868-1933), the first scholar (in the 30s of the XX c.) attempted to describe the problem of human resource management. Unfortunately, her work has been ignored because it was “politically incorrect” with the then-current views regarding the initial theory of management. Follet felt that the situation of conflict may be an opportunity to better understand the employees, and she also proclaimed the belief that through better understanding among employees (due to the dialogue) the productivity increases. Unfortunately, her findings were not appreciated because then the Marxist notion of the insolubility of class conflict was dominated and the minimizing of costs was the only criterion of good management. Today it is believed that Follett was closer to the truth about society, people and management than the views of scholars and practitioners who rejected her work (Drucker, 1998).

Currently in the social sciences can be observed a state of waiting for a new systemic, holistic and interdisciplinary paradigm, which should become the methodological keystone of the different human sciences and the spiritual and material reality.

This new paradigm should overcome behaviors leading to social pathologies such as excessive individual ambitions, absolutized autonomy of human entity (not making allowances for the good of other people), aggressive behaviors as a result of morbid competition, deepening disproportion between the layer of people unfairly becoming rich and people pushed in the margin of poverty, unemployment and homelessness (Biela 2011). Such pathological behaviors can cause social conflicts on a local scale, as well as on a global one, where they relate to large social, ethnic or national groups.

Paradigm in the social sciences should allow to shape the mentality of the people and societies in the direction of mutual benevolence, friendship and brotherhood, to look for and to appear in human behaviors first of all what unites us, not what divides us. Man is a social being and all divisions are contrary to his nature (Grochmal 2015).

THE PARADIGM OF UNITY – A BREAKTHROUGH IN SCIENCE AND CULTURE

The above-mentioned paradigms (subjective or methodological) have a common object of study or methodological scheme. They try to categorize the different, exploratory or methodological concepts, often mutually exclusive. However, the use of a paradigm should also answer the question about the purpose of the research. This goal can be eg. explaining the cause-and-effect relationships between social phenomena or investigation of factors that cause the behavior of people or the proceedings of processes that led to such phenomena.

The paradigm of unity, formulated by Biela, is a teleological and not an object-oriented one, therefore it refers to the goal and not to the object of study. It is not possible to classify it according to the hitherto proposed typology of paradigms, but it can be

investigated and described by its characteristics. This paradigm allows to know the truth about man and society on the one hand, and on the other, the teleological motive of the paradigm of unity is to stimulate the social and civilization development towards building the principles of communication, sharing the material and spiritual goods, and social integration (Biela, 2005).

In the twenty years since the formulation of the paradigm of unity numerous scientific studies were realized. They confirmed the importance of this paradigm not only in the social sciences, but showed its interdisciplinary nature and application in various fields of science and contemporary culture (Araujo 2003; Biela 2006, 2009; Bruni, Sena 2012; Donati, Colozzi 2006; Grochmal 2012, 2013; Lubich 2002; Siniscalco, Innocenti 2010).

In order to present the most important features and applications of the paradigm of unity, according to the author, it is worth:

- demonstrate compliance of the paradigm of unity with the various concepts of science,
- appreciate the dialogue, which based on the paradigm of unity is maintained in the various disciplines of science and contemporary culture,
- define the role of the paradigm of unity in the meaning and attempts of solving the crisis of the contemporary culture and western civilization, identified with the crisis of Christianity.

PARADIGM OF UNITY IN THE FACE OF THE DIFFERENT CONCEPTS OF SCIENCE

In the history of science there are distinguished some concept of science: the objectivist Platonic-Aristotelian, subjectivistic according to Kant, sensualist according to Comte and evolutionary based on the works of Darwin and Spencer. It is worth considering, how a paradigm of unity can be seen in each of these concepts.

In the first, the Platonic-Aristotelian concept, the basic questions “why?” and “why is that?” are posed. In the paradigm of unity the mystery of Jesus forsaken, referring to the big “why”, which Jesus addressed to his Father before death: *My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?* (Mt 27, 46) plays the key role. Can Jesus forsaken answer the question about the mystery of existence, the meaning of human existence? What condition must be fulfilled in order to say: “I am”, “when I am” and “why I am”? Lubich explains the meaning of existence: “I am myself not when I close myself off from the other, but rather when I give myself, when out of love I lose myself in the other². (...) Therefore, my subjectivity is when it is not, out of love; that is, when out of love it is completely transferred into the other (Lubich 2001).

Lubich assessing the significance of the paradigm of unity for the philosophy of being relies on the thinkers of our time, J. Maritain and E. Przywara. Maritain wrote that *“the Greeks, both Plato and Aristotle, knew that God is Being. They did not know, however, that God is Love. We, Christians, are still far from understanding what is relevant to the way of thinking for the area and reasoning.”*

Maritain and Przywara *“predicted the possibility of progress in the search for truth, coming out of a new understanding of being as love that flows from the cross of Christ”* (Lubich 2001). It seems legitimate to say that with the paradigm of unity has appeared a new category – love as a way of understanding and getting to know the reality.

The second concept of science proposed by Kant is based on the scientifically creative question of the cognitive abilities of the human mind; and also about the purpose of the cognitive process.

According to the Aristotelian concept of science the learning objective in itself it was true, which occurred through knowledge. However, in the Middle Ages the very purpose of scientific knowl-

² Lubich gives the example of giving away a flower: “If ... I have a flower and I give it to someone, certainly I deprive myself of it, and in depriving myself, I am losing something of myself (i.e., non-being)” (Lubich 2001).

edge was challenged. St. Bonaventure (1217-1274) proclaimed that *“knowledge for knowledge itself is the pride”*, and proposed to serve the understanding of love, because *“there is no knowledge without love”* (Foshee 1967).

The paradigm of unity based on the Gospel also proposes recognition through love, in the words of Jesus, *“Who loves me, will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and manifest “* (J 14, 21). The cognitive theories assume that in any situation a human being is looking for information to make a rational decision. Thus, if we consider the paradigm of unity, it can play the role of the criterion of rationality: does the recognition serve for love, or in a particular situation I strive for unity with others or not.

The third concept of science given by Comte (called sensualist or positivist) is based on the question: how do the phenomena appear, what are the interpersonal relationships and how do they affect the human behavior?

The paradigm of unity shows not only the phenomena and processes as a result of the interaction of people (solidarity, kindness, mutual assistance, empathy, cooperation), but also the motivation of such actions and the standards and rules shaping the attitudes of people to such actions.

The fourth concept of science is based on the Darwin's and Spencer's theories of evolution in which the question is: what kind of biological and social forms allows nature to survive? Or in other words: what human behaviors, skills and competences enabled, and still enable, the human beings to survive and develop in the process of evolution?

The paradigm of unity proposes to science a methodological suggestion for the study of behaviors and human skills, just because it is an exploratory scheme of the analysis of human behaviors, social habits and skills, in particular behaviors and skills of community. The history of civilization shows that the various forms of unification enabled people to survive in evolutionary processes. Communities of people who have better skills to unite,

they were in a better position to survive than those who have not acquired these skills.

The above considerations confirm the fact that the paradigm of unity regardless of the concept of science can confer to it not only theoretical importance, but based on the peoples' experiences can provide concrete arguments for each of the concepts.

The proof of the scientific nature of the paradigm of unity can be carried out on the basis of the scientific method combined with the Popper's principle of falsification according to Aristotle's rule *modus tollendo tollens*³. For instance, the denial of the idea of the economy of communion, which is an implementation of the paradigm of unity in the management sciences, leads to a denial of the assumptions of the paradigm of unity (Grochmal 2013).

In addition, the scientific nature of the paradigm of unity is due to meet the requirements set by Kuhn and Lakatos (Lakatos 1995) and can be demonstrated by fulfilling the following requirements (Grochmal 2013; Kuhn 1977/1985; Gospodarek 2009):

- consistency (credibility and internal, logical and conceptual consistency of theory),
- simplicity (inclusiveness of concepts and theories essential for this science),
- creativity (creation of new partial theories, leading to generalizations), – social utility (opportunity to discover and explain new phenomena and problems),
- transformability (possibility of improvements and additions over time, along with discovery of successive testimonies and explaining theories).

The paradigm of unity is logically consistent, does not occur in it at one time any statement and its negation, it is built on the

³ In propositional logic to Aristotle's rule of inference *modus tollendo tollens* $[(p \Rightarrow q) \wedge \sim q] \Rightarrow \sim p$ corresponds the law of transposition: if the truth of one statement implies the truth of a second, then the negation of the second implies the denial of the first $(p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow (\sim q \Rightarrow \sim p)$.

basis of simple and understandable concepts and simple principle of unity. It inspires and makes it possible to create new theories, it is supplemented and modified with their development. Creating new partial theories is confirmed by the creation of a new scientific doctrine (Lubich 2002), eg. the realization of the economy of communion project in more than 800 companies worldwide has created a new doctrine in economics and in the sciences of management (Grochmal 2013). Social usefulness of this paradigm is confirmed by the fact of its use in practice, before the formulation of a new scientific doctrine in this field. The development of several scientific disciplines in terms of spirituality of unity shows over several years the transformability of the paradigm of unity, because it is a dynamic concept, taking into account not only the current state of human relationships with the world and society but stimulating these relationships in accordance with the holistic nature of the development of every human being.

In light of these premises the paradigm of the unity can be considered as the scientific paradigm in the sense formulated by Kuhn.

THE DIALOGUE IN VARIOUS DISCIPLINES OF SCIENCE AND WITH CONTEMPORARY CULTURE

The dialogue – according to the assumption of paradigm of unity – is a basic tool of communication in science and culture. The basis of this dialogue is openness to every person of good will, regardless of his or her beliefs. Dialogue assumes equality and respect due to the reasons of parties participating in it despite of the diversity of arguments and research methods. The necessary condition for dialogue is good will and a desire to strive for the truth, and also to understand that between good and evil, between truth and falsehood there is no compromise, and in relation

to the essential values must be preserved and recognized basic axiological systems of all persons participating in the dialogue.

For creating the dialogue the paradigm of unity provides a method with a very rich and effective strategy, the essence of the matter of which can be summarized in words: make yourself one with the other (Araujó 2010). "Making yourself one" implies a double move: out of himself (to be empty), and enter another to accomplish an integration which is not fusion but full unity in distinction. The first move (out of oneself) is realized in the willingness to listen, to free the mind and heart in order to create a place of silence in which the other can speak, create a shaded background that can reflect the light. The second move (enter into the other) is consequent of the first. The result of this step is the integration, unity in distinction.

Araujó writes: "The parties of the dialogue are not only individual actors but also the collective actors, i.e. the groups, communities, states. Reports that you create are not only interpersonal but also present in the 'macro' dimensions of both private institutions (structures) and public" (Araujó 2010).

The dialogue in the paradigm of unity is understood not as a goal but as a way of the common search of truth. Dialogue is a form of relationship that aims to the common standpoint in a fair way, with respect and mutual sympathy, without assuming *a priori* a disapproval, without aggressive polemics.

The paradigm of unity considers dialogue – according to the teaching of Paul VI – as the art of spiritual communication. It requires a clear and understandable transfer of thought, invites you to explore the challenging levels of competence and capacity of participants. Dialogue is an expression of peaceful intentions, avoids violence, it is patient, creative and generous. The dialogue supposes and demands comprehensibility (Paul VI 1964).

The convincingness in the dialogue is based on truth and love. It uses examples and no instructions or orders. Dialogue, through mutual trust, should be bound for approaching, friendship and

spiritual integration of persons. Mutual focus on the good excludes the selfish interests of each party (Araujo, 2010).

The growing importance of the paradigm of unity in many fields of science points to the need to develop certain doctrines that would be able to dialogue with the humanities, social, as well as mathematic and natural sciences. These doctrines arise and develop in a dialogue with scientists of different disciplines, based on contemporary achievements and whole heritage of these sciences. As a result, the so-called "inondations" were arisen, representing the doctrinal currents, carrying out dialogue of the culture of unity with the different fields of science and contemporary culture.

The paradigm of unity in the particular sciences does not pretend to replace the existing science through something entirely new, rejecting the achievements and all of its existing heritage. New elements of these teachings are an integral part of the existing discipline but differing significantly from the previous due to the new look through the spirituality of unity for each of the studied disciplines.

Currently there are implemented 12 inondations for the following areas: economics, politics, psychology, social communication and media, law and justice, medicine, education, art, architecture, sociology, ecology and sport. Due to the limited possibilities of this article will be presented key assumptions of paradigm of unity only in the first four above mentioned disciplines.

Inondations in economics

The paradigm of unity in economy is expressed mainly through the idea of the economy of communion and it develop in a scientific doctrine (Grochmal 2013). For understanding of this idea and the choices and motivations of the entrepreneurs who implement it in practice, it is extremely important the dimension

of interpersonal relationships as a good⁴, and not just as means of acquiring wealth. This dimension until now often overlooked is characterized by not instrumental but internal motivations, essential for happiness of the person.

Reciprocity is one of the fundamental categories in economic inondation. This is an action typical only for human beings (at animals exists exchange, also altruism, but there is no reciprocity). In this inondation the reciprocity is considered on the basis of the spirituality of unity: as a reciprocity unconditional and disinterested (gratuitous). The role of internal motivation (also in experimental dimension) is under examination, both in terms of direct reciprocity (A→B, B→A) and indirect one (A→B→C, C→A) (Bruni 2006; 2010).

The next topic of research within economic inondation is a common rationality. It concerns the relational assumptions affecting the rational choice. Within this range interesting results of research as well theoretical as experimental were achieved. They show the motivations of choices realized in certain circumstances by the persons asking: *“what would be a better option for us”* and not just *“what would be a better option for me”*?

In addition, in the context of economic inondation the processes of business management based on the aspects and *“tools”* of community spirituality are investigated (Grochmal 2013), as well as the styles of leadership, management in conflict and crisis situations and the comparisons of economy of communion companies with social enterprises (Grochmal 2015a).

Inondations in economics mark out also the perspectives and future directions of research and projects, such as: ways of generation of good and its measurement in the economy of communion businesses, evaluation of the conformity of the style of business

⁴ Relational goods are the good, which are the result of relationships, through meetings in which the identity and motivation of the other, with who I am collaborating, are important elements in the creating and in the value of this good.

management in practice with the declared principles of conducting the business in a spirit of the paradigm of unity (Grochmal 2013a), and identification and promotion in the broad sense a vocation and mission of the entrepreneur.

Inondations in politics

The revelation of politics through the paradigm of unity is an image in a totally different light than it is usually perceived and practiced. The fundamental category of this inondation are the relationships as well interpersonal as inter-party. These relationships are considered as a value, which plays an important role in exercising of politics with an orientation on the common good and in the promotion of a new political culture.

In the characteristics of this inondation there are some important elements: clear, precise and honest character of the activity, the diversity of involved acting persons, and inspiration focused on the idea of universal brotherhood, understood as the striving to the common good. Brotherhood in politics implies the replacement of the party mentality, according to which an opponent can never be right, by the Christian mentality, according to which also an opponent is my brother and also with him/her I can try to work for the common good, and his/her party to love as my own. Belongingness to different political traditions, motivated by the elections, which everybody undertakes in accordance with his own conscience, should not interfere in the pursuit of realization through the political activities the universal values which form the basis of action for the common good.

Inondations in psychology

The importance of the paradigm of unity in psychology should be considered in the context of the orientation of research at the positive aspect of human behaviors in specific situations, as a result of an interactive process between the human subject and situational stimuli. The human being is seen as an active component of shaping the unity relations with the external stimuli (i.e. the other persons, natural environment) and the ideas existing in his or her mind (e.g. with transcendent reality) (Biela 2012)⁵.

The relationships in psychology appear as a basic psychological need. In fact, the human mind is relational and just the relationship with the other gives a sense of the psychological identity of every human being. As a necessary condition for individual growth and development of the mind is perceived the relationship of reciprocity. Psychology speaks about reciprocity in the aspect of recognition, empathy, acceptance of diversity. Recognizing and being recognized by the other means the recognition of his and own identity, building the best form of mutual influence between people.

However, the inondation in psychology defines something more: it investigates and develops the meaning of the particularly complex and developed form of relationship – the communion. The authentic communion between the persons is conditioned by

⁵ In this presentation Biela gives three examples of a typical building a relationship of unity with another person. The first example is the attitude of the evangelical Samaritan in the parable of the Good Samaritan. The second one is the proposal by medieval Polish husband to replace her tired wife working behind the quern, associated with the first sentence written in Polish in *Liber fundationis claustris Sanctae Mariae Virginis* in Cistercian Monastery of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Henryków in 1270 year: “Daj, ac ja pobruszę, a ty poczywaj!” – what means in English: *Let me grind at the quern-stone, and you rest.* The third example presents the voluntary going to the hunger death by St. Maximilian Kolbe in exchange for another prisoner in a German concentration camp in Auschwitz in 1941.

the ability of mutual listening and leading the dialogue (Kozubek 2015). Communion does not only limit to the recognition and approval but it requires absolute and unconditional acceptance of another human being, opening to the total share with him or her, a radical gift of self for the other. Such requirements represent a kind of interpersonal relationship, which transforms the “I” into “we”, a relationship in which everyone expresses its own identity which opens up a meeting with the other, rather than to negate him/her (Magari 2010).

The paradigm of unity in psychology explores the relationships in which develops both individual personality and communion. It presents a model of life which is characterized by a balance between the individuality of the human person and the reciprocity in interpersonal relationships, by a certain integral vision of the person in the field of psychology.

The modern man often does not understand and does not accept any restrictions that affect him or her. There are various physical or spiritual sufferings, falls and painful experiences which may constitute a significant obstacle within the meaning of the sense of life and self-realization in communion with the other. It is extremely important to understand the role of limitations because overpassing of them is a constitutive element of the psychological balance and their acceptance in life is an essential condition for achieving psychological maturity⁶.

The perspectives of scientific research in psychology based on the paradigm of unity relate to the nature of behaviors of persons remaining in the community or in unity with another person. It concerns the help for others, sharing with others with material

⁶ Lubich explains it in this way: *In the process of maturity one cannot reach a new stage without detachment and renunciation of the previous stage (weaning of child is its passage, which carries the suffering, but it is necessary so that it can grow in its humanity; acceptance of siblings assumed the painful transition from selfish being the center of attention to the stage of socialization (...) to integrate with others and go in the stage of “we”)* (Lubich 2001).

and spiritual goods, supporting others in their personal, professional and spiritual development, as well as the creating with others a community striving to realize the common good.

Inondations in social communication and media

Social communication is an essential and integral dimension of the human person, contributes to its development, is a constitutive element of the human personality. In the spirituality of unity communication is the condition *sine qua non* to unite people. The paradigm of unity considers the communication as an expression of the mutual relationship of people and communities – communication is the love to the other (Zanzucchi 2011). Communication also means a participation in the community because by the word, language, gestures, text, images or sounds the person participates in the community life.

The means of communication are therefore a very important tool to build unity. To achieve this scope it is not enough, of course, only using the technical means. The essence of this inondation are the methods of communication and the contents transmitted by these means.

Within this inondation are undertaken various initiatives and certain research are conducted, the aim of which is to show the importance of the charism of unity in the shaping of attitudes of persons working in the media, and to encourage them to use the communication methods and conveyed contents in order to create the correct interpersonal relationships, to show a positive influence of ethics on the social behaviors, and to develop human capacities for cooperation and assistance in a spirit of solidarity.

The paradigm of unity in the sciences of the social communication seeks to sensitize media professionals to integrating human activities and initiatives of creating and magnifying the dimension of common good. It seeks to shape the responsibility for the man-

ner and content of information, and to present a positive image of the media opposed to the methods and means of contemporary art of communication, focused on massification, commercialization and uncritical targeting at the ideological aspects.

The globalization in the culture of communication conditions more and more a man from the market imperatives and political strategies. The paradigm of unity seeks to be opposed to the vision of the media society in which reality is created virtually in order to make a man dependent on all products of the media culture. Such a creation of reality is socially dangerous, especially for young people, because it leads to the disappearance of the border between reality and fiction.

The basic category of social communication is language. The culture of language is passing now a serious crisis. An SMS-style is more and more popular, especially among young people. It is characterized by an impoverished vocabulary consisting of a small quantity of words which are declined only according to the rules of specific "grammar". The contacts between persons have often only a phatic⁷ character and does not serve any purpose of interpersonal communication. The culture of unity in social communication is opposed to such a type of pseudo-culture of language.

The culture of communication based on the paradigm of unity is also opposed to such actions of media operators, where there is a lack of respect, instrumentalization of human suffering and intimacy, showing the evil and human iniquities, the images tragic and negative in their expression.

Culture of unity in social communication promotes respect for every human being, especially being in difficult situations, respect for his or her privacy, highlighting what is good, emphasizing the positive image of reality and perspectives, with a prudent

⁷ Phatic (gr. *phátis* – speech) means the words or other language elements serving only for maintain a contact, not for the exchange of information.

showing the errors and defects in an objective and responsible way. This culture does not pass over in silent what are negative in people and situations, but more emphasizes what is positive (Lubich 2001).

The role of communication according to the paradigm of unity is to transfer and exchange the ideas between people, to explain the reality, to shape the attitudes to the seeking a comprehensive and integral human development.

In the system of mass-media communication the participation in the events was replaced by information. However, the essence of communication between people is to build relationships and co-participation through which a man grows up and develops in his or her humanity⁸.

The communications media should serve to the sustainable development of all people, societies and nations, oppose the imposition of one culture and one vision of the world, aim to reduce the negative impact of globalization processes in the interest of building a community of different civilizations and cultures.

THE PARADIGM OF UNITY IN RELATION TO THE CRISIS OF MODERN CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

One of the basic features and requirements of each paradigm is a consistency. Conclusions from assumptions cannot lead to the denial of these assumptions. On the other hand, quite comfortable conditions for the introduction of the new paradigm is a crisis situation, when the previously accepted assumptions are questioned by the new events, results of research or new concepts.

⁸ The term: *communication* comes from the Latin verb *communicare* what means *to be in a relationship, to make common, participate, associate*; so *communication* has a very important relationship with life in the community and being in the relationships.

In addition to the importance which the paradigm of unity can have for modern science it seems advisable to indicate the role that it can play in the understanding and overcoming the crisis of modern European culture and civilization⁹.

The European culture is rooted in Christianity and is associated with it in an extremely important way. You can say that – in analogy to the Kuhn’s definition of the paradigm – twenty centuries of European culture identified with the Christian culture is a period of “the normal science (culture)”, more or less impairment but which have not led to its downfall. Today’s contestations and often protests or even hostile and hateful attitudes towards the culture and the Christian faith, occurring not only in Europe, are an image of the Kuhn’s “anomalies”, leading to a crisis situation. The contemporary crisis of culture is in fact the crisis of Christianity. So, will the crisis situation lead to a complete rejection of the existing assumptions (i.e. Christianity)?

According to the paradigmatic theory of the science’s development there are possible three ways (solutions): to explain the anomaly, to ignore them, or to take them as a base to overthrow the existing paradigm and make attempts to create a new one. There may be yet another situation when in the crisis situation occurs an apposition and a detailing of the significant assumptions of paradigm (explaining the reasons for the emergence of anomalies), which are forgotten or have not known during the long-term use of paradigm.

One of the effects of the crisis of culture is a breakaway from the Christian roots and the desire to adopt the nihilistic attitudes. This nihilistic effect is obviously something negative, but in the spirituality of unity and in the paradigm of unity ensuing from it there is no escape from the attitude of the current situation. You

⁹ Limitation only to Europe does not diminish the role and significance of the paradigm of unity in the culture, but the analysis of other cultures is beyond the scope of this paper.

should instead look for solutions which could bring off a good from this situation and renew contemporary culture. The spirituality of unity teaches that every difficult, negative situation can be transformed into good by analogy to the suffering and death of Christ in the perspective of His resurrection.

The spirituality of unity calls such a state the face of Jesus forsaken, which expresses His feeling of the greatest distance from God, but at the same time entrusts Him His spirit, entrusting Him to the end, expressing of His union with the Father (Lubich 2001).

The reference to Jesus forsaken and crucified any negative events, human suffering and lack of mutual understanding, divisions and non-unities, to be used and humiliated by others is in the spirituality of unity the key to understand the meaning of suffering and trouble, seeing in the perspective of Cross the meaning and effect of suffering – the Resurrection. This crisis of modern western culture can be understood not as a fall and degeneration of culture but as a chance to renew it just by this way of the acceptance of these negative phenomena.

Looking at this crisis in the spirit of the paradigm of unity and being based on the premises of Jesus forsaken reality, according to the experience and thought of Chiara Lubich one can understand the whole modern crisis, its sense and scope. Lubich identifies the image of Jesus suffering and abandoned with every person tortured, persecuted, excluded, lonely, lost, with each division between brothers, between churches, between nations as well – what is important from the point of view of the analysis of the crisis of culture - with the image of a modern, secularized world, rejecting God, suffering all kinds of madness (Lubich, 2006).

Zanghi believes that being aware of this situation, through the experience of nihilism, loss of the sense, deadlock of the traditional metaphysics we are in the out-phase of the crisis towards a new cultural paradigm which can be a gift of renewed western civilization for other cultures (Zanghi 2007). That is not the point of imposing Christianity on the other non-Christian cultures but

about testimony of profound changes, which western culture has to face to pass from superficial references to the understanding in fullness the essence of Christianity. The chance to renew the modern culture depend on the will, skill and possibilities of people to unite each other, to strive for universal brotherhood, to live with the culture of unity.

This is the quintessence of the new paradigm, the paradigm of unity in culture and science, in which many scientists have their hopes for renewal of man, contemporary culture and western civilization.

CONCLUSIONS

It is worth noting that paradigm of unity seems to have many methodological advantages. It may integrate research projects in the social sciences by exploring the social mechanisms supporting the actions of people towards more solidary relationships, joint ventures and mutual help. In addition, the methodology of research in the social sciences based on the paradigm of unity, due to its multidimensional aspect, gains a powerful instrument to develop the advanced research methods.

The paradigm of unity is also a specific tool to search and create the relationships between a man and the surrounding reality in every field of his or her action, and first of all the relationships with another man. This paradigm also proposes to modern man a vision, frameworks making the reference points, to give him or her on this basis the skill of behaviors in new way in the face to the people and to the world.

REFERENCES

- Araújo, V. (2003). *Il paradigma dell'unità dai discorsi di Chiara per le lauree h.c.*, Raduno delle volontarie, Castel Gandolfo.
- Araújo, V. (2010). Il "quinto dialogo" del Movimento dei Focolari. Cosa è, cosa vuole, cosa fa. in: Siniscalco L., Innocenti A.L. (eds.). *Atti il quinto dialogo*. Testi del Convegno di febbraio 2010, Rocca di Papa.
- Babbie, E. (2010). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont: Cengage Learning Inc.
- Biela, A. (1996). *Przestanie jedności*, Laudacja wygłoszona 19 czerwca 1996 z okazji nadania tytułu doktora *honoris causa* KUL Chiarze Lubich, Lublin: *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL*, 39, 195-211. Italian version: Una rivoluzione copernicana per le scienze sociali. *Nuova Umanità*, Vol.18 (6). n.108, 699-708.
- Biela, A. (2005). *The Need to Build the Paradigm of Unity in Social Sciences*, in: Araújo V. (ed.). *Social Relationships and Fraternity: Paradox or Sustainable Model? A Social Sciences' Perspective*, Accounts of the International Conference on Sociology *Social-One*, Castel Gandolfo (Rome). 11-13.02.2005, www.social-one.org/it/download/doc_download/47-ens3-bielapdf.html; (accessed 10.05.2012).
- Biela, A. (2006). A Paradigm of the Unity in Social Sciences. *Journal for Perspectives of Economic, Political and Social Integration. Journal for Mental Changes*, vol. XII, no. 1-2, pp.166-177.
- Biela, A. (2009). A Paradigm of the Unity in Psychology. *Journal for Perspectives of Economic, Political and Social Integration. Journal for Mental Changes*, vol. XV, no. 1-2, pp.77-88.
- Biela, A. (2011). *Paradygmat jedności jako motyw nadania doktoratu honoris causa Chiarze Lubich przez Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski w czerwcu 1996 roku*, in: W. Otrębski (ed.). *Elementy myśli społecznej Chiarzy Lubich – 15 rocznica nadania DHC przez Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.*, Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Fiore.
- Biela, A. (2012). *Paradigm of unity as a prospect for research and treatment in psychology*, Presentation on International Conference on Psychology and Unity, Castel Gandolfo, May 2012, pp. 11-15.
- Bowman, P. (2014). *Changing Paradigms in Economics: Economics as Relationships*, July 4, 2014, <https://explore.scimednet.org/index.php/wiki/changing-paradigms-in-economics/> (accessed 20.09.2016).
- Branstetter, J. (2012). *Normative Occlusion and the Deliberative Paradigm in New Media Research*, Western Political Science Association, Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Bruni, L. (2000). *L'Economia di Comunione*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.

- Bruni, L. (2006). *Reciprocità. Dinamiche di cooperazione, economia e società civile*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Bruni, L. (2010). *I luoghi di azione e l'EdC*, in: Siniscalco L., Innocenti A.L. (eds.). *Atti il quinto dialogo*. Testi del Convegno di febbraio 2010, Rocca di Papa.
- Bruni, L., Sena B. (eds.). (2012). *The Charismatic Principle in Social Life*, London: Routledge.
- Burrell, G., Morgan G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*, London: Heinemann. http://faculty.babson.edu/krollag/org_site/org_theory/Scott_articles/burrell_morgan.html (accessed 7.08.12).
- Buss, D.M. (2012). *Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind*. Allyn & Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.
- Drucker, P. (1998). *Management's New Paradigms*, "Forbes", October 5, 1998, p. 152-177, <http://www.forbes.com/forbes/1998/1005/6207152a.html>; (accessed 05.11.2011).
- Dogan, M. (2001). Paradigms in the Social Sciences. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 16 (New-Per). N. J. Smeltser, P. B. Baltes (eds.). Elsevier Amsterdam, pp. 11023-11027. <http://wpsa.research.pdx.edu/meet/2012/branstetter.pdf>; (accessed 10.08.2012).
- Donati, P., Colozzi I. (eds.) (2006). *Il paradigma relazionale nelle scienze sociali: le prospettive sociologiche*, il Mulino, Bologna.
- Foshee, C.N. (1967). *St. Bonaventure and the Augustinian Concept of Mens*, *Franciscan Studies*, Vol. 27, pp.115-162; DOI:10.1353/frc.1967.0005; <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/454312/pdf> (accessed 10.09.2016).
- Gospodarek, T. (2009). Representative management' as a rational research program in Kuhn–Lakatos–Laudan sense. *Int. J. Economics and Business Research*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp.409–421.
- Gospodarek, T. (2012). *Aspekty złożoności i filozofii nauki w zarządzaniu*. Wałbrzych: Wydawnictwo Wałbrzyskiej Wyższej Szkoły Zarządzania i Przedsiębiorczości.
- Grochmal, S. (2012). *The Paradigm of Unity in Business Management*, in: *Tradition and New Horizons: Towards the Virtue of Responsibility*, Proceedings of the Fifth ISBEE World Congress, presented by the International Society of Business, Economics and Ethics & Kozminski University, Warsaw, July,11–14, 2012.
- Grochmal, S. (2013). *Paradygmat jedności w kontekście zarządzania organizacjami*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, Rzeszów.
- Grochmal, S. (2013a). *Evaluation of conformity of management practice with a paradigm of unity in economy of communion businesses by quantitative methods*, in: *Knowledge – Economy – Society. Global and Regional Challenges of the 21st Century Economy*;

- P. Lula, B. Mikuła, A. Jaki (eds.). Publishing House Foundation of the Cracow University of Economics, Cracow 2013, Chapter 53, pp. 683-694.
- Grochmal, S. (2015). Mental and cultural changes of enterprise management in accordance with the paradigm of unity. *Journal for Perspectives of Economic, Political and Social Integration. Journal of Mental Changes*, Vol. 20, Issue 1-2, pp. 105-134, ISSN (Online) 1733-3911, DOI: 10.2478/v10241-012-0028-0. <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/pepsi.2014.20.issue-1/v10241-012-0028-0/v10241-012-0028-0.xml?rskey=h5qWN8&result=3>
- Grochmal, S. (2015a). Ekonomia komunii w relacji do ekonomii społecznej – analogie, różnice, szansa na współdziałanie, *Ekonomia Społeczna*, Nr 2/2015, pp. 43-59; DOI: 10.15678/ES.2015.2.03.
- Gray, R.M. (2005). *Archetypal Explorations: An Integrative Approach to Human Behavior*. London: Routledge.
- Guba, E., Lincoln Y. (1994). *Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research*, in: N.K. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln (eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks,
- Gwiazda, A. (2010). *Zarządzanie jako nauka wieloparadygmata*, „Współczesne Zarządzanie”, Nr 4, pp.22-33.
- Hatch, M.J. (1997/2002). *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford; Polish edition: (2002). *Teoria organizacji*, PWN, Warszawa, p.204-238.
- Huehn, M. (2008). *Paradigms in Management*, Working Paper No. 9, German University in Cairo, <http://mgt.guc.edu.eg/wpapers/009huehn2008.pdf> (access 05.09.2016).
- Jemieliński, D. (2008). *Praca oparta na wiedzy. Praca w przedsiębiorstwach wiedzy na przykładzie organizacji High-Tech*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1977/1985). *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*, University of Chicago Press, 1977, p.321; Polish edition: (1985). *Dwa bieguny: tradycja i nowatorstwo w badaniach naukowych*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962/1968). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, 1962; Polish edition: (1968). *Struktura rewolucji naukowych*, Warszawa: Aletheia.
- Kozubek, M.T. (2015). „Wspólnota” i „jedność” w wybranych obszarach życia społecznego – doświadczenie Ruchu Focolari, *Paedagogia Christiana*, No 2/36, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/PCh.2015.027>.
- Lakatos, I. (1995). *Pisma z filozofii nauk empirycznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Lubich, C. (2001). *La dottrina spirituale*. Roma, Mondadori
- Lubich, C., (2002). *Una cultura nuova per una nuova societ*. Roma:, Citta Nuova Editrice.
- Lubich, C. (2006). *La nostra risposta alla notte collettiva e culturale di oggi*, Giornata della fraternit  universale, Messaggio al Volontarifest, Budapest, September 16, 2006, A FokolareMozgalom bels  haszn lat ra, Budapest.
- Madej, Z. (2011). Paradygmaty i g ówny nurt w ekonomii. *Ekonomista*, Vol. 2011, T. 2.
- Magari, S.(2010). *Psicologia e Comunione*, in: Siniscalco L., Innocenti A.L. (eds.). *Atti il quinto dialogo*. Testi del Convegno di febbraio 2010, Rocca di Papa.
- Marciniak  . (2008). Stawanie si  nauczycielem akademickim. Analiza symboliczno-interakcjonistyczna., *Przegl d Socjologii Jakościowej*”, Tom IV, Nr 2. http://przegladsocjologiijakosciowej.org/Volume7/PSJ_monografie_3.pdf (accessed 10.08.2012).
- Palley, T.I. (2004). *From Keynesianism to Neoliberalism: Shifting Paradigms in Economics*, May 5, 2004, Foreign Policy in Focus, http://fpif.org/from_keynesianism_to_neoliberalism_shifting_paradigms_in_economics/ (accessed 05.09.2016).
- Paul VI (1964). *Ecclesiam suam*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Poni, M. (2014). Research Paradigms in Education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, Vol. 4, No.1, pp.407-413.
- Puuronen, V. (2005). Methodological Starting Points and Problems of Youth Research, in: Mixed Methods in Youth Research, H. Helve (ed.). *Finnish Youth Research Network and Finnish Youth Research Society, Publications 60, Tampere*, pp. 15-28. http://faculty.babson.edu/krollag/org_site/org_theory/Scott_articles/burrell_morgan.html; (accessed 7.08.12).
- Ritzer, G. (1975). *Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science*., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, p.12, p.164.
- Sapp, S.G. (2013). *Paradigms in sociology*, www.soc.iastate.edu/sapp/soc235Phil.html, (access 05.09.2016).
- Siniscalco, L., Innocenti, A.L. (eds.) (2010). *Il quinto dialogo*. Testi del Convegno di febbraio 2010, Rocca di Papa.
- Su kowski,   (2010). Two Paradigms in Management Epistemology. *Journal of Intercultural Management*, Vol. 2, No. 1, March 2010, pp. 109–119.
- Su kowski   (2013). *Cultural Paradigms in Management Sciences*, „Management and Business Administration. Central Europe”, Vol. 22, No. 3(122). pp. 50–57.
- Varvatsoulas, G. (2010). Convergent pathways between evolutionary psychology and psychology of religion. *Journal for Interdisciplinary Research on Religion and Science*, No. 7, July 2010, p.41-63.

Zanzucchi, M. (2011). *La Parola e le parole. Comunicare è essenziale*. XV Meeting online, 14.10.2011, <http://www.net-one.org/archivio/articoli/scienze-delle-comunicazioni/1197-xv-meeting-online-michele-zanzucchi.html> (accessed 15.01.2013).

Zanghi, G. (2007). *La notte culturale dell'Europa*, Scuola delle e dei Prevolontari, Castel Gandolfo, 20 Aprile 2007.