



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

Selected by coverage in Social Sciences Citation Index, ISI databases

POSTMODERN ETHICS AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AUTHENTICITY IN COMMUNICATION-BASED SOCIETY

Iulia GRAD, Sandu FRUNZA

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2016, vol. 53, pp. 326-336

The online version of this article can be found at:

www.rcis.ro, www.doaj.org and www.scopus.com

Published by:

Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:

„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,

Department of Sociology and Social Work

and

Holt Romania Foundation

REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA

is indexed by ISI Thomson Reuters - Social Sciences Citation Index

(Sociology and Social Work Domains)

Postmodern Ethics and the Reconstruction of Authenticity in Communication-Based Society

Iulia GRAD¹, Sandu FRUNZA²

Abstract

The new type of society that postmodernism brings has at its base not only a new conception of the human being, but also on its ethical condition. To avoid any conflict between ethical absolutism and relativism and also to avoid falling into a nonfunctional ethical relativism, postmodern thinking brings a complex construction of plural ethical options. We use the concepts of communication ethics, relational ethics, interpretation ethics, responsibility ethics, dissemination ethics, and authenticity ethics with the purpose to establish a few landmarks in configuring the ethical attitude of the postmodern man. The construction of postmodern ethical relativism under the sign of a relational ethics opens the ethical practices towards a building of a reality defined by personal instances that relate to the imagined community and an imagined horizon. The purpose of all these is to accomplish the good life as an authentic existence.

Keywords: social construction, communication-based society, ethical communication, relational ethics, interpretation ethics, responsibility ethics, dissemination ethics, authenticity ethics.

¹ Romanian Academy, București, ROMANIA; Babes-Bolyai University, Department of Communication, Public Relations, and Advertising, Cluj, Romania. Email: iuliagrad@gmail.com

² Babes-Bolyai University, Department of Communication, Public Relations, and Advertising, Cluj, ROMANIA. Email: sfrunza@yahoo.com

Communication and relational reality

There already is an agreement more or less voiced that we live in a communication-based society. More than that, it can be considered a society based on ethical communication. We cannot conceive today's society without ethics because communication cannot be conceived without a central element of communication-ethical liaison. Technological development did not bring along a neutrality of establishing relationships. Many of the critics of technological development thought that the fast growth of technology, especially of communication technology will lead either to a neutrality in relation to ethical concepts or to a form of taking control over men by the very instruments of communication. Each one of these should have had negative consequences on the level of authentic relationships on which the human experience is built. In reality, the phenomenon is just the opposite.

Even if technology (as a decisive factor of today's society postmodern character) participates in the fragmentation of seemingly unmistakable Western society's foundations, this is not done in a destructive manner; it is rather geared towards a new social and interpersonal construction. This is one of the reasons that determines Gianni Vattimo to state that the birth of communicational society leaves a deep mark on postmodern society along with changes in the ideatic plan-such as the dissolution of the history metaphysics philosophies-and the end of Colonialism. All these elements participate in a reconstruction of the world. They are closely tied to the context of dissolution of central points of view, of general multiplications of visions of the worlds and the corrosion of the principle of unique reality (Zyla 2014). Therefore, we can accept that reality has become today "the result of junction, of contamination of a series of images, interpretations, reconstructions which in competition with each other, or without any central coordination, are distributed through means of communication" (Vattimo, 1995: 9).

There is a question that arises: is there a specific way the new communication context leads to the construction of reality? A possible answer might come from rethinking the relationship between communication and religion (Ferre, 2015; Grad, 2014). This relationship can be analyzed in the context of the connection between mass media and religion and the professional practices specific for mediatic communication. Researchers emphasize in this case a special dialectic of the relationship between subjective and objective, between what reality really is and the built reality or the imagined reality, each one becoming a resource for developing the other. More than that, "media and religion are handling together the continuous challenges imposed by the fast technological progress in worldwide media communication" (Nistor & Beuran, 2014: 178). We will see that thought and option pluralism are reflected on representations pluralism and that of religious choices. Although postmodern ethics is built under the form of a laic

ethics diversity, most often they does not leave the original religious background, even if it becomes marginal. There is a form of transcending- on the level of every speech and ethical practice, depending on the plural forms of reality construction. In this context, Gianni Vattimo identifies the significance of erosion of the principle of reality in the world of mass media, in the explosion of a multitude of particular rationalities, which goes beyond the simple acknowledgement of pluralism. It entails going from being aware of historicity and the contingency of all values systems towards the “demythisation of demythisation” (Vattimo, 1995: 49).

Another important aspect in the description of communication in postmodern society is represented by a paradigmatic change highlighted by Codoban who considers that we are witnessing a shift from a modern theory of communication as informational vehicle to a postmodern one, of communication as relation. The relational – affective aspect which occupied a central position in the old modern and illuminist concept of communication becomes essential. “The postmodern and globalizing concept of communication considers as a primordial trait not the generation of information but the building of relations. (...) To communicate means to be in a relation because the origin of community lays in the need to relate to other people, to make them cooperate, to coordinate their actions regarding different commune purposes” (Codoban, 2011: 46). The comfortable knowledge episteme is surpassed by the uncomfortably fluid episteme of communication. In this context, “besides the world wide web, the introduction of virtual reality is one of the defining characteristics of the world we live in” (Codoban, 2011: 49). The ethical dimension is inherent in the communication process, whether we refer to direct interpersonal communication or to mediated communication, the ethical scrutiny is absolutely necessary. The special relationship between communication and ethics becomes even more obvious in the context of this change in paradigm. Communication means relation, and the relational character is what makes ethics in this case a relational ethics. It does not target a transcendence of values anymore, rather a construction of these in communication. We do not want to claim here that classical forms of ethics in professional environments are completely eluded (Cojocaru, Cace, & Gavrilovici, 2013) or those of ethical valorization in society with a strong religious mark (Ardelean, 2016; Vladutescu & Teodorescu, 2015). What is essential is the fact that ethical reconstruction of postmodern society is accomplished as way of favoring the relationship in relation with totality, or in other words of the individuality in relation with the Universal. Therefore a relational ethics must start from the individual and from the multiple transcendents he can have in relation to alterity.

Facing global communication, the challenges we have to confront demand new approaches of the ethical dimension that should take into account the impossibility of an a priori knowledge from which ethical priorities can be deducted. They can have general themes or they can target groups with special ethical

requirements (Pop, Dabija, & Iorga, 2014; Holliday, 2013). The dynamics between human freedom and responsibility is affected by the communicational society, in which we live in, but “we still do not have a necessary language for expressing this kind of relation, but, as fragile, incarnated and finite beings we are invited to develop it” (Taylor, 2011: 103; Alonso & Fernandez Rodriguez, & Carlos, 2010). Without eluding ethical traditions as a possible source of the postmodern ethical construction, the theoretical framework necessary for an ethical approach of this development process are offered by the scholars of postmodern ethics who describe “the third type of ethics” which follow the final stage of ethical secularization and finds its pattern neither in traditional religious ethics, nor in the modern secular duty, rigorous and categorical (Lipovetsky, 1996: 19).

In this respect, B.C. Taylor and L.C. Hawes identify four specific statements for postmodern ethics relevant in the sphere of communication ethics, especially in the context of recent developments in media communication. The four statements are: (1) ethics is central, not auxiliary in the discourse concerning human condition; (2) alterity is the main concern of ethics, and postmodernity is a condition of increased susceptibility to alterity which, in turn, emphasizes the mysterious, stimulating, but also threatening nature of the encounter with difference, thus becoming a source of conflict and insecurity; (3) the ethical agent is constituted in and through discourse; (4) the postmodern refusal to identify an original source of ethics (Taylor & Hawes, 2011: 100-102). The authors identify two major consequences of placing communication ethics in the field of postmodern ethical theory. First of all, is the assertion of the constant effort to find meaningful ways of deliberation in the case of differences concerning ethical issues. A second consequence is that there is the need to reconceptualize the communication agent as a result of the decentralization of ethical agent. “The necessity of reconceptualizing communicative agency following the decentering of the ethical subject ... ‘Responsible’ ethical agents are those whose abilities to respond are developed and supervised in ongoing relationships. If there is virtue still to be found in communication, in this view, it does not emanate from the objective validity of a particular theory, or the character of an individual speaker. Instead, it is accomplished by actors in reflectively nurturing the potential for mutual recognition and transformation that is opened through the process of their encounter” (Taylor & Hawes, 2011: 104). Relational ethic is an ethic of responsibility which is built as a form of meeting in the context of interpersonal dialogue, often conditioned by the complex process of different types of acknowledgement in the public space, of the manner in which mass media shapes reality or of the way in which local and global identities participate in joint significations in the generalized communication process (Minea, 2012; Corbu, 2009; Garcia Capilla, 2012). Acknowledgement is a process in which alterity is always discovered through participation in the world of meanings, by building shared

significations, which basically means contributing to the project of a good life inside a community.

Communication and the ethical life of the subject

The ongoing negotiation of meanings and significances implied by a post-metaphysical ethic is illustrated in the distinction made by Vattimo based on the special relation between hermeneutics and ethics, between communication ethics and ethics of interpretation. Starting from authors such as Appel and Habermas, Vattimo believes that communication ethics is an ethic still dominated by metaphysical-transcendental preconception, acknowledging “an a priori which is a boundless communication or the action of communication”. As Vattimo states, this ethic confirms “the intersubjective essence of self not by binding it to concrete historical conditionings, but only according to the specific law of the collective seen as a place of communication universalization,” (Vattimo, 2000: 149) and shows strong signs of an a historical tendency (Mackenzie, 2011).

It must be said that even in situations where there are remnants of the metaphysics that inspired it, postmodern ethics seen as communication ethics doesn't pay tribute to these because it is an ethic based on a subject that subtracts itself, in a programmatic way from such conditionings (if we accept this as a possibility). The subject is permanently built as a relational being, capable of a construction that goes on forever and through it gains the attributes of an entity that always projects itself outside itself. It is inexhaustible, but at the same time circumscribed; it has self-existence, but at the same time is conditioned by the ethical relation with the others; it builds reality with the data of its own historical life, but at the same time it is limited by the other's presence as an existential given and landmark. Communication and interpretation should be rather seen as two sides of the same coin in the ethical game. A large part of what we can identify as ethical life of the subject is found in their interference. Vattimo believes that unlike communication ethics, the ethic of interpretation focuses on the reconnection of different specialized languages and area of interests with the Logos - common consciousness, understood as “an extreme idea, the adjustment ideal of a community of life which is always about to create itself, but never identifiable to a real historic society whose established values would have to be accepted and taken as canons” (Vattimo, 2000: 146). Historicity as belonging and truth as articulation of a tradition to which it belongs, offers hermeneutics the chance to remain loyal to its ethical vocation. Because it does not declare itself as “a descriptive theory concerning the hermeneutical structure of existence”, hermeneutics becomes the philosophy of mass communication which states that “there is not a truth existing as a stable structure of existence reflected in sentences, but numerous horizons, different cultural universes in which real experiences are unfolding, as

articulations and internal interpretations” (Vattimo, 2000: 152). This ethics of interpretation, as it is described by Vattimo, belongs to “the world of public opinion, of mass-media, of Weber’s polytheism, of technical organization which is totally biased to existence, and which can offer itself a theory of truth not as conformity, but as interpretation” (Vattimo, 2000: 153). Only as a reflection on the end of modernity defined by the shift towards informatics technology, when we discuss the generalized communication and when human being is weakened and scattered, that hermeneutics takes the place of communication ethics through an ethic of interpretation, based on an ontology of scattering and which specifies the search for landmarks in provenance, not in existential structures (Vattimo, 2000: 157).

Communication society, with its extensions, determines us to become aware of the fact that, as proven by the scholars of postmodern ethics, “an ethic is an essentially historical affair” (Caputo, 1988: 256) and that today we are dealing with “an ethics of otherness.” The theoreticians preoccupied with the post-colonization and de-colonization of ethical communication function as a good example. Assuming that “ethics of communication is overwhelmingly limited by the Eurocentric cultural assumptions”, they are trying to prove that “western illuminist notions of rationality, justice, humanity are not necessarily entirely transferable in other contexts without engaging in issues of social injustice which are generated by ideological and intellectual domination of western theoretical thinking”. Thus, from this perspective, “the strength of post-colonial theory stands in the fact that it offers us a critical framework which validates local epistemologies necessary for the creation of a global ethic, and which acknowledges power inequalities in which various cultures and nations are historically positioned” (Munshi, Broadfoot, & Smith, 2011: 119).

Searching the authenticity

Starting with the reflections of John D. Caputo we can see that authenticity, a term privileged by postmodern ethics, is in fact “the acknowledgement of the fact that we do not know “the master’s name”. Caputo warns that we are obliged to take a lesson in humility and to move forward with concern for the other. The moral conclusion of this story is that we are “a community of mortals: both mortals and a community”. The task of a radical ethic, as Caputo describes it means the braking of metaphysical binary schemes and the assertion and compliance of its difference and right. The virtues promoted by dissemination ethics are “a cautious humility and compassion”, in the sense that we share the same fate: “a common comfortlessness” (Caputo, 1988: 259). The ethics of dissemination, operating only within the community and only in the conversation between people and whose concern is to respect the fair play nature of the conversation

represents the ethics of the “modern mega-polis.” In modern mega-polis civility becomes a „meta-phronesis, namely, the skill to cope with competing paradigms”, the virtue of knowing how to enjoy it and to live with the dissemination of ethos (Caputo, 1988: 262; Vanden Auweele, 2013).

However, regardless of how it is described, the ethics of modern mega-polis, as an ethic of interpretation, of dissemination or of authenticity, the question of necessity and possibility remains open for discussion, as well as the danger posed by the presence of comprehensibility elements. Even in a culture of authenticity based on the rhetoric of difference and diversity – perhaps more than anywhere else – the awareness of an inevitable horizon of comprehensibility is necessary, because in the end it guarantees the difference. “Authenticity cannot be defended through methods which blur the horizons of significance.” (Taylor, 2006: 33). The question which arises in this point of our approach is whether we can talk about “horizons of significance” in the communicational society. Trying to figure out an answer to this question, Ronald C. Arnett analyses the ironic part played by meta-story in communication ethics and states that the reality of a meta-narrative certainty remains an important part of the human structure in postmodernity. Arnett describes the difference as being the new dwelling place for goodness, as the universal, democracy, codes and procedures, contextuality, narrative and dialogic were before this. This postmodern house of goodness directs the study of communication ethics (Arnett, 2011: 33-34).

The development of communication media intensifies in an unprecedented manner the connection with difference, and this aspect marks the dynamic of the relation between the unexpected, protection, and goodness, this latter one being perceived not in terms of Manichaeism, as the opposite of badness, but as a “presupposition or a sense of ground upon which all depend.” Thus, “our current era is engaged in the protection of the postmodern good of difference.” It is precisely in this special relationship between postmodernity and difference that Arnett finds something “akin to a metanarrative” understood as a „connecting link that helps us in making sense of the world” (Arnett, 2011: 34). In contemporary society, the focus of communication ethics is on alterity, by the fact that it states the impossibility of maintaining the supremacy over a certain position leads from Arnett’s point of view, paradoxically, precisely to the realization that metanarrative cannot be eliminated. Placing communication ethics in the realm of theory-practice dialectic, the author claims that despite the postmodern rejection of metanarrative, communication ethics leads us into a world of difference and otherness which sends us back to wonder and which affirms the ongoing reality of metanarratives in communication ethics.

The abandonment of great stories (Lyotard, 1993; Raese, 2011) also meant the abandonment of a totalizing vision of the world that exerts a standardizing pressure. The integrating force of the story seemed to also be one that determines the standardizing in the name of the internal logic of the ideatic system on which is

built. This is how it is sometimes explained the association between the preference for meta-narrative and ideologies. This end is closely tied to the role played by meta-narratives in cultural mentalities. It is believed, and it's partially true, that along with postmodern thinking meta-narratives have lost their meaning and more often they do not have the capacity to sensitize at a deep level of the postmodern human being. They are replaced by personal experiences and spot on stories that disclose personal feelings. They bring-besides the necessity of integrating the experience of personal stories in a shared experience-a larger visibility of difference and a need of valuing alterity. Although the Westerner builds a large part of its cultural history through discovering alterity, through the constant expanding of its acceptance sphere, the accent put on the importance of difference has never been so large. Besides a great cultural and ethical strength it also has an extraordinary political power. We can see today, in the pluralist society, a special concern for the cause of the stranger, the enemy or for the radical alterity of the terrorist. Each one of these images has attached to itself an ethical-political force of great impact. At the same time, they entail a constant perfecting of control mechanism and a nuance of techniques, methods and contents of communication.

Difference, whether perceived in terms of metanarrative as Arnett does, or as "imperative" of a radical ethic as Caputo describes it, remains the central element of proximity from the perspective of communication ethics inside postmodern society. By the fact that it privileges elements which are traditionally marginalized, like fragility, impermanency, gender, decentralized self, ethical pluralism, post-modern theory offers new possibilities for communication ethics (Taylor & Hawes, 2011: 105). Postmodernism, described by Bauman as "morality without ethical code", or as modernism without the illusion of replacing "the entanglement of human world" with the systematic and orderly reign of reason, re-enchants the world because he stops perceiving "mystery as a tolerated stranger waiting for a distance mandate" and proclaims that in order for ethics to be practical, it has to function as "an inside affair" (Bauman, 2000: 39).

But, the third age of ethics, contemporary authenticity, which follows that of ancient excellence and modern merit, doesn't imply the cancellation of these previous ones because "authenticity tends to be revalued only when accompanied either by the virtue of courage, or the power of seduction, so when it functions as the authenticity of an inner richness whose expression generates approval or admiration of others" (Ferry, 1997: 327). The price of maintaining the exigency of authenticity is precisely this singular and generalizable character of the individual. In the culture of authenticity the significance horizon remains inevitable in order to avoid a weak relativism which destroys itself. Taylor goes even further, stating that choosing the self as ideal makes sense just because some issues are more significant than others, and authenticity imply a series of demands from beyond the self, because self-isolation implied by a weak relativism is an self-contradiction (Taylor, 2006: 33-34). Arnett's perspective draws attention on the

inevitability of affirming a significance horizon, as well as on the risk which this assertion implies, the risk of becoming a postmodern metanarrative.

The horizon of postmodern narrative, whether it concerns meta-narratives or personal fragments, cannot have another horizon except that of establishing the individual world. It can be expanded only as far as the individual can reach with the construction of his imagined world. This is the way its symbolic conscience sets the frames of authenticity. Its experience isn't torn from the experience of the modern society's world, "even if we may agree that postmodern man is restricted to a different form of symbolic thinking both in intensity and in the present significance pertaining to mentalities ... Postmodern man's feelings and response to the real as a human being of cultural and cosmic sensitivity are no less authentic than those caused by traditional experiences or induced by the culture of the elite. No hierarchy needs to be introduced regarding the authenticity of feelings to which each contributes in its own way. This is a consequence of the consumer society and of the cultural diversification brought about by globalization" (Frunza, 2014: 173).

In a cultural context of this manner, what makes the individual stories works in a similar way to meta-narratives is the fact that the internal logic of fascination produced by narratives and meta-narratives is logic of the sacred. The metamorphosed presence of it is what enhances the universe of authenticity. Beyond the isolation in which the individual lives, he integrates with his personal need by using-among other resources he has-the tools put at his disposal by the rather unconscious presence of the sacred.

Conclusions

The authentic being is the relational being. There no other ways of human fulfillment except those that involve its status of either hidden being (silence) or unraveling (expression) - in either case it's about different specific ways of communication.

Released from the pressure of absolute values, giving up on instances of totalitarian power, postmodern ethics regains multiple ways of establishing the ethical relation. It starts with the individual experience of a *minima moralia* (Adorno, 1999; Lipovetsky, 1996; Pleu, 1994; Koubova, 2014) moving in unidentifiable directions as communication ethics, responsibility ethics, interpretation ethics, authenticity ethics etc. Each time the relational element is comprised, whether it's about a relationship with its own internal life with different instances of alterity or with objects from the exterior world invested with the quality of subjectivity (Baudrillard, 2008). Thus it becomes possible the expansion of the ethical relation beyond the human condition, the animal condition, towards the

world of objects charged with the subjective energy of man, towards an ethical relation with the entire known or imagined nature. Despite all this, the human being remains in postmodern ethics the central reference in setting the ethical subject and the object of ethics.

References

- Adorno, T.W. (1999). *Minima Moralia. Reflecții dintr-o viață mutilată*. București: Univers.
- Alonso, B., & Fernandez Rodriguez, A., Carlos, J. (2010). Consumption and hypermodernity: a revision of Gilles Lipovetsky's theory. *Anuario Filosófico*, 43(2), 325-351.
- Ardelean, F. (2016). Modernitatea - palmares și nevroză, *Familia. Revistă de cultură*. Seria a V-a, anul 52 (152), Nr. 4 (605), 117-121.
- Arnett, R. C. (2011). Communication Ethics: The Wonder of Metanarratives in a Postmodern Age. In R. S. Fortner, P. Mark Fackler. *The Handbook of Global Communication*, West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing.
- Baudrillard, J. (2008). *Societatea de consum. Mituri și structuri*, București: Comunicare.ro.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Etica postmodernă*, Timișoara: Amarcord.
- Caputo, J.D. (1988). *Radical Hermeneutics. Repetition, Deconstruction and the Hermeneutic Project*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Codoban, A. (2011). *Imperiul comunicării. Corp, imagine și relaționare*, Cluj: Ideea.
- Cojocaru, D., Cace, S., & Gavrilovici, C. (2013). Christian and Secular Dimensions of the Doctor-Patient Relationship. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 12(34), 37-56.
- Corbu, N. (2009). *Brandurile globale. O cercetare cros-culturală*, București: Tritonic.
- Ferre, J.P. (2015). New Media and Communication across Religions and Cultures. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 92(1), 247-248.
- Ferry, L. (1997). Homo aestheticus. Inventarea gustului în epoca democratică, București: Meridiane.
- Frunza, S. (2014). Advertising constructs reality. *Religion and advertising in the consumer society*, București: Tritonic.
- Garcia Capilla, D.J. (2012). From Postmodern Ethics to the New Ethics of the Me Generation: The Transition from Mass Media to the Internet. *Comunicacion Y Sociedad*, 25(1), 165-187.
- Grad, I. (2014). Religion, Advertising and Production of Meaning. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 13(38), 137-154.
- Holliday, Adrian. 2013. The politics of ethics in diverse cultural settings: colonising the centre stage. *Compare-A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(4), 537-554.
- Koubova, A. (2014). The Ethics of the Rejected and the Victim's Morality: On Human and Inhuman in Adorno, Butler and Amery. *Filozofia*, 69(7), 549-557.
- Lipovetsky, G. (1996). *Amurgul datoriei. Etica nedureroasă a noilor timpuri democratice*, București: Babel.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1993). *Condiția postmodernă*, București: Babel.

- Mackenzie, J. (2011). Christ in Postmodern Philosophy: Gianni Vattimo, Rene Girard and Slavoj Zizek. *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 13(3), 363-365.
- Minea, E.M. (2012). Back to Agora. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, Special Issue, 98-108.
- Munshi, D., Broadfoot, K.J., & Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2011). Decolonizing Communication Ethics: A Framework for Communicating Otherwise. In G. Cheney, S. May, D. Munshi, *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, New York: Routledge.
- Nistor, C., Beuran, R. (2014). Exploring Media and Religion - With a Study of Professional Media Practices. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 13(37), 178-194.
- Pleșu, A. (1994). *Minima moralia. Elemente pentru o etică a intervalului*, București: Humanitas.
- Pop, N.A., Dabija, D.C., Iorga, A.M. (2014). Ethical Responsibility of Neuromarketing Companies in Harnessing the Market Research – a Global Exploratory Approach. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 16(35), 26-40.
- Raese, M.W. (2011). The Real, the True, and the Told: Postmodern Historical Narrative and the Ethics of Representation. *Soundings*, 94(1-2), 169-174.
- Taylor, B.C., & Hawes, L. C. (2011). What Are We, Then? Postmodernism, Globalization, and the Meta-Ethics of Contemporary Communication. In G. Cheney, S. May, D. Munshi. *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*, New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, C. (2006). *Etica autenticității*, Cluj: Ideea.
- Vanden Auweele, D. (2013). The Poverty of Philosophy: Desmond's Hyperbolic Gifts and Caputo's Events. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 87(3), 411-432.
- Vattimo, G. (1995). *Societatea transparentă*, Constanța: Pontica.
- Vattimo, G. (2000). *Etica interpretării*, Constanța: Pontica.
- Vladutescu, S. & Teodorescu, M. (2015). An analitical extended book review. S. Frunza: Advertising constructs reality (2014). *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 6(1), 98-106.
- Zyla, J.M. (2014). The Moment Of Faith: Against Relativism through a Reinterpretation of the Story of Abraham. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 13(39), 45-67.