Stevo NIKIĆ[*], Ivana BEĆAGOL[**]

GLOBALIZATION, INTERNET AND THE CRISIS MEANING

Abstract: The relationship between globalization and media, from axiological point of view, can be critically elaborated in terms of consequenses that contemporary mondialisation have on the fundamentals of meaning. Globalisation and Internet are so interrelated that they are practically inseparable. Fist of all, there is the development of democracy as a political system and the suppression of national state, which makes way for the spectacular progress of financial, commercial and industrial mondalism. Another feature of the context Internet appears in, is the general loss of meaning that many refer to as the specific feature of postmodern culture and the general crisis of meaning related to modern civilization fundamentals. Maybe the paradox and ambivalence of globalization and media can be overcome by the new revaluation of the traditional value system — by setting up a new paradigm of collective vs. Individual. Here is a new perspective in which the accent is now placed on the user's own information and there is a kind of "Copernicus turnover" because in the traditional system of values, the basis of the morality of an informative message was sought in the morally responsible information producer. In the new perspective, it is more important that the point of support is found in something that is given by the sensibility and the spirit of time, to be demanded form a producer, a professional and possibly a legislator, one behavior that would be accepted as a morality by the majority. This point of support is to increase the capacity of the user to rise to the height of the role assigned from a producer, a professional and possibly a legislator, one behavior that would be accepted as a morality by the majority. This point of support is to increase the capacity of the user to rise to the height of the role assigned to him, clear awareness as when it comes to making decision when using food with genetically modified content. This requirement sets the consumer in the position of a sovereign consumer who could establish certain ethical rules that would evaluate the morality and legitimacy of the information provides. Accordingly, in order to establish the real basis for the ethics of the media, starting from the post-modern assumptions, a request for the identification of the product and its constituent parts with

[*] Rector, Adriatic University, Bar, Montenegro
[**] Adriatic University, Bar, Montenegro

another pole of potential regulation should be combined, i. e. to establish a critical arena of constituent parts with another pole of potential regulation should be combined i. e. to establish a critical arena of confrontation and exchange between dissatisfied citizen / consumer and producer / journalist. This could be achieved through one form of media education and raising the level of self-awareness, which should be part of the reform of the education system, but it is indisputable that for the value system of the modern man, this is far from now.

Key words: *Globalisation, media, internet, collective, crisis of meaning*

1. INTRODUCTION

The two are the root cause-effects of globalization and the media. In the first case, an analysis of the context of social adoption of the Internet in mid-1990. year shows the strengthening of democracy as a political system and as the dominant culture and suppression of the national state, which enables spectacular the advancement of financial, commercial and industrial mondialism. Media and the Internet in this context, they are the basis of commercial and industrial tendencies, theirs connectivity and flexibility.

By the end of the 80s of the last century, the ethatist regulation of the media in spite of various protests and discussions, it was taken as legitimate and even desirable. Almost everyone political actors regulated trade through state interference. With the fall of Berlin wall and strengthening of democratic and decentralistic tendences, the state begins to be pulls, and more and more in developed countries overestimates the idea of a *minimal state*.

In the end, the events of September 2001. halted this trend, increasing the consensus for giving priority to the police and military functions of the state, and a stronger appealing that the media and the internet are regulated by the state, which is gaining more and more sympathies with the ruling political elites.

Another great characteristic of the context in which the media and the Internet appear there is, no doubt, in the general loss of normative labels, which many authors present as one particularity of postmodern culture. This would be the product of one global change of the philosophical perspective and sensibility of the West. It's about the fact that political and cultural life dominates the sense of losing one central and higher the order from which comes a kind of generalization, sentiment of political powerlessness large anticipatory projects and affirmation of diversity.

What really happened? A whole Western European civilization was resting on the paradigm of the *age of light* as the inherited assumptions of the *great thinkers*, which is took human reason for the undoubted criteria of order and order of human progress. This one the concept since Decatur rests

on the confidence in the future and the belief that the man is going once progressed thanks to the efforts of reason. However, more historical experiences have eroded these beliefs. Atomic bombs and today's environmental problems have been put in the doubt of belief in a better future for mankind. Orthodox communism, rigid bureaucracy, petty sociodemocracy, are just some of a series of moments bringing into doubt the good intentions on the political path towards collective progression and opening the road to discouragement. [3] There are also Nazism, wars and violence, generalized as an instrument of the fight against terrorism and subsidies, which all leads to question is possible arbitrage of reason. Finally, more fundamentally, there is an erosive one the effect of science, which by Einstein and Heisenberg is no longer a universal achievement absolute truth, but rather a communion of temporal truths. It is not now the knowledge, but a process that is being built every day as a scientist's activity. Science today it merely finds itself in the interest of discourses of social actors. One time words, the destruction of reason is completed at all levels of absolute and truth, including here science itself, so it will be *grown* in the sense of Marks Weber. [8,9]

While a modern-day man began intellectual life with faith in ideal, the man of postmodernism ends with the demise of transcendence of romanticism. It's from now on the sentiment most of the general loss of the fundament of sense. Postmodernism puts on value relativism, tolerance and irony, confirming its cynicism as a reaction of reduced belief in progress and irreversible progress towards reason.

We are really witnessing an unusual cultural crisis. General evolution of our space it becomes so fast that fear and hope can be countered, without knowing what this leads to.

The horizon seems to be definitely closed and maybe we're going faster than one unpredictable future.

Amongst all aspects of the contemporary crisis of culture, it is difficult, in fact, to find some meaning. It does not understand what the meaning of the events that took place before our own by the eyes: the demolition of the Berlin Wall, the American empire that dominates the world, terrorism, the more powerful the money game, the overcoming of liberalism and the crisis of liberal conception, mondialization, enrichment and poverty, fanatisms, wars, explosions of cyberpaces, biotechnologies.

Institutions are so much affected by technical, economic, and organizational changes to their purpose and the traditional act of functioning, look shaken. The symbolic value bottom shoots and leaves a gap behind. The paradoxical fact is that people are increasingly becoming strangers in their own

culture. This state of postmodernism could be called *post-culture*, a singular state in which *crisis of meaning* becomes chronic from now on. [1]

What so far formed the basis of our values simply disappears, fragmented, it breaks. The family as the foundation of society loses its sense, parents for children no longer have the same importance they once had. Knowledge is getting more and more superficial, idealizing kitsch and banalization. The lifetime of light is replaced by values of capital, and the material value becomes an undeniable ideal. Interests transform so quickly that career or the choice of a profession becomes a kind of surfing on a definitely missing market of expertise. Religions become personal options between the wider a series of possible choices, so that the sense of religion, which, again, it can no longer form a transcendental basis in the way it did it the past. Drugs are being fabricated, legal and illegal, which increasingly modifies how metobolism and mental fusion. Birth of technically programmed human beings and the possibilities of genetic intervention make drastically shrink the basics on which traditionally rests on human life and its meaning. Now it's not just human DNA perhaps modified and put in the hands of the *devil's apprentice*, but all possible DNA: political, social, professional, family, cultural, religious, psychological, epistemological, axiological; all the sources of sense and identity that were put into the future in the future mutation, which still does not see the true meaning and global goal. [13]

A possible interpretation of this new cultural context could be stated the following explanation: there has been a general acceleration of all evolutions, especially scientific, technical and economic; it practically came to *narrowing the planet*, which causes the mixing of different cultures, interconnectedness of all systems and non-existence of international borders; and finally, telecommunication development has occurred, electronic developed media and informatics, leading to the culture of *cyberspace,* interpersonal connectivity that in the previous system of values it was unthinkable. [5]

We entered, in fact, into a virtual system of culture, a symbolic system in which everything can get in touch with everyone. This system of correspondence makes a new one culture — *cyberculture*, ie. a new stage in the development of a society in which all systems are the correspondence of an independent creation, that is, not the results of the uniqueness of experience, they are not transcendences, so they are not fixed. Science itself is just one creation and this is a creation that continues, which is manifested by the fact that science is continuous research and continuous progress. [9] We discover, therefore, that the culture of the creation that enters into relationships with beings who live the other horizons of meaning, producing so fast the transformation of symbolic systems that structure our own peculiarity.

All forms of communication (transport, informatics, world market) represent the process of interconnectedness of mankind in a planetary society. We are witnessing that all the personalities and objects, all institutions, all facts, all opinions have their own *website* and their email address and they are virtually linked to one social network. This simplification and abstract universalization, the way of everyone's clean possibilities symbolic system, with its realization produces the situation of permanent change, in which there is no relational confusion between the two elements or any combination can not be sustainable in a stable way, as the global network does not cease to increase and modifies its structure. Nothing goes into the system of stable correspondence anymore but it constantly transmits, interweaves in one moving or much multidimensional network. Many values, funadal relations created yesterday as cultural bases, now they are grown and lose their meaning.

Normally, here a crucial issue of meaning, direction, unity, the archive point of the support, according to which this event could be understood. We enter into a kind of culture that seems to mix all the previous labels that they are others tried to build the architecture of human meaning. Postculture, a new culture above the culture, perhaps it could be a progress that arises in the quality of the permanent creation of culture and the unity of mankind. [11]

In fact, contrary to what might be logically followed from the indicated context, postculture does not have to be a chaos or a loss of meaning, it can be understood as one openness where all correspondence is possible. Maybe we can get the optimistic ones the assumption that humanity is only at the beginning of its experiment towards something which could have a valid meaning. We can increasingly observe the current transition of culture in post-culture as the beginning of the systematic development of new types of possible cultures. Maybe we come to some new, absolute systems of cultures that mankind has not yet survived?

If we kept on this optimistic variant as one of the possibilities, then this new culture would be a substitute for traditional culture. In one awakened culture, human beings, can participate, with their own freedom, more direct, more inventive and more personal way. They would have lived in a reorganized life of the spirit that animates them and who they all animate together, simply existing as human beings, knew it or not.

The means of communicating *cyberspace* give us, in that sense, more and more access to these possibilities of collective intelligence and to such an optimistic one hypothesis, that would be the goal of their creation. In this *awakened* culture they are rooted in the spirit of individuals who live, the

most free, open and free semantic network, as those of the personality that appear in classical cultures. Individuals who would weave this new culture would probably be in much more direct contact than the ones in the previous one culture of emptiness.

It does not want to say that there will be no more injustice, misery, wars, environmental risks and more spiritual hopelessness. It only wants to say that the rich and the poor, the victims and the imposters, the problems and the fears are from now, the problems of the entire humanity. Old customs to identify the culprits and denounce others should be replaced by responsibility. Coherence or meaning can no longer be set *a priori* and exclusively, to ignore or reduce what does not enter into already set schemes. Unity is no longer transcendental, but becomes a visible way of activities of increasing one's human collective dynamics are increasingly interdependent, responsible for a creative solution to the issue of meaning. [13]

2. POSTMODERNISM AS A NEW POSSIBILITY

Scientific and technical development, transport, communications, migrations, world capitalism has created a culture that, with its interdependence, causes a crisis of meaning without precedent. But there remains one great opportunity for us in all of this finds something common and universal. Contacts of culture, culture by contact and reciprocal development encourages us to think more optimistically in the time which is before man, invite people to be aware of all connections of our acts.

On the other hand, which might be paradoxical, this relativism also carries in it a kind of resistance when it comes to the collective management of deception, delusion and evil, not allowing the imposition of any form of authoritative opinion (whether or not it is in the sphere of politics or science, which is the most prominent in the field of biotechnology or contemporary medicine). The ethical demand, precisely, is becoming more and more sought after the norm of postmodernism, as a cry for regulation and lost meaning. And that, again, means that an empty space, created by a value turn, is required to fulfill the new one content. [6]

The state is no longer what it was and its legitimacy is getting smaller. They multiply tendencies that promote ethical deficits, which encourage or suggest moral principles, whether it's about the media as public spokespersons, about the problems destruction through genetic manipulation, discrimination of health care barriers, the dangers of excessive surveillance of the private sphere, or, in turn, the content of the Internet.

Here we come to the basic assumption of the relationship of globalization, the media and the sense contemporary civilization. Perhaps the issue

of moral value of content, activity, and the practices of modern media can be set by reversing the usual perspective that is has so far been based on the ethical responsibility of the information producers, that is by turning this constellation starting from a sovereign information consumer. Before all the way, as soon as the new value system can be started from the individual as self-conscious and responsible persons as the only basis that remained due to postmodernism culture. In the classical system of values, it is not, but it has been previously hurt citizen, less grown up than another, immature.

Why does not now try to insist on a sovereign citizen for the construction of the basic axiological system? [4]

This assumption starts from the modern idea of democracy as something that prevails symbolic weaving of developed societies, one idea according to which each individual is equal to every individual. The prototype of this is equal to the importance of individual voices in code since this electoral equality gives everyone the right to express himself publicly. Does not exist, therefore, some transcendence in public research according to which something morally is determines, condemns or prohibits. There is only a struggle of thinking, certain rival attitudes to forming a temporary majority in debates and campaigns.

This *functional democracy* introduces a slight reduction in the difference between dominant and subordinate social groups. The global movement is going to be not only reduces the potential of the power of social groups, but also their particular differences as which are differentiations between sexes, men and women, parents and children. Individual gets over the general, especially over the universal, the individual over authority.

The new social and intellectual environment is now characterized the normative affirmation of democracy and the valorisation of individual and minority reason. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, democracy becomes the only legitimate system, that is, desirable. Within this concept, it seems normal to be the basic value citizen — individual. Freedom and individual responsibility must therefore, to exist and all inevitably need to be adapted to the methodological postulate of individualism and the realization of social functioning as a result of games of strategy and individual interests, through the rules of the game that accomplish a democratic competition.

In other words, democracy is theoretically possible, two are needed elemental conditions: the existence of a free and responsible personality and the possibility of her elections have political effectiveness. Traditionally, these two aspects were just an illusion. Individual freedom and its political manifestations were just an illusion, since it is citizen manipulated through history, either through capitalism, or through geopolitics, or through market

interests, or through the structure of the language, or quite simply through the media communication. This last one appears as one communication dominant, vertical, what corresponds to the spectacles of Nazi and communist manipulation. [16]

Therefore, postmodernism puts the center of discussion individua, so that communication choices are no longer a state or a center of power. The media sphere is expanding to regional and local level, multiplying its productive offer. Everyone can publish your information, either by radio, in print, or online. *A fetish of personal choice* has been established which contributes to one important anti-movement unification, rigidity and every form of authority that wants to impose on each one the price of its values.

Heterogeneity and pluralism are becoming more and more defended within postmodern states. Therefore, if we enter a kind of *cyberspace*, then, the team more, it can raise the question of the ethics of the media and the Internet, starting now from the individual as

the basic values to which the democratization process came. That is, this choice would should be in harmony with the intellectual environment and cultural sensitivity of the present time. This, again, does not mean that this thesis does not carry the danger of passage from *the alienated consumer to the autonomous user* and that it is the form under which it is presents an exemplary mode of an active user of the media. That he wants to construct one the figure of a heroic recipient who triumphs in *semantic democracy*, and ignores them boundaries of other content such as imposing a professional meaning illegal social distribution of discursive resources and imperative discourses.

Modern democracy, for example, forces journalists to oppose everyone forms of authority. Opposition culture, which very aggressively seeks transformation media by multiplying offers, represents a media expansion leading to the most hidden shelters for social life. Media presence modifies behavior social actors and provokes certain regularity and regulation.

According to some authors [10], certain basic moments can be determined self-regulation and legitimacy that spontaneously regulate the ethical content of the media in the autodisciplinary process and the self-regulation of their actors. First of all, it is about this that the media investigate a kind of authenticity that the actors are not aware of; that it is permanent there is a moral importance of public arena where media, their work and media are discussed values; to be permanentally opposed to the monopoly position of individuals media.

In this way, the etatist intervention of the state is not excluded, but it is subordinated a strong social consensus and a broad coalition of social actors.

The regulation is thus established by morality, credible moral norms for one large population. This is a kind of rhetorically very convincing argument, one the form of an ethical consensus capable of establishing, on the one hand, autodiscipline and autoregulation of actors and on the other, to service the basis of one legislation; one legal and deontological self-determination of the actors.

It's no longer a question of a professional group establishing certain ethical ones demands, to order them to give an ethics, or to respect already established ethics rules. The fact is that cyber-tradeists discipline themselves in the united states.

In the United States there is one specialized association (*Online News Associntion*) that gathers more than 600 cyberbullying. Their declaration relies on the five great ones principles such as journalistic integrity (ie. a clear distinction between true journalism and other information on the Internet, for example publicity); publisher independence; journalistic excellence; free expression and free access. [17, 15]

Applying this to the media, these demands can be made in the form of a clear one an identification that first asks about the *offered product* (what is it about: fiction, reality, promotion, information ...). Then, the other *origin of the offered material* (the right to copy, communication, government documents, forecasts, phone call, anonymity ...). And finally, the *source of information* (independent media, big industrial group, official news, individual ...).

This requirement of indication and notification would, according to some authors, be similar already established clear and specific consensus on the issue of presence genetically modified organisms in food (OGM). In either caseit is assumed that an adult and a sovereign individual can make a choice between one which is offered. In the case of OGM, the problem is not only that they are products commercially used, but also that after their dispersion in the environment there is a realistic the danger of being genetically modified. In the case of content media and the Internet, the label does not solves the no more fundamental issue of false, wrong or insulting connotation. But in one case as well as in the other case a notice on the identity of the content labeling, allows the sovereign consumer (consumer) the possibility of his non-exploitation, his unconsciousness. [2]

The proposed perspective, which addresses the user of information, in other words, to make a craft from a traditional assumption where the basis is morality searches for a morally responsible messenger. In the new perspective, it is moreover, the point of support is found to be sufficiently evident in something that is given sensibility and the spirit of time, to be required by the manufacturer, the professional and the possibly a legislator,

one behavior that would be accepted as a moral by the side most of them. This point of support is in increasing the capacity of the user to rise to the height of the role assigned to him *a priori*, clear awareness as they are at issue decision making when using foods with genetically modified content. This one the request puts the consumer in the place of a sovereign consumer who could establish certain ethical rules that would evaluate morality and legitimacy information provided. [14]

In fact, in order to establish the real basis of media ethics, starting from postmodern assumptions, a request for indetermination of products and their products should be combined component parts with another pole of potential regulation, i. e. establish a critical one arena of confrontation and exchange between dissatisfied citizen/consumer and producers / magazines.

The question of the method, the way to get the basis for the time establishing an effective ethical requirement, which would lead to information about information could undoubtedly be done by starting at least two indisputable values contained in the new context:

— Request for tolerance and respect for risks that incarnate ecumenism, multiculturalism, radical value relativism — everything that is in it postmodern sensibility; this absence of norms was valorized, however, in the culture itself with political correctness, which seeks to impose one psychological coercion in favor of correct behavior.

— Call for dialogue and public debate without physical violence in terms of triumph democracy as a political model: then, an attempt to fulfill a normative one emptiness by affirming the universal values of (Western) democracy by itself, such as the right of man and minority, to prevent the imposition of the rights of one state or nation over the other, putting a supranational over the national. In this second case, the foundation of a transcendent of norms is sought, which particularly fits into the general.

3. CONCLUSION

Certainly the postulate a sovereign adult and self-conscious personality is only one abstraction, that the reality of everyday life turns this construction into a very weak link that is subject to manipulation and various influences. It remains, according to many authors, for now the possibility of an increasing demystification over an ideal model and a kind of cynicism in terms of the media. This could be achieved in one form of media education and raising the level of self-awareness, which should be part of the reform of the education system, but it is indisputable that it is a modern human value system for now it's far away.

REFERENCES

[1] Y. Boisvert: "La Postmodernisme" Montreal. Boreal, 1995. p. 30.
[2] P. Brunet: "Espace public et prive sur internet" Les presses de l' Universite Laval. Laval. 2002. p. 60.
[3] C. Collins, J. Parros i A. Brijatoff: "Baties pour durre" Paris, 1990. p. 56.
[4] F. Demers: "Que revendiquer au nom de l' ethique pour un cybernaut/consomateur considere comme souverain?" Les presses de l' Universite Laval. Laval, 2002. p. 15.
[5] J. Dherse et D. Minguet: "L'ethiqie et la chaos" Presses de Renaissance. Paris, 1998. p. 87.
[6] J. Ellul: "Le siste comme souverainme technician" Calman-Levy. Paris, 1997. p. 12.
[7] Ethique et Internet: "Les presses de l'Universite Laval", Laval, 2002.
[8] E. From: "Bekstvo od slobode" Nolit. Beograd, 1968.
[9] E. Gidens: "Sociologija" CID. Podgorica, 1998.
[10] C. Lemieux: "Mauvaise presse" Paris, 2000. p. 31.
[11] P. Levy: "Internet et la crise du sens" Les presses de l' Universite Laval. Laval. 2002. p. 85.
[12] K. Mock: "Hate on the Internet" Human Rights and Internet. New York, 2000. p. 141–152.
[13] S. Nikić: "Internet i etika" Fakultet za pomorstvo Kotor. Kotor, 2007. p. 6–39.
[14] C. Ouellet: "Qui fait la loi sur Internet?Censure ou liberte, droit et responsibilite" Les Presses de l' Universite Laval. Laval, 1998. p. 77.
[15] H. Schiller: "Living in the number one country: Reflections from a critic of American Empare" Seven stories Press. New York, 2000. p. 79.
[16] C. Simpson: "Science of coercion communication research and Psychological" Oxford University Press. Oxford, 1994. p. 40.
[17] Wall Street Journal: "Le Devoir" 2002. p. 7.