Abstract

Since the invention of print, the media have been increasingly influencing individual and social awareness. They seem apt to undo, in a relatively short period of time, whatever good the upbringing and authorities of a high moral standard have instilled into a person. However, the media can also support the development of this good in a significant way. They are a powerful tool that everyone has to reckon with, they are a place to exchange all sorts of ideas – from the worst to the best. That is the reason why anyone who wants to proclaim the principle of Christian personalism in society should try to think through how to wisely use them to spread the message. However, this message will inevitably meet with strong opposition from people who have opposite beliefs and from the media they own, as they have made them a fundamental place for the struggle for power and dominion over human consciousness. This article, written on the basis of theoretical considerations, but also the rich media experience of the author, attempts to provide practical advice on these matters. The article explains the common structure of all such opposition that follows the pattern of the very loud media case of Fr. Krzysztof Charamsa (in which the author was himself deeply entangled), Tygodnik Powszechny and Gazeta Wyborcza which supported him. In this way, the article shows the mechanisms of manipulation of contemporary media, but also the remedies available.
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Christian personalism is one of the most significant contemporary currents in philosophy, and not without reason. Among the multitude of various philosophical views, sometimes uncertain, contradicting and fighting each other, one of the potential loci of agreement may be acknowledging the central role of the person. This metaphysical and anthropological minimum is what many thinkers can agree upon. Moreover, it is well justified by the following philosophers: Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine of Hippo, St. Thomas Aquinas, Immanuel Kant, Max Scheler, Dietrich von Hildebrand and Karol Wojtyła. Inasmuch as some of them may have been inspired by Christianity, their thinking is all the more valuable, as it is Christianity that, as it were, discovered the meaning of the person. One could say that personalism combines what is best in ancient, medieval and modern philosophy. Christian personalism perceives the person as the peak of the created world, a being endowed with self-awareness, individuality, emotionality, intelligence, rationality and freedom. Thus, the person may know oneself, the world and God; she/he may form a bond with God and other persons, may have a spiritual life and is capable of making decisions. Endowed with the flesh, the person is able to act not only in the spiritual world but also in the material one. Equipped with the highest and most precious properties that there are, she/he is worthy of the deepest respect. One should therefore care most of all about the dignity, good and growth of every human being. Respect should be the foundation for all relationships, as well as for every community and culture as a whole. Such a community should make room for Christianity – religion best ‘suited’ to the nature of person and in accord with personalistic principles. If the person grows in a relationship with God developing her/his intelligence, rationality, morality, spirituality and wisdom, so much the better for the culture he/she creates. And the more profound the culture is, the more enriching its influence on the person.

Nowadays the crucial platform for creating and spreading culture is mass media. They play a decisive role in informing people, shaping them and thus contributing to who they will ultimately be. According to the principles of Christian personalism, mass media should help discover and communicate the truth as in this very way, they will best serve the growth of people and their interactions. However, it is well known that this is not the case. Mass media serve their owners and those who run them rather than contribute to the truth and the good

---

1 Of course, this is about Christianity in terms of a discovery and not in terms of justification, because then we would be rather dealing with theology.
of the person. As such, they manipulate more than inform, diffusing ideology according to the wishes of the media oligarchs. Instead of contributing to the liberation and development of people, mass media enslave and “format” them. Thus, they are the arena of (also spiritual) wrestling for anyone who tries to act in accord with the principles of personalism: the truth and good of the person.

In this article I explain my main message regarding the personalistic struggle in the media. I draw on my theoretical, philosophical and theological analyses of the role that mass media play, as well as my personal experience in the field. Readers may notice that my theoretical thinking and experience intermingle and inspire one another. I shall start with discussing an exceptionally telling mass media affair into which I became deeply entangled: a coming out campaign of Fr. Krzysztof Charamsa PhD. The method I employ is “participant observation” which enables particularly deep insights into the matter.

1. Prelate as a Sexual Homo-Revolutionist

On the last day of September 2015 on the front page of Gazeta Wyborcza, the most influential daily newspaper of the day, one could find an article by Michał Wilgocki entitled Ksiądz Oko pod lupą [Fr. Oko Under Scrutiny]. It was a quasi-summary and endorsement of a different text, Teologia i przemoc: przypadek księdza Oko [Theology and Violence: The Case of Fr. Oko], which was published on the very same day in Tygodnik Powszechny. Interestingly, on the front page of Gazeta Wyborcza there was yet another article Putin rzuca Ameryce wyzwanie [Putin Throws Down a Challenge to the USA] which informed of the intentions

---

2 Although everything is ultimately a gift, not a merit, I must admit that especially by the opinion-making elites of this country my media activities are assessed as my having significantly contributed and am still contributing to a defense of Poland against atheistic ideologies.

of the president of Russia to seize control and substitute Washington in its role of the world’s ‘policeman’. Thus, next to the main headlines one could see photos of three people: president Obama, president Putin and… myself. How come more space in the editorials (by ca. 60 percent) was devoted to me and not to the two most powerful men in the world?

In his article Michał Wilgocki explained to the readers that Fr. Prelate Krzysztof Charamsa, an important official in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and in the International Theological Commission, a lecturer at the Pontifical Gregorian University and the Pontifical University Regina Apostolorum, expresses a deep disapprobation of Fr. Dariusz Oko. Such criticism straight from the Vatican was understood by both papers as my ‘elimination’ in the Church (suspension and dismissal from the clerical state), academic life and mass media. They may have considered it as the lesson taught to the whole Polish Catholic Church and its hierarchy, as it was well known that the majority of bishops supported me. No wonder Tygodnik Powszechny gave the issue exceptional attention: Fr. Charamsa’s text had 10 pages (a record in the history of the paper). Moreover, in the same issue of this weekly one could also read a text by Fr. Adam Boniecki Nasza „święta” przemoc [Our ‘Sacred’ Violence], which was, at its roots, an endorsement of Fr. Charamsa’s claims. To make things worse, in the next issue of Tygodnik Powszechny one could find two articles which were to be the final nail in my coffin.4 The columns of Gazeta Wyborcza were similar.5 It was rather evident that the editors of these papers went through great lengths to destroy me morally.

Yet, their endeavors came to nothing. As if through foresight, I agreed to several interviews on the very same day the attacks against me hit the headlines. I found immediate and strong support in several bishops and cardinals from Poland and the Vatican.6

---


I had no doubt that I should firmly respond to Fr. Charamsa’s attack. After reading a few pages of his text I was sure that he was an active homosexual priest. I had already been admonished by similar persons so I knew their way of expression, their repetitive and predictable way of argumentation. My evaluation of his stricture was so sharp that not all the media had the courage to quote me.

Less than three days after the publication of his calumny, Fr. Charamsa called a press conference, at which he revealed his sexual orientation. The conference was meant to be much more than just a personal coming out. It was a public rebellion against the Church (its teaching on homosexuality in particular), a call to revolutionary changes that would essentially come down to a total submission to the demands of the world’s homosexual lobby. Fr. Charamsa turned out to be a gay revolutionary who demanded a homo-revolution in the Church presenting the views of Judith Butler and Michel Foucault far more important than those of Lord Jesus and St. Paul. This conference and his texts were a means of putting pressure on the Synod of Bishops on the Family (due to start the next day in the Vatican) in the hope that it would introduce the changes Fr. Charamsa called for.

Fr. Charamsa continued to explicate his views in other texts and interviews. He went so far as to cheat when, for example, he promised exclusive interviews to various weeklies.


However, the Church took a firm stand against him, did not change its teaching and condemned his behaviour. Three days after the first attack on me, on October 3rd, Fr. Charamsa was removed from all posts, banned from teaching and suspended. He was strongly criticized by many clergymen, including a number of cardinals. So what he had demanded for me in his article happened to himself. Instead, I received words of appreciation from thousands of Catholics, both clergy and laymen.

One might compare the situation to the story related in the Book of Esther from the Old Testament. Haman, the ignoble chief advisor of the Persian king, gets permission to have all the Jews in the kingdom killed. Yet Esther, the king’s wife, foils the plan and saves the Jews from destruction. Ultimately Haman meets the fate that he has meant for others. and is hung on a tree which he has

---


prepared for Mordecai, Esther’s cousin. One could say that the faith and morality of Catholics were saved and Fr. Charamsa suffered a great spiritual defeat while I could speak the words of the psalm:

*I was pushed back and about to fall,*  
*But the Lord helped me (...)*  
*The Lord has done this,*  
*And is marvelous in our eyes.*

It was obvious that from now on it would be much more difficult for my adversaries inside and outside the Church to attack me, because they might be immediately suspected of acting just like Fr. Charamsa, having similar motivations (which, in many cases, is unfortunately true).

In spite of it all, Krzysztof Charamsa continues with his lifestyle and its justification. He moved to Barcelona, with his partner Eduardo, lives with him there and tries to fight the Church. He sees no fault in himself, projecting it onto the Church, while at the same time admitting that, since the start of the seminary, he led a double life.

However, as an additional justification of his behavior he adopted the ideological ideas of the enemies of the Church, who basically approve of almost any kind of debauchery: Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, Julia Kristeva or Luce Irigaray. Thus he attempted to combine the purity of the Gospel with extreme gender promiscuity which seems quite absurd.


11 Psalm 118: 13.23.

12 It can be said that I prophetically described the case of Krzysztof Charamsa in an article published three years earlier. This was possible because I had got acquainted earlier with similar cases. On this basis, I already wrote about this kind of clergy at that time: “On the one hand, they administer the sacraments every day, celebrate the Holy Mass, deal with the most holy things, and, on the other, they constantly do exactly the opposite, something particularly wicked. They “become immune” to what is higher and what is sacred. However, if the higher dies in them, the more the things of the lower order take its place, thus the desire for material and sensual things – money, power, career, luxury and sex. It is hard to help them because what could save them if the greatest means of formation, faith and grace failed?” (D. Oko, *Z papieżem przeciw homoherezji (With the Pope Against Homoheresy)*, “Fronda” 63 (2012), pp. 128–160, 138.) One can add that this article was highly acclaimed and disseminated in the Church worldwide, it was also translated into many languages, and I received a special blessing of Pope Benedict XVI for it. It was a classic of its genre. See also my article which was the continuation of the former: *Częściowe zwycięstwo prawdy (Partial Victory of Truth)*, “Fronda” 63 (2012), pp. 24–41.
No wonder prof. Józef Augustyn SJ, a great authority in the Catholic Church in Poland, thus commented on Fr. Charamsa’s behaviour:

Eighteen years of being a priest and six years spent in a seminary – a total of twenty four years of life in the homosexual underground. And all this without a real will to curb his sexuality, as anyone who promises celibacy (to God in the first place, then to the Church), commits himself to do. This led to such an accumulation of emotions that there was an explosion – the fruit of a double social life, double consciousness every day: at the office, at the altar, at the pulpit, in the family.\textsuperscript{13}

And one of the main Polish journalists, Rafał A. Ziemkiewicz, observed:

We deal with a man who for years has not ‘walked the talk’. Everyday he would celebrate a mass, preach, sign documents of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. In recent days he even had the audacity to criticize one the wisest and most honest of Polish priests while living against the Gospel, vows and the Catechism. And after so many years – he had no guilt at all. Moreover, the man is insolent enough to declare in public that it is not him who is wrong but the Church, the commandments and precepts. It is as if he was saying: away with it all! The Church must adapt to me and similar hypocrites. If it does not, I am going to drag its name through the mud while shining in the media as an anti-Catholic celebrity.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{14} R. A. Ziemkiewicz, Trąd u ołtarza (Leprosy at the Altar) 4.10.2015, http://www. uziemkiewicza.pl/2015100492/blog-naczelnego/92-trad-u-oltarza (14.04.2019). In a similar vein a number of well-known journalists expressed their criticism of Rev. Krzysztof Charamsa,
It is very significant that Fr. Charamsa who has led such an anti-Catholic life, breaking the main rules and vows, has been supported not only by the media that I find hostile to the Church (Gazeta Wyborcza and Newsweek), but also Tygodnik Powszechny which claims to be a Catholic magazine. It is also telling and eye-opening about the ‘nature’ of these papers which is why I will take a closer look at the issue.

2. Tygodnik Powszechny as a Pro-homosexual Magazine

Despite the events described above, supporters of Father Charamsa, primarily from the milieu of Tygodnik Powszechny and Gazeta Wyborcza, still seem to identify with him and continue to support him while attacking me. I have

never heard from them a single word of remorse, apology or retraction. On the contrary, new flames were produced against me.

For example, when about a year and a half later I had a retreat for health care staff in Wroclaw and gave lectures on gender, I was greeted by Gazeta Wyborcza with an article entitled Rekolekcje księdza kłamcy [A Spiritual Retreat by Fr. Liar].\footnote{Cf. E. Wilczyńska, Rekolekcje księdza kłamcy (A Spiritual Retreat by Fr. Liar), “Gazeta Wyborcza” 18–19.03.2017, Dodatek Wrocławski, p. 2. As I will soon explain, it is rather this newspaper, taking into account the words of its editors that should be seen as expressing hatred. There are a number of studies on this subject, and it is discerned by many other people, see e.g. S. Remuszo, „Gazeta Wyborcza”. Początki i okolice, (kalejdoskop) [The Beginnings and the Near (Kaleidoscope)], Warszawa 2006, Oficyna „Rękodzielio”; R. A. Ziemkiewicz, Michnikowszyzna. Zapis choroby, (Michnikowszyzna, An Account of A Disease), Warszawa 2006, Redhorse; J. Najfeld, T. P. Terlikowski, „Agata”. Anatomia manipulacji, (“Agata”. An Anatomy of Manipulation), Warszawa-Kraków 2008, Fronda-AAA; A. Dmochowski, Kościół „Wyborcza”. Największa operacja resortowych dzieci, (The Church of” Wyborcza”. The Biggest Operation of the Departamental Children) Lublin 2014, Wydawnictwo Słowa i Myśli.} It is significant that above the article there was an endorsement of Ewa Wanat’s interview Prostytutki wszystkich krajów, łączcie się! [Prostitutes of All Countries, Unite!], a great commendation of prostitution which was to appear in the next issue of the daily.

In Tygodnik Powszechny one could even read:


Instead of apologies, printing a retraction, the editorial staff sent some journalists to follow me around during my lecture in Munich. It reminds me of the measures taken by the communist Security Service: its officials shadowed blessed Fr. Jerzy Popieluszko and other priests who effectively ‘sabotaged’ spreading the Marxist ideology. Tygodnik Powszechny published yet another article about me in which, similarly to the text in Gazeta Wyborcza, one could find the approval of prostitution, as well as manipulation of facts. The authors overlooked
the appreciation and gratitude for my lectures and the discontent they met with when they revealed who they worked for.\footnote{Cf. A. Goc, M. Żyła, Luter, Hegel, Hitler, Gender, “Tygodnik Powszechny” 5.02.2017, No. 6 (3526), pp. 28–33.}

The very words and deeds of both editorial teams speak for themselves. It seems they are always true to the precept that if anyone utters a critical opinion on homosexual people, even if justified, they will be labelled as ‘homophobic’, that is the irrational hatred towards homosexuals. And yet it is through their texts, that they show their open hostility towards nearly everyone who, at the core, is more knowledgeable as far as the issue of gender studies and homosexual ideology are concerned. They appear as hostile to reason, truth and Christianity and all those who sabotage their actions. One may assume that this attitude is the result of their anti-Christian views and pride.

This is how I understand their open hostility against me, and their joy in the hope that I will be ‘annihilated’. It is mainly because I belong to a group of people who, in the common belief, most effectively defend our society from gender and homosexual ideology while laying their absurdity bare.\footnote{As a result of the wide recognition of my activities in this field in all major Polish cities, I gave a series of over 250 lectures on gender theory, and in the recent years I also gave lectures in a number of the largest cities of Germany, Austria, Great Britain, Ireland, Canada, the United States and Ukraine. In January 2014 I gave a lecture to the MPs in the Sejm of the Republic of Poland, and in June 2018 to the MPs in the Highest Council of Ukraine (i.e. in the Ukrainian Parliament) and in the Ukrainian House (i.e. the country’s most important cultural center). The following persons were present at the Sejm lecture: Beata Szydło – the future Prime Minister, Beata Kempa – the future Head of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister, Małgorzata Sadurska – the future Head of the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland, Marek Suski – the future Head of the Political Cabinet of the Prime Minister, Joachim Brudzinski – the future Minister of the Interior and Administration, Anna Fotyga – the former Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Head of the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland, Bartosz Kownacki – the future Secretary of the State in the Ministry of National Defense, Maciej Małecki – the future Secretary of State in the Chancellery of the Prime Minister, Bogdan Rzońca – Marshal of the Podkarpackie Voivodeship. And, therefore, it is also widely believed that this lecture significantly contributed to the curbing of the impact of gender theory in Poland.} This is unbearable for both editorial teams who support these ideologies being at odds with the reason and teaching of the Church. These editors, and Tygodnik Powszechny in particular, cannot explicitly admit that they strongly reject the teaching of the Church and therefore they attack me for my tongue, which is sharp, though still milder than theirs. One could call them “so called Christians” who give blows to those who defend the Church most effectively against its enemies. It is all the more
astounding when such people still try to play the role of the best Christians and claim the right to patronize others, including the Episcopate and the Pope.

No wonder that it is from this milieu that the loudest apostates of the Church come from, e.g. prof. Tadeusz Bartoś. This ex-Dominican used to be a ‘star’ in those papers, now he seems always ready to attack the Church in public. Tadeusz Bartoś has even proclaimed that to believe in the resurrection of Jesus Christ is like believing in Elvis Presley rising from the dead. Prof. Tomasz Polak, earlier known as Fr. Tomasz Węcławski, was the chief theologian of *Tygodnik Powszechny*, and now after abandoning his ministry, he renounced his faith in Christ and God himself. Also Fr. Michał Czajkowski, yet another author of this weekly, had collaborated with the communist Security Service for twenty years. He informed on his own bishop and blessed Fr. Jerzy Popiełuszko, for which he was amply rewarded.¹⁹ After the fall of communism in 1989 he was one of the favorite authors in the media both hostile towards the Church and patronizing the Episcopate. He was the one chosen to bless the new ‘headquarters’ of *Gazeta Wyborcza*, a daily most notorious for attacking and destroying Christianity in Poland. He was there presented as a model as far as the attitude towards homosexuals was concerned. It must be admitted that he well suited the editorial staff, for whom Judas seems to be most worthy of respect of all the Apostles.²⁰ When Fr. Czajkowski’s cooperation with the Security Service came to light, the editor-in-chief of *Tygodnik Powszechny*, Fr. Adam Boniecki said that nothing of importance had happened and Fr. Czajkowski may still publish in *Tygodnik* as it badly needed such excellent authors.

Jerzy Zawieyski, a writer, has been another great hero for *Tygodnik Powszechny*. Fr. Adam Boniecki even thought him worthy of Order Orła Białego [the Order of the White Eagle], the oldest and highest order awarded special merits despite the fact that his attitude towards religion, under the guise of piety,


²⁰ Cf. H. Bortnowska, Szacunek, nie litość (Respect, Not Pity), “Gazeta Wyborcza” 4/5.06.2005, p. 28 and K. Wiśniewska, Judasz, przyjaciel Jezusa? (Judas, Jesus’ Friend?), “Gazeta Telewizyjna” 14.04.2006, No 89, p. 22. From the very beginning, the editors of this newspaper have been trying to dictate to the Church what it should be like. The editorial office wants to reshape the Church according to their own faith, to whose dogmas one can also include homoideology.
seems blasphemous. He is known for his promiscuity: he turned his apartment and the room left at his disposal in the monastery in Laski into a tryst. He even used the sacrament of penance as an opportunity to arrange meetings this time with a partner in a cassock.

In September 2016, a year after the ‘apotheosis’ of Fr. Charamsa, Tygodnik Powszechny together with the monthly magazines Znak and Więź engaged in the campaign „Let’s spread a rainbow sign of peace” run by the LGBTQ community. It was funded by multimillionaire George Soros, a well-known enemy of Christianity, who made his fortune through, among others, financial manipulations that made citizens of poor countries even poorer. Supposedly, the objective of the campaign was to deepen respect towards homosexual people. In reality, the aim was to make us get used to their sins and change the teaching of the Church. So these editors did exactly what the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith led by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger condemned 30 years before. The Vatican office then had stated:

The movement within the Church, which takes the form of pressure groups of various names and sizes, attempts to give the impression that it represents all homosexual persons who are Catholics. As a matter of fact, its membership is, by and large, restricted to those who either ignore the teaching of the Church or seek somehow to undermine it. It brings together, under the aegis of Catholicism, homosexual persons who have no intention of abandoning their

---


22 “He would arrange for new ‘adventures’ over the phone, and also over the phone he would “expose” his partners to the Security Office, which could blackmail them later, especially if they were priests. Yes, he was a real collaborator and informer of the Security Office, for which the communist services protected him and promoted him.” Based on the materials of the Institute of National Remembrance, Joanna Siedlecka describes his behavior in this way: October 4, 1958. ‘Kubuś, a monk, visited him. Taking advantage of the temporary absence of Staś, to whom someone came, he led the monk to another room, loved him in no time and parted quickly.’ Most transcripts came from the days when he had a ‘free hut’. (J. Siedlecka, Biografie odtajnione, op. cit, 187). For more on the double life of Zawieyski, see ibid., pp. 173 et seq.

23 It especially concerned his relationship with Rev. Roman Szczyciel SAC, Joanna Siedlecka writes about this subject thus: “He called Father Roman Szczyciel, a pallotine, his spiritual father and son, and officially he was his private confessor. (...) His love letters to “Szczyciełek,” already published, leave no doubt as to the nature of their relationship”. (J. Siedlecka, Biografie odtajnione, op. cit., p. 182n, cf. 174n, 188, 191n, 202n). Cf. Listy Jerzego Zawieyskiego do ks. Roman Szczyciła, (Letters of Jerzy Zawieyski to Fr. Roman Szczyciel), Kierunki 1982, No. 30, 32. As one can see the problem of homosexual sins for some clergymen, as in the case of Krzysztof Charamsa, begins already at the seminary.
homosexual behavior. One tactic used is to protest that any and all criticism of or reservations about homosexual people, their activity and lifestyle, are simply diverse forms of unjust discrimination.

There is an effort in some countries to manipulate the Church by gaining the often well-intentioned support of her pastors with a view to changing civil-statutes and laws. This is done in order to conform to these pressure groups’ concept that homosexuality is at least a completely harmless, if not an entirely good, thing. Even when the practice of homosexuality may seriously threaten the lives and well-being of a large number of people, its advocates remain undeterred and refuse to consider the magnitude of the risks involved.

The Church can never be so callous. It is true that her clear position cannot be revised by pressure from civil legislation or the trend of the moment. But she is really concerned about the many who are not represented by the pro-homosexual movement and about those who may have been tempted to believe its deceitful propaganda.24

The Polish Episcopate spoke in the very same way expressing disapproval of homopheretic actions under the guidance of Tygodnik Powszechny.25 The editors of the three papers mentioned above responded with a joint statement that they accepted the teaching of the Church, but they only wanted to improve relations with people from the homosexual milieu. So again publically, in front of the whole of Poland, they lied: in the promotional materials of the whole campaign one may find a number of their statements explicitly supporting homoideology and negating the teaching of the Church.26 This is a great lesson for everyone: people who are able to lie and manipulate in public, are probably capable of doing worse things behind the scenes. If they harm the Church openly allying with its enemies, what are they capable of when hardly anyone can see? What do they do clandestinely?27

27 During this pro-homosexual action in the media I expressed my opinion in the following interviews: „Tęczowi” chcą akceptacji grzechu. Kościół pod homopresją, (”The Rainbow-like”
It is very characteristic of the editors of such magazines that their „Christianity” means a dubiously warm attitude even towards the worst enemies of the Church and at the same time sharp criticism of the pope and bishops, their teaching, and bashing the most ardent Christians. For at least a dozen years or more, virtually every issue of Tygodnik Powszechny in particular has contained reproof of the Church for its teaching, and endorsements of anti-Christian ideologies, including, especially, gender- and homoideology. How is it that it is so hard to find any criticism of leftist atheists and so easy to find approving words even about the greatest enemies of Christ, like Judas and Jerzy Urban. Father Boniecki himself became famous for his demonstrative support of the Satanist Nergal, a singer known for blasphemy, the public tearing of the Holy Bible, or a song promoting the extermination of Christians. Neither Urban’s nor Nergal’s language seem to bother him. If Fr. Boniecki speaks well of Poland’s leading Satanist, he, as it were, supports other less known Satanists and Satanism in general, which is the greatest negation of Christianity. No wonder, such a priest is later on the side of gender- and homoideology. But if such is the attitude of the senior editor-in-chief, a model and doyen for his colleagues, what can one expect from others?

It is no wonder then that Fr Boniecki was punished by his religious authorities and allowed to publish only in Tygodnik (probably this milieu was considered 'lost' anyway). One could say that he was negatively evaluated by the community that knows him best, i.e. in his own convent. There must have been many charges against him if the order, of which he had once been the general, felt compelled to do so. It could be compared to a diocese punishing its retired


ordinary bishop. After all, he is to blame for the fall of *Tygodnik Powszechny*, its spiritual and financial downfall. The weekly, which was a Catholic stronghold in the communist Poland and had every chance to become the first Catholic medium after 1989, almost went bankrupt under his leadership.

If it still exists, it is due to financial aid from people hostile to the Church, which speaks for itself. I find *Tygodnik Powszechny* an expression, to a great extent, of the “comfort zone” mentality, i.e. having exclusive rights to the promises of Christianity while not opposing the world and its ideologies which are in sharp contrast to Christianity. Such people commonly violate God’s commandments and instead of converting, they try to “convert” God and the Church. This is the attitude of people like Fr. Krzysztof Charamsa, Fr. Roman Szczygieł SAC or Jerzy Zawieyski. We should therefore be wary, since a significant number of authors publishing in this newspaper (both clergy and laity) may share this mode of thinking and lifestyle. I base this supposition on the consistent line of the weekly over the last few decades. Such people value the world and their sins more than Christianity (you cannot serve two masters), they attack the Church constantly to serve the world and justify their sins. That is why its weekly content largely boils down to explanations why we should disapprove of the Church and its teaching. Thus, authors flaunting their superiority may even come to the conclusion that there is no use hanging on to the Church that is so wrong.\(^{29}\)

The self-destruction of *Tygodnik Powszechny* is very similar to the one of the Church in the Netherlands. These two cases should be carefully studied, so as not to repeat their errors either now or in the future. The Dutch Church used to be one of the most beautiful, strongest and best organized Churches in the world. However, after the Vatican Council it lost most of the faithful just in a dozen of years. It, as if, ceased to exist. It was substituted by the most atheistic ideologies, the legalization of prostitution, drugs, euthanasia and homosexual lifestyle. How come? A number of the Dutch clergy considered the results of the Council insufficient. They created their own theology, into which they incorporated important elements of leftist ideologies. It is like implanting the germs of a deadly disease into oneself – one’s death thus should come as no surprise. This is a typical path of the so-called “liberal, left-wing Christians.”

Their aspirations, their thinking, their “theology” are in fact surrendering to the world that is contrary to Christianity. They have the mentality of the

consumer society which puts short-term sensual pleasure above all/anything and is guided not by the principle of truth and goodness, the truth of the Gospel, but the principle of pleasure and the, so called, truth of the world. Those people want to enjoy all possible pleasures – even the most revolting to God, sinful and harmful. That is why they create theology without the Cross, that is, without Jesus. It is a kind of “luxury theology”, which inevitably becomes anti-theology. A typical representative of such theology is Fr. Krzysztof Charamsa, who, as if, negated reason and Gospel.

Such „theologians” do not defend Christianity against the ideologies and lies of the world, as Christ did with the Pharisees, but surrender to the world, succumb to its enslavement. Of course, one is very much praised for this by the world. This “strategy” is easier and yet much more suicidal. In fact, such theology has nothing to say to the world since it loses its own source placing the world above Christ. The only thing it actually does is reflecting the views of the world and adding “Amen” to it. Thus, it loses its originality and value, withers as Ersatz theology or even a “fake”. However, people see it and reject such a fake, secularized Church: they prefer the original that is the world itself. This is the mechanism of self-destruction of theology, the local Church or the pseudo-Catholic mass media.30

This is a path chosen also by the editors of Tygodnik Powszechny who adopted the basic elements of leftist ideologies as their own. It is no wonder they are notorious for their perpetual attacks on the Church and never its enemies (for which they are particularly valued and distinguished). Christians find the weekly too openly anti-Christian. Anti-Christians, on the other hand, are well satisfied with their original writings – they do not need the appearances of Christianity.

This desertion of the teaching of the Church can be especially seen in articles of “homoheretic” nature. Basically, in Tygodnik Powszechny any text on homosexuality is usually its endorsement and, at the same time, it is a strong rejection of reason and the Church’s teaching on the subject. This is particularly evident in all texts by the editor Artur Sporniak and Jacek Prusak SJ. One may treat it as a warning as to where one ends up if the Gospel is substituted with gender ideology, if the teachings of Christ and St. Paul are replaced by Marx and Sartre.

This is how the prophecy of one of the greatest saints and prophets of our time, God's servant, Fr. Franciszek Blachnicki, comes true. On the day of Pentecost 1961 in a cell of a communist prison he uttered the following words:

Time has come for the partial Catholicism to be wiped out (the same lot awaits even its deeper, intellectual version that makes a pact with the world in the style of Tygodnik Powszechny). It will all drown in the sea of modern paganism. Only the outright, authentic and evangelical Catholicism will stand. You have to decide and choose to be a saint.\(^3\)

These words can be a guideline for further analysis and a sign-post for our life.

3. Defending the Truth and the Good in the Media

I have given, here, vivid examples of negative media activity. However, I base my convictions, also, on my own, particularly broad, media involvement which began in June 2005 when I started a strong public criticism of homoideology and gender theory.\(^3\) I have had many experiences similar to those described


\(^3\) The introduction to it was my famous article “Ten Arguments Against,” in Gazeta Wyborcza 28/29.05.2005, pp. 27–28, which was cited, among others, by the then President of Warsaw, professor Lech Kaczyński. This article became the most well-known and discussed Polish anti-homoideological text. On the one hand, I encountered a great support of Polish society and the Church, on the other hand, a big campaign of the leftist atheistic media, as well as secret, anonymous and most repugnant threats of every kind. A series of articles directed against me were printed in “Gazeta Wyborcza,” and I was not given – which was against an elementary notion of honesty and the press law – any possibility of a response, which was a typical procedure of this “Ministry of Truth”. Of course, it was supported by “Tygodnik Powszechny” as if it were a gay supplement to GW. However, the value and strength of this article is proven by the following list of publications that both editorial offices regarded as necessary to at least partially reduce the text's impact. A whole series of articles directed against me were released. It was the first great 'media storm' related to my text and my person, it was the first big campaign against me led by these magazines – even before the one with Fr. Charamsa in the main role. See K. Bielas, A. Bikont, T. Bogucka, A. Fostakowska, P. Goźniński, D. Jarecka, M. Lizut, K. Naszkowska, L. Ostalowska, E. Siedlecka, P. Smoleński, T. Sobolewski, J. Szczęsna, M. Szczygiew, W. Tochman, E. Wieczorek, Nie chcemy takich tekstów (We Do Not Want Such Texts),”Gazeta Wyborcza” 4–5. 06.2005, p. 2; H. Bortnowska, Szacunek, nie litość (Respect, Not Pity), “Gazeta Wyborcza” 4–5.06.2005, p. 28; M. Szuldrzyński, Prowokacyjna parada (A Provocative Parade), “Gazeta Wyborcza” 10.06.2005, p. 20; Kościół gejów nie odrzuca (The Church Does Not Reject Gays) – interview with Fr. T. Bartoś OP, “Gazeta Wyborcza” 11–12.06.2005, p. 4; Niedojrzałość, nie choroba (Immaturity, Not a Disease) – interview with
above. I have been harassed but also supported.33 I have given over one hundred interviews for Polish and foreign magazines and the Internet, and appeared in the most popular and influential television programs of various ideological and political backgrounds. These include programmes hosted by, on the one hand, Monika Olejnik, Tomasz Lis and Agnieszka Gozdyra, and on the other hand, Jan Pospieszalski, Dorota Gawryluk and Adrian Klarenbach. I have also been a guest at the Redemptorist Trwam Television.

I could call my media activity “ecumenical” as I seek to convince as many people as possible. I have, therefore, appeared twelve times in the flagship program of Trwam Television and Radio Maryja Rozmowy niedokończone [Conversations to Be Continued], seventeen times in Monika Olejnik’s interviews Kropka nad i [Dotting the i’s and Crossing the t’s] and seven times on the programme hosted by Tomasz Lis. Altogether, I have been a guest in over two hundred and fifty television, radio and Internet broadcasts, which were watched or listened to by about three hundred and fifty million people in total. Many of my speeches, interviews and lectures have been posted on the Internet where millions of people have read them, although the number is difficult to estimate.34


34 Apart from that, three audiobooks with the recordings of my interviews and an extended interview, entitled Moje życie. Z ks. Dariuszem Oko rozmawia Piotr Litka (My Life. Piotr Litka talks to Rev. Dariusz Oko) were released, Kraków 2014. Wydawnictwo
As a result, my texts are often cited not only in academic literature, but also in popular literature.

Of course, there are people (supporters of gender ideology in particular) who criticize my activities and me personally, but they usually happen to be hostile towards the Church as well like prof. Magdalena Środa, Robert Biedroń and prof. Jan Hartman. I scrutinize their texts and respond to their attacks. Interestingly, the subsequent life choices of such people often confirm my assessments. That was the case with Fr. prof. Eugen Drewermann, Fr. prof. Tadeusz Bartoś OP, Fr. prof. Tomasz Węgłowski or Fr. Krzysztof Charamsa.

Being active in mass media is so crucial because nowadays they have a huge impact on human consciousness – they are capable of shaping it (also very negatively). They can destroy what is best in the soul of man and what has been built for years by her/his family, school and church. Since it is much easier to ruin and demolish a house than to build it, so it is with a human being – it is much easier to corrupt a person than to raise her/him (also in the case of self-education). The role of the righteous media in our time was probably best understood by St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe. Already in the interwar period he drew attention to their prominence and prophetically emphasized that it is possible to erect many beautiful churches, but without effective Catholic media they will quickly become empty.35 This prompted him to develop the much-needed mass Catholic press. His spectacular achievements in the field make him the best model and patron of the media work of Christians.

St. Maksymilian Maria Kolbe was indeed right. I have already shown the examples of wickedness and hypocrisy of the media (including Tygodnik Powszechny which acts out the role of the Trojan horse in the Church) that are typical of the media led by atheists and leftists fighting Christianity in order to “rule indivisibly”. I could find that out for myself, being often invited to discussions especially about gender ideology and homoideology. In the beginning I thought that we, as interlocutors, would be together in an honest dialogue looking for the truth, as it happens during academic seminars. I soon realized how naïve I was: it was not about searching for the truth, but about promoting left-wing ideologies in the most effective and brutal way. I was essentially meant as a “fig leaf” to hide manipulations, help create appearances of objectivity.

Św. Stanisława. The extended review has already been published in thousands of copies and it is being continually reprinted.

The strategy adopted against me included: giving me more opponents to speak to and less time to answer. It was not about rational, objective reasoning, but rather about attacking me, exposing me to ridicule so as to discredit me and my views. One of the greatest philosophers of our time, Chantal Delsol, points out that this is a strategic way of fighting adopted by modern, totalitarian left. We are therefore faced with media terror at the heart of which there is mockery, derision and blasphemy. The objective is to “annihilate” those who oppose gender ideology in the media so that they can exert no influence on social and political life. When they are eliminated, only atheistic leftists and leftists will have the floor. The aim is to gain total power, no matter what. Years ago it was accurately described by George Orwell.

Having experienced all this, I have realized that there are many people in the public sphere who do not care about seeking the objective truth and the common good but, first and foremost, about the greatest possible power and possession, about spreading leftist, atheistic ideologies. The media are drawn in to help them enslave society and destroy its rational thinking. Journalists serve merely as tools for media owners. Some of them do this in accordance with their beliefs, some are forced by their economic situation. That is why they are often ready to write lies and turn to iniquity. They are often unable to see the absurdity and harmfulness of what they proclaim as they have become too entangled due to their beliefs and own life choices. So, sometimes, they “preach” absurd ideologies so as to justify and rationalize their own sin and hypocrisy – as in the case of Fr. Krzysztof Charamsa.

4. Anti-Personalistic Character of Gender Ideology

What atheistic, leftist journalists proclaim is in fact the opposite of Christian personalism, indeed all personalism. Their main theory is genderism, which today plays a leading role as Marxism once did. This is not surprising, since genderism is virtually a mutation of Marxism transformed by the Frankfurt School for the needs of the atheistic revolution in the West, where the original version

---


of Marxism did not have such chances of victory as in the East. Just as Marxists wanted to gain (and often gained) power by “liberating” workers and peasants, so do genderists by “freeing” human sexuality in all, even obviously the most disordered forms. This inevitably leads to overthrowing rationality, to the rule of lust over reason, that is, in fact, to sexual enslavement – just like the workers and peasants were much more enslaved in the Soviet Union than in the West. If one, therefore, attempted to define gender ideology (which of course will always be a simplification), it should be said that it is another leftist ideology in which atheists put sex in the place of God. If we accept this assumption, it will appear to be very useful hermeneutically – we will find it much easier to understand the usual gibberish of genderists, as well as their actions, especially the overwhelming pursuit of the sexualization of children as early as possible, which virtually means their sexual depravity.

After reading thousands of pages written by genderists, I can say that inherent in those is the primacy of sexuality over reason. Christian personalists are

---


convinced that primacy always belongs to reason: it is with reason that we should learn about the nature of man, the cosmos and God, and then adopt appropriate norms of action in all areas, including sexuality. Genderists claim just the opposite. They put sexuality above all else, it is a central value, human dignity and reason are subordinate to it. Pleasure counts above all – not the other person, not a relationship. This constant pursuit of sexual pleasure may entail fundamental detachment from the dignity of the person and the value of relationship (including marital, family, ethical and religious). With such depersonalization of man, the supposed “sexual liberation” becomes sexual enslavement, because it is similar to treating a drug addict with larger doses of the drug.41 Here reason is at the service of desire, which manifests itself in the absurd propositions to be found in genderist texts.42 One can clearly see the extent to which this “programme” is contrary to personalism, with its dehumanization and reduction of the person.


42 Alan Sokal became exceptionally famous for demonstrating the absurdities of gender theory in his provocative text: Transgressing the boundaries: Towards a transformative hermeneutics of quantum gravity („Social Text” 46/47 (1996), pp. 217–252). This article was in fact an intentional pseudo-scientific discourse devoid of any sense, which, however, in the editors’ opinion deserved to be published in a renowned sociological journal, because, as it turned out, a significant part of its content has exactly such gibberish character. After this successful provocation, Sokal together with Jean Bricmont wrote a book whose Polish edition is entitled: Modne bzdury. O nadużywaniu pojęć z zakresu nauk ścisłych przez postmodernistycznych intelektualistów (Fashionable Nonsense. Postmodern Intellectuals Abuse of Science) (transl. P. Amsterdamski, Warszawa 1998, Wydawnictwo Prószyński i S-ka). In this book, he criticizes the texts of thinkers such as Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva or Luce Irigaray and a number of others. In their texts, they rewrite entire paragraphs from mathematics or physics textbooks to give an impression that the whole is rational. Their texts become pseudo-scientific. They compromise themselves and lose their credibility – and those who take them seriously too. In Poland, a similarly provocative and nonsensical article was published by a psychologist,
How the genderist theory translates into practical policy is well demonstrated, for example, by the German *Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt* textbook (i.e. *Sex Pedagogy of Plurality*) by Professor Elisabeth Tuider and her team of colleagues.\(^{43}\) It is a handbook for teachers who are to have lessons with children. One of the exercises in the book is entitled “Der neue Puff für alle”, which literally means “A New Brothel for Everyone”.\(^{44}\) During the exercise 15-year-old children receive the outline of a brothel building after renovation (basement, ground floor and first floor, respectively) and are to plan its rooms so that “all possible people may visit it, (…) all possible people are served and they are satisfied”. Children should also think what its advertisement should look like, “how one could reach all people with it”, what the price list should be and how much “service providers” should earn. The purpose of this exercise is also clearly stated: children should gain “personal freedom” along the way, so that “they can use sexual services themselves or offer such services themselves.”\(^{45}\)

It seems prof. Tuider and her colleagues are convinced that every German boy and girl at the age of 15 should be encouraged to go to brothels and work in brothels (which is close to pedophilia). In a normal country such proposals may be the basis for prosecution on a charge of corruption of minors. However, in a genderist state like modern Germany, it is parents who are punished for


\(^{44}\) Cf. ibidem, pp. 75–78. It is to be noted that the whole group of authors prefers the word “brothel”.

\(^{45}\) Ibidem, p. 77.
not letting their children attend such lessons, whereas professor Tuider is still considered one of the highest educational authorities in Germany.\textsuperscript{46}

However, if the Germans have made gender ideology the main ideology of their country, such results are inevitable. In this case, the processes of social degradation are accelerating even more. One may expect that more brothels will be built in this country, and at the same time more churches will be closed. We can observe a real anthropological, social and demographic disaster. Just like Marxists aimed to reduce man to a work machine, so genderists have turned him, as it were, into a sex machine. This amazing, deeply anti-personalistic and therefore anti-human programme is propagated not only by the media, but also at school.

One can clearly see how Western Europe is, in some respects, deeply degenerated, how ‘disordered’ its citizens and authorities. What is happening in Germany takes place in other countries as well and is promoted by the European Union. It also shows how critical, intelligent and assertive we need to be when entering into a dialogue with Western culture. In every culture and society, as in every human being, there is some good and truth, but also some evil and falsehood. That is why we have to be critically open towards every culture, just like towards every human being. We need to be open so as to be able to accept their truth and good. And critical so as to defend ourselves against their evil and falsehood, which are most likely present as well. Unfortunately, professor Tuider’s lessons are certainly one of the worst things that can happen to young people and children.

Gender ideologists, it seems, want to do the same in Poland. Gender ideology is being imposed on us as a program of widespread cultural depravity through sexual revolution. One of its leaders is prof. Jacek Kochanowski, a sociologist from the University of Warsaw and one of the highest authorities of gender ideology in Poland. He is exceptionally often cited in the genderist community and entrusted with the most responsible tasks, such as fundamental criticism of personalism in education. As part of this ‘mission’, he became the main editor of the study \textit{Szkoła milczenia} [\textit{The School of Silence}], which is, at its roots, a strong condemnation of school programmes currently preparing

\textsuperscript{46} It should be added that both the German Catholic and Protestant Churches do not object to such lessons, and do nothing to protect children. The Churches are subject not to the Gospel but to the state. This attitude also explains largely what is happening now during the “Synodal Way” of the German Catholic Church.
Polish children and youth for family life. Of course, one could expect that from such a book. And yet, one may be truly intrigued by what prof. Kochanowski proposes in return. We can learn this from his other publication, the book Sociology of Sexuality. It is there that one may find e.g. the approbation of sex that is as close to animals’ behavior as possible (as such it gives particularly strong sensations). Prof. Kochanowski, the Polish coryphaeus of queer theory, eulogizes almost all possible sexual activities. He also admonishes homosexuals not to pretend that they mean to marry because it is all about sex with the maximum number of partners, while the “bonds of marriage” would mean being limited to one partner. Marital union would also be another form of colonialism for them i.e. a submission to the norms of heterosexual society. Homosexuals should continually “transgress” all boundaries, and be more and more proud, though of something quite different than people “enslaved by heteronormativity.” In other words, they should free themselves from personalism.

Prof. Kochanowski bases his teaching also on his observations in dark rooms of gay clubs. In darkened rooms homosexuals engage in sexual intercourse with men they have just met at the bar. Sometimes such a brief encounter at the bar is not necessary, one may have sex with anyone, seeing their face is not necessary

---

47 Cf. J. Kochanowski and others, Szkoła milczenia. Przegląd treści szkolnych podręczników do biologii, WOS i WDŻR pod kątem przedstawienia w nich problematyki LGBTQ i treści homofobicznych (The School of Silence), Toruń 2013, Stowarzyszenie Na Rzecz Lesbijek, Gejów, Osób Biseksualnych, Osób Transpłciowych Oraz Osób Queer „Pracownia Różnorodności”.


49 Cf. ibidem, p. 215n. During gay parades one can meet men disguised as animals, for example, dogs or pigs, walking on their four even for a few kilometers or being led with a leash or chain. And thus with their own bodies (and especially knees) they express what was said by prof. Kochanowski. Out of their own free will and to a certain degree they become similar to animals. One cannot think of a more severe self-denigration. However, when sex becomes a god, even such things are possible.

either.51 Thus they can even have several partners one evening. One can hardly imagine a more telling example of depersonalization. Prof. Kochanowski reports that some gays feel a bit embarrassed at the beginning of such a practice and try to hide. He, as an authority, tells them not to:

I think the slogan of gay pride, lesbian-gay pride, is becoming clearer in this context. (…) Working with one’s emotions in the case of sexual transgression, related to the search for casual male-male sex in the club, requires passing from shame and the feeling of being “unworthy” because of improper behavior, to pride and approval of the needs of your body and the ways of meeting these needs.52

Thus, what prof. Kochanowski and others want to teach our children, what he would like see instead of the current programme of ‘Wychowanie do życia w rodzinie’ [Bringing Children up to Family Life] is now rather obvious. Children and adolescents are to be raised to, as it were, have promiscuous sex with many partners, possibly without personal bonds because these are redundant. This is pure anti-personalism, a reduction of man to sexual activities. Prof. Kochanowski would indeed be a worthy collaborator and partner of Elisabeth Tuider.

The above examples clearly show the threat to children and young people that gender ideology poses (sex depravation which is virtually an organized crime on their souls and bodies). They also indicate that those who invent and support such programs (including many editors of papers such as Gazeta Wyborcza, Tygodnik Powszechny, Nie) may be deeply lost or degenerate. Their papers are not only full of lies and manipulation in this field, but they are also powerful depersonalization machines hidden behind beautiful slogans of equality, plurality and love. And I claim this not only on the basis of theoretical considerations, but also on the grounds of their texts and actions which I have been studying for fifteen years.

We must oppose them firmly and defend our country, our families, children and young people. This requires a great spiritual and media struggle. We need to establish and run our own pro-personalistic media, acquire communication

51 Their faces are sometimes even specially covered with paper bags, as Paula Szewczyk describes in her article Grindr: Seks w epoce cyfrowej (Grindr: Sex in the Cyber Era), https://www.newsweek.pl/polska/grindr-to-aplikacja-dzieki-ktorej-geje-umawiaja-sie-na-seks/i7ktpdy, 4.07.2015 (3.01.2019). There is only a sign on the bag saying what a given gay wants. This is another example of the deep depersonalization of the human person.

52 J. Kochanowski, Socjologia seksualności (The Sociology of Sexuality), op. cit., p. 91.
skills useful during media appearances and reach for appropriate textbooks and advisors. One should also be aware that our opponents have many possibilities of cheating as one can lie about a given issue in a thousand and more ways. We always have to take into account that our adversaries will do it if they find it convenient, even temporarily.

6. Making the Most of a Media Appearance

For Christian personalists the best (though somewhat forgotten) advisor and model is Jesus Christ. Clearly, He was not a weakling who would give up in front of wrongdoing, lies and violence. On the contrary, He fought, though peacefully, for the truth and justice. He strongly opposed the manipulations and lies of the Pharisees, Sadducees and priests – the religious, political and ‘media’ elite of Israel – defending people and God’s truth.

When necessary, He called His opponents a “brood of vipers, whitewashed tombs, murderers of the prophets,” and asked how they could “escape damnation in hell?” He used strong words to defend Himself from those who incessantly set traps for Him in order to imprison and kill Him. Sometimes uttering one sentence was enough to help Him out of the worst set-up. His ripostes were brilliant solutions, saving his own life and that of others, and at the same time they were a revelation of an important truth. For example:

Let any one of you who is without sin be the first to throw a stone at her. (J 8:7),

or:

Show me a denarius. Whose image and inscription are on it? (...)Then give back to Caesar what is Caesar’s, and to God what is God’s. (Lk 20:24–25),

or:

53 Wolf Ruede-Wissmann’s Satanische Verhandlungskunst und wie man sich dagegen wehrt, München 2006, Wilhelm Heyne Verlag (Szatańska sztuka dyskusji i jak się można przed nią bronić) can be helpful in a defense against the wicked methods of discussion. Decent people may wonder about how many ways there are to lie, cheat and manipulate communication. However, since they exist and are used, they must be known, of course not to use them, but to recognize and neutralize them.

54 Cf. Mt 23:13–36; Mk 12:38–40; Lk 20:45–47.
I will ask you one question. Answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I am doing these things. John’s baptism – was it from heaven, or of human origin? Tell me! (Mk 11:29–30).

We are involved in a spiritual struggle and we must learn how to use such rhetoric from Jesus. This is also a task for Christians if we are to follow Him. After all, what is at stake here are personal lives of millions of people, their future with God on earth and in eternity. Just as Jesus defended people against the lies of the greatest Pharisees of His time, so must we defend them against the lies of our times.

To help others “make the most” of media appearances, I will share my experience gained in many struggles of this type, especially media confrontations with leftist, atheistic ideologists, whose attitude is often anti-Christian and anti-personalistic. I will describe how to prepare for the most difficult cases, since if we learn to be effective in those, it will be easier to get along in conversations with journalists and debaters who are slightly more pro-personalistic, more open to the person, the truth and good.

In a media appearance we have an opportunity to address thousands or even millions of people, so we should talk about the most important truths in the most convincing way. It is always a great opportunity and honor when so many people devote their time and attention to us. If we attempted to reach them through advertisements, it would cost millions. If we wanted to reach them more conventionally, at school lessons or church sermons, we would need thousands of years.55

Therefore, to be as effective as possible, one should:

1. Prepare one’s background. This virtually means one’s whole life. The “quality”, goodness and richness of one’s personality determines the quality, goodness and richness of the thoughts, feelings, judgments, words and deeds coming out of one’s depth. That is why the more profound one’s personality is, the greater the chances of conveying rich and effective messages. Our personality, in turn, is a synthesis of our whole life, so it is essential for our development that we live as beautifully as possible, as wisely as possible. One must therefore work as much as possible, learn, pray, live in the best possible communion with the best people and God, use one’s mind and will, feelings and body to the best of one’s ability. That is how we can move forward, gathering in our mind and

55 For example, I estimate that if wanted to have, through traditional pastoral care, the same number of listeners that I have had through the media – that is, about three hundred and fifty million people – I would need more than ten thousand years.
heart as much knowledge, wisdom, love and beautiful feelings as possible. Only then will we have something to share with others. Moreover, our intellectual, moral and religious “advantage” will help us defend ourselves against aggressive interlocutors. In all this, one must try to follow Jesus Christ with all one’s might. First of all, we must grow as people. After all, every thought, feeling, decision, word and deed is an expression of who we are.

2. Learn appropriate communication and media skills, as well as accumulate maximum specialized knowledge in the area we are to talk about. When our opponent’s knowledge and thought horizon is only a subset of our knowledge and our horizon, it will obviously work to our advantage. This should always be the case when we talk to a journalist: after all, it is due to our expertise that we should be invited.

3. Work on the right spiritual attitude towards discussion partners and journalists: full of respect and kindness (striving ultimately for Christian love) even if they are our adversaries. If that is the case our demeanour should in no way “feed” their hostility (especially the host’s, on whom the course of the discussion depends to the greatest extent). So, if possible, establish being on friendly terms before entering the broadcasting studio and going on air. Every good thought, philosophical reflection, prayer and meditation can help a lot here. One should show kindness and respect toward every person. Such an attitude also protects us from glaring errors such as insulting or humiliating our interlocutor or losing our temper. Sometimes we may be provoked to do this. And if we do get carried away, our reputation will be compromised. Here especially one can understand the meaning and fruits of Christian spiritual formation and the precept to love one’s enemies.

4. Take care of one’s appearance. One should wear clothes that are modest and at the same time help us reach out to others, encouraging them to communicate with us. Bear in mind that a friendly, communicative body language also matters. So adopt the upright posture and show sincere interest in the person who is currently speaking. Beware of feeling superior even if you are quite certain that what someone is saying is asinine and primitive or such is their behavior. In general show kindness to everyone. If such is the shape of your heart, your facial expression and communication will follow it.

5. Set fair and clear rules that translate into equal opportunities (including equal time) for all interlocutors. Make sure your supporters are in the audience and that a journalist is impartial (if not, at least remind him of the principles of neutrality). Once you are in the studio, you should exact the
rules, explicitly demanding e.g. an equal amount of time to speak and fair treat-
ment. If the rules are disregarded by others, you can protest repeatedly even if it
virtually means disrupting the meeting. Do not let others treat you as an easy
target or prey when they utter aggressive remarks. However, always use ethical
means of defense – be truthful and considerate towards the opponent. Do not
worry about others showing signs of aggression or rudeness: when viewers see
their anger or unethical behaviour, they lose the game (the inference being that
if they lack morally, so may they intellectually).

6. **Listen to the host of the program, as he is the referee on this
pitch.** Speak when he gives you the floor, otherwise the conversation can easily
turn into mutual heckling (as a result, viewers will hardly understand what you
mean) Fight for your right to speak only if you are clearly discriminated against.
You can, for example, wittily say: *Let us settle the time when you interrupt me.
Will it be after I say three or five sentences?*

7. **Be prepared for the worst,** in certain media in particular. Be sure
that if their hosts, editors and guests have an opportunity to manipulate or lie,
they will. Genderists, as leftist atheists, seem to stick to the rules generally only
when they feel weak, when there are too many negative consequences on the
horizon, i.e. their public image being undermined.

8. **Punch holes in arguments.** If our opponents are conceited, if they
commit a fundamental mistake of being atheists, then, consequently, they are
very likely to make many other mistakes and be relatively easy to confute. One
just has to read their texts, listen to their speeches, get to know their life history,
listen to their critics, and will certainly find a chink in their armour that can
be brought to light if need be. Let us not be afraid of them, let us not be paralysed
with fear. If they are against good, truth and God, then we have a better chance
of being right. You just need to demonstrate it, e.g. citing appropriate passages
from their works.

9. **Keep one’s cool.** The most typical misdeeds of our opponents may
include humiliating and insulting us and our relatives, even our entire national
or religious community. Our opponents do so, on the one hand, out of hostility,
which they cannot hide. On the other hand, they may hope to upset us, break
our logical thinking, provoke us to insult them in turn. We can never be taken
in as then we will lose the ability to communicate effectively. If we are led astray,
we are utterly defeated. You should be aware that sometimes we are in the very
center of a spiritual battle, where our opponents want our moral downfall in the
limelight. If this is a fight, not an honest dialogue, you must behave like an officer
responsible for the course of the battle, especially for the lives of thousands or even millions of soldiers. He should, therefore, keep his cool, think clearly, and decide sensibly. If he gives in to emotions, goes into a panic or flies into an anger, he can easily lose, causing death of thousands of people, which was avoidable. So he must calmly and effectively analyze the opponent’s moves and decide how to respond to them, what “resources” (arguments or rhetorical tools) to use. He should work on accumulating resources of the best quality and as many as possible, thus preparing to this on-air confrontation. His moral life and hard work are crucial here.

10. Talk about the issue, not oneself. One should also have the courage and inner peace not to react to foolish, primitive attacks, to leave them aside and go to the “substance of the case”. Let us not waste our time, which is only a few minutes we are given to speak, on futile defense. After all, we have come not to talk about ourselves, not to attract attention to ourselves, but to discuss issues that are important to many and even to the whole society. So talk primarily about the heart of the matter, not about yourself – no matter how unjustly you are being attacked. Moreover, viewers will see it for themselves if your adversary is behaving in a wicked, brutal way, thus losing face.

11. Talk not so much to your opponents in the studio, but to thousands or millions of viewers or listeners. Most of the time there is little chance of convincing your opponents (they would take it as their “professional failure”, their public defamation). Therefore, you often have to speak, as it were, “beyond them”, to the audience whom you may reach. That is why you should have the most important and best arguments prepared beforehand and try to get them across. If you are asked foolish questions, accused or interrupted, you can always start with: To answer your question, first, I must discuss X, Y, Z. You should have arguments in a large surplus so that if you forget anything, you will not “get stuck” (which makes a really bad impression) Generally, you should take advantage of every minute given to you and utter the best arguments.

56 One of the most frequently asked questions as for my appearance in the media is the one about my usual keeping calm, also at the time when I and my community are offended, when our opponents burst out with hatred and aggression. Interviewers often state: “I wouldn’t stand it, especially again and again for years.” I answer these questions thus: first of all, I take care to be kind and patient to everyone – like a spiritual doctor for patients with seriously ill souls. Secondly, I know that this battle is a spiritual one, and effectiveness, first and foremost, requires calmness, prudence and self-control.
12. Strive for the best, well-founded arguments. If possible, use clear, easily understandable charts and tables. We can display them on the screen or hold them in our hands if we can't rely on the studio staff. Let us appeal to the reason, freedom and noble feelings of viewers or listeners. However, we should not expect them to agree with us immediately. It is hard to expect that someone's old beliefs will change under the influence of our three-minute speech. For people who are close to us spiritually, our words may serve as positive enforcement. For others, more distant to us spiritually, they can be like seeds thrown into the soil, which can grow and bear fruit after a few months or years. So just present your point. Do not try to convince the most stubborn opponents, do not live with delusions. If you are attacked, respond not merely to your interlocutor, but to more open people in the audience.

13. Expressiveness, wit and intelligence. You don't have to hide your talents, though always use them with respect towards others. Wit seems useful as sometimes we have no other chance to break through the entire media hype. What is more, journalists like clever statements immensely, because they draw attention to their programmes and to themselves. Thanks to this, we may receive return invitations, which gives us more scope to influence others.

14. Be a long-distance runner. Focus on influencing others gradually, step by step. Always argue fairly, calmly and convincingly. This is how you create your “brand”, inspire trust and hope. This increases the chance for being a return guest as editors will know that our contribution is always particularly valuable, we always have something important and well-founded to say.

15. Focus on steady progress and learning. Let us accept and consider the comments coming not only from friends but also from enemies, which we receive after the programmes (of course, if they meet the criteria of rationality). Let us always be open to learning something new – not only from friendly but also unfriendly people (the latter will spot and express our weaknesses more readily). Let us watch meeting recordings in which we have taken part, think and look for areas to be improved. Let us not worry about good retorts or arguments that sometimes come to mind an hour or a day after the programme (nonetheless, they can be useful next time, so take them down). The scope of subjects and arguments of our opponents is, after all, limited, so we will inevitably have a chance to refer to those retorts and arguments. Then, viewers can sometimes be amazed how quickly we reply – in fact, we simply make good use of thoughts that came to our mind shortly after the previous programme on a given topic.
16. Let us seek help, light and correction from God. If we are believers, the time of prayer is never a waste of effort. On the contrary, it may be most fruitful, as God can act the most in us. The power and effectiveness of His actions infinitely exceed ours.

Last but not least, let us never lose sight of the main purpose of our presence in the media. It is truly always about the person, personalism, not self-promotion nor satisfying one’s ambitions. Mass media are, above all, a place of service to others and, therefore, to the Truth. The sole aim is always to provide the maximum number of people with the maximum number of best arguments in the most convincing form. The point is to help our sisters and brothers in their journey to the Truth and Good, in their journey to themselves and to God.
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