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Introduction

The guiding principle of the Redemptor hominis encyclical letter (John Paul II, 1979), which was John Paul II’s pontificate programme, was the conviction that man’s destiny is bound to Christ, reflecting on the individual and social nature of the human person. In the Pope’s teaching, knowing oneself and reality appears as an obligation to act, to take

1 Artykuł w języku polskim dostępny jest na stronie: https://www.stowarzyszeniefidesetratio.pl/Presentations0/2021-4Gar2.pdf
responsibility in the spirit of the personalistic principle he formulated, that is, the faith that every human being deserves love namely because he or she is a person. The personalist norm confirms this: the person is a good towards which the only proper and adequate attitude is love (Wojtyła, 1981, p. 41). This one sentence can be called the axis of Karol Wojtyła’s action and conduct, which is realised through a triad of attitudes mutually derived from one another. These are: dialogue, the participatory principle, and leadership. This chapter is devoted to discussing the above triad and the order of relationships between its elements. It seems, in fact, that scientific takes on personalism up to now have rarely, if ever, revealed the causal character of a growing person making the commandment of love the conscious principle of his or her behaviour. The methodology used is based on an analysis of the concepts of dialogue, participation, and leadership, within which a common foundation is observed: an orientation towards the person who listens and who is listened to (dialogue); who self-creates by participating in the lives of others (participation); and who sets goals and influences others in a way that helps them to develop and grow (leadership).

1. Content and scope of the personalistic norm

The idea of the personalistic principle emerges in Karol Wojtyła’s book Love and Responsibility. He formulates it as a response to an objectivist, utilitarian approach to the other person. *A person’s rightful due is to be treated as an object of love.* (Wojtyła, 1981, p. 42). The proposal to implement the personalistic norm in everyday life appears in many documents and statements of the Pope. We should begin our considerations with the Familiaris consortio exhortation, which was written as a summary of the Synod of Bishops’ several years’ work. In it, John Paul II indicated the four tasks of the Christian family: forming a community of persons; serving life; participating in the development of society; and sharing in the life and mission of the Church. One of the most important quotations from the document that links these four individual tasks is the passage on love being the essence of the family (John Paul II, 1981, no. 17). Thus, each task of the family, but also one of each of its members, can be interpreted integrally and pursued not as separate calls but as interpenetrating realities, life decisions and actions. A distinguishing feature of these guidelines lies, therefore, not so much in concrete recommendations, but rather in their source, namely love, which requires responsibility.

Wojtyła discerned that according to the personalistic norm, the value of the person is always higher than pleasure, need, or utility. In the course of his pontificate, he pointed out areas of human activity that had not hitherto been obvious, which, like the space of family relations, should be guided by this norm in the shaping of social relations: the workplace, institutional relations, state governance and international relations.
There are many speeches by John Paul II that were delivered in a spirit of shared responsibility for the protection of life, justice, and peace. The most interesting ones, as they bring hope for the greatest agency, seem to be those related to politics. No one must shirk from actively, responsibly and generously participating in this common cause. Justice and peace depend on each one of us (Jan Paweł II, 2011, p. 529).

This conviction stems from the anthropological and philosophical assumptions which Karol Wojtyła adopted and which made him a representative of Catholic social teaching. However, this is not the only reason. The way in which John Paul II develops the axiology and how he understands the social norms grounded in Christian thought is also due to his in-depth reflection on the question of the identity of the person and the spaces of its becoming or realisation.

Current research into the views of Poles and the formation of their values shows that when asked who is primarily responsible for social change, they do not indicate themselves at all, but instead they ascribe this responsibility to the state, institutions, and schools. More than 70% of respondents, when asked why it is worth protecting the environment, point to the future generation (Badanie, 2020). Thus, they do not personally relate to the need for change. By doing so, the individual also offloads responsibility onto a next generation, unspecified and difficult to account for.

The teaching of John Paul II leads in a different direction. It focuses on pointing out that agency in action must happen through the person, here and now. Hence his call for responsible participation in public life, which is addressed to everyone taking into account the responsibilities they can take.

In this context, the Pope’s statements addressed to politicians as one of the most empowered groups with the strongest influence on social change are invaluable. The Pope’s message focuses on several points. The two most important of these are, firstly, the promotion of solid values in public life. The change of reality takes place not by calling for it, but by working for the promotion of perennial human values in public life, in accordance with the correct methods proper to political activity (John Paul II, 2003). John Paul II defines politicians’ tasks in terms of inalienable duties. They include taking into account all those social conditions which favour the full development of human personality (John XXIII, 1961, no. 65). The second point concerns absolute respect for the human person, based on a spiritual vision of man (John Paul II, 2003).

A particular feature of his teaching is linked to his profound anthropological and ethical conviction, substantiated on many occasions, that fraternity and solidarity are not utopian and that they can be realised without losing valuable traditions of one’s own. This message is present, for example, in his speeches to the European Parliament (John Paul II, 1979). The source is the conviction that any organisation, any community, including such one as the European Union, can achieve unity in diversity, provided that all its actions are
directed towards a single goal: serving humanity. The human being is the decisive criterion that should order and guide all efforts. This kind of service requires constantly new initiatives (John Paul II, 1979). Commitment to the human person must be at the centre. It is then that concepts such as justice, development, or solidarity gain their strength (John Paul II, 1980).

John Paul II was convinced that all structural changes should be made with the human being in mind. The progress indicator should determine the degree of a person’s development, on top of the level of planning and implementation of local social policies to make life more human. The Pope used the concept of a city to the measure of man (Miasto, 2020) to indicate that what matters for the development of a person is not so much material prosperity, although this is also necessary, but the value of life in its various aspects (from fundamental ones, such as protection from conception to natural death, to equally crucial ones such as the right to profess a religion, safety, care, development, and honesty). All these human rights taken together are in keeping with the substance of the dignity of the human being, understood in his entirety, not as reduced to one dimension only (John Paul II, 1979, no. 13).

The concept used by John Paul II’s message seeks to express the idea that material goods, even if they may seem unlimited in their multiplicity and versatility, do not unfortunately have an unlimited capacity to satisfy human needs. Material wants and needs usually lead to conflicts and divisions between those who possess them and those who benefit from the goods. Needs, such as freedom, a sense of fulfilment, or a relationship with another person, are not limited to a material or spiritual range of values. For the individual person, both parallel levels of values are relevant. At the same time, material values are difficult to share in the sense that they will always be limited. Spiritual goods, on the other hand, are open to unlimited enjoyment by many at the same time, without diminution of the goods themselves. Indeed, the more people share in such goods, the more they are enjoyed and drawn upon, the more then do those goods show their indestructible and immortal worth (ibid.).

In order to understand the sources of the above message, it is necessary to follow John Paul II in the assumption that human life is a fundamental value and its protection is a priority in all decisions which can be influenced. Self-determination (also self-education and self-owning), which Wojtyła discusses in Osoba i czyn [The Acting Person] (Wojtyła, 2000, pp. 152-154), implies, among other things, a constant process of becoming aware what respect for life is and how it should manifest itself in one’s everyday decisions. Wojtyła talks about developing an attitude of bravery and trustworthiness. Awareness of the reactions of one’s body and mind, of their needs, limitations and possibilities, as well as of the reasons for decisions taken, is nothing but the foundation for a strong, stable identity, which not only does not waver under the influence of opinions and views, but it shapes personality, supported by lived experience. It drives the person to make the right decision in difficult,
extremely surprising moments (Starnawski, 2020). Such a decision is the right one since it results from working on oneself, and is always the best one which a person is ready to make at a given moment. At the same time, this means that personal maturity is a kind of a discretionary, ordering concept for social life.

2. Dialogue

The personalistic norm can come into life thanks to a number of characteristics present in the attitude of dialogue. These are: the knowledge and acceptance of one’s identity, listening and openness to the other, and readiness to search for truth together. The essence of Wojtyła’s concept of dialogue and its core is getting to know the other without any intention or desire to treat him instrumentally in any shape or form. This cognition for cognition’s sake, which is nevertheless a prerequisite for all further action and cooperation, constitutes the uniqueness of Wojtyła’s concept. Dialogue, in this sense, is therefore not originally understood as an agreement, compromise, consensus, etc., but is first and foremost a meeting of persons and an opening for mutual knowledge.

According to Karol Wojtyła, it is necessary to accept that a community will always be heterogeneous, as diverse as the people who make it. It is impossible to imagine a reality in which everyone thinks the same, wants the same, and solves problems identically. Thus, the assumption Wojtyła is making, that every contact with the other is a meeting of persons in the space of their differences, seems to be true. Seemingly, in this context one could argue with the first premise of the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas or Fr. Józef Tischner, took as their starting point that the other is a stranger. In the idea of dialogue, it is necessary to construe an assumption that every other is different, but not strange. The first step in introducing dialogical thought in society is to understand that it is utopian to have a model of thinking in which we want everything and everyone to be reconciled with each other. It is the otherness of the other, and therefore the very diversity, that allows one to know oneself. This is also where the participation principle begins to be implemented. Acceptance of the diversity is the first step towards interpersonal and social dialogue (Żukowska-Gardzińska, 2020). Development is not measured by the quality of our lives, but by how aware we are of ourselves and to what extent, for the sake of being in dialogue, we also allow others to be themselves. It is out of respect for ourselves and others that the level and format of dialogue will be an indicator of our humanity. In dialogue, in addition to being open to what the other thinks, it is equally important to be aware of the reason for this. It is extremely difficult to accommodate and agree to interpersonal differences, especially in situations where community decisions would have to be taken. It is even more difficult to recognise that, despite our differences, dialogue is the only thing that can unite and sustain us as a society. Rightful opposition (Wojtyła, 2020, pp. 324-325) will also be an element of dialogue, but one
which is not just conversation and communication, but which demands a meeting of persons, not social roles, not opinions, or showy and emotional rationales. After all, dialogue does not presuppose abandoning one’s identity and sacrificing it for the sake of a short-term agreement. [Dialogue] must be directed towards the recognition of individuals and human groups in their specific nature; in their original character, with the area of freedom which they need, (John Paul II, 1983a, no. 10). It is particularly difficult to engage in dialogue or to take responsibility through decisions and actions in conflicts concerning fundamental issues, namely, values (such as life or freedom) and needs (such as security or belonging). The most complex social situations usually penetrate deep into the personality issues that define a human being. In such a case, understanding and even acceptance of other views and decisions is extremely difficult. For John Paul II, the first step out of such a social passus is to direct the debate not towards who and when has what rights, or who is more disadvantaged in a given situation, but to ask how to build a reality in which we can start with applying the personalistic norm. Otherwise, when the action taken does not serve the common good, a legitimate and justified objection is grounded. It is done not against the attitudes of dialogue, but precisely and paradoxically in defence of it. Opposition, in Wojtyła’s understanding, is necessary when we witness or participate in events in which the good of a person in general is not on the table, and is replaced by the perspective of meeting the subjective needs of individuals or groups (Wojtyła, 2020, pp. 325-326). The fact that a just objection is never the result of deliberations or consideration is even more important. It is not emotional, but it is the result of working with one’s conscience. It is an expression of the defence of values, and therefore of one’s identity. In this sense, it is dialogical because it does not allow, firstly, the loss of personality and, secondly, or even more importantly, it upholds the respect and affirmation of one’s neighbour (the personalistic norm). The work of making dialogue a reality allows us to expand the space of encounter between subjective truths and egoistic needs in favour of a common approach to the truth about ourselves and the reality that at any given moment and time is the best we can give to each other and shape together.

3. Participation results from the attitude of dialogue

Dialogue understood in this way shapes the reality in which man is immersed, but at the same time it becomes a way of realising the theory of participation, described by Wojtyła as if at the end of his reflections in his book The Acting Person. In practical terms, it is a certain concept of the process of forming a person’s personality. The content of this concept consists of the interdependence between the fact that man finds himself and understands himself by participating in the actions of others, and at the same time is able to act together with others, thus realising himself (Wojtyła, 2020, pp. 308-309; Zboralska, 2012). A truly human act (Wojtyła 2020, pp. 304-306), as Wojtyła describes it, is such because it affects and
shapes the person, and the motive of its undertaking is – only and as much – the person. Through this act, the person obtains information about himself and on this basis, builds his or her own identity also by being in community with others. Wojtyla is not concerned with every action a person takes. He understands it as a conscious and creative human activity. The human deed is a particular given moment in the experience of the person, and in fact through it the person is revealed. The more authentic and self-aware one is, the more authentic relationships one creates. Performing a truly human act is a call to transfer the subjective recognition of values into the depths of objective truth, at the source of which is God.

Thus, if, by functioning in a community, a person realises himself, then, at the same time, what acts he performs together with others affect the values that he realises and that co-create him (ibid., pp. 306-307). It can be said that an individual’s identity is created through connections with others, and solidarity leads to acting in the interest of others. In this context, it becomes clearer that the personalistic norm should not be treated as a worldview or philosophical choice, although it will always depend on freedom of decision. The notion of a norm acquires significance here, because by complying with it, man creates himself. In other words, to be oneself means to transcend oneself. At the same time, any kind of being together with others presupposes an ethical reference to one’s neighbour and member of the community. With that in mind, the first reference, one’s neighbour, implies that the assignment of all human beings to one another on the basis of their humanity itself, and the reference system of a “community member” does not yet reveal this assignment (Wojtyła, 2000, p. 333). According to Wojtyła, the still valid task for human communities is to perceive the necessity of creating such bonds together with others on a personalistic level, so that a reference system of the neighbour becomes established as fundamental and superior (ibid., 335). In this context, transformational leadership which aims at change resulting from the value of the person as such, is a way of accomplishing this task.

4. Leadership

The implementation of the dialogue and the principles of participation allow the person to act as a leader. This combination of the three concepts of participation, dialogue and leadership visualises what it is in practice and what the life of an integral person, who subordinates their emotions and desires to conscience, acting in freedom, based on faith in God, might look like.

Leadership is the attitude by which a person effectively pulls other people along, giving direction to their actions (Maxwell, 2019, p. 17). Several schools and models of leadership always emphasize that a leader, through his or her behaviour, influences the change of decisions, behaviours, and attitudes but also brings about social change.
understood not only in the professional context, but also in the individual, family or global context (Karaszewski, 2008, p. 68). One does not become a leader by using coercive measures, nor can one establish oneself as one. This is due to the personal qualities of the leader, who becomes an authority for the group, and the group follows him/her because they see a possibility of changing the existing reality and developing themselves therein.

In relation to John Paul II, we can speak of integral leadership, which was characterised by: his personal authority, strength of will, determination and consistency of action, as well as humility and the supportive nature of the relationships he created. Wojtyla’s leadership consisted in the fact that he engaged in action for the good of others, and through natural action through dialogue and the principle of participation, he made people gather spontaneously, who changed reality by his side and together with him. A characteristic feature of John Paul II’s leadership is that it was derived from dialogue as a natural, one might say, way of human functioning in a reality created in the image and likeness of God, for which the leader feels a particular responsibility.

Wojtyła himself did not directly analyse the notion of leadership or leading, but he dealt with these ideas through his many speeches, meetings and statements. One of the most interesting are those addressed to young people (John Paul II, 1985) or to politicians, discussing the meaning and purpose of the actions one takes.

A leader develops leadership qualities throughout his or her life. Thus, a leader in a process of constant self-education and self-possession. He or she does not do so because of personal ambition. Rather, a leader feels unsatisfied with the experienced relationships and situations, and thus adopts an attitude of striving to learn about reality, to continually develop, to establish and build relationships based on trust, to see the wider context of the witnessed events, and to direct his or her reactions towards serving others.

For a leader, the pursuit of integrity is a natural way of knowing oneself. This enables him or her to use all the qualities of their character, to respond effectively to circumstances, while turning challenges into a path for their own development. However, integral leadership is not a skill. Of course, a person develops different skills and qualities as part of their development, but leadership is an attitude. It is about who you are and this is reflected in all aspects of your personal and professional life.

Karol Wojtyła also had such a personality, but at the same time he wrote a lot about it and defined the assumptions of the leadership model in a simple way. He often used a form known in communication language as call to action. In other words, he used short phrases calling for action. Some of the most prominent ones can be mentioned as examples: Do not be afraid (John Paul II, 1978), You need to be demanding of yourselves (John Paul II, 1983b); You need to be rather than to have (John Paul II, 1987, no. 5); you must on the one hand “love the world” ... and at the same time you must acquire interior detachment with regard to all this rich and fascinating reality that makes up “the world” (John Paul II, 1985, no. 5); Indeed, it is my hope that
your youth will provide you with a sturdy basis of sound principles, that your conscience will attain in these years of your youth that mature clear-sightedness that during your whole lives will enable each one of you to remain always a “person of conscience”, a “person of principles”, a “person who inspires trust”, in other words, a person who is credible (ibid., no. 7); Each one of you must in some way contribute to the richness of these communities, first of all by means of what he or she is. ... Man sees himself, his own humanity, both as his own interior world and as the specific area of his being “with others”, “for others” (ibid, no. 7); you are strong with the power of human brotherhood (ibid, no. 15).

Publications (Maxwell, 2019; Collins, 2018; Chand, 2006) on leadership present different sets of leader personality and character traits. Since one of the key concepts related to personal development that Wojtyła uses is integrity, it seems reasonable to call the attitudes he presents as integral leadership, which requires dialogue and participation at the same time. These will include features such as: personal authority, strength of will, determination, consistency of thought, action and teaching, consistency of action, humility, creating relationships not for oneself but for service to others, goal-oriented action regardless of what others think; voluntariness of participation; acting by pursuing one’s mission and inviting others to join in.

Of course, what distinguishes the leadership of John Paul II from the models of leadership known today is the source of this action, namely, God. Dialogue saves the other from the misery of selfishness. Wojtyła’s leadership is aimed at service to the other. It is the result of the creative act of God, who has given man his image and likeness, but has also made him responsible for other people and the created world. The teaching of John Paul II makes it possible to see the practical and inclusive message of the theology of grace in everyday life. Entering into dialogue, participation, and leadership happens through the free will of man. But it itself needs to be developed as well, and the human person needs to be perfected in moral and conscientious choices. The good of the person, the common good that would result from the triad: participation, dialogue, and leadership, is always related to God and results from a relationship with God. It is he, and not man as such, who is the reference point. Admittedly, I would define John Paul II’s vision of leadership as reaching the fullness of humanity (by achieving the integrity of the person), but while assuming that we are thinking of a fullness whose point of reference is God, who saves man. The Pope’s last will and testament, and in particular one of the passages he added during his pontificate, may be helpful in understanding this idea. On 1 March 1980, John Paul II added a sentence to his will: I hope too that it [death] shall be made useful also for this important cause in which I am trying to serve: … the safeguarding of the human family and of all the nations and the peoples (among these I refer in particular to my earthly Country), useful for the persons who in a special way have entrusted to me (John Paul II, 2000). It is faith that is the driving force behind action on behalf of others, and leadership in such a model, one might say, happens by the way, as an
unplanned and unintentional activity. It is the probably natural result of the extent to which it is filled with action driven by the personalistic norm. This is why the leadership that Karol Wojtyła represents is so perfectly illustrated in his biography. By way of example, I will mention just a few facts which, in my opinion, most accurately reflect the nature of this leadership, and which are the result of work on dialogue and making the participatory principle a reality.

5. The personalistic nature of John Paul II’s leadership

Polish empirical research on the public perception of John Paul II’s leadership has shown that the very notion of exerting influence is strongly associated with the field of politics. Consequently, the majority of respondents, even if they believe that the Pope played a very important role in the socio-political changes of the 20th century, do not link this action to his leadership (Łukasik-Turecka, 2020). In a way, this report confirms the previously available research results according to which we, as societies, use cultural codes that contain a vision of a perfect leader (Żukiewicz, 2011). Unfortunately, the most popular theories such as Gustav le Bon’s or the much earlier one by Niccolò Machiavelli, where the most important determinant of action is purpose or charisma legitimising power, do not fit John Paul II. Consequently, it is difficult to spot a leader who escapes the accepted and assimilated norms. In a theological context, one could conclude that Karol Wojtyła’s leadership is revealed due to a need for a man who would remind and call for the love of one’s neighbour with an effect that goes beyond the realm of religious reflection and reaches into political, social and cultural decisions.

During his first pilgrimage to Poland, John Paul II met with the communist authorities, who did not want to allow him to come. The pilgrimage marked the beginning of the communist systems in Central and Eastern Europe collapse (John Paul II at the Belvedere, 2 June 1979). The Pope spoke at many international forums. These utterances inspired people all over the world. They set the tone and direction for organisations, as was the case with the now famous speech at the United Nations on 2 October 1979. John Paul II said there that the dignity of the person is the foundation of justice and peace. The progress of humanity must be measured ... by the primacy given to spiritual values and by the progress of moral life (John Paul II, 1979).

In 1994, the Time magazine declared John Paul II as Man of the Year. He was nominated for his vision of the good life and for following it. Some of the Pope’s biographers put forward bold theses to the effect that ideologies, beliefs and worldviews give way when confronted with the person of John Paul II. Paweł Skibiński’s book (Skibiński, 2020), Bernard Lecomte’s articles (Lecomte, 2020, pp. 43-50) or Paweł Zuchniewicz’s journalism (Zuchniewicz, 2020) are written in such a spirit. How else can one interpret the fact that
international leaders, not always Catholics, sought a meeting with the Pope; that the Pope’s audience was awaited by the authorities and 80,000 young Muslims in Casablanca (John Paul II, 1985); that the international media, critical of the Catholic Church, changed the narrative from negative to positive during his pilgrimage, recognising the Pope’s leadership? And perhaps the most obvious testimony to John Paul II’s leadership was when his funeral brought together so many heads of state and international leaders, who met in St Peter’s Square not because of their Catholic faith. People followed John Paul II not because of his function, not because he was the head of the Catholic Church, and also not because of what he did for people. They followed him and they still follow him today because of who he was and what he represented. On Maxwell’s leadership scale, this is the 5th highest level a leader can achieve (Maxwell, 2019, p. 21). For this reason, among others, the memory of John Paul II is still present during the World Youth Day (Mercier, 2020, pp. 309-321), which, as an initiative of the Polish Pope, continues even though its originator is no longer with us. Thus, the causal and influential effect on others, which is usually sought in determining a person’s leadership levels, is being realised.

**Summary**

Dialogue, participation, and leadership as concepts seem to be coming from other axiological levels. Each of them, however, not only fosters the discovery of the person’s integrity, but allows the individual to go through life responsibly, with a sense of self-fulfilment and empowerment in the context of the surrounding reality. The triad described in this article clearly shows that the Polish Pope’s teachings are not about imitating him, but rather about understanding the meaning and essence of his message and translating it into one’s own individual life. The above analysis has shown that the conviction that the personalistic norm is the proper determinant of one’s relation to the other person, but due to the nature of man, also the relation to himself delivers a certain summary of the personalistic reflection of Karol Wojtyła. Two natures of love appear here: an ethical one connected with the notion of *neighbour* and a social one focused around the reflection on *being together with others*. If, therefore, the assumption is made that the person realises himself, discovers himself, and finally becomes fuller through actions (truly human acts – *actus humanus*), then the causal character of such attitudes as dialogue, participation, and leadership becomes understandable. The integrity of this triad is revealed both in the very characterisation of John Paul II as a person and as a consequence of his desire to apply the personalistic norm in his life.
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