Dejan Donev

Euro College University, Ul. Braka Ribar 1, MK–1300 Kumanovo
donevdejan76@gmail.com

Determining Media Ethics in Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

Abstract

In traditional media we will often find a wrongful persuasion lingering through: that media ethics is synonymous with journalism ethics*, that is, that we can place a sign of equivalence among these two ethics. This misinterpretation consists in narrowing down the relevant moral-ethical media communications and media practice solely to the journalist's field, instead of understanding it as the application of the philosophical-ethical thinking of the specific area of human practice related to the mass communication. This indicates tendency to reject the fact that the moral-ethical responsibility may be divided in every mass-media act accordingly. Thus it is simpler to consider that the media ethics is not that much more different and diverse than the journalism ethics. Because of that, the first step we ought to do is to terminologically distinguish the notion and the subject matter of media ethics from the notion and subject matter of journalism ethics.*

Keywords

media, ethics, professional moral, journalism, mass communication, communication means

1. Introduction

Although in later stages of philosophy after Kant there were no extensive understandings of Kant's notion of *moral duty*,[1] still in the collective conscience of the contemporary epoch certain understandings for the importance of the idea of the moral duty or the moral obligations remained to be present. Of course, it is another question whose understanding and in what way a social community determines moral duties and obligations. One can claim that moral duties and obligations, in a general sense, are determined by the entirety of the experience of the social life of people, while in a specific sense, certain contemporary professions (medicine, journalism, business, et cetera) have experienced specific moral demands which hold the form of moral obligations in those professions. This is how the need to create applied ethics or practical ethics appeared, and it deals with the appliance of ethical principles, theories, norms or values in a concrete practical situations in different areas of life. In accordance with differences in those areas, in the last couple of decades of the development of ethics as philosophical and applied science, a large number of disciplines of applied ethics shaped specifically. Among the most significant one's are bioethics, medical ethics, environmental ethics, social ethics,

---

1

Kant's *moral duty* was considered to be too much of an abstract, formalistic, and rigorous   concept lacking reference to the complex reality of the modern human practice.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

156

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

economic ethics, and business ethics, with a special emphasis on media ethics and journalism ethics.

Being a philosophical in-depth thinking about moral, ethics is one of the forms of human practice. Its general function is to understand moral phenomenon, a result of a much wider context of understanding the human essence, its position in the world, in the human society as well as in the relations between the human being and its own humanity. In the contemporary society, in media, in journalism, and in the dissemination of information in general, ethics hold primary significance due to the fact that "according to the quantity of time devoted to them by the contemporary human, mass media are positioned at number three, right after working and sleeping".[2] Today, the media has an irreplaceable role in the modern democratic and pluralistic society. They are one of the factors which enable the functioning of the society. Despite the fact that these societies have reached the point where all values are being relativized, still, we continue to ask questions regarding ethical values and criteria according to which the events in the world of social communication could and should be managed and valued.

Therefore, it is impossible to avoid discussion on the morality of the media and the journalism practice and theory, especially due to their extensive efficacy. The same hauls a great deal of responsibility because the journalism always and repeatedly comes into service of different interests, and that, together with the formal and the content qualities of what media can offer, is one of the most important criteria for evaluation.[3]

These are the reasons why we need to apply the judgment of reason and apply moral evaluations in this subject area. Otherwise, the media which lack morals become a gathering of wretched avidity, an image of the social chaos in which the continuity is being harshly interrupted, and the system of social norms is being destabilized along with modern society itself.[4]

Poorly formed working situation, and the undifferentiated structure of media and journalistic profession provided media workers and journalists with much more freedom and creativity. However, "this privilege should be justified by them by exercising a higher level of qualitative culture in their profession",[5] with a well-elaborated media ethics as a focal point, which should be profound, and terminologically and thematically distinguished from journalism ethics as well as from the audience ethics.

2. Terminological distinctions in media ethics

The first step towards achieving profound elaboration and clear distinction is to terminologically distinguish between the notion and the subject matter of the media ethics and journalism ethics.[6] In traditional media we will often find a wrongful persuasion lingering through: that media ethics is synonymous with journalism ethics, that is, that we can place a sign of equivalence among these two ethics. This misinterpretation consists in narrowing down the relevant moral-ethical media communications and media practice solely to the journalist's field, instead of understanding it as the application of the philosophical-ethical thinking of the specific area of human practice related to the mass communication: "media ethics is about alerting journalists to the task at hand; it's about reawakening, or to see".[7] This indicates tendency to reject the fact that the moral-ethical responsibility may be divided in every mass-media act accordingly. Thus it is simpler to consider that the media ethics is not that much more different and diverse than the journalism ethics.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

157

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

Another possible source of wrongful persuasions for the univocality of the media ethics as a journalistic one, and vice versa, is the practice of determining media ethics in the narrower sense of phrase, by which media ethics is said to be dealing with the journalistic processing of the information, e.g.:

"… media ethics is a response to standards of journalism occurring within a media framework (…), and at the heart of this debate is the issue concerning the role of journalists, vis-à-vis society and the responsibilities that they have for both expanding and maintaining democracy."[8]

In other words, it deals with the moral aspects of all media work and corresponding activities, which "result in a situation to make a choice and make decisions in terms of the content and the form of the information which are being offered to the public".[9] Hence, without indicating that the process refers to defining media ethics in its narrower meaning, it is said that the media ethics is or is being equalized with the journalism ethics and vice versa.[10] However, *journalism ethics* represents a summary of general moral convictions, comprehensions, and norms of the individual's conscience in the journalistic profession. More specifically, *the focal point in the journalism ethics is the journalist as a moral subject with own individual moral, who acts in a complex relationship within his own profession, with all the other actors in the mass media, whereby the journalist is carrying a moral responsibility for his own actions before the judgment of her personal conscience and before the judgment of other actors in mass media, and also before the judgment of the public.* At the same time journalist, as a moral subject, has a moral duty to follow specific media-related moral norms and obligations of professional ethics i.e. the journalistic ethos.

For *ethics of media* or *media ethics* can be said that they belong to *applied ethics*. Their basic research subject is the deliberation and regulation of concrete human practice with moral character in the area of modern mass media. This means dealing with the issues of fair, truthful, non-tendentious, responsible, on-time, non-manipulative, non-disqualifying, righteous, comprehensive informing of the public by the journalists, the editors and the remaining responsible entities within the media, but it is also "dealing with other issues related to the users of the media information i.e. the audience".[11]

2
Daniel Korni [Daniel Cornu], *Etika informisanja* [*Ethics of Informing*], translated by Vera Ilijin, Clio, Beograd 1999, p. 7.

3
Cf. Patrick Lee Plaisance, *Media Ethics: Key Principles for Responsible Practice*, Sage, London 2009, pp. 21–43.

4
For additional arguments about the reduction of the role and professionalism of/in the media see: Matthew Kieran, "Introduction", in: Matthew Kieran (ed.), *Media Ethics*, Routledge, New York 1998, pp. x–xv.

5
Andrew Belsey, "Journalism and ethics: can they co-exist?", in: M. Kieran (ed.), *Media Ethics*, pp. 1–14, p. 4.

6
This analysis refers to the necessary distinguishing between media ethics and journalistic ethics in traditional mass media, but not in the new system of mass communication, titled "new media". The later requires different research, and cannot be discussed here.

7
David Berry, *Journalism, Ethics and Society*, Routledge, New York 2016, p. 85.

8
Ibid., p. 86.

9
D. Korni [D. Cornu], *Etika informisanja* [*Ethics of Informing*], p. 17.

10
The same applies to researching journalist ethos.

11
About responsible entities within the media see: Dennis McQuail, *Media Performance: Mass Communication and the Public Interest*, Sage, London 1992, p. 14–15.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

158

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

According to the previous definition of the media ethics, it is noticeable that the subject of the same is conditioned by two of its important qualifications which are inter-related:[12]

– *Media ethics is the system of moral values, opinions, judgments, regulations, norms, and obligations of the moral, ethically responsible actions of all actors in the process of mass communication and in mass media.*[13] By this definition, media ethics appear as a specific form of moral-ethical regulation of the actions of each actor participating in the production, distribution, and the reception of content provided by the mass media, a summary of obligations which provide regulation of this practice. Hence, media ethics is one of the potential forms of regulation of moral practice.[14]

– *Media ethics is the system of philosophical (ethical) opinions which refer to moral practice related to the mass communication means.* These opinions serve the purpose of understanding, theoretical founding, and norming of moral practice of all participants in the process of mass media, deliberating and indicating rules for implementing ethics in the practice area typical for media ethics. By this definition, media ethics is in-depth thinking which, starting from the general ethical thought orientations, opinions and notions, examines the essence of media and moral, the possibilities for morally norming and limiting practice in mass media. Accordingly, media ethics is being considered as a form of ethical reflection (in-depth thought) of one area of moral practice.[15]

2.1. Media ethics as the regulation of media practice:
the moral of media organizations, journalists, and audience

Considering that *media ethics* is being perceived as belonging to applied ethics, with the basic subject of deliberating and regulating concrete human practice in the area of morally-connoted modern mass media, the media-ethical responsibility is carried by the people working in the media, including creators of the mass-media content (journalists, editors, desks), media outlet owners (publishers, TV stations, media corporations, and other), and media users (audience). However, the difference in moral responsibility among these agents could be identified by applying the model of gradable division of responsibility.[16] Media ethics, as a way of regulating moral practice of all mass media agents, is norming the moral behaviour of the different mass media actors,[17] which is the following:

1) Institutional and organizational area of mass media: *ethos of the media organization*;
2) Area of the individual action of the creator and the distributor of mass media: *ethos of journalist*;
3) Area of user (recipient): *ethos of audience*.

Institutional-organizational responsibility, the ethos of media institutions, represents the responsibility of media organizations for the general and concrete moral orientation of the totality of its activity (abiding to the general humanistic principles, truthful reporting, information accuracy, respect for human decency and individuality, the avoidance of any form of discrimination, the right to criticize public figures, events, and similar).[18] This responsibility, on the one hand, is normed by internal rules, codes, program principles, and customs within the practice of the media organization. With these rules, media organization sets a moral self-obligation to a conduct, in a way, ad-

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

159

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

equate to the internal formal regulations which have moral character or the informal regulations of the culture of organization itself. On the other hand, this responsibility is subjected to institutional control and self-control of ethical institutions and control agencies (journalist's associations, press councils, media-critically oriented public, and similar). In addition to the previous two options, the area and the form of moral responsibility are arranged by the specific norms of profession which are being established with special ethical codes written by each particular organization as well as with the established ethos of the journalism i.e. the journalistic profession.

However, the individual agents within institutions are also exposed to the moral normativity in mass media, considering that they are the front-line creators of media content. In this domain also, media ethics is being traditionally marked as journalistic ethics dealing with the ethos of journalist, representing general moral convictions, understandings, and norms of the conscience of the individual in journalistic profession. This means that a journalist is placed at the core of media ethics, as a moral subject with its own individual moral which, within its own profession, acts in a complex relationship with all the other mass media agents (the public, the owners of the media outlets, editors, desks, colleagues, and similar). On the one hand, as a moral subject journalist acts according to its moral character. She is led by her own moral convictions and notions, intentions, moral choices, and decisions, carrying moral responsibility for her own action, judged by her own conscience, and by the audience. On the other hand, the journalist as a moral subject has the moral duty to follow the specific media norms and obligations (critical demands by the public, self-commitment to free information and rebuttal, the norm for accurate reporting, and similar). This means that "the moral duty of the journalist is made of respecting and following the norms and the regulations of the professional ethics i.e. the journalistic ethos".[19]

Ethos of the audience is the third integral part of the general media ethics. The relationship of the audience and the provided content, and the influences of mass media is not value neutral, but quite the opposite. Mass media, in larger or smaller scale, are impacting the general value orientations of audi-

12

Dejan Donev, *Etika vo novinarstvoto* [*Ethics of Journalism*], UKIM, Skopje 2011, p. 156–157. For philosophical issues in this area, see: Elliot D. Cohen (ed.), *Philosophical Issues in Journalism*, Oxford University Press, New York 1992.

13

John Merrill, *Journalism Ethics: Philosophical Foundation for News Media*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1997, p. 9.

14

D. Korni [D. Cornu], *Etika informisanja* [*Ethics of Informing*], p. 10.

15

Ibid., p. 9. See: Denis Huisman, *L'Age du faire: Pour une morale pour la communication de demain*, Hachette Littérature, Paris 1994, pp. 12–13.

16

For further reading about all three entities in a media sphere see: Clifford G. Christians,

Mark Fackler, Kathy Richardson, Peggy Kreshel, Robert H. Woods, *Media Ethics: Cases and Moral Reasoning*, Routledge, New York 2016, pp. 1–4.

17

Matthew Kieran, *Media Ethics: A Philosophical Approach*, Paeger, Westport (CT) 1997, pp. 2–3.

18

About this problem see: Conrad C. Fink, *Media Ethics: In the Newsroom and Beyond*, McGraw-Hill, New York 1988, especially "Ethics of Job – Deciding and Acting".

19

Fred Brown, *Journalism Ethics: A Casebook of Professional Conduct for News Media*, Marion Street Press, Portland 2011, p. 274.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

160

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

ence their standpoint regarding world.[20] Establishing and changing people's opinion for variety of issues and events in the public sphere is achievable by mass media!

"On the global level the need for information to enable people to play their parts as citizens of the world is indisputable, and the opportunities for the media are therefore legion."[21]

Mass media are a significant factor in the upbringing and the socialization. The latest researches on relations between morality and media turned the attention towards an array of questions about morally based behaviour of adult recipients in reference to the media, the pedagogic control of the consumption of media by children, the educational and pedagogic tasks of media – above all the television – the morality of/in media products, television as a "secret (co-)educator", etc.[22] However, regardless of the powerful ability to pacify and motivate audience, the moral responsibility of audience has not been reduced! Ethics of audience implies the awareness of audience for the quality of the content, the demands for quality in media production and distribution, as well as the readiness to play an active role in terms of influencing media. In this regard, the ethics of audience approaches media pedagogy.

Users of mass media have certain rights and obligations in ethical reflection regarding media.[23] In the reception of the mass media, three roles, with the corresponding responsibilities, belong to the audience:

1) Audience uses media for the critical understanding of reality, and for the purpose of shaping the will of citizens;
2) Families and parents have special responsibility for the use of media by children and youth;
3) Media serves the function of an alternative during free time for the formation of individual.

This means that *the audience has a civil responsibility in securing free journalism*. This is the source of demands for a much greater participation of audience in the programming structure of the media (reader's advices, participation in press councils, and similar).

2.2. Media ethics as a philosophical reflection

In accordance with the previously stated distinction, media ethics may be seen as a form of philosophical reflection. Hegel's well-known position that "the newspapers are the morning prayer of contemporary man" has turned the attention of philosophy to the existence of newspapers as mass media. Ever since, within philosophy and thus ethics, growing interest is being given to the philosophical (ethical) issues of existence, functioning, social role and influence of mass media. In another words, "the philosophical approach to media ethics is broadly concerned with what good media practice amounts to and whether it is as it should be".[24]

First wave of theoretical reflection about mass media happened near the end of the 19th century in America, and it was oriented towards understanding the newspapers as a complex social institution as well as the professional and ethical call of journalist. Second wave of significant theoretical attempts at establishing media ethics was related to the beginning of education for journalist. Finally, in the last twenty years in North America and Western Europe a large number of books and publications were published on media ethics as a theoretical discipline. They either point towards a relation between ethics and

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

161

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

communicology, or argue on a number of specific moral issues appearing in the phenomenon of mass media. On the basis of the review of the theoretical positions and methodological frames of the establishment of media ethics, it is possible to distinguish two understandings of the media ethics as a theoretical-philosophical reflection:[25]

Firstly, *ethical reflection of mass media system* originates in the general perspective of understanding mass media as one of the most influential postmodern sources of creating a certain image for the reality. In the centre is the question of *who*, *why*, *and under what circumstances* is choosing, setting up, and presenting media content, and on the basis of what kind of image is being created to represent reality. This reflection has the role of critical reflection on ethically troublesome content, events, individuals, and actions in mass media system.[26] It presupposes theoretically "awakened" reflection of audience, and it is based on the critical analyses of troublesome media forms,[27] as well as the critical analyses of discourse and the use of language.[28] The critical reflection and evaluation of technical, institutional, business, and social structures and processes of media system are also part of the ethical reflection of media system. It includes analysis of the structure of new technologies and communication protocols, analysis of media-political processes and the mass-media forms of organization, research on the concentration and commercialization of mass media, the market- and political power dependency of mass media, etc.

Secondly, *ethical foundation of media ethics* arises from a general standpoint that media ethics is not a separate or special ethics, but rather an ethics applied to a very specific research area, the area of mass communication means, and that its basic theoretical position results from philosophical ethics.

"Instead of focusing on the daily routine of journalism, we have to focuses on the philosophical and theoretical foundations that support that daily routine."[29]

20
For media influence see: Robert S. Fortner, "The Ethics of a Very Public Sphere", in: Robert S. Fortner, P. Mark Fackler (eds.), *The Handbook of Global Communication and Media Ethics*, Volume 2, Blackwell Publishing, West Sussex 2011, pp. 973–991. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444390629.ch49.

21
Andrew Belsey, Ruth Chadwick, "Ethics and politics of the media: the quest for quality", in: Andrew Belsey, Ruth Chadwick (eds.), *Ethical Issues in Journalism and the Media*, Routledge, New York 1994, pp. 1–11, p. 4.

22
See: Zlatko Miliša, Nenad Vertovšek, Mirela Tolić, *Mediji i mladi: prevencija ovisnosti o medijskoj manipulaciji* [*Media and Youth: Prevention of Addiction to Media Manipulation*], Sveučilišna knjižara, Zagreb 2009.

23
For an in-depth analysis see: Wayne Woodward, "A Philosophically Based Inquiry into the Nature of Communicating Humans", in: Lee Wilkins, Clifford G. Christians (eds.), *The Handbook of Mass Media Ethics*, Routledge, New York 2009, pp. 3–12.

24
M. Kieran, *Media Ethics*, p. 3.

25
Milenko A. Perović, *Etika medija* [*Ethics of Media*], KIC Bijeli Pavle, Danilovgrad 2007, p. 131.

26
See: Clifford G. Christians, "Primordial Issues in Communication Ethics", in: Robert S. Fortner, P. Mark Fackler (eds.), *The Handbook of Global Communication and Media Ethics*, Volume 1, Blackwell Publishing, West Sussex 2011, pp. 1–20.

27
For example, these are the various forms of entertainment, commercials, depiction of government, depiction of certain events *et cetera*.

28
For example, gender specific forms of communication, hate speech, demagogy *et cetera*.

29
John Merrill, *Journalism Ethics: Philosophical Foundation for News Media*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1997, p. xiv.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

162

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

Having in mind the fact that there is a large number of the leading modern conceptions of philosophical ethics which are individualistically incorporated and depend on the original presumption of moral individualism and value-based pluralism, an entire spectre of philosophical (ethical) issues and problems is a result of the realization that such individualistic and pluralistic standpoint is always some type of socially formal or informal system of moral self-conduct of the people in general, which means that there exists some sort of moral community.[30]

In the media ethics, the transition from moral individualism towards the discovery of possibilities for the existence of moral community is being hardened by the fact that mass media represent an institutionally structured system of human practice in which there is always a technological, organizational, market, and even political conditioning of practices by agents while the same is conditioned by the purpose of media as a system. The mass media, as moral-ethical phenomenon or as a specific moral community of people, represents just one of the elements of existence and functioning of mass media.[31]

In this sense, contemporary theoreticians, dealing with the theoretical foundation of the media ethics, have significant difficulties in the terms of providing full value and usability to its media-ethical standpoints. While tackling these difficulties, certain theoreticians, such as Karl-Otto Apel and Jürgen Habermas, attempted to construct certain *ethics of communication*,[32] what should make media ethics *based on the understanding of the ethical character of human communication itself*.[33] It is about the meaning and the essence of communication, and about the condition for good inter-human relations in the world, aimed towards connecting universally and establishing common understanding.[34]

In this context, the representatives of *discourse ethics*[35] considered that *media ethics may results from the connection with the universal principles of truth, trustworthiness, and righteousness, making it possible to derive specific normative principles for media ethics*. They are convinced that philosophically based principles may serve to eliminate the eventuality and obstinacy. In reference to this, it is not by accident that Jürgen Habermas, relying on the historical and philosophical experiences, in the need of final ennoblement of human society, has set "the quest for the truth" in the sphere of communication.[36]

3. Conclusion

While reviewing the idea that today's society is the "society of spectacle", it is quite irrelevant whether the element being emphasized is the one which marks today's society as "society of fun" or it marks it as "information society" because it is quite too obvious and clear that the role of the *media became the main engine for the shaping and reshaping of world and life itself, aproximate to the power they have generated*. For this very reason, in today's world, the media should be reviewed as a very important factor in steering society, as well as in the creation of social processes, and should be predominantly viewed neither as a sporadic social phenomenon nor as a simple companion in the social events and happenings.[37]

Viewed as a (communicative) place for sharing the knowledge of society for itself, media are a "social agency" depicting the only process of social practice by which the society can be founded. In this context, it is quite reasonable and justified to claim that

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

163

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

"… in the society, the directions for any shape or form of movements, vertically through the historical development and horizontally through its social diversity, are being created through the media."[38]

This is additionally supported by the fact that *the media are not just an apparatus, organization or a group, but are before all a dispositive for the creation of conversational worlds, the very cultural-communicative environment which embeds content, meaning and collective gestures which result in or produce change*. Created

"… through the interaction of politics, society, the business environment, and the technology, they are again building a system through journalism and public, which in a determinative way influences not only the factors of individual and collective but also of private and social life."[39]

In addition, the discussion is not only about the issue of interrelation between media and the social movements, but also about the issue of constitution of the human itself, which under the influence of the media tends to change.

In this context, the practice in this moment shows that

"Flying at dusk, Minerva's owl came upon the enormous influence of the mass media on a contemporary citizen. Some among the operating processes thereby are turning the public into the mass, the citizen into the viewer/spectator, and the spectator into the passive worker sold among media corporations together with production companies i.e. broadcast i.e. the media."[40]

For this very reason, it is unusually important and necessary to again openly discuss these issues, especially about the meaning of the phenomenon of eth-

30
Guillaume De Stexhe, "A Philosophical Approach to Professional Ethics", *Ethical Perspectives* 4 (2/1997), pp. 217–236, p. 220. doi: https://doi.org/10.2143/ep.4.4.562983.

31
For further research see: Norman Fairclough, *Media Discourse*, Edward Arnold, London 1995.

32
Modern expansion of mass communication, their deep impact in all spheres of life, and the development of communicology initiated the need to found *communication ethics* with the task to examine moral issues occurring in contemporary communication.

33
Information ethics developed from communication ethics. Increased growth of need for information in post-industrial society, along with associated possibility for the misuse of information, have conditioned the need for ethics which might examine the morally allowed behaviour regarding the creation and use of information. See: Masha Woodbury, "Ethics and information", in: Jorge Reina Schement (ed.), *Encyclopedia of communication and information*, Vol. I–III, Macmillan Reference, New York 2002, pp. 296–299.

34
For a detailed elaboration see: Thomas W. Cooper, *Communication Ethics and Global Change*, Longman, New York 1989.

35
See: Jürgen Habermas, *Justification and Application: Remarks on Discourse Ethics*, translated by Ciaran Cronin, MIT Press, Cambridge 1993.

36
See: Jürgen Habermas, *Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt 1968.

37
This applies for both "classic media" (newspapers, radio, and television), and "new media" (above all, the internet, which in this specific situation may also represent a paradigmatic example for this newly occurred situation).

38
Thomas A. Bauer, *Mediji za otvoreno društvo* [*Media for Open Society*], ICEJ, Zagreb 2007, pp. 8–9.

39
Ibid., p. 14.

40
Hrvoje Jurić, Sead Alić, "Philosophy and Media", in: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, *18th Days of Frane Petrić*, Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, Zagreb 2009, pp. 14–16, p. 14.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

164

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

ics and the morality of media, and their inter-relations in intertwined environment. Additional reason for this is the fact that media are also the reflection of process creating condition and movement of society. It means that the democracy, above all, is expressed in the media, their structure and culture. The same, as it is, demands good and live journalism – ethically founded, universally engaged, humane, and valuable. Without its high moral setting, it is a plain illusion to expect the good functioning and development of democracy.

Therefore, if we want an open, free, democratic society, which is to be determined by itself, then we are more than responsible for its realization, though advancement of the culture of communication that we are developing in media and with media i.e. through journalism and its key moral subject – the journalist. This is possible only when

"… theoretically and practically, we will make the effort to develop capabilities, readiness, as well devote attention to ethics which is not measured by quantity, but only by quality."[41]

Namely, this model of contemplation for an open, free, democratic society places the state in the backstage because it contains the strive to understand itself as the absolute place of power, governance and influence, at the same time favouring the idea of self-responsible civil society. For this reason, within such a vision, argument, word, communication, media and journalism have a social and, as creators of the society, a key role in theory and practice.

Dejan Donev

Određivanje etike medija u
tradicionalnim medijima: terminološke poteškoće

Sažetak

U tradicionalnim medijima često ćemo pronaći suptilno pojavljivanje pogrešnog uvjerenja da su etika medija i etika novinarstva *sinonimni, odnosno da između njih možemo staviti znak jednakosti. Nerazumijevanje proizlazi iz sužavanja relevantne moralno-etičke medijske komunikacije i prakse na područje novinarstva umjesto razumijevanja da se radi o primjeni filozofsko-etičkih promišljanja posebnog područja ljudske prakse vezane za masovnu komunikaciju. To upućuje na nastojanja da se odbija činjenica da se moralno-etička odgovornost mora raspodijeliti na temelju medija. Utoliko je jednostavnije pretpostaviti da etika medija nije toliko drugačija od etike novinarstva. Zbog toga je prvi korak terminološki razlučiti pojma i predmet etike medija od pojma i predmeta etike novinarstva.*

Ključne riječi

medij, etika, profesionalni moral, novinarstvo, masovna komunikacija, načini komunikacije

Dejan Donev

Bestimmung der Ethik der Medien in
traditionellen Medien: terminologische Schwierigkeiten

Zusammenfassung

In den traditionellen Medien stoßen wir häufig auf das subtile Erscheinen einer irrtümlichen Überzeugung, wonach Medienethik und journalistische Ethik *Synonyme sind, bzw. wonach man zwischen ihnen ein Gleichheitszeichen setzen kann. Diese Fehldeutung ergibt sich aus der Verengung der relevanten moralethischen Medienkommunikation und praxis auf den Bereich des Journalismus, anstatt einzusehen, dass es sich hier um die Anwendung philosophisch-ethischer Erwägungen eines speziellen Bereichs der menschlichen Praxis handelt, die im Zusammenhang mit der Massenkommunikation steht. Dies deutet auf die Bemühungen hin, die Tatsache abzu-*

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
63 (1/2017) pp. (155–165)

165

D. Donev, Determining Media Ethics in
Traditional Media: Terminological Issues

lehnen, dass die moralethische Verantwortung auf der Grundlage der Medien verteilt werden muss. Insofern ist es einfacher anzunehmen, dass die Medienethik nicht so verschieden von der Ethik des Journalismus ist. Aus diesem Grund heißt der erste Schritt, den Begriff wie auch den Gegenstand der Medienethik von dem Begriff als auch dem Gegenstand der journalistischen Ethik terminologisch abzugrenzen.

Schlüsselwörter

Medium, Ethik, professionelle Moral, Journalismus, Massenkommunikation, Kommunikationsarten

Dejan Donev

Déterminer l'éthique des médias dans les médias traditionnels : difficultés terminologiques

Résumé

On retrouve souvent dans les médias traditionnels l'apparition subtile de la fausse conviction selon laquelle l'éthique des médias et l'éthique du journalisme *sont synonymes, soit qu'il est possible de placer un signe d'égalité entre eux. L'incompréhension découle du fait de limiter une communication et une pratique pertinentes des médias éthico-morales dans le domaine du journalisme au lieu de comprendre qu'il s'agit de l'application de réflexions éthico-philosophiques d'un domaine particulier de la pratique humaine liée à la communication de masse. Cela renvoie aux tentatives qui refusent l'idée que la responsabilité éthico-morale doit être attribuée sur la base des médias. En raison de cela, le premier pas consiste à distinguer, d'un point de vue terminologique, le concept et l'objet de l'éthique des médias du concept et de l'objet de l'éthique du journalisme.*

Mots-clés

média, éthique, morale professionnelle, journalisme, communication de masse, façons de communiquer

41
T. A. Bauer, *Mediji za otvoreno društvo* [*Media for Open Society*], p. 7.