

Journal of International Scientific Publications:
Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

**JOURNALISM AND THEORY OF JOURNALISM:
CONTRADICTIONS OF INTERACTION**

Sergey G. Korkonosenko

Theory of Journalism and Mass Communications Department, Faculty of Journalism,
St. Petersburg State University 7-9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, Russia

Abstract

The analysis in the paper is focused on complex problems which characterise relationships between modern theory and practice of journalism. Special attention is paid to situation in the Russian media community. After the crash of the Soviet political system domestic press has lost former methodological base. It started to develop spontaneously by empirical ways. In these conditions the ideas of a denying any theory appeared, in different forms and variations. But empirical roads lead to fundamental damage in the character of journalism including reforming into so-called post-journalism. Journalism theory should rethink own structure and conceptual basis in order to find new explanations of media processes and maintain own system unity.

Key words: *journalism theory, media practice, public interest, model.*

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a commonly accepted practice to think and speak, that the science is obliged to respond continuously to challenges of time. However in contemporary Russia the problem can be outlined even more particularly: a spontaneous development of journalism became a challenge to science. Let us underline, that in these words there is no “eternal” opposition of journalism theory to the practice. Our thesis is no more radical, than its literal formulation. We deal with the conflict of scientific knowledge with a separate, specific segment of journalistic reality – and only with it. As a whole the science searches ways to harmonious coexistence with practical journalism – both with the current press, and with that one which will arise in long-term future. And it is capable to do so. The question is put in general; outside the brackets of reasoning there is a quality of concrete theoretical works as well as a maturity of practice, its capability to generate fresh and deep decisions.

In ideal case the representatives of editorial practice could treat their attitudes to the theory in similar way – as inevitable and mutually useful cooperation. However in reality the newest Russian history regularly shows how journalism rejects scientific knowledge. Our analysis is aimed at understanding of an essence, forms and consequences of this unnatural confrontation.

National press refused to interact with theory within 1990s which fact has found a visible embodiment in spontaneous development of journalism. It means that professional ideologies and organization of mass media, as well as a technique of working underwent deep transformations, up to polar change of priorities. There is no necessity to prove or even to illustrate the fact of transformations – it is obvious and commonly recognized reality. However these processes went spontaneously, without intellectual support on clearly expressed system bases. In the beginning of a new century the Press Minister of those days M. J. Lesin argued, that the last years represented “a transition period in development of the mass media”, during which some “principal mistakes” have been made. According to the Minister, the

Journal of International Scientific Publications: Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

main mistake was that “the own strategy of development of the mass media market” was absent in the state (Lesin recognizes... 2002).

In our opinion, the problem should not be reduced neither to the end of “a transition period”, nor to the organization of the mass information market. But at the first step of our analysis it is more important to find out, how much in general the press is ready to autotrophy in self-development and how much the autotrophy is expedient from social and professional points of view. Let us listen attentively a summary conclusion of the Finnish researcher Kaarle Nordenstreng who within decades steadfastly observes the Russian press: “Certainly, the free journalistic practice has suffered under pressure of the Soviet state and the party, and, undoubtedly, it suffers under pressure of the new capitalist market in modern Russia... after disintegration of the USSR there was a short period of pure freedom when political structures were in a collapse, and market structures were not formed. This historical interval gives us the textbook with examples of pure freedom of press, probably maximum achievement in modern history” (2001, p. 24). In the frame of our analysis the statement of so authoritative expert comprises a following logic chain: the Soviet journalism did not have due freedom – the new Russian press has found freedom, and owing to that there was a chance to resolve central problem of world journalism – this chance was missed, because Russia has gone after the world experience (which proved to be not successful). Some years later the same author confirmed his conclusions: “... The Russian media system is unique in its historical development. On the other hand, its contemporary character is no longer so special but rather a more or less typical case for highlighting universal problems” (Nordenstreng 2010, p. 186). In other words, there was no birth of a new, historically perspective model of journalism, and, in particular, the Russian press has found itself in far not the best conditions.

It is easy to show perniciousness of hopes on common sense and empirical-experimental self-development, if to examine a lot of examples from a routine practice of contemporary journalism. We shall use one of them, concerning especially disturbing sphere of social life – criminality and measures of struggle against it. The growth of sharp interest of press to these subjects has been predetermined by objective circumstances. However, according to jurists, this interest has turned into new social dangers, namely attempts to find heroism in persons, who infringe the law and to protect these persons. “Abusing of modern media... is aggravated with criminological illiteracy of a great number of journalists. Damaging the value-moral system of the Russian society, media in some cases have a clearly expressed criminal influence on mass consciousness and by this indirectly influence upon a state of criminality and a level of anti-criminal potential of the society” (*Makienko* 2000, p. 129).

We don't agree to consider all present journalism in Russia as an embodiment of ideological-conceptual and creative failures or abusing. That would radically contradict the reality, in which today there are a lot of courageous actions, and not ordinary persons, and unknown earlier types of editions and broadcasting programs, and development of the most “advanced” technologies. However visible, in a sense even superficial party of novelty and variety is completely not equivalent to progressive change of a public role of the press and its place in that civilization, which is being formed rapidly on our eyes. The American media analyst Monro Price remarks, that in the end of XX century a new symbol of the future appeared, namely electronic highway, due to which a dream of five hundreds of TV channels became a reality. However “five hundred channels... may be similar to 500 aromas of a chewing gum... they are capable to create an illusion of choice or genuine variety”. Actually they have turned into infinite variations of the same themes or into distribution of a lot of dirt, violence and so long (Price 2000, pp. 284–285). The solution, in his opinion, is concluded in reformulation of public interest in the field of broadcasting, in view of new technological opportunities.

The same alternative appears in front of us again, though it is not expressed in an obvious form. Either journalism will spontaneously master the unprecedented technological riches fallen suddenly in its

"hands", while it is unable to conceptually comprehend the tectonic socio-cultural shifts, or methodological work should be made outside and then its results will be introduced in a current practice of press. M. Price emphasises a leading role of the government in comprehension of dynamics of public interest. Meanwhile it is clear, that the administrative staffs do not belong to the number of institutes which are specialized in producing of conceptual knowledge. The same we should say regarding to the corporation of media professionals. The European observer writes in this connection: "In other words, journalists have not always defined their professional identities by asking themselves *how* they produce their work as much as *why* they produce it. Indeed, when asked to legitimate their professional decisions, journalists will almost invariably refer to the value system of the profession and only admit to more down-to-earth explanations, such as the prevalent newsroom culture or practical issues, when pushed to do so" (Bogaerts 2010, 140). The specialization of deep understanding is prescribed to a science, which creates ideological-intellectual base – both for the state activity as a whole, and for (in our case) national policy in media area.

We stay far from total accusations against editorial practice. This way of behaviour is both unproductive, and unfair. In early 1980s – late 90s journalism actually has lost the methodological base. Such base, undoubtedly, existed during the Soviet time, though from the height of today's knowledge we can critically estimate the communist party's theory of press and methods used for establishing its domination. As in the academic historic-political researches it is written: "Journalistic practice was carried out not spontaneously or not only to please to interests of authorities as it can seem at cursory examination of features of the mass media functioning. Their development was built on the basis of stable features of spiritual culture, which have been affirmed during long time, and in view of political traditions of our society" (Strovskii 2001, p. 234). We must notice, that such words were written in post-reformed country when the necessity of apologetics of the Soviet authorities has disappeared.

Let's risk declaring, that in a new social situation the practice proved to be braver and "more clever" than theory, it has earlier responded to avalanche increasing of transformations. National science in last decades did not have enough foresight, skills of forecasting and innovative potential to prepare solutions of the strategic and tactical problems, which have arisen in front of journalism with the beginning of a so-called transition period. As researchers consider: "The fast updating of the conceptual basis of thinking has provoked the situation, in which many journalists in the first years of a transition period... have lost a belief that this world can be explained and rationally structured in principal... Thus, it is possible to say that during the described period in national journalism there was a change of professional paradigms, accompanied with total relativity of all representations" (Dzyaloshinskii 1999, p. 121).

So there was extremely confused collision. The press, which has received an unprecedented open space for experiments and self-expression, has started to operate energetically and resolutely in these directions. But it had not enough own strategic potential, while it has not found support in a science. As a result the common qualitative level of journalism has sharply fallen, if to correlate it to conditions and demands, which were formed by social environment. In this respect it has lost much in comparison with "yesterday's" national journalism. But not in rectilinear comparison of one phenomenon with another, which is in general rule inadmissible from dialectic-historical point of view, but in more subtle and deep understanding of good and bad things. The model of press is good when it corresponds as much as possible to the social world, in which it lives and also to which it serves. So veteran of famous Russian newspaper "Izvestia" A. Plutnik looks at the problem when writes: "...I would not like to belittle advantages of modern journalism at all, comparing it with yesterday's journalism. It is necessary to compare not with those newspapers and magazines, which existed in essentially other historical conditions. It is necessary to compare how much then and now

the press uses the opportunities given by time... I should notice, however, that journalism does not use a half of accessible opportunities of time" (*Plutnik* 2007, p. 7).

2. DENYING THE THEORY

These circumstances became leading factors of formation of a steady phenomenon – a denying the theory of journalism. While the practice simply began to do without theory, not burdening itself with discussions on this subject, in academic community a denying the theory has got a status of doctrines and concepts.

It is necessary to remark here that chronologically a fussy rewriting the history of the country became the first victim of nihilism regarding to fundamental knowledge. Undoubtedly, from year to year in the works of inquisitive and diligent researchers the past of the nation appears in more and more full and living-like pictures. But in parallel within insignificant short term the time-servers (from among scientists, publicists, politicians and simply enthusiasts-volunteers) were successful in a breaking of history on unsystematic set of fragments which is equivalent to its destruction. Through a complex composition of intermediate steps this process has affected researches in the field of press.

Scepticism and denying are aimed at the general theory of journalism, which mission is to create a methodological foundation under the analysis of empirical experience, i. e. under applied researches. Let us try to observe briefly a classification of such nihilistic sights. First of all let us mention sceptical statements of those media employees, for whom any dialogue with a science would serve as a tiresome burden and under whose actions it is impossible to bring though any theoretical base. However there are great doubts whether such opinions deserve theoretical polemics. Legal experts have discovered the facts of mercenary use of the press by journalists in collusion with underworld, including campaigns in favour of "thieves in the law", and even have found out the sum of compensation for these services – rather impressive amounts (*Makienko* 2000, pp. 143–144). This is some effects of spontaneous evolution of the practice in interests of practicing community. It is necessary to consider them as a reality, to perceive as a challenge; but theoretical disputes with apologists of similar acts do not have any reason. Therefore our interest is focused on "legitimate" considerations of the experts who have become on a position of non-recognition of an available theory. Their views differ both by scale of generalizations, and by manner of thinking, and by a target orientation.

Denying-ignoring is based on the idea of a constant priority of concrete experience in comparison with any "sophistry". Such style of reasoning is not new and, most likely, is always opened for interested persons to follow by this way. It is chosen with readiness by neophytes of "a new wave", who else yesterday had no connection with editorial process, but today set the fashion both in publishing business and in discussions on a destiny of the Russian and world press. Typical examples can be found in frank statements of the editor-in-chief of rather successful printed editions. He is dissatisfied with the employees who "do not understand, that the newspapers are the goods which needs to be sold in the same way as yoghurt or coca-cola... It often happens difficultly or impossibility to explain to the correspondent, that his text is the goods, not a product of genius" (*Popov & Obukhov* 2007, p. 36). And in other case with him: "Usually we write in one language with people: we use popular speech, informal speech, obscene speech if the stars speak so... As you see, in our magazine there are many things which look absurdly, but it does not confuse me: let them look absurd, but not grey" (*Mostovschikov* 2011).

Denying-renunciation is peculiar to experts who are not only familiar with theoretical luggage of former decades, but also, as a rule, actively participated in its updating. Applied researches become the new shelter for them, including projects which are carried out on the basis of grants from foreign foundations or of the orders from political organizations in the frame of elections. Especially sharp

condemnation from their side is caused with a party-state control of the press and, accordingly, a political-ideological domination over the theories, which existed during the Soviet time. Really, many postulates of those years today are perceived as relicts of the elapsed epoch. However whether it forms the basis for an absolute refusal to think conceptually? Even if in corporation of researchers such coordinated decisions were made (imagine impossible thing), there are a lot of disturbers of calmness who would continue to put and solve questions of high theory. The loss of former paradigmatic unity in the theory generates statements about a deadlock, into which the theory has ostensibly come today. On the contrary, in our opinion, right now its blossom comes, owing to an opportunity to express and compare different theoretical views, to consider the polarity in ideas as a normal thing, and to accept even extravagant (in habitual opinion) concepts. We must add that the active theoretical process in today's Russia includes the views of foreign analysts, which earlier stayed behind the "Iron Curtain".

The next version of denying we mark as *replacement*. It means denying extremely popular conceptual postulates according to which national journalism theory is being constructed either from neighbouring disciplines, or from an arsenal of foreign theoretical schools. In a reality one can find also a combination of these actions; for example when informational or communicational approaches to the analysis of journalism are used as these "substitutions". In a view of researchers, in the modern world there is "a mythologisation of such concepts, as "information", "communications". It is especially actual for the Russian science, which now goes through a splash of the superficial literature upon given theme" (Shaihitdinova 2004, p. 21).

Supporters of these approaches proclaim the theory of social communications a meta-theory for the system of social-communicative sciences as a whole, and then they include in its structure all the disciplines, which are concentrated, in their opinion, on "movement of senses in social space and time". Thus they see the obstacle in the fact that disciplines appointed to be "subordinated" (pedagogy, hermeneutics, library science, study of arts, and others) "do not recognize themselves as social-communicative sciences" (Sokolov 2002, p. 175). Theory of journalism has good reasons to be included into the category "and others". As well as, for example, study of arts theoretical journalism represents the complex, multidimensional formation with own conceptual bases created by a long experience. Moreover, it is possible to believe, that journalism is able to develop in a conceptual configuration, which is more organic for it.

Philosophical perusal of problems of media sphere leads to a conclusion that it is necessary to separate from each other the concepts of communications, intercourse, et al. It is quite difficult to transmit the nuances of sense, which determine the differentiation of "communication" and Russian word "obchenie" (общение). Some interesting explanations are proposed within philological tradition in science. "Communication has always been at the heart of Russian ethos. Neither completely European nor completely Asian, Russia has been caught in the middle geographically, historically and culturally. As a result, its connectedness to the world, to the Other, has been complex and contradictory, full of fear and fascination. There are even two words in Russian expressing the idea of connectedness: *obchenie*, understood as personal interaction based on common and shared values, and *kommunikatciya*, understood as transfer of information.

Ironically, communism (*kommunizm*, in Russian) became the ideology for building a new social order, and the spirit of the commune (*obschina*, in Russian) suffered in the aftermath of the October Revolution of 1917 and subsequent collectivization of the USSR. Had, perhaps, the idea for a new society been expressed by a different name, capturing the roots of the Russian language and soul and, thus, more native to the Russian ear, the country's development might have been more evolutionary" (Klyukanov 2008, p. 5).

"Obchenie" is closer to English "intercourse" and "dialogue" in a soft opposition to "communication", and below we shall use the "intercourse" for translation and explanations. Let us listen to philosopher

Journal of International Scientific Publications: Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

of journalism. "Intercourse is an interrelation to personify, while communication is a one to unify... During intercourse a spiritual extension of the person is not thrown away, not ignored; on the contrary, it will be claimed... Communication according its characteristics is not included into philosophy of the person; it designs the 'external' world". It is necessary to recognize, however, that "'imperious beginning' of different sorts (communication) in media systems more and more pushes aside 'the alive beginning' (intercourse). This is a key problem of our time" (Shaihitdinova 2004, pp. 207–208).

As an argument in support of newly appeared meta-theories various reasons are offered, including the judgement that this is the main line of development of the humanities abroad. Really, dominating West-European and American doctrines of the press among their major sources have socially-psychological (communicative as a matter of fact) theories presented by names of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Freud, Le Bon, etc. (Kucherova 2000). However in the Western Europe and the USA were being born values of completely not universal and not common to all mankind. Moreover, in the American research community, which habitually associates with globalisation attitudes to the culture and the press, the appeals to build nationally identical models of journalism sound more and more persistently. For example, it is said so: what each of various disciplinary approaches "have in common is that they all tend to focus attention on individuals, families or other social groups, a society in general, and cultures in the broad sense. All of the interpretations frame meaning and investigate their subjects within institutional frameworks that are specific to any nation and/or culture" (Alexander & Hanson 2001, p. xvi). The idea on national-cultural identity of the press occupied strong positions in the European journalism, both in a practice and in science. Rather unexpected effect is being caused by the comparative study of media in six developed democracies (the US, the UK, France, Italy, Germany, and Finland) from 2000 to 2009. The investigator writes in his report: "I argue that, despite frequent predictions of progressive 'system convergence'... the last decade has been characterized by an 'absence of Americanisation' of the news institutions in the five European countries considered. National institutional differences have remained persistent in a time of otherwise profound change. This finding is of considerable importance for understanding journalism and its role in democracy, since a growing body of research suggests that 'liberal' (market-dominated) media systems like the American one increase the information gap between the advantaged and the disadvantaged, have lower electoral turnout, and may lead large parts of the population to tune out of public life" (Nielsen 2011, p. 397).

However this moment we are more interested in substantial coordinates of denying-replacement, instead of geographical ones. And it is not so essential at all, which discipline pretends to appropriate journalism – all or in parts. In special contexts an economy could pretend for a role of a meta-theory – referring to laws of business in press, the psychology – because this science, undoubtedly, has a subject of interest in journalism or, perhaps, physiology, which is anxious about an expenditure of human resources in producing of the mass information...

Researchers from Russia are not lonely in the anxiety on mixing of journalism with other communication or business phenomena. Portuguese professor Joaquim Fidalgo has presented at the conference of the International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR) the report on a theme "What *is* journalism and what only *looks like* it?". In a conceptual part of the work he wrote: "We can say that professional journalists... no longer have the monopoly of this activity – of this public service, we should say. Still, many new actors trying to enter this field – or to mix with it – very often don't seem to respect some of the basic standards and ethical demands in which journalism is grounded, although they tend to use its technical tools and usual forms and models... We argue for the need of a kind of *back to basics* effort, meaning specifically *back to ethics*, under the assumption that... the line defining the boundaries of journalism (and, therefore, distinguishing journalism from other forms of public communications) is, above all, not a matter of 'who', 'what' and 'where' things are done, but rather a matter of 'how', 'why' and 'for what' you do them" (2007).

Journal of International Scientific Publications: Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

The problem of replacement would not be so sharp if there was no substitution of basic characteristics of the scientific discipline – object, techniques of research, terminology, etc. Unfortunately, it occurs, and sometimes in the violent forms: through transformation of curricula in the centres of professional training for mass media, vigorous spreading of corresponding terms and jargons, directive government's documents and so further. World scientific community realizes dramatic consequences of such substitutions. For example, increase of technological power of media, including expansion of digital TV, induces researchers to make stronger differentiation between every information flow and mass dialogue arising owing to journalistic activity. Swedish professor Peter Dahlgren, not being afraid of charges in conservative positions, "states a wish to maintain in digital TV a television specificity and to not to reduce it to the computer communications because the public TV already has the suitable forms of serious contacts with public, which should be improved, instead of to supersede with twaddle 'chatting' of debatable groups of the Internet" (Zemlyanova 2001, p. 93).

The special role in modernization of scientific bases of the Russian journalism belongs to *denying-development*. It should be understood as a preservation of continuity in getting knowledge with simultaneous updating of more or less significant characteristics, up to qualitative transformation of some of them. As it is easy to see, here we deal with the organic laws of dialectics. The central contradiction, which moves the methodology forward, consists in a discrepancy of former representations to the new social and media realities. The elimination of this discord also constitutes an essence of updating of theoretical paradigms. However it is a question of overcoming the concrete contradiction, instead of rejection of all amount of knowledge, categories of the analysis, terminology, etc.

In the given connection, it is necessary to concern concepts "transition", "transitive society", "transitive condition of press", and the like. As a matter of fact they are not synonymous to development, and resist to it and even block it. They have become so habitual in scientific discussions and publicists' articles that they are being perceived already as something normal and simply understandable, however only in relation to the countries of the East Europe and the former USSR and only for current period. Some representatives of the European research schools do not agree with this style of thinking. They subvert stable (as it was traditionally considered in the West) foundations of the theory of press when deny dogmatism and stereotypes and propose new intellectual approaches. So, professor Colin Sparks (UK) examined explanatory potential of the transitological theory which in last decades formed the basis for analysis of changes in political and media fields in post-communist countries. As he writes: "At least, the model of political change advanced by transitology is that there are observable twin process of democratic political change and the burgeoning of market economies. Together, these factors are working to change previously undemocratic societies in the direction of the political and economic conditions prevailing in the USA... This approach also strongly influences much of the writing about media in former communist countries. While there are some very important exceptions... the mainstream clearly argues that the key criterion to observe are the extent to which the media in post-communist countries have evolved towards a state similar to that prevailing in North America or Western Europe... In other words, the really-existing media of different countries are measured against what has come to be known as the 'liberal model'." The analysis of media changes in Russia, Poland and China "demonstrated that transitology gives very little insight into the prevailing situations", while "the theory of elite continuity accounts much better for major features of the media systems" (2008 pp. 7, 9).

Meanwhile, first, transitivity as a movement from one condition to another basically is an integral part of human and social life which was peculiar to the society at all stages of history – though speed and depth of changes were various. Second, it will not be a mistake to recognize, that the present civilization as a whole has proved in a situation of break, regarding both traditional forms of life and scientific views on it. The American professor M. Price, comparing his country and the East Europe,

Journal of International Scientific Publications: Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

writes: "It is difficult to believe, but the United States... represents an example of a transitive society. Revolution in the communication technologies, full transformation of a role of the government, an overturn in structure of broadcasting branches – all these facts are the characteristic of the American reality" (2000, p. 164). There is no paradoxical sense in the last words – in them the voice of unbiased expert is being heard, which thinks dialectically. Certainly, it would be strange to identify the situations, which have arisen in the USA and, for example, in Russia on a margin of millennia. Jump-development occurs in both countries, but for us it is much sharper and accepts other forms and leads to other end results.

Third, the question on the purpose and results of transformations during already long period remains opened for Russia. Transition brings high results if there is the exact representation on the aim, which the society tries to reach (as well as the press and theory of journalism) and how long the conditions of instability will continue. Meanwhile the clear answer to these inevitable questions is not done. But under "signboard" of all-penetrating transitivity in Russia, continuing already two decades, in journalism the phenomenon of a put off demand was generated – for the high professionalism, moral criteria of estimation and self-estimation, executing of a public duty and the like – up to the "normalization" of the general situation in the country. Instead of discussion of these vital issues and opening of new areas of theoretical knowledge experts are involved into infinite and, if to say frankly, frequently futile debates on three taken for rent "t" – transitivity, transparency, and tolerance.

3. SYSTEM UNITY OF A THEORY

The answer to challenges of spontaneity and nihilism is contained in a system unity of a science. Theory of journalism has no opportunity to stay on a waiting position. It should offer the solutions of problems, which are already put in the agenda. And (if to think objectively, instead of obscurantist rejection of science) the practice waits from researchers for the advanced knowledge, which models a tomorrow's situation. After confusion of the first "post-Perestroika" years, the science has accumulated sufficient potential to return the lost function of methodological support to journalistic activity. The science is obliged to accept a challenge, with which the social reality addresses to it and which is most particularly expressed in a spontaneous journalistic practice. Moreover, a science itself should become a challenge which means to take the initiative and to start creating original, competitive, perspective model of domestic journalism.

Some highly important circumstances induce it to do so. First. The major value criterion of scientific researches consists in the actuality of their problematic. It is hardly possible to find more actual problem, than the crisis state of our journalism repeatedly being fixed by domestic and foreign experts. The way out of the crisis might be found in complex modelling, instead of attempts to solve separately a lot of particular questions. Second. As a social study the theory of journalism should bear a gene of civic responsibility and activity; that is, it should feel anxiety on decreasing prestige of the Russian press and on pejorative attitude to it from the population of the country and foreign experts. For example, not without surprise mixed with irony, the European observers note that the open partiality became an attribute of specific post-communism understanding of freedom of press, revealing the right of the journalist to express his own opinion in a greater degree, than the right of an audience on information (Votmer 2000, p. 494). Global community does consider the national press like the "show window" of the nation, and ethical obligation of a science (to say more exactly – of mass media researchers) is to repudiate such charges, as far as possible. Third. The threat of such deep regeneration of the press, which is equivalent to its disappearance as qualitatively certain phenomenon, became not mythical. We designate its isolation from needs and ways of society development by introducing a concept of asocial journalism (*Korkonosenko* 1998). The further development of asociality, which radically contradicts public nature of the press, is able to evoke even

more disturbing consequences. In one of own works we considered the process of dying off of journalism as a quite probable one though such result does not correspond to our civil and professional aspirations. The Swedish colleagues in a similar research situation use a concept of post-journalism (Becker, Ekecrantz & Olsson 2000, p. 13). Science should find enough consistency and courage to thinking on declared ideas up to the end; it must have objectivity and high prognostic culture to foresee and describe in due time these tendencies if they grow up in a spontaneously developing of editorial practice.

For this purpose it is necessary “inside of” science to develop principal representations about itself, own mission, modern conditions, and prospects of development, i. e. a science has to realize own integrity as united formation. Yes, today it is far from this level of maturity. But just for this reason the coordinated “code of interaction” of research community is needed, as well as a basic unity in questions on what beginnings of the theory of journalism will be built and promoted (see argumentation in detail: *Korkonosenko 2010, pp. 41-83*). Some of these questions demand a profound investigation. Others, most obviously visible, it is possible to designate on a preliminary stage already now. What ones?

The unity of our theory can be found out in its comparison with other forms of comprehension and development of the world (arts, practice, techniques, etc.), and also with other areas and levels of the journalism studies (history of journalism, journalistic criticism, empirical researches and recommendations, etc.). The theory is united in rejection of all imitations of conceptual thinking when an unbiased search of truth is being replaced with a juggling by stereotypes, whether it is domestic intellectual “fossil” or a standard formula taken from outside. While attitudes to some of “not theories” may stay a subject for discussions inside university corporation, the opposition to imitations oversteps academic limits and becomes a civic duty of experts. Journalism, because of its public nature, openness for criticism and controlling influence, becomes an easy prey for outside scientific ideologies, which come from amateurism, voluntarism, political tactics or other sources. Public unmasking of them makes a constant professional and moral obligation of scientists for society and national press.

Further, the viable model, certainly, should be built on a national-cultural ground, and it gets a value owing to own uniqueness and harmonic inclusiveness in a given civilisation context. Attempts to use “ready” models from the alien environment, which we meet today, hardly get a long recognition and success. Many thanks to Denis McQuail, who said once: “...Idea that distinctive approaches to the study of communication can be found in different countries and regions... It does look as if the countries and national academic institutions of Europe have responded in different ways to the demand for the new field of study and have drawn on different intellectual resources as well as investing in varying degrees and for varying reasons... There are a number of reasons for expecting a national culture to have shaped and marked an activity that is everywhere a cultural practice”. But, to be true, he added skeptically some lines below: “...Although this means ignoring the elephant in the living room, in this case the United States, since the field was most fully developed at an early date in the US and its history in Europe can also be seen as a matter of adoption in varying degrees of the dominant American paradigm in the years after World War II” (2009, p. 281, 282). If to take Russia as well as some other parts of the Eastern Europe, the American influence was relatively weak directly after World War II. This means they was forming original schools in own communication/journalism fields. There is no reasonable answer why now they should forget this experience forever. National culture prolongs shaping this kind of a cultural practice.

At last, in constructing the theory it is necessary to overcome dictatorship of today's practice as an indisputable fact. This statement is not equivalent to ignoring of practice. On the contrary, researchers should estimate and compare various versions of the press experience, because in the history and in

Journal of International Scientific Publications: Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

diverse present practice a huge number of versions are accumulated. But what is the best of all? Every moment there are a few directions of choice, and it is impossible to recognize a priori one of them more perspective, than all others. About one of such historical and cultural “crossing” the Norwegian researcher S. Høyer writes: “Modern news journalism was mainly an Anglo-American invention... On the Continental Europe... the traditional ideal of a journalist was the mature gentleman of press commenting on the affairs of the world and interpreting trends in politics, arts and science from a given philosophical position. By contrast the Anglo-American ideal was outgoing aggressive news hunter” (2000, p. 41). Division on respectable-commenting and sensational-reporting manners of working was typical for the newspapers in "old", pre-Soviet Russia as, however, there is now. Experts also know well, that alongside with Anglo-Saxon model and stylistics of press successfully exist, for example, original French or German schools, and this variety enriches a palette of the world journalism.

So, the choice of a base empirical experience as a component of model is not predetermined by pragmatic market rationalism of news journalism. Moreover, progressive, according to a common recognition, types of mass media – for example public TV – gravitate towards a revival of “pre-market” journalist.

Of course, to rely upon altruistic aspirations of journalists, instead of providing them with a worthy standard of well-being, means to construct methodologically false and ethically not noble alternative. But from another hand it will be wrong idea to recognize them unable to fair public service (after the solution of their prime everyday problems). Perhaps, traditions of the Russian press, with all breaks of its history, especially brightly show, that journalistic profession opens in the person his civil potential, spirituality, adherence to ideals of humanism and truth. According to our representation, without inclusion of these professional-moral components in the object of the theory of journalism the technocratic scheme will appear, but not a prototype of the future alive practice.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, A & Hanson, J 2001, ‘Introduction. Ways of thinking about mass media and society’, in A Alexander & J Hanson (eds.), *Taking sides. Clashing views on controversial issues in mass media and society*, 6th edn, Guilford (Connecticut, USA).
- Becker, K, Ekecrantz, J & Olsson, T (eds.) 2000, *Picturing politics: visual and textual formations of modernity in the Swedish press*, Stockholm.
- Bogaerts, Jo 2010 ‘To befoul one’s own nest? Joris Luyendijk and the impossibility of journalism in the Middle-East’, in N Carpentier, IT Trivundža, P Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, E Sundin, T Olsson, R Kilborn, H Nieminen & B Cammaerts (eds.), *Media and communication studies. Interventions and intersections: the intellectual work of the 2010 ECREA European media and communication doctoral summer school*, Tartu.
- Dzyaloshinskii, IM 1999, ‘Russian journalism searching the model of development’, in M. Dzyaloshinskaya (ed.), *The role of press in formation of civil society in Russia*, Moscow (Russian).
- Fidalgo, J 2007, ‘What is journalism and what only looks like it?’, paper presented to the scientific conference of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, Paris, 23–27 July.
- Høyer, S 2000, *An introduction to the sociology of news*, Oslo.
- Klyukanov, IE 2008, ‘Inaugural essay’, *Russian Journal of Communication*, vol. 1, no. 1, Winter.

Journal of International Scientific Publications: Media and Mass Communication, Volume 1

ISSN 1314-8028, Published at: <http://www.scientific-publications.net>

Korkonosenko, SG 1998, 'Asociality of the press and a deviating behavior of journalists', in YN Zassoursky & MV Shkondin (eds.), *Journalism in a transition period: problems and prospects*, Moscow (Russian).

Korkonosenko, SG 2010, *Journalism theory: modeling and applying*, Moscow (Russian).

Kucherova, GE 2000, *Essays of the theory of foreign journalism (XIX - first half of XX centuries)*, Rostov on Don (Russian).

'Lesin recognizes presence of threat to freedom of mass media and promises to reduce state participation in the media market' 2002, *Mass Media Law and Practice*, no. 2 (Russian).

Makienko, A 2000, 'Underworld and mass media', in M. Dzyaloshinskaya (ed.), *Union against corruption: the mass media, civil sector and business unite their efforts in a struggle against corruption*, Moscow (Russian).

McQuail, D 2009, 'Diversity and convergence in communication science: the idea of "National Schools" in the European area', in N Carpentier, P Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, R Kilborn, T Olsson, H Nieminen, E Sundin & K Nordenstreng (eds.), *Communicative approaches to politics and ethics in Europe: the intellectual work of the 2009 ECREA European media and communication doctoral summer school*, Tartu.

Mostovschikov, Ye 2011, 'Other mass media. If we shall be writing, that our authorities are bad, our circulations will be the same which "Novaya Gazeta" has', *OpenSpace.ru*, 10 October, viewed 15 January 2012, <http://www.openspace.ru/media/paper/details/30915/?expand=yes#expand> (Russian).

Nielsen, RK 2011, 'The Absence of Americanisation – media systems development in six developed democracies, 2000-2009', in R Salaverria (ed.), *Diversity of Journalisms, Proceedings of ECREA/CICOM conference*, 4-5 July, Pamplona.

Nordenstreng, K 2001, 'Role of mass media in a society: lessons from Russia', *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Series10. Zhurnalistika*, no. 3 (Russian).

Nordenstreng, K 2010, 'The Russian media system: something special?', in E Vartanova (ed.), *Content, channels and audiences in the new Millennium: interaction and interrelations*, Moscow.

Plutnik, A 2007, 'Freedom of speech with the Russian accent', *Journalism and Media Market*, no. 1 (Russian).

Popov, R & Obukhov, V 2007, 'All on sale?', *Journalism and Media Market*, no. 6 (Russian).

Price, M 2000, *Television, telecommunications and a transition period: law, society, and national identity*, Moscow (Russian).

Shaihitdinova, SK 2004, *Information society and "situation of the person": evolution of a phenomenon of alienation*, Kazan (Russian).

Sokolov, AV 2002 'Terra incognita of the social communications', in VI Kon'kov (ed.), *Mass media in the modern world*, St. Petersburg (Russian).

Sparks, C 2008, 'Media systems in transition: Poland, Russia, China', *Chinese Journal of Communication*, vol. 1, no. 1, April.

Strovskii, DL 2001, *Domestic political traditions in journalism of the Soviet period*, Yekaterinburg (Russian).

Voltmer, K 2000, 'Constructing political reality in Russia. Izvestiya – between old and new journalistic practices', *European Journal of Communication*, no. 15.

Zemlyanova, LM 2001, 'Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly and Canadian Journal of Communication on the eve of a new century', *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Series10. Zhurnalistika*, no. 3 (Russian).