SOCIETIES IN TRANSITION – A CHALLENGE FOR JOURNALISM AND JOURNALISM CULTURE A THEORETICAL DISPOSITION

Thomas A. BAUER[*]

Abstract: Transitionsgesellschaften–Eine Herausforderung für Journalismus und Journalismuskulturen. Eine theoretische Annäherung

Gesellschaften, die sich im Status der Transition befinden, sind in vielfältiger Weise gefordert, nicht nur im Hinblick auf die Veränderung ihrer Systeme, sondern auch im Hinblick auf die kulturellen Umbrüche. Diese Umbrüche machen sich vor allem als Veränderung der Kommunikationsmuster bemerkbar. Im Kontext der medialen gesellschaftlichen Kommunikation repräsentieren sich diese Umbrüche natürlich in der Umstellung des Mediengebrauch durch Rezipienten, aber auch in der Praxis der journalistischen Medienkultur: Journalistinnen und Journalisten lernen um, sie redefinieren ihre Rollenauffassung, ihre geysellschaftliche Funktion und ihre ethischen Prinzipien. Nicht selten vermischen sich dann politische, journalistische und private Deutungssysteme.

Der Artikel bemüht sich, für die Beschreibung, Klärung, Ordnung und Wertung dieses kulturellen (und professionellen) Wandels einen Rahmen von Begriffen aufzustellen, die zwar im Umfeld der Theorien des sozialen Wandels definiert sind, aber weiter greifen (und auch weiter ausgelegt werden) und daher auch als theoretische Referenzen für die Analyse des Transitionsprozesses und dessen Auswirkungen auf die Medien- und Kommunikationsgesellschaft angewandt werden können. In diesem Sinne beschreibt der Artikel auch ein abstraktes Modell für die kritische Analyse der Transitionsperspektive in der türkischen Gesellschaft, auch wenn diese hier nicht sui generis untersucht wird

Schlüsselwörter: Transition, sozialer wandel, journalismuskultuı.

Öz: Geçiş Sürecindeki Toplumlar: Gazeteciliğe ve Gazetecilik Kültürlerine Bir Meydan Okuma Kuramsal Bir Yaklaşım

Geçiş sürecindeki toplumlar sadece sistemlerinde olan değişikliğe değil, kültürel devrimlere de ihtiyaç duyarlar. Bu dönüşümler her şeyden önce kendilerini iletişim örneklerinde gösterirler. Bu bağlamda bu değişimler hem medya uygulamalarında hem de medya kültürlerinde kendilerini ortaya koyarlar.Gazeteciler rol kavrayışlarını, toplumsal işlevlerini ve etik prensiplerini tekrar tanımlamayı öğrenirler.

Bu makalede toplumsal (ve profesyonel) değişimler toplumsal değişim teorisi çerçevesinde irdelenecektir. Çalışmada geçiş sürecinin kuramsal analizi ve medya ile iletişim toplumları üzerindeki etkisi referans olarak uygulanabilir kavramlar çerçevesinde tasvir edilecek, açıklığa kavuşturulacak, düzenlene-

[*]Prof., University of Vienna, thomas.bauer@univie.ac.at

cek ve değerlendirilecektir. Dolayısıyla makalede Türk toplumunun geçiş perspektifindeki eleştirel analizi için de taslak bir model sunulmuş olacaktır.

<u>Anahtar sözcükler:</u> *Geçiş, sosyal değişim, gazetecilik kültürü.*

…………………………………….

INTRODUCTION

Analysing the impact of journalism to the society always demands to consider the conditions for journalism coming from the social, political, cultural, and symbolic environment. In regard to this mutually influencing relationship there has always been the temptation to describe or to analyse the structural networks in order to interpret the conditions of power - mostly through figures, dates and facts. Those descriptions and analyses follow the idea that quantities assert and reveal connections, causalities and correlations. Maybe they do. But they do it under the condition of a culturally (meaningful) hidden premise: any consideration is a cultural approximation to a phenomenon and is done in the interest of affirmation of culturally mandatory horizons. That's the reason why the scientific description of any considerable correlation demands the declaration of the interest of enlightenment: so ever the description of albeit structural phenomena is a cultural narration on the basis of interpreting consideration.

This initial deliberation, done in respect to challenging conditions for journalism development in the new democratic countries in Southeast of Europe, incites to focus immediately on culture, particularly on journalistic culture as a hybrid world, where political events, gestures, attitudes, patterns, and values meet public observation, and public observation come across system structures and political conditions. Out of respect to that starting position it does not make so much sense to

re-analyse the structures (e.g. organizational structures of media, program output, organizational input, law, legislation, economical situation etc.) but would give much more insight and understanding (in the sense of applied social studies) to focus on cultural components of the media culture in transition countries in Southeast Europe. The reason is: the challenging conditions for media development in post-communist societies (including journalism education and training) is not the development or the establishment of all the structures that are indispensable for the organization of democracy, but shape up as problems of culture and mind. There are enough sources and resources: knowledge, experience, external support and possibilities. The main question is how the administration, organizations, institutions, media companies, and the public opinion deal carefully with all those structural conditions. The same interpretation counts for journalism education. The challenging conditions, since they are cultural ones, do not touch the possibilities of developing structures for educational systems in post-communist countries. It would not be a problem to overtake or to copy successful systems from all over Europe. There do exist many supporting programs offered by foundations from many European countries, mainly coming from the Scandinavian countries, from Germany, France, Italy, or UK. The question is how to find the own (intrinsic) way to media democracy? That emerges as a challenge of cultural transition to be met.

It is the cultural rationality of communication that serves as the source (reservoir of diversity) to manage conflicts and crises. That seems generally to be an important pointof reference in handling transition and dealing with the multiplex conflicts within and between the countries in South East Europe. Crises usually come up in processes, when it is not clear enough which criteria are the deciding lines to be followed, -often when there are different interests to be realized or to be served. In that situation it is helpful to have a background- culture which is wider and in its leading criteria more integrative than the actual interests. There is no other legitimized direction for operation of communication potentials in case of conflict and crisis but the cultural programs, which keeps the archive of values of mutual understanding. But it works only, if it is in general use. Culture, which is not in everyday use is not culture, it is just a decoration in case of need. A decoration, taken in service in the case of need, does not represent enough depth, not enough credibility, not enough objectivity, in order to compensate uncertainty. Crises are dispositives (Foucault, 1988) of communication. They depict, what communication is like: a re-construction of sense, negotiated by exchange of information and by sharing a decision. This is not a mechanism which just has to be brought on its way, it is a subjective performance of competence in differentiation and decision of being able to pay attention to the other out of a clear (and transparent) own position. The panic, which often comes up in critical or decisive situations, often happens because of the fact, that the hidden interest or hidden agenda is not compatible to the cultural background or is somehow a separated interpretation of a common cultural program. Decisive communication demands cultural background and only gets solved in relation to a common cultural program. Communication competence in situations like that is cultural competence: ability, preparedness, authority, and responsibility to decide the performance (rhetoric) of communication and to balance the options both of common sense of cultural behaviour and of challenge of overcoming the crisis by authentic expression of critical situation. The cultural rationality of communication is to decide to give the crises, the challenge, the complexity a position (performance) of communication.

The task of this article is to concentrate on cultural problems of development of qualitative journalism in critical reference to identity or self-identification in the framework of a cultural explanation of communication or a communication-theory-based explanation of journalism culture. Referring to a blended concept of communication and culture (Bauer, 2003) the idea is not to find new solutions for old problems, but to make new problems attractive for thinking and for practice. The solution of a problem with that dimension as the culture of diversity of opinion represents, is not to intend to get off all the problems, but is to come to know, what problems should an organized and democratically civilized society face, in order to manage the diversity of opinion as a cultural good.

Challenge of Changes in Theoretical Understanding Journalism
The current development in theoretical conception of media communication does not refer so much to the structures. The matter of analysis becomes more and more the cultural meaning of structures (Bauer 2000). Therefore -searching for the impact of social conditions to the development of journalism- it has to be the intention to draw the atten-

tion to a theoretical perspective of communication and of media communication that may shoot new light on journalism, both in practice and in education. Journalism is an organizational system that reflects in its traditional theory and practice and in its education a concept of consensual communication. That concept constructs communication as an exchange of meaning, based on objective information that aims to select out all possible differences of meaning the facts (information), thus coming to a homogenized and closed content of equal understanding (meaning). Consensus then (or at least a compromise of optimization) is the (normative) factor of building communities for society. In media context consensus is taken as the paradigm of public sphere, which also is (normatively) conceptualized as an as far as possible homogenized system of sharing (common) meanings. The aspiration of commonality may be taken as an indication of the desire of mutual exculpation of complexity, of contingence and of uncertainty. Communality is a kind of control. If that is what makes journalism being the professionally organized platform of public communication culture then journalism becomes the projection screen of desire for certainty and public trust.

Living with and within a communication (media) society means that we understand our societal environment through means of media and through the reasonability of media (reduction of complexity, public attention, stress of publicity, standardisation of content, passage of meaning and relevance). It means that we have a media-made image of the societal (political, cultural and symbolic) environment. And it means that the axes of building knowledge about others and about oneself (identity) are not longer taken

from national borders, from institutional rules, from rituals of families or from predictions of the milieu one is living with, but much more from flexible and often changing frames of reference: communication systems and media. So we learn to control loss of competence by keeping contact to media. Media is the communicational system of generalisation of rules what is to know in order to keep in touch with the societal environment.

The social (and societal) environment, since it is represented by far through media and since media are as an economical good an object (and as public means of communication a carrier of) of globalization, the societal (organizational, social, cultural, symbolic) environment becomes more and more globalized. It becomes more and more culturally stirred and hybrid.

Globalization is a factor in global development and social change that effects and influences very much the concepts of cultural neighbourhood all over the world. This factor is easy to be named, but difficult to be brought into a comprehensive model, since it contains a mixture of experiences and notions and myths. It needs a blanket and theoretically far in depth going analysis of the complex phenomenon, summarized by the term of globalization, in order to convince that this process cannot be just valued between the antagonism of good and bad. In reality globalization is not just a process being observed, but it is a concept that deals with the conception of man in an environment of modernity and of modernization (Charalambis, 2004) It is a process of a universal social change that is culturally natural and necessary and that necessarily provokes changes, even in form of contradictions.

Globalization is a process with wide ranging propositions and effects in streamlining the economical and organizational systems in order to achieve transmissibility and penetrability of markets, meanwhile with strong ties and deeply anchored structures of interchange and interdependency. It really can not be surprising that the economical process converges with cultural ones – especially in media environment - since the cultural (also media) changes express themselves economically. Culture, taken by itself, is a system of meaning, socially structured, that directs the execution of everyday life and contains frames of reference for identity, belongingness and normative orientation. Culture steers the everyday use of values. It is a cybernetic circle that reflects itself, also by reflecting other cultures somehow in a way of 'fight for meanings' (Hepp, 2002: 857). The production of cultural goods emerges from the need of self-representation and representation against others. This process claims territories (nations, communities, societies) and stresses borders between one and the other. It is exactly this quality of segregation through cultural borders, what gets criticized by theoretical concepts of intercultural communication (Hepp, 2002: 29).

The Rationality of Culture: Diversity in Communication

Generally spoken culture is a social practice in generating meaning and in referring to generalized meaning, it is the social constructive expression of a socially and collectively developed program on values and orientations of sense, which fulfil the notion of an 'own territory', of identity and togetherness of all people experiencing itself being connected by that program (Schmidt, 2004) in significant media: language, common social institutions, common history, common narrations, common traditions. In this interpretation culture always may be taken as a framework and legitimacy and justification of social control. But: origin is not the only point of reference for a definition of culture (and here already an open minded theory of culture needs to break the routine of everyday use of the category) but also: ideas of never realized notions, horizons and room to move, options of being otherwise, and future. Thus besides through a repeating use (which also is a way of changing it - mimetic aspect (cf. Gebauer-Wulf, 1998) culture realizes itself as well through creation of sense and meaning, especially in times of crises or challenge (creative perspective). It is a character of traditional attitude to conceptualize culture in reference to history or what is thought/said to be the history of a social group. Drawing identity concepts from cultural frameworks of the past leads the attention to categories of race, ethnicity, religion, language, and common territories. Drawing identity concepts from cultural frameworks developed in relation to present challenges or crises (future aspect) leads the attention to the potentials of rooms to move: discourses, creative language, and unaccustomed performances.

All in all the cultural competence (which includes ability, readiness, authority, and responsibility (Bauer, 2002) of any social amalgamation relies on:

'Sources of historically developed programs' of assimilation to and accommodation of environmental conditions of life, from where it may draw models of knowledge and models of reality (Schmidt, 2003: 34), and equally on 'Resources of creatively developed and proved program's of appropriation of meaning, of realities and environmental condi-

tions of life. The (socio-cultural) way of appropriation of reality is communication (de Certeau, 1988).

In the same way as communication and interaction maintain a framework of reference (and even: order) of reality (sharing meanings) by permanent changing performance, character and media (discourse) (Foucault, 1988), culture (meaningful social practice) maintains a framework of reference negotiating collective identity by permanent trying out its potentials of development, change and variety. Thus development, change, and variety can be taken as the intrinsic characters of cultural unity and universality, which get expressed and symbolically mediated in diversity. Diversity is a matter of media (performance) through which culture expresses the intrinsic competence of variety and plurality. In this context of reflecting the rationality of culture, which is based in reasons of diverse mediation of communication, it seems that the concepts of multiculturality, interculturality or transculturality (Hepp&Löffelholz, 2002) were just theoretical surrogate of the concept of diversity.

Journalism Culture: Discursive Diversity of Opinion

The insinuation of making a meaningful statement about journalism as a cultural system that enables diversity of opinion as a principle of a democratic society is possible as soon as one accepts equally being obliged to make a meaningful statement on diversity of culture. Deciding for a theory of culture means deciding for a culture of theory. If we decide for an open and learning model of theory we come so far to conceptualize an open learning model of culture. In this sense culture is an open software, which is getting to know itself (always referring to itself) by

use of itself. Culture always is in need of getting confronted by reflexive interruptions (Schmidt, 2004: 59), which become a part of itself, because culture is a circular communicative process, communication on communication. In order to explain the advantage of a cultural approach to the question of development of journalism it is necessary to remind of the epistemological circumstances.

Epistemological Pre-conditions

The observation of culture is possible within a cultural framework of observation and also only reasonable when being aware of that staring point. As observation is a way of getting in a communication (understanding) position to what you are talking about, the key of observation is communication. The more complex the experiences of social connectivity (society) become – and they become so by increasing organization of the communication interests of society -the more important it will be to compensate moments and factors of uncertainty. Which only can be managed by instances of self-observation holding increasing complexity. Thus the society insinuates to hold certainty of control. In the same time the world of societal reality becomes more open and more casual. Beyond of all processes of systematization (e.g. by media) the society tries to get off of all strong protocols of tradition and discovers the horizons of orientation more and more in itself and within the execution of itself. What means: society, in search of understanding itself, increasingly gets involved in paradigms, which mirror less the conditions of continuing formations but more the challenges of alteration. Culture and Communication are such paradigms. They get theoretically (Giddens, 1990, Hall, 1998) and politically more and more interpreted as ground models of an open and self-

responsible society. In that (cultural) gesture of self-reflexive attention the society learns there and then to come to its best practice: culture and communication explain themselves mutually within the context of self-reflection. Culture and communication are to each other the one to the other side of the coin (which is society); the one is not negotiable without the other. In spite of the fact, that they are different competences of social practice, the fragility of culture always is the fragility of communication, the vulnerability of culture is communicative, the vulnerability of communication is cultural.

A culturological understanding of communication (Bauer, 2003a) seems to be the right theoretical framework, in which it makes sense to reflect on problems and solutions of diversity. And even more: A communication-theory-based analysis of diversity is at its best end a diversity-theory-based analysis of communication and culture. A study of social change in culture and a study of feasibility of social change in negotiating diversity only makes sense out of the condition to understand change itself as a matter of culture, as an effort of culture: culture is the in formation level of change as change is the formation level of culture. What culture is supposed to be, is changing under the eyes of consideration as it of interest to change the point of view. Where there is no such interest, nothing will change. The will of change always is the preparedness of self-reflexive (intelligent) interruption of routines.

A Culturalist Journalism Theory for A Cultural Journalistic Practice:

In order to find a plausible explanation of what is the cultural implication in journalistic acting, and in order to find a reasonable cognition of the relationship between individual journalistic acting as a cultural semantic and the professionally organized way of doing journalism as a cultural disposition for individual acting, it needs at least two theoretical concepts: the concept of Cultural Studies (for example Stuart Hall) and the concept of Critical Structuralism (for example Pierre Bourdieu). The general assumption is: there must be a mechanism that is responsible for the phenomenon of social obedience and assimilation. Journalists and politicians, both in responsibility to public, are typical representatives for the fact that people gets assimilated with action and mind to the surrounding symbolic system. Is it just a strategy of surviving or is it a mechanism of generating of symbolic capital? Journalistic culture is both, an individual concept of value of the profession and a collective concept of meaningful acting in public context. As such it is a question of moral knowledge, of professional identity, and of social responsibility, how journalists handle expectations of the own company, of politicians, of any other person or organization in respect to the audience.

Due to the assertion of Cultural Studies in media- and communication research journalism became a subject of cultural research. As it is the interest of Cultural Studies to reflect and interpret the relationship between media, power and societal culture, journalism as an agency of societal discourse and of distribution of popular meaning (Hall, 1975). Analysing journalism within the frame of Cultural Studies reveals the connectivity of entertainment and politics and makes clear that the media is the mirror of the relationship between both. Due to Cultural Studies popular journalism has become a conceptual measure   in   understanding   journalism

(Renger, 1999). The most relevant enlightenment in respect to a critical evaluation of journalism as a link between the system of politics and everyday life (Hall, 1975: 22 f.) is: journalism not just produces news, but makes news meaningful. The reader of a newspaper in Hall's comprehension is a 'product of transaction' between producer and receiver, whereas the success of that transaction depends from the process of mutual affirmation between the roles of them who produce and them who receive. Since the producer must adopt position, attitude, and habit of the receiver, the producer needs to make the settings of reception to pre-settings (precondition) of his action. Insofar this preconditions are engraved in journalistic practice by layout, rhetoric, interpretation, signification, tone, and last not least through the selection of topics, the journalistic work (media) is a cultural representation of the relationship between political system and social life. In that sense journalism culture is a concept of working in respect to the audience and the professionally shared attitude among journalists (within a local milieu) that qualifies the decision how and why to pick up and to distribute news and knowledge. Since the cultural dimension of journalism is realized through the fact that journalism – at least as long as mass media remain as the platform for professional journalism and online communication does not mean the "end of journalism" (Quandt, 2000) - is the (!) central space of the society's cultural self-reflection and self-treatment, in any society central moments of the social (political) culture get anchored in journalistic cultures, or the other way round: the socio-political culture absorbs the journalistic mind. Bourdieu's concept of "habitus" has explained that phenomenon in general (Bourdieu, 1997): there

are customs of mind, through that members of a group share and socialize a common personality, expressed in style of living, language, and social acting. Members of a group affirm mutually each another to belong together through similar patterns of acting such internalizing collective dispositions. The concept of habitus can be taken as a central instrument of cognition that can explain the social practice through an culture-anthropological perspective.

Journalism Culture and Culture of Democracy:

Democratic journalism culture refers to values of freedom, independence and interests of public participation. But always the cultural environment takes notes in the journalist's work. What journalism culture looks like in concrete countries, can only be filtered out through comparative analysis of journalistic basic patterns (Kopper-Mancini, 2003), because the comparison makes obvious the interpretation of (anyway mostly similar or even of same) structures of work, organisation, law or management. Journalism Culture always is in relation to the media industry on the one side and to the communication policy at the other side (Bohrmann-Kaus-Machill, 2007). The challenging conditions for journalism are not first those structures, but the everyday use of them. What makes meaning and difference is not the natural (objective) but the symbolic environment, which consists of all the signification of structures (and things), that becomes constructed through social interaction. Since culture then is the social design of sense and since sense not just exists but has to be made (Schmidt, 2003), culture is the inspiration of usage of (technical) structures. What culture makes being a meaningful presence of gestures, symbols

attitudes, and patterns is the common knowledge about values in using structures. That's what culture is in its nucleus (Blumer, 1973: 144): the everyday usage of values.

Journalism Culture is the everyday usage of values of relations between journalism and politics, audience, media company and so on. Journalism culture is a culture of relationality, it does not exist for itself and by itself, but emerges out of the communicative and medial use of the social (political) environment. It always and everywhere reflects the social and the political culture and mirrors the collective mind of (the) society. This relationship between journalism and society is mediated by media and represents to some extent a system of societal trust. Public trust in a system theoretical view can be understood as a cultural mechanism that reduces public (communicational) complexity (Luhmann, 1998). It is also the mechanism through which all those categories act a part in public communication that usually frame the public (generalized) consciousness of a society in relation to internal cohesion, external differentiation, identity, and identification. In a practical sense journalism culture is the way how and with what intention journalists act within the context of political (public) communication.

Journalism is a socially organized system within a media conversation environment. In general there is a strong, mostly normative notion on the relationship between journalism, society and communication saying: in free societies journalism has to provide people with discourse and stories – thus constructing a public sphere of exchange of opinion and giving a general connection to what is going on in global environment to anyone who thinks to need to know. In that

sense journalism also is supposed to be a system of trust serving the principles of democracy: publicity, independence, freedom of speech. Such a scenario of connectivity of society and media communication, mutually mediated each other through journalism, is quite easy to be explained when you think journalism is a way of generalizing the opportunity of access to and the interpretation of what is going on. As it is with any other system, the function of journalism is to reduce the complexity of communicational selection by the way of minimizing misunderstanding and misinterpretation (so called: truth). In that perspective the theoretical understanding of journalism is related to a normative concept of social and public communication that says: media is an agency of societal communication saying what is matter of social communication (agenda setting). Such an construction of journalism is built on the interpretation of understanding: understanding is the way to find the intrinsic, entitative and the essential structure of connectivity – and as far as that is the capacity of the object itself, it can not change by consideration, it has to be (must be) the same for anyone's eye. The essentialist view is: Things and connectivity are explaining themselves to the observer, the constructivist view is: the perception is the way to explain (the meaning of) things and connectivity (Vernon,1977).

Since the journalistic order of communication is to report things and events as they are (objectivity), journalistic communication contributes a lot to a consonant and homogenized public observation and serves the arrangement of equation. That interpretation of objectivity keeps an essentialistic and a normative paradigm: truth is a capacity of objects, and not a contribution by ob-

servation, and truth is a matter of unity and uniqueness, things only can have one entity by their own. As it is not so easy to shape out the truth of things out from the assemblage of layouts, of interpretations and exegesis, you need a professionally or by personal ability trained qualification to approach to truth as close as ever possible. The factor of publicity in media communication constitutes the attribute of trust. Nevertheless we find ourselves more and more in an environment of diverse cultures and of polysemiotic interpretations of reality, we have to ask, whether this orientation of unification of public truth still is the concept of journalism the society needs. The question is not new: it was always in question, whether journalism can be objective, what meant to see things as they are by their own. But never the question was: what if objectivity is to observe the diversity of observation as a principle of reality and truth? Such a question only can be posed and answered within a constructivist conception of communication, information and reality (Schmidt, 2003, Glasersfeld, 1965).

The term transition in general marks the complex social change, that takes place since the communist system broke down. It signifies the decomposition of former rules and the simultaneous building of new institutions. It is an idealistic and as well a normative term, since it supposes a consciousness and deliberate process of change, above all from an authoritarian or (in some cases) totalitarian system to a democracy with normative claim (Schlindenwein, 2007: 6). Exactly that implication creates the collective feeling of pressure of change according to the expectations of the rest of the world, especially of European Union, a pressure that is often corresponded by implementa-

tion of structures in the way of simple copies, but without any further change of mind. The transition process, much as it is necessary and unavoidable, it keeps in itself a lot of problematic potential in the way it happens. The strongest impact for media, media communication and public opinion as an agency and platform of society building and for media culture as the horizon of the self-reflective observation of the society comes from simultaneity, periodicity (path dependency), and undirected concept of freedom (disorientation).   (Merkel,Sandschneider& Segert, 1996, Thomaß&Tzanoff, 2001, Bauer, 2006b)

Cultural Scripts:
It is obvious that well established cultures tend to maintain and to resist to changes, unless there has already established a culture of change. Cultures sing on memory, and memory refers and relates to cultural environments. Cultures survive in social scripts. Cultural scripts, generated by cultural programs, are not individually fates; they are an agreement between collectives and individuals, done within the collective and individual identity building process, both drawing benefits from it (Douglas, 1996). Cultural scripts sediment in rituals and symbols, these in turn serve as social control of the common cultural language and as positions of prevention before identity crises. The theoretical assumption is that the cultural scripts in the transition countries are strong and also related to sometimes overdone national pride, especially because of the fact that the countries in South East Europe had to struggle for all their past with wilful infraction of their identities.

Identity comes to public attention as a problem, when politics touches the frames and

the conditions cultural self. In that case psychology becomes politics. Therefore it has to be pointed out once again: identity is a concept of relational rationality. It is a semantic code for the fact, that self-perception is not possible without perception of one's relation to others and vice verse. Even more: It would not make sense to use the concept of identity as a theoretical or analytical value of reference, or as a category of political decision, if it would not include the fact of relational rationality. The rationality of relationship –again– is communication. Identity is not an ontological category, but a semantic description of social constructive constitution of self. The construction is culturally maintained by symbols. There is no 'true' identity outside this symbolic interaction. The threat of integrated identity comes from diffusion of (and diffusion in) social relations.

In so far diversity of cultural symbols (language, media, topics, cultural rituals of minorities) seems to trouble political or national identity and create a new type of 'cultural citizenship' (Klaus-Lüneborg, 2004: 198), it is relevant for the problem perspective and as well for perspectives of solution to consider which concept of identity the public discourse in politics and media is following. It is to assume, that they think in categories of essentialism, which affirm the idea, that stating identity is just a matter of mirroring or giving others the same insight. If you look into the mirror (images of or treatment by others), you think to see yourself or what you think to have been all the time before. Identity is both, history and future. It is history in the sense that history is the narrative construction of identity as it has become. In this conceptualization it is thought to be the future as the sustainable continuation of evolving what it was before and until today. As history, we see our identity as in a mirror, our faces a map tracing the path of all that has gone before.

Following such a relational and socio-reflexive conceptualization of cultural consciousness, crises of identity are not to be defined as problems of consistence/ inconsistence between sight of oneself and sight of oneself by others, as the essentialist concept recommends, but –what is especially important, when a psychological term becomes politics– is a matter of closed mindedness of relations (to others and their sight of yourself) based on self-concentred estimation of yourself. The crises of identity start with the refusal of plurality of points of view and of diversity of perceptions. Crises of identity rise as crises of distinction and differentiation – mostly caused by lacks of communication. Identity is the framework of ordering relationships according culturally internalized values, which is a dynamic process: contents from past, present and future serve as vanishing points of realizing relations. Self and the environment of self get integrated and mixed up in that process, what makes identity becoming a construction of a social framework, to which one refers in order to decide for a unite of meaning, or a unity of meaning and observation. In case of crises people often goes back to routines, to schemes. They give the feeling of certainty.

Often in same manner done decisions become a schema, called a script. Scripts (frames) are schemes of success of behaviour, which give certainty in repeating situations, not matter if in professional or private life. Scripts (a term of Transactional Analysis) are learned instructions, which include both cognitive and emotional components. The complexity of scripts is mostly created by emotional implications. In particular

there are no clear rules and no codex of be-haviour for those scripts. They are learned programs and they influence the further learning programs Especially because of the emotional dimensions of consciousness, they get first remembered in complex situations. Emotional implications cause the difficulty to become open minded for other models of decision than for those, which already are ruled by the script.

Simultaneity:

The simultaneity, already mentioned, has to be evaluated as the particular intrinsic di-lemma of that process, The 'dilemma of si-multaneity' (Offe, 1994) leads to lacks of attention, of self-reflection and to mutual blockades of processes in different and un-equal systems (politics, economy, media, education, law, civil society). The simultane-ity disorganizes the relationship between cultural (historical) and functional memory of the societies and irritates the balancing correspondence of them (Bauer, 2006a: 145). Either the collective cultural knowledge does not find place and attention in the acceler-ated implementation of structures or the functional mechanisms according to that the society works do not settle down culturally in order to become a part of memory. This incongruity might lead to a pattern of disre-gard and disesteem of the culture-building values of media, media communication, media professionalism, and media literacy.

Abandonment and break-up in same time (what always means: with same energy and attention) overwhelms as a general rule any society and misleads to fragmentise the (public) awareness. It has been already ac-knowledged that transitions processes for example in East- and Southwest Europe have become somehow acceleration proc-esses (Schlindenwein, 2007: 14) that roped in the media in a way that deregulated all rules of the game of power, inside the media houses and outside of them. The political speed has overtaken the media velocity, since exactly there the inertia was very dis-tinctive due to traditions of owning positions of function, domination and power. The cultural change obviously has started quite a time after the structural one, what means: the proportion according to that media pro-voke economy or politics was turned around to: economy challenges the media – a rela-tionship due to that media could not earn the position of authenticity in critique and control. Immediately after proceedings of privatisation in all transition countries emerged media companies of different measure. They learned to operate according to the new rules of market economy, while in same time the traditional patterns and methods of corruption, intransparency (no significant or valid figures on economic structures, resources or results) and clientel-ism remained as they have ever been.

Path-Dependency:

According to most of the theoretical concepts on societal transformation transition is ana-lysed in reference to three phases (Merk,Sandschneider&Segert, 1996): liberalisa-tion, increasing democratisation, and democ-ratic consolidation. That is just the normative model, which makes the empirical always being far from coming so far. But it terms of political evaluation for internal and for ex-ternal observation the normative concept of democracy is used as the frame of reference to measure the improvement. But what are the criteria for democracy? There is no con-sistent concept to be found in political sci-ence and not in political practice. The di-lemma lies between theory and practice. The

political practice simply tends to affirm its own practice by transferring organizational structures of democratic systems from West to East assuming that democracy is democracy wherever realized. The theoretical consideration says that democracy is not a system that gains its legitimacy and prove by itself. Theoretically thought democracy is a cultural construction on how people can live together giving each other best conditions of individual and social welfare. Since it is a cultural concept, it must be realized within the cultural context (which is: collective mind, cultural memory, common values, functional knowledge and functional memory) however the conditions are, but in a way that enables people to improve those conditions in order to improve the values of communality.

The concept of those three phases assumes that the first step has to liberalise the system from authoritarian structures. But even if this is done the individual mind and the collective memory is stronger and much more sustainable. If within the first phase the liberalisation has not become a cultural program (what is rather impossible due to the acceleration and the pressure from outside), then the next step (phase of increasing democratisation) usually leans to some projects just to becalm the stakeholders (international economy, EU commission etc.) and once more erode the weak constructs of social trust and demoralise public credibility. In plaintext, theoretically analysed and defined as the concept of 'path-dependency' by Douglas C. North in reference to the economic transition development (Merkel,Sandschneider&Segert, 1996: 7, North, 2000): Each society established in its past informal rules of the game that maintain during the process of transition, outlive

all the (three) phases and influence the results in each of them.

This theoretical consideration also clarifies that the two phases on the way to democracy (liberalisation and democratic consolidation) must not lead necessarily to (a westerly understood) democracy. Around the new democracies in East and South East of Europe one can identify rather different formats of political organization of community and collectiveness, all of them adjective democracies by special attribution (for example: directed, controlled, defect or authoritarian democracy). In reference to development of democratic quality of media, media organizations or media culture the challenge is to get or to keep clean and to bring into practice the concepts of independence, of active critical control and –what is most important of all – to develop a culture of critical participation. Even if there is media freedom guaranteed by constitution, it is not yet an issue of everyday journalistic life. Especially in relation to a democratic media development many public or official texts do not come beyond a quality of a display window (Schlindenwein, 2007: 8). Imagine how such an ambivalent situation stresses any media publisher – and even more any journalist to decide between the overall experience on what people really awaiting and the conscious knowledge what people is waiting for.

Transformational Disorientation:

Orientation is somehow a decision between reasonability and emotionality. The rational energy calculates with risk and chance and the reasonable voice says, if something is changing it always is better to know whereto the change should (normative potential), could (potential energy), or might (critical awareness) lead. If not, the rule becomes

effective, that for a ship that does not know its course never blows a favourable wind. The emotional energy concentrates on the antagonism of own and alien, oscillates between fear and hope, and tempts to retraction or aggression. That means, transition needs in order to turn out successful – in relation to reasonability -a clear decision of the direction, and- in relation to emotionality, the habit of critical self-reflection. Both sources of energy in case of transition need to be charged. Such a clear decision on a consensual course only can be done, if –at least- the common sense states that the direction of the past has turned out somehow wrong in itself, and the (a) new direction is committed by self-identification. There is no country in the transition region, where at least that minimum of consensus has been reached. To many people that has taken benefit from he old system now tries to take benefit from the new one. Too many people has just shifted from one to the next system without changing the mind, what could be interpreted according to the dictum of the boat: the course goes forward, the sight goes backwards. There is something behind that ambivalent pattern: independency (in individual and in public life) as it at least has become more possible as it ever was, demands decision. Decision requires security of distinction or trust in the conditions of decision. Trust, as already said, is a mechanism of reduction of complexity (Luhmann, 1998) and as such it evaluates the conditions of decision through emotional programs rather than through rational ones. While transition is a program with high rational potential, tradition (habit) is a program with high emotional energy. In that sense transition is a problem of identity building and the direction is not firstly a question of a right or reasonable way, but more a question of identifi-

cation in (critical) relation to the history matter and in open relation to options of change. That in - its last consequence– is a question of social competence of a community (society) (Bauer, 2002).

The Cultural Face of Media Landscape in Transition Countries

In a comparative view the analysis should concentrate to the media landscape as a unit with comparable unity, and should not describe special structures in special countries, but should stress the cultural dimension of such structural data and by that way focus on what is typical for journalism -or/and media– culture in transition countries as it was done for example on South East Europe by Livingstone or Hallin and Mancini (2003). Of course journalism culture always corresponds to the political culture. It does make a difference, whether news are produced and used in an cultural environment of a concordance democracy (e.g. Austria, Germany, standing for central European journalism culture), within an environment of extreme proportional representation and ideological polarisation (e.g. Italy, Greece, standing for a Mediterranean journalism culture) or within an environment of highly rationalized democracy (e.g. Great Brittan, Ireland, standing for a Anglo-Saxon type of journalism culture) (Hallin-Mancini, 2004). Within the comparative journalism research there does not still exist a valid typing of what is the Southeast specification in journalism culture. But it makes sense to   Since the 1990ies the countries of central-east, southeast and east Europe are in transition and within that process they experience more democracy, more media freedom, and pluralism of public opinion.

Extrinsic Perception of Democracy:

One of the basic problems in that process, often stated by experts (Sschlindenwein, 2007: 8) is that the simple assimilation of constitutions or of media products according to western prototypes in most of the countries not could avoid the impact of corruption and of clientele- centred strategies in journalism. That experience made clear that media freedom, supposed to be a chance for choice for independence, is not a democratic concept that can be simply exported from one to an other cultural system, or can be just copied, at any case not can be regulated Media freedom is a societal good, a basic right that has to be developed and appropriated actively through a creative-conscious attitude and pattern of journalistic work (Zappner,Mihr,Leif in Schlindenwein, 2007: preface). When media freedom and journalistic freedom is not linked to a public management of communication order, to a qualified system of journalistic education, or to a strategic development of journalistic professionalism, then journalistic freedom quickly turns to become chaotic. When it comes so far, then the idea, media freedom was something that just creates disorder, brings people to call for censorship. Generally spoken, there is not so much accordance among the transition analysts in evaluating the transition process as it appears in South East Europe as far as media are concerned (Schlindenwein, 2007: 10), but in one point it is: the complexity and the mutual interplay of changes on various levels is the reason that each of the transition countries choose its own way to proceed.

The transitive situation is – once again facing the problem that this is a normative consideration- characterised by the case that the legal and organizational structures for a formally democratic media landscape get so

far established. After all that the extrinsic motivation (achievement of compensation for donations and benefits) is high enough to do anything that satisfies giant neighbours as it is the European Union, the intrinsic motivation (doing efforts in order to benefit from democratic values) states at a rather fragmentary status. In particular the changes in media landscape can be described as follows (Thomaß, 2003, Schlindenwein, 2007: 9):

> -In structural sense media change from being an appendix of the political system to a subsystem within the society with own logic of function,
> -On legal level new law fundamentals have passed the parliaments and media receive new liberties and directions – at least on paper,
> -In reference to economy commercial media emerge and establish new business,
> -In reference to the societal functions of media the role of media change. Instead of being the mouthpiece of parties or governments media learn to discover their role in criticism, enlightenment and corrective information

Journalistic Ethics Versus Nationalism Concepts in Identity Building

Though the political theory refers to the enlightenment that national identity is not any more a proper concept in times of globalization and within the context of transition. But reality and practice do not follow the normative knowledge. It has to be taken as an invention of the era of nation-states and of a banal nationalism (Billig, 1995) that national identity has its certain categories or factors: language, religion, history, territory. That conception of identity is not only theoretically too simple, it is also persuasive and tendentious. As any other group community, national communities emerge through delimitation from "the others" which requires

for markers like territory, language, religion, history. All that criteria, of course, result in consequences on the allocation of rights (Törnquist-Plewa, 1998: 100) Making this believe completely accepted requires a strong mobilisation, when national identity should be stronger than any other referential identity.

Images of Freedom of Media Between Economic Pressure and Western Perspective:

In all discussions on the relationship of media to economy or to politics always comes up the mutual interweavements of economy and media. As high quality media rely from investors from economy as such they already are supposed to be dependent. The fact that one can really see through the interweavements between economy and media got even worse as a consequence of Europeanisation and globalization. The problem is situated like that: political parties and governmental institutions try to influence media through financial support. As a consequence among journalists in East and South East Europe the term 'freedom of press' became ambivalent and is now, because of that, suitable to only a limited extent. Conditions like that make it difficult to find objective indicators for a measurement of press freedom, aside from the question how meaningful is to put different political cultures (it is about democratic basic values) under pressure of international ranking. Recent research on indicators of press freedom (Becker-Vlad-Nusser, 2007) call into question, whether it is methodologically possible to measure freedom through structural facilities and state in general the tendency of shifting from focussing on political and social factors to economical frame conditions.. Following that the theoretical context of freedom of media

is to be seen as a result of economic welfare and low market concentration (Schlindenwein, 2007: 11). Such a conception, of course, again comes from western institutions and reveals that the classification of 'free' and 'unfree' media in general is an attribution coming from outside (Wunden, 2005) that does not measure the internal work of social change and systemic transformation. Similar to that is the discussion about the increasing tabloidization of media, which can be observed in transition countries. It is true, that there is a huge part of media falling appearing as tabloids. But it is a normative and elitist argument on media development and a moralistic interpretation of freedom from a western point of view: an increasing clearance for freedom increases responsibility). There are suggestions to work with more operable categories in order to measure the achievements of media freedom (Schlindenwein, 2007: 13): that is the category of media independence.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: There Is Something Left To Do On The Audience Side

There is another partner in public communication and in coming along with the transition process: the audience, always linked to its societal environment and struggling to come clear with its expectations on public communication within social conversation. If media competence, understood as a cultural good, developed through a mutually expected patterns, media competence is the source of media culture. There is no sense in compensating the dilemma of the society on shoulders of individuals of only one side. Because the overall problem to be solved is media and communication competence as a habit and a tool for a democratic society – which is a cultural challenge, any effort in

enriching the journalism competence has to be completed by enriching the media literacy of the public. Therefore the program has to be continued and the next step has to be the development of programs in media education.

The role of media has to be rethought in this context. It has become a remarkable aspect of communications research that former reference points in shaping identity –orders of religion, culture, ethnicity, nationality, race, etc.– are going to be replaced by much more mobile, hybrid and virtual ones, by the discourse models of media communication. Media, as the agencies of public discourse, have to take over the task of critical reflection on the workings society. They are the instruments of a cultural catharsis, when and where a society is in need of restoring or re-inventing itself. Media have the connective capacity to observe the public conversation (meta-communication), to enlarge it where information is too limited, and to enrich it where the discourse-content is too thin or too shallow, to intervene from the outside when conversation is too introverted, to steer from the inside when the discourse gets lost in translation. And while they may be under pressure to reduce the complexity of programs for financial reasons, it may also be their responsibility to return a reasonable complexity to their consideration of social and political life. Mobilizing this critical self-awareness is a question of competence in living and surviving under conditions of an ever-changing environment; it is a pragmatic view of ethics and an ethical use of practice. This pragmatic and ethical horizon of self-realization has to be brought into the public discourse; it is a kind of intelligent and therapeutic rule breaking that –in context of

society– can only be done by the kind of collective power the media represent. As the media are agencies of topical social interaction, they represent the social competence of a society, for which critical self-observation is one of the key skills.

This of course demands a media culture that cares about the stakes of all participating individuals, peoples and institutions, where owners, editors, journalists and the public – all by their own capacities– share the responsibility of public consciousness. All remarks concerning the notion of competence must be done in order to argue that all projects just make sense, when they refer to the communicative construction of society and the societal construction of communication. The fact that society is constructed by its (non-media- and/or media-mediated) communication makes it worth to take a look at the quality of communication. The fact that communication (non-media- and/or media-mediated) in its cultural construction is pre-conditioned by societal structures makes it worth to take a look at the (civil and political) quality of society. The theoretical decision for society conceptualisation in a sense of an event of social communication and communication as a question of its societal conditions is to be taken as a precondition for reflection of the relationship between society and media, or better said, the relationship between the quality of society and that one of its media. In that sense, the normative understanding of society, by which communication and/or media competence becomes arguable, should be kept in mind as a specification of societal and social competence and as a cultural resource of society building.

REFERENCES

Barker, C. (2000): Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice. London (Sage).

Bauer, T. A. (2000): Zukunft der Kommunikationswissenschaft. Kommunikationswissenschaft der Zukunft. Eine Anregung zur Transformation. In: Österreichische Gesellschaft für Kommunikationswissenschaft (ed.): Medien Journal – Zeitschrift für Kommunikationskultur 2/2000. Innsbruck/Wien/München: Studien-Verlag (2000): 47-58.

Bauer, T. A. (2003): Medienpädagogik als Mediationsagentur zwischen Medienökonomie und Medienkultur. In: Altmeppen, Klaus-Dieter / Karmasin, Mathias (ed.): Medien und Ökonomie. Bd. 1/1: Grundlagen der Medienökonomie: Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft, Medienwirtschaft. Wiesbaden (Westdeutscher Verlag): 115 – 138.

Bauer, T. A. (2003a): Vom Strukturblick zum Kulturblick. Entwürfe zu einem Blended Theory-Modell. In: Karmasin, Matthias / Winter, Carsten (ed.): Kulturwissenschaft als Kommunikationswissenschaft. Projekte, Probleme und Perspektiven. Wiesbaden (Westdeutscher Verlag): 127 – 167.

Bauer, T. A. (2006): Culture of Diversity. In: Bauer, Thomas A. / Ortner Gerhard E (eds.): Werte für Europa. Medienkultur und ethische Bildung in und für Europa. Düsseldorf, p. 242 – 267.

Bauer, T. A. (2006a): Media Transition in Southeast Europe. In: The Analyst. Central and Eastern European Political and Economic Review. 2/ 2006: 133 – 148). Budapest.

Becker, L. B., Vlad, T. & Nusser, N. (2007). An Evaluation of Press Freedom Indicators. The International Communication Gazette, 69 (1), 5-28.

Billig, M. (1995): Banal Nationalism. London (Sage).

Blumer, H. (1973): Der methodologische Standpunkt des Symbolischen Interaktionismus. In: Arbeitsgruppe Bielefelder Soziologen (1973): Alltagswissen, Interaktion und gesellschaftliche Wirklichkeit. Band I: Symbolischer Interaktionismus und Ethnomethodologie. Reinbeck: Rowohlt (1973): 80-101, 144-146].

Bohrmann, H./ Klaus, E. / Machill, M., eds. (2007): Media Industry, Journalism Culture and Communication Policies in Europe. Cologne (Herbert von Halem).

Bourdieu, P. (1997): Zur Genese der Begriffe Habitus und Feld. In: Bourdieu, Pierre: Der Tote packt den Lebenden. Hamburg.

Charalambis, D. (2004): Demokratia ke pagosmiopiissi. Pragmatiki aferessi ke orthos logos: I enia tu anthropou stin neoterikotita. (Democracy and globalization. Real abstraction and reason: the conception of man in modernity. Athens (second edition).

De Certeau (1988): Kunst des Handelns. Berlin.

Douglas, M. (1996): Thought Styles. London.

Foucault, M. (1988) Der Tod des Menschen im Denken des Lebens, hg. Von Marcelo Marques. Tübingen.

Gebauer, G. / Wulf, C. (1998): Spiel, Ritual, Geste. Mimetisches Handeln in der sozialen Welt. Reinbeck bei Hamburg (Rowohlt).

Giddens, A. (1990): The consequence of modernity. Stanford (Stanford University Press).

Glasersfeld, Ernst von (1965): Radikaler Konstrukltivismus: Ideen, Ergebnisse, Probleme. Frankfurt.

Hall, S. (1975): Introduction. In: Smith, A.C.H.: Paper Voices. The Popular Press and Social Change 1953 – 11965. London : (Chatto & Windus), 11 – 24.

Hall, S. (1998): Ausgewählte Schriften. Hamburg.

Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004). Comparing Media Systems – Three Models of Media and Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hepp, A. (2002): Einführung. Und: Translokale Medienkulturen. In: Hepp, Andreas / Löffelholz, Martin (eds.) (2002) (Hrsg.): Grundlagentexte zur transkulturellen Kommunikation. Konstanz (UVK), 861 – 885.

Klaus, E./Lünenborg, M. (2004): Cultural Citizenship: Ein kommunikationswissenschaftliches Konzept zur Bestimmung kultureller Teilhabe in der Mediengesellschaft. In: Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft. – Jg. 52, 2/2004, S. 193-213.

Kopper, G. G. / Mancini, P. (eds.) (2003): Kulturen des Journalismus und politische Systeme. Probleme internationaler Vergleichbarkeit des Journalismus in Europa – verbunden mit Fallstudien zu Großbritannien, Frankreich, Italien und Deutschland.

Luhmann, N.: (1968): Vertrauen. Ein Mechanismus der Reduktion sozialer Komplexität. Stuttgart.

Merkel, W./Sandschneider, E./Segert, D., eds. (1996): Systemwechsel 2 : Die Institutionalisierung der Demokratie. Opladen.

North, D. C. (2000): Institutionen, institutioneller Wandel und Wirtschaftsleistung. Tübingen.

Offe, C. (1994): das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. In: Offe, Claus (1994): Der Tunnel am Ende des Lichts. Erkundungen der politischen Transformation im Neuen Osten. Frankfurt.

Quandt, T. (2000): Das Ende des Journalismus. Online-Kommunikation als herausforderung für die Journalismusforschung. In: Löffelholz, Martin (ed): Theorien des Journalismus. Ein diskursives Handbuch. Wiesbaden (Westdeutscher Verlag), 483 - 509.

Renger, Rudi (1999): Populärer Journalismus. Bedeutungsproduktion und –rezeption zwischen Information und Unterhaltung. Salzburg.

Schlindwein, S. (2007): Zwischen Propaganda und Kommerz. Medien(un)freiheit in Südost-, Mittelost- und Osteuropa. Ed. By: n-ost, Netzwerk für Osteuropa. Berlin.

Schmidt, S. J. (2003): Geschichten & Diskurse. Abschied vom Konstruktivismus. Reinbeck bei Hamburg (Rowohlt).

Schmidt, S. J. (2004): Unternehmenskultur. Die Grundlage für den wirtschaftlichen Erfolg von Unternehmen. Weilerswist (Velbrück Wissenschaft).

Thomaß, B. / Tzankoff, M. (2001): Medien und Transformation in Osteuropa. Wiesbaden.

Thomaß, B. / Tzankoff, M. (2003): Medienentwicklung und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Osteuropa. In: Behner, Markus / Krotz, Firedrich / Stöber, Rudolf, Winter, Carsten, eds.: Medienentwicklung und gesellschaftlicher Wandel. Wiesbaden.

Törnquist-Plkewa (1998): Cultural and National Identitification in Borderlands. In: Karlsson, Klas-Göran / Peterssen, Bo / Törnquist-Plewa, eds.: Collective Identitites in an Era of Transformation. Analysing Developments in East- and Central Europe and the former Soviet Union. Lund (University Press), 78 – 107.

Vernon, M. D. (1977): Wahrnehmung und Erfahrung. München.

Wunden, W. (Hg.): Freiheit und Medien. Münster. LIT Verlag 2005.