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Abstract
(a) Purpose. Triggered around year 2005, the current economic and financial crisis has gained a global character. The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of the crisis upon journalistic communication of financial and economic profile.

b) The collection of basic information. As the main premise, it has been noted that in a natural way, there is a "negative journalism", a journalism based on persuasion. In addition, it has been noted as a second premise, the existence of the financial and economic crisis. Under the scale of the two premises, the sampling of the information was carried out by consulting the Romanian financial and economic press.

c) Findings. The result was that the number of the articles dedicated to crisis and its effects, has increased gradually. The more the crisis has intensified, the more the emotional component of the articles has stressed. The emotional inhibited the rational, so that persuasion has been amplified. At the same time, the partizan and dishonest character has expanded. The correlation observed was that while the crisis has escalated, the economical and financial journalism has grown more and more emotional and negative.

d) Practical implication. The press made a big-crisis out of the real crisis. The economic and financial crisis of the moment must be read in a dissuaded way.

Key words: economic crisis, basic information, article, model, influence

JEL Classification: G01

1. Introduction
In the preface to the book „Documenting in journalism” (2011), the teacher Ilie Rad, consistent with its position of campaigner for an ethics of journalism, gives tongue for a total journalistic honesty. At the same time, he provides the example of German journalistic model: „It would be good for the media in Romania to take over the German model, practiced by the Der Spiegel magazine: ‘To give up information, rather than risking a false reporting’ (Rad Ilie, 2011, pp. 5-8). Economic journalism, as an institution, assumes the obligation to manage and administrate the journalistic speech on economic themes. One of the tasks of this type of management is the coordination as a whole of the different influences which media interventions trigger. An economic journalistic operator, for example, doesn’t represent a single and simple influence. In the pages and on the course of his articles, starting with the editorial title and ending with the eventual publicity section, varied influences are proposed, advanced and exerted. Any influence is the resultant of a location. Mediatic economic operators are part of the social and economic levels. They subsist in the public social space, and their speech is impregnated by the social. As John E. Richardson says: „Journalistic discourses are always socially situated” (Richardson J. E., 2008, p. 153). Social situation determines the impregnation into the
social. Within social, an extended phenomenon is put under persuasion and persuasive influence. A journalistic operator constitutes, finally, a coordination of influences. The unitary effect of the influences gives the orientation or the direction of the media operator. When the influences of the main functions of media come out, then, the path to a negative journalism is validated, the road of the persuasion has already been opened.

2. The characteristics of current economic journalistic communication and propensity towards negative journalism

Economic and journalistic communication and journalistic discourse have economic indices and idiomatic, pensive indicators which give them a recognizable profile. As a speech of power, the first of the characteristics of journalistic communication is autonomy. Authentic journalism is independent, its speech transforms the independence in autothelism and autonomy. The economic journalism has, in its authenticity, no over systematized connection. In its authenticity, this journalism is not ordered by anyone: it is self-contained and autothelic. His speech is managed alone and, furthermore, it sets the production principles by itself. The autothelism and the autonomy constitute the principles of economic journalism, of economic journalistic communication. The journalistic culture need to anchor in reality through autonomy and autothelism. Of these main defining features it derives the specific of impartiality. The acts and facts which have become significant and catalogued as economic events, are placed in the speech with fairness and objectivity, with honesty and equity. Impartiality is the objectivity achieved with fairness. The objective is what it is and it does not want to be something else. Discursive subject constitutes the territory of what lies in the hands of relativity, interested on the sense of preferentiality. As a location, the subject stands in the lability area of faith and influences. The thinking spirit accepts subjectivity as his right of being at the disposal of its own variability. The area of subjectivity is delimited as a geometrical place, free from obligations towards the strictly rationalism. In relation to this idea of subjectivity, the objectivity is looming as the subjective exteriority. The destiny of the subjective is versatility. His status is the inconsistency. The subjectivity is the path of the insertion of influences. On the other hand, economic journalism is interpretive. Journalistic interpretation, in order to remain objective, must lie on the range of application of rationality. Being rational and intelligible, the interpretation brings the lability and versatility on the field of what it is objective. In the second place, the objectivity of interpretation arises from the subjectivity, willing to realize itself in what concerns self-accomplishing intention. In this way an interpretational impartialism occurs. We can see in objectivity an open effort of journalistic subjectivity to overcome the interests, sympathies and resentment i.e. direct emotions, and to reduce to the minimum the fatal partiality in relation to the acts and facts put into the speech. In the process of removing the inexorable partiality, the economic journalism is kept away from partisanship. It must be postulated that journalistic objectivity strives through honesty and fairness, to avoid partiality. It can acquire impartiality just surpassing without remorse partisanship. Beyond these, predisposition to objectivity appears. The journalist must only improve with honesty, the predisposition to objectivity: impartiality will only be through it and so captured. Double impartiality is required: towards the event and towards the public. Resisting to the public is the hardest. The journalist emerges from the public and assumes the obligation and the effort to become objective. For this he must resist the needs which would push him to produce a speech through which he can contribute to their satisfaction. He must face some interests that might be his own interests. He mustn’t give up priorities and beliefs free from balance.
3. Negative journalism, dangerous and disapproved mix, between „bad”, „yellow” and „persuasive journalism”

The main content of journalistic objectivity is represented by honesty. This is, at the same time, the core of journalistic ethics. On the other hand, honesty means telling the truth. The German model evoked by the professor Ilie Rad has the truth in the center. The teacher Dona Tudor (Tudor D., 2012) and Gabriela Rusu-Pășărin (Rusu-Pășărin G., 2010) also agree with the “professional conduct”. It is revealed, in this order of ideas that in accordance with the code of „The International Federation of Journalists”, respect for truth and for the right of public to truth is the first duty of the journalist (Apud Harcup T., 2007, p. 2). Therefore, beyond professionalism, even as a component of professionalism, the journalism needs to cultivate and to protect honesty, truth and ethics in general. This is also because in its turn, ethics is a dimension of social legitimation. As Ian Richards shows, “the ethical dimension is of fundamental importance to the moral legitimacy of journalism” (Richards I., 2004, p. xiii). If he wants to remain strong and credible social institution, it must keep the profile as cultural discourse, the journalism must resist, in addition to the state, the audience and competition. Honest objectivity leaves to the journalists a restricted area of options. The great enemy of impartiality is, in this order of ideas the leadership, the heads, the management, corporations, the owners of capital, the circles of interest, parties etc. In what concerns journalistic impartiality, it can be kept just by securing the objectivity of the collection, drafting and distribution of the information.

Whenever the autonomy and impartiality (honesty) are violated, journalism becomes negative. One might say that without autonomy, autothelism and honesty it becomes unethical journalism. Given that journalism is an activity with social impact and the journalistic speech a manifestation directly of the fourth power, no one can speak of an unethical journalism. In his book, “The Ethical Journalist” (2007), Tony Harcup shows: “An ethical journalist is one who cares: cares about accuracy, cares about people, cares about journalism, cares enough to speak out, and cares enough to challenge preconceptions and prejudices” (Harcup T., 2007, p. 144). As a person who contributes to canonic and general discourse of journalism, a journalist shouldn’t be, but exceptional is that it can be an „unethical journalist”. For a person it can be accepted, as an exception, the lack of ethics, but for a power such as journalism the lack of ethics is unacceptable. That’s why, we consider that the “unethical journalism” is, in fact, a negative journalism. “Unethical journalism” must be combated as negative, for he can mark the world destiny in a negative way. Lorrie Lynch understands the possible “unethical acts” of some journalists, but rejects such acts when it comes to media operators; she illustrates such the situation in the following way: “Rupert Murdoch is well known for his unethical and ruthless business practice, and his empire faces sanctions in Britain” (Lynch L., 2012, p. 290).

Negative journalism is, on the one hand, “a bad journalism”, “a yellow journalism”, and on the other „persuasive journalism”: „Bad journalism, according to Matthew Kieran, is truth-indifferent and fails to respect truth-promoting practices” (Kieran M., 1998, p. 35). „Yellow journalism” is the abstract concept detached from the way in which, actually, The New York City press, particularly, represented by J. Pulitzer and W. R. Hearst, in the 1890’s meant to reflect reality. As Joseph Turow points out, the term is used for a newspaper characterized by irresponsible, unethical, and sensational news gathering and exhibition” (Turow J., 2009, p. 307). It is understood through the definition of J. Turow that beyond and over the ”unethical journalism”, there is another one which is first “irresponsible”,and, thirdly, sensationnel”. We add to these three features, the characteristic
of persuasion. The journalism characterized by “persuasive”, “unethical” (“truth-indifferent”), “sensational” and “irresponsible” attributes, constitute negative journalism. It is a dangerous and rejected mix between “bad”, “yellow” and “persuasive journalism”.

4. The discourse of negative journalism

The rational and emotional argumentation are elements of a cultural-influential institution with a profile that must be verbally watermarked. The forum of the negative journalism, individualises through a specific gearing of the thinking and idiomatic machine, in applying on the social framework of some objectives which give identity to the discourse. If it didn’t have a separated and important figure of thinking, in what concerns the social discourse of influence, negative journalism wouldn’t deserve any attention. It must be thought and explored not to be taught, but to be rejected.

When normal journalism can’t avoid the partisanship and cannot pass near persuasion, it becomes inevitable and automatically, negative journalism. Generally, journalism destiny cannot exclude persuasion, as a form of influence on an emotional way. Negative journalism is preponderant, a “persuasive journalism”, and “the most persuasive journalism engages and stimulates the raw feelings of the reader” (O’Shaughnessy J., O’Shaughnessy N.J., p. 37).

The culture of the money and the media industrialization command upon the structure of objectives of the negative journalism in economic communication. As such, financial interests are privileged. In the hierarchy of the values which move the discourse, the money come first, financial efficiency of influence. On the culture of negative journalism raises a civilization who believes in the particular register of mass-media expression. This register doesn’t ask the addressee for a bigger effort than positive journalism, because the first of its concerns is to hide under the positive, thinking, idiomatic machine. The deliberate insidiousness believes in the language of the positive journalism. Thereby, it attracts unrejectable values and it stimulates influential answers called up by the positive journalism in a natural way. An unlimited disguise fascinates in the discourse of the negative journalism. The productions of negative journalism come to us through a positive journalism surrounded by language and reflection which hide negative interests. These interests come to us as lies, seduction, fiction and mith, having economic and financial content. The comprehension of the negative discourse can occur only after identifying concrete elements of the persuasion: lie, seduction, fiction, mith. In the end, all of them make room for the constitution of the negative message. It is not the persuasion which dictates the message, its role is only to decide the discursive modality of its progression. Negativity thus, cannot be disabled, only put under control.

5. Journalistic interpretation and journalistic message

Within journalism, the disclosure of a financial and economic event will always be succeeded by an interpretation. Everytime succeeded means permanently anticipated. In other words, the signaling of an event will be forworded and followed by interpretation. This turns out to be an interpretation which may loose the real significations of the event. Signalling and interpreting are completely different things. They are not due to the fact that the interpretation of the events is always variable, but because it is not based on a strict argumentation. The argumentation, articulated in the news, a natural argumentation, based on false rationalism, sophistry, treacherous arguments. The people who take decisions have a major role in installing positive or negative journalism. Nevertheless, the journalists, through their honesty and austerity have the last word. They are the ones who create the journalistic discourse: select the subjects, turn them into speech, present, assume
and expose them. Paradoxically, the journalist is still under the power of the public. He writes under the requirements of the public. In other words, the public is the one who “writes his own articles” through the medium of the journalist. The journalists have an ethical conscience and they formed in the rigour of honesty. Honesty is for them, the second nature. When the journalists and the journalism forget their vocation, then the journalistic message turns out to be “an instrument for dominating the spirits, a factory of the distortionate world, under the excuse of narrating it” (Voyenne B., 1975, p. 283). Whereas the global economic crisis determines the behaviour of all the economic participants, all the economic operators are involved in the flux of influences. On the negative component, they partially or totally back off to autonomy, impartiality and honesty and become instruments of dishonest interests which are assumed or only promoted. The more the crisis accentuates, the more the economic interests amplify, which leads to a more extended incidence of the negative journalism. Economic mediatic operators are components of the economic system. The main object of their discourse is represented by the economic itself. Economic journalists are, among journalists, the most versant of the economic phenomenon.

6. Conclusions

Journalistic communication, as it functions today, dispose of two methods of edification of the informative discourse: the method of the rational persuasion, and the method of the emotional persuasion. The appliance of one of the methods or the mixing of the two represents the journalists’ option. As a distinct figure in what concerns the journalism’s ontology, it has been delimited in the last 40 years, the negative journalism, a journalism of persuasion and dishonest interests. The press in general is sensitive to the major influences. The financial and economic crisis has effects in the financial and economic journalism: the raise of the pressure of the economic information upon the mediatic operators and the raise of the pressure of the paymasters upon financial strategies of the operators. Under these circumstances, one of the operators’ reactions is represented by the development of a persuasive and accentuated behaviour in what concerns the adopting of some shadows of dishonesty. In other words the escalation of the financial and economic crisis leaded to the amplification of the negative journalism because of whom the real crisis appeared as “megacrisis”. Nevertheless the financial and economic press, when writing about crisis, must be read so that the readers may be able to change their own decisions whenever they want to.
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