

## ЕЛЕКТРОННІ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ: ІСТОРІЯ І ПРАКТИКА

### BALANCE OF THOUGHTS AND INDIFFERENCE IN THE CONTEXT OF INFORMATION WARFARE

**Volodymyr Antonov**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
Generala Chuprynka Str., 49, 79044, Lviv, Ukraine,  
e-mail: antonovolodymyr@gmail.com*

The article is about the influence of postmodern tradition of being indifferent on journalism and on the understanding of the core of journalism. It is a kind of “thinking out loud” about such oxymoron phrase as “indifferent journalist”.

Everything is relative, everybody is subjective, deputies are the same, women are the same and men, all men are bastards. It seems that these thoughts are so fashionable nowadays. We doubt, we don't trust, we don't believe even in our existence. As a result, we prefer to live according to the rules that claim that there is no big difference between good and evil. Well, after all, it so modern (or better to say, postmodern) to think that you can't be sure that good is really good and evil is really bad.

These thoughts are perfect basement for indifference which is going to become ground floor for that building which architects wish to see (notice please, that I am talking not about the Architect or the Creator, I mean simple people who are placed by us on the positions of architects). The whole postmodern mentality is full of slogans that call for indifference, slogans which proclaim relativity of values. All these slogans are chaos based and against the idea of system as a base of human life. Well, I mentioned term “postmodernism” so many times, but I want to emphasize that I blame postmodern mentality, postmodern lifestyle, not postmodern culture, which has already given us so many pieces of art – in literature, in cinematography, in fine arts, etc.

So, it's time for definition, my subjective (oh, it is so postmodern, but still...), my subjective definition. *Postmodern lifestyle* is, perhaps, artificial, or, perhaps, natural feeling of disappointment in everything. And that disappointment becomes a ground for indifference. We, as a society, become indifferent to outer world, to inner world, to those people who guide us. And the very last phrase of previous sentence, actually is mentioned to bring us to the idea of thinking over the fact of postmodernism – natural period of disappointment or artificial one. Well, sorry, but still it is not so important, because it is more important to see

that postmodernism is just soap bubble with a huge doze of contradictions: “postmodernism preach the absence of cult but make this preaching the cult itself. Postmodernism proclaims desacralization and simultaneously makes this desacralization sacral” [1].

The wave of indifference is in journalism also, but I guess that it even sounds as an oxymoron, because journalism is opposite to the indifference, the core of journalism is ability to be not indifferent as much as possible. But after all we have this bad tendency in media. And the tendency definitely influenced the interpretation of the standards of journalism. Yes, of course, we all know these standards:

- Balance of thoughts
- Efficiency
- Separation of facts and commentaries
- Accuracy of facts
- Completeness of factogue

But do we really understand them? “Maybe, yes, maybe, no”.

And I think that a lot of representatives of media sphere have problems in interpretation of the very first standard of journalism which I am going to dwell upon. So, Balance of thoughts. Usually, Ukrainian journalists mixed up word “balance” and “equal representation”. They invite to their studios people from opposite camps and give them equal right, equal time for expressing their points of view, their outlook. Well, says, those journalists, we are following the rules – balance of thoughts, you know. But what is actually balance? Let’s start from the opposite term. *Disbalance* is a notion of disequilibrium that is a threat to the existence of the system which is actually based on the equilibrium of its components. If we have on air messages which threaten to the system of ideas of our society, to its equilibrium, these messages has nothing in common with balance. So, logically, some thoughts are just simply should be excluded from the media space. And we can’t justify ourselves with the help of “universal” balance of thoughts, because I am going to repeat, I am going to emphasize – some thoughts which are basically a threat to the system of Ukrainian society has nothing in common with the term “balance”. Nobody is surprised that we don’t have murderers and rapists who have the same airtime as their victims have. Nobody is surprised that these murderers and rapists have no airtime for discussing their motivation for committing crime, after all, the details of its committing. It is not normal. So why should it be normal to dedicate airtime to rapists of Ukrainian idea. The last one is actually the essence of the balance of Ukrainian society. And the main reason why many journalists misinterpret the idea of balance is indifference. Even better to say, wish of indifference. It is easier to be indifferent and put the whole journalistic responsibility on the phrase “balance of thoughts”. It is easier to calm yourself down with so “benign” words as detachment and impassivity. As a result postmodern addiction to indifference creates a situation when threatening messages are hung in the air as a sword of Damocles. What makes the situation even worse is that Ukrainian living-in-war society-system now much more vulnerable than it was before. And now, in such critical moment, I can’t not quote Vasyl Lyzanchuk who is actually my inspiration for writing this “thinking out loud” about the difference between balance and equal representation of thoughts. Lviv National

University professor says that “during the war it is too problematically to talk about balance of thoughts... We need to talk about informational hygiene in this situation, not about balance of thought or freedom of speech [2].

Except of pure journalistic sphere other adjacent spheres need purification. Especially, entertaining sector. “Devjanosto pjaty kvartal” until recently was jokes monopolist. This production created dozens of projects which, to be honest, had nothing in common with Ukrainian system of beliefs, Ukrainian outlook. “Kraina “U”. Kazky (Fairytale)” project is especially exasperating for me. This show changes historical facts and ruins that balance, which we were talking about earlier. Russian folklore, Russian language, medieval Moskovian scenery – everything is very similar to the plan of changing Ukrainian past to change our future. Where is our officials who try to ban everything, but not always that what we really need to ban. Because do we really need to exclude “The Irony of Destiny” and “Leviathan” from the airtime and cinemas respectively?... The first movie is an example of courage in Soviet Union times. Ryazanov created sarcastic image of theater of absurd which the Union has always been. A cartoon in the beginning of the movie helps us to understand that the genre of the film is definitely not a social realism but sarcastic social drama. And “Leviathan” is a world known masterpiece which shows wild Russian realities, that grey antihumanistic jungles. Zviagintsev’s creation was nominated on Oscars and won Golden globe with palm branch of Cannes. It is a world-acclaimed picture. This movie actually stands against political system of Federation. Such movies are great weapons against the country that started war against us. But what our officials do? Substitute these movies with that kokoshnikland<sup>1</sup> (Kraina “U”). And the reason why, for example, “Leviathan” is banned, is that the movie was released after Ukraine was military attacked by Russian troops. Such intellectual fail, or maybe, indifference is really disappointing.

Again we started talking about indifference and again I just can’t disagree with professor Lyzanchuk, who also see the reason of short-sightedness of Ukrainian media workers in postmodern fashion of thinking superficially that derivates from human subjectivity. According to him, “during the war we are imposed with postmodern paradigm, where an attempt to distinguish good and evil is interpreted as something primitive” [3]. And according to other authoritative journalist Myroslava Barchuk, “the real evil is when people do not differentiate between evil and good and do not admit this polarity...” [4].

And after all I strongly believe that journalists are vocated to be those who should look for and find that difference between good and evil and not look for that tragicomic middle between plus and minus. And only those who after finding difference between good and evil can’t ignore his or her wish to fight on the light side, only those should become journalist, others should avoid this path. You mustn’t look for balance between light and darkness, if you are journalist, you should help light to become an absolute winner. This is how it works.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kokoshnikland is a neologism derived from the word “kokoshnik”, which is traditional Russian headdress.

## Resources

1. Круглий стіл: ситуація постмодернізму в Україні [Електронний ресурс] // Кіно-Театр. – 2001. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://www.ktm.ukma.edu.ua/2001/6/postmodern.html>.
2. Лизанчук В. В. Російська агресія і стандарти журналістської професії [Електронний ресурс] / Василь Васильович Лизанчук // Львівська газета. – 2001. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://gazeta.lviv.ua/arhiv/life/2015/04/28/42400.html>.
3. Лизанчук В. В. Інформбезпека: баланс між чорним і білим - сірість [Електронний ресурс] / Василь Васильович Лизанчук // Укрінформ. – 2017. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/gubric-society/2150199-informbezpeka-balans-miz-bilim-i-cornim-ce-sirist.html>.
4. Сандакова Н. Про чотири медіазагрози [Електронний ресурс] / Наталія Сандакова // “День”. – 2017. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/media/pro-chotyry-mediiazagrozy>.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 26.10.2017

Прийнята до друку 30.10.2017

## БАЛАНС ДУМОК ТА БАЙДУЖІСТЬ В УМОВАХ ІНФОРМАЦІЙНОЇ ВІЙНИ

**Володимир Антонов**

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,  
вул. Генерала Чупринки, 49, 79044, м. Львів, Україна,  
e-mail: antonovolodymyr@gmail.com*

Наше суспільство зіткнулося з війною і зараз постала гостра потреба шукати правильні моделі поведінки. І в умовах, коли постає питання, що ж робити, постмодерна ментальність нашого суспільства, де пропагується байдужість та зневіра, часом, змушує журналістів придумувати такі “стандарти” медіасправи, які дискредитують медіасправу, як таку. Люди забувають, для чого взагалі потрібна журналістика. “Стандарт” “баланс думок” сприймається деякими сучасними медійниками, як спосіб побути своєрідною підставкою для мікрофону, що не несе відповідальності за забруднення інформаційного простору, проте, я вважаю, що, особливо в умовах війни, журналісти повинні, власне, бути тими, хто дбатиме про гігієну медіапростору, а не тими, хто через прищеплену постмодерною традицією байдужість уникає цих своїх обов’язків. Бо ж байдужий журналіст звучить якось занадто оксиморонно. Власне, мої роздуми стосуються того, що саме відрізняти добро від зла, темряву від світла, плюс від мінуса і, не роздумуючи ні хвили більше, ставати на сторону світла – такий справжній обов’язок журналіста.

*Ключові слова:* постмодернізм та журналістика, стандарти журналістської праці, стандарти журналістської справи в умовах війни, гігієна інформаційного простору, обов’язки журналіста.