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ABSTRACT

The study starts from the observation that in everyday life persuasion is inevitable. Under this premise is investigating the negative effects of persuasion through seduction and deceit. To eradicate diseases induced by persuasion would be needed a medicine of communication. As is inevitable, persuasion should be accepted: people have to get used to live with persuasion. As such, it must be taken into account if not eradicate, at least mitigate the negative effects of persuasion. The best tool for such an approach would be “hygiene of communication” in which to assess rationally persuasive elements of communication.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Persuasion exercises a double pressure on the opinion: of arousing the excess and the supply of reasons for change. In both cases, the grounds for subjecting to pressure are persuasive and specific tools are used: seduction, lie and myth. Persuasion releases the natural opinion and contradictorily pushes it to public expression. It provides protection to this expression, creating logical and social-psychic conditions of implantation by influencing a so-called collective opinion: an attractive and confident one (Boengiu, 2002; Borowski, 2013). The persuasive approach is assumed in different ways. Persuasion wins and agglutinates individuals by myth, by the call to the powers of the unconsciousness, through terror and threat. Persuasion changes the social structure with the purpose to remove the obstacles which locks its expansion and vitiates its effect. It is also acted through rational explanations and exposure of deeds, without coming out of the myth and lie, meaning of the fiction. It may be said that fiction operates in all forms of persuasion, alone or supported, aided, pressed by seduction. Fiction, myth, lie are impregnated by seduction, the yield of negative journalism would be just as higher. The extraordinary possibilities of persuasion make a terrible threat float over the world. Persuasion is the most feared informational aggression. In this way, true psychological epidemics can knowingly be caused (Vlăduţescu, 2004; Borowski, 2014; Powell, 2014). Through engineering of subjects, negative journalism produces individuals with automatically controlled opinions, attitudes and behaviours.

Psychology, sociology and communicology add a mass communication strategy to the seductions and lies, fictions and myths, rhetoric subtleties and demagogic artifices through negative journalism. Persuasion represents an extension of the operations of irrational-affective communication on an invisible dimension of masses. Not being done specifically
for persuasive effects on the masses, persuasion is however done for the masses. It is specifically and increasingly more consolidated in order to attract and reach the masses. Persuasion articulates an equally important process on this process of persuasive flattery: of contempt and defiance of the masses. Flattering the masses (just like adulation) derives from seduction. The process of disregarding the masses occurs in two undertakings: ignoring the masses as assembly of beings and minimising the spontaneity of their participation as people.

Ignored, the public is used as entertainment being. Flatter and contempt are behind the rhetoric of persuasion. With their help, negative journalism distorts or triggers social forces. The persuasive ideas transferred through influence, intoxication, propaganda, manipulation, disinformation and rumour, as well as through other forms of persuasion become forces, and by means of masses – social forces.

2. GENUINE COMMUNICATION AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION

As it is known, the topic dealt with in an editorial provides the same thought to the mass on the same day. The persuader possesses the thought of a mass. If the negatively modulates this thought, persuasive communication shall think at a mass level. In order to become negative, journalism does not require effort. Its great efforts are to be positive. Everything else is considered to be negative (Shopovski, 2012; De La Rosa & Shopovski, 2013). It can be negative due to any failure of the positive, due to any error. From this perspective, negative journalism appears as “unavoidable”. However, if a persuasion is also implanted voluntarily as main exhibit in negativity, then negative journalism becomes fundamentally negative. To be in one way or another, at the level of the huge power which it has available anyway, journalism has all necessary means and all possibilities open. It has technical means and a wide audience of the undecided, hesitant and disoriented. For this audience, negative journalism brings rescuing information in the most innocent and delicate way of the disaster. A perverse salvation is persuasively provided to that who is lost in their own uncertainties. The effect of negative journalism is guaranteed. It results from here that persuasive communication is the shortest path to the effect. Instead, the short part of rational communication is difficult, it forces into a huge effort of permeability, it is the royal path.

In reality, rational communication has its title of royal path exactly due to the very existence of negative journalism. In the absence of negative journalism, positive journalism would be at the reach of the undifferentiated. Both types of communication are moving towards a potential of expanding influence. The masses have an increasingly broader intellectual perimeter of absorption towards influence. Communication responds to the availability of influence which the audience shows. It seems it responds particularly through persuasion, meaning negatively, and not through conviction, meaning positively. The journalistic influence is not communicational, the influence is directly and shockingly real. Communication has a power that cannot be neutralised or anesthetised. If communication would also be immune to the persuasion it fights, then it could be the first power.

Because it is normal, communication misses the chance to be the supreme arbiter. The favourable circumstance is incomplete and because persuasion itself has a negative side. This side, which is impossible to eradicate because it is part of the impelling mechanism, should be managed scrupulously. Its well awareness belongs to this management project (Arsith, 2014).

Persuasive communication presents a scenario dedicated to the frame of prefabricated intellects. Once it is born, the child opens itself a new rainbow to the unconscious, if the child
is conditioned by diffusers reaching its unconscious, if afterwards a path is delimited for the child within its family, at school and in the society, a path where for an infallible direction they shall be channelled on the line of a programmed destiny: this is a prefabricated intellect. Used to the spices of seduction, lie and myth, in its innocent predestination, journalism does not hesitate to disguise into the opposite, meaning perfidy, flattery and despise. From the ideal of correct information, persuasion chooses flattery and aversion. Once accustomed to flattery, adulation, despise and aversion, communication is utterly and completely persuasive. The consciousness of perversion is covered with the idea of self-defence, of provoked response, of induced obligation. Nobody provokes, defies, forces the communicator to be persuasive if the latter’s responsible consciousness does not allow them to be as such. The consumer of journalism must protect itself against persuasion. Therefore, the consumer would be interested to force the journalism to be positive and rational. One is however not fully decided in this respect: one’s decision is even the product of negative journalism.

There is a solution for the fictive-fabling component of the mechanism generating persuasion in all its forms. There is the Domenach solution against negative journalism of fabling orientation: “Against the invasion of the lie and myth, we need to raise and strengthen the power to refuse, which there is not morality or intelligence without” (Domenach J. M., 2004, p. 148). Fabling must be suspended, otherwise the generating mechanism seizes up. The consumer must fortify in order to withstand the devastating call of the myth invoked by negative journalism. In order to save themselves, the consumer is forced to begin an unjust crusade against the myth that is provided to them as seducing refuge, as accessible grandeur, as an available comfort.

Persuasion can be counteracted. Dissuading may be by capitalising the central right in freedom: the right to refuse. There is genuine communication only where the audience is correctly informed, where it is invited, called to know and participate. Authentic communication pretends a wide diffusion of knowledge; it is not a matter just about instructions of intellectual training, but basically of knowing the issues (Neaca & Neaca, 2011).

In reality, communicators keep the audience far from the real issues, considering that the terms according to which the issues must be raised and solved are the same. It is an error which it interestingly propagates: the terms according to which the problems are raised do not coincide with the terms according to which they are solved.

We are dealing with a main irony: persuasive communication leads to perfection the art of preventing people to stick their noses into affairs which do not concern them. By the persuasive tools, it is possible to bring the audience into the situation of being disinterested of its real problems and of getting socially involved into the issues created within communication. It is a secret which mass communication enterprises hide under the setting agenda. The mass-media makes the agenda, the mass-media produces the agenda. The mass-media reality tends to be a prefabricated one, and in the case of negative journalism, it fully succeeds. Only if hardly does the communication opens a debate on this topic from time to time, but however never definitively and resolutely a substantial debate. Strange this type which is not willing to explain the credits in seduction and fabulation!

Its hygiene of communication pretends that all is well (Kot & Ślusarczyk, 2013; Kot & Ślusarczyk, 2014). Only thus can the power flaunt. Persuasion can only be combated by a journalism that is well consolidated in democracy, one which could also afford among other things: public documentation offices, official press releases to update the public opinion on economic, social, demographic issues, development of the anti-negativism legislation,
extension of the right to respond so that the lie issued to block with sets of replies those pages which caused it, etc.

Audience’s salvation lies in participation. Correctitude and honesty can exercise their legitimacy only as such. The non-genuine needs lie beyond the legitimate participation, needs which negative journalism engage in intoxication, disinformation, influence, rumour, propaganda, diversion or manipulation, by fabling and seducing.

The legitimate participation generates dialogues, and the persuasivity is suffocated in dialogue. The communicational consciousness may thusly be balanced. The legitimate participation in dialogues shall have a sacred aspect by instauration. People shall move inside it, remaining at the fingertips of a shared piety. A certain respect shall be installed, a fervour which shall be given by recognising the legitimacy of the other’s opinion. This is not a myth such as those which proved their harmfulness by inducing the fanaticism. It is not a myth brought to delirium, it is not a myth of persuasive fabling shaping. It is a state of things to attenuate the power of negative journalism. This profane man must enjoy something sacred: the legitimacy of participation. This joy is amplified and also vitiates negative journalism. By capitalising the social inertia of phenomena, persuasion develops as if it were a specifically cultivated plant, and not an obstruction plant. Newsom and B. Carrell conclude that people in the society nowadays “support most of their decisions and behaviour on emotions, not on logic” (Newsom D., Carrell B., 2004, p. 60). Whether it is a matter of purchasing a certain car or of supporting a certain political candidate, it seems that most people take decisions based on impressions rather than on intelligence (Deaver F., 2004, p. 149). There is evidence likely to make us believe that impressions are created and influenced by means of the mass-media messages, the source of most of them being the publicity or public relations. Persuasion is the short way, the minimum effort, the emotional way.

A critical sense (a common sense) remains from the nostalgia of evidence, a sense that may censor the opinion. This critical sense is attenuated by the morals of respecting others’ opinions. Instead, it represents a guarantee of validity, based on the idea that it raises a sovereign contempt against fanaticism. On the path of contempt, the critical sense is shaped as obstacle in the way of negative journalism. Critical sense is an obstacle, but not a limit (Vlăduţescu, 2008; Zamfir & Vlăduţescu, 2003).

Another support of persuasive communication is also another positive element: that who is truly convinced of something shall seek to make others also believe in that something. Trusting something is a solid argument to consider that another should also believe in that something. Not truly believing in something leads to not promoting that something. The two pillars of negative journalism ensure it permanently and it shows that unless we have the necessary faith we are incapable of leading to the propagation of value. The human dedicated to an idea believes in a faith which life does not continue without! “To be true, said A. Camus, means to continue”. Those who do not believe in their ideas, in their vocation, they do not believe in their own future. We conclude that persuasion is a natural manifestation of the society. It is a major wrong what persuasive communication does, but it is a developing wrong, a necessary wrong (Secelceanu, 2008). We can combat this wrong, but we should not make it our impossible ideal to eradicate it.

The wrong that is produced cannot be denied (Efrim, 2011; Vârzaru & Jolivet, 2011). But us, who blast persuasion, can we imagine it is sufficient in our world that truth would just appear and shall immediately be recognised?

The truth is difficult to recognise. If it is difficult to recognise, then it shall be firstly recognised by some. We know it is not enough for the truth to survive if it remains in the heart of a few initiates. When those few initiates would perish, the truth would disappear. In
order to survive, truth must be propagated. Persuasion does not have a separate truth. It propagates a truth of appearance. The death of persuasion would configure the method according to which the truth would die by non-propagation (Roșca, 2012). Persuasion must therefore be controlled, but not dissolved. In order to control it, it is necessary we thoroughly study it. It is useless to consider we could secure the propagation of values through purism now when the issue is in terms of mass. It would be just as useless to say that we could extirpate persuasion by a concerted mysticism of overall public honesty.

3. CONCLUSION

Rational communication and persuasive communication are mixed. When the values appear in various forms, them purify equals to unbalancing the mechanism of managing and propagating the values. It is known that although it is not exactly desired so, the truth may also be promoted through lie, the good is also spread through the wrong, justice also exudes from injustice. It can be said that, without this being the ideal and preferred, a rational communication is achieved through persuasive communication. It is better to repetitively note this before not observing the difference anymore.
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