There is a need for ethical guidance in the communications professions sharpened by the advancement of knowledge and technological capability. For communication to be all-encompassing in space as well as instantaneous in time is a mixed blessing reaffirming the need for balance between "secrecy" in arriving at decisions and the public's need and right to know about judgments which affect them. We need to be reminded that judgment is a reversible act, taking human time, while transmitting that judgment with modern technology is an irreversible act, taking essentially no machine time. Under the excuse of the public's right to know, the very act of communicating (if the communications are premature) may be substituting for human judgment, by being irreversible. "Privacy" or the confidentiality of professional information can move from a claim of individual accountability to one which affects others. This fuzziness where private individual confidences impinge on the public weal can be extended to such matters as copyright privilege of authors. Ethics and the communication arts are inseparable. The problem of individual need versus common good is always with the communications professions, and the only universal ethic that history shows is applicable to all situations is moderation. (HOD)
Chairman Fitton, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is an honor to be asked to give the keynote address to the 1973 Institute on Technical Communication. Being a relative newcomer to keynote addresses, and having 2 months ago only a vague notion of the topics before this assembly, I was sorely tempted to prepare an address with a background of contributions to communications from physical sciences where I would feel comfortable.

However, having studied your program and having been impressed by the large number of very knowledgeable people moderating esoteric topics, I have changed the thrust of my remarks into an area about which I am less trained, thereby falling under the universal inclination of keynote speakers towards public self-immolation.

I wish to subtitle this talk and group my thoughts around two areas which are naturally of concern to this society for technical communication. They are the ideas of secrecy and privacy.

While I will not try to explore all of the images which might spring to your minds from these two code words, I will attempt at least to brush against such concerns as executive privilege and classified information, falling within what I will call the general area of secrecy. And matters such as copyright, confidentiality of sources, invasion of privacy and pornography, falling under the general rubric that I am calling privacy.
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SO, RATHER THAN ATTEMPT TO CARRY COALS TO NEWCASTLE AND DISCUSS HOW LASER BEAMS MAY BE USED FOR MULTI-CHANNEL COMMUNICATIONS, I WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS INSTEAD WHAT I CHOOSE TO CALL THE ETHICS INVOLVED IN COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION.

SECRECY

I AM AWARE THAT IT IS UNPOPULAR TO TALK IN PUBLIC THESE DAYS ABOUT THE TOPIC OF SECRECY, MUCH LESS TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR SECRECY. I AM DOUBLY AWARE THAT MEMBERS OF THIS SOCIETY WHO ARE CONCERNED IN THE FIRST INSTANCE WITH COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY AND ITS UTILIZATION MIGHT FIND THE VERY MENTION OF THE WORD SECRECY DISTASTEFUL. BUT I BELIEVE THAT WE MUST PAUSE TO CONSIDER EFFECTS ON MODERN SOCIETY OF THE EVER INCREASING ADVANCES OF COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY.

ONE OF THE OVERWHELMING FEATURES OF MODERN COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY IS ITS ABILITY TO FILL OUT SPACE. WE ARE IN THE ERA OF GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS; SATELLITES, RADIO, TV, FILM, PUBLICATIONS - ALL HAVE TRULY MADE US ONE SMALL PLANET. WHILE TECHNOLOGICAL PROBLEMS REMAIN FOR FURTHER EXPLOITATION, AND WHILE WE CONTINUE TO HAVE LANGUAGE BARRIERS TO OVERCOME, NO ONE WOULD DENY THAT COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY HAS BROUGHT INFORMATION EVERYWHERE.

BY THE SAME TOKEN, IN THE FOURTH, TIME, DIMENSION, MODERN COMMUNICATIONS ARE WELL-NIGH INSTANTANEOUS. THE TIME LAPSE BETWEEN THE OCCURRENCE OF AN EVENT AND THE REPORTING OF THAT EVENT HAS SHRUNK TOWARDS ZERO. IN A VERY REAL SENSE, AS WE CAME TO REALIZE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE TRAGIC VIETNAM WAR, THAT WAR WAS BROUGHT INTO, AND FOUGHT IN, EVERYONE'S LIVING ROOM. NATIONAL EVENTS AND EVENTS FROM ABROAD, BE THEY OLYMPIC GAMES OR MASSACRES,
ARE TO MOST PEOPLE HAPPENING RIGHT NOW. WITH MORE AND MORE BEING COMMUNICATED FROM EVERYWHERE, WE ARE INUNDATED IN INFORMATION EVERY WHEN.

AS WITH MOST TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTIONS AND ADVANCES, THIS ASPECT OF COMMUNICATION, TO BE ALL-ENCOMPASSING IN SPACE AS WELL AS INSTANTANEOUS IN TIME, IS A MIXED BLESSING. THE SOURCE OF SOME OF THE CURSE IS THAT THE TECHNOLOGY HAS OUTSTRIPPED HUMAN ABILITIES TO COPE. IN THIS CONTEXT, LET ME TAKE UP THE AGE-OLD PROBLEM OF ARRIVING AT A JUDGMENT IN SECRECY.

THERE ARE SEVERAL ASPECTS OF SECRECY AND I WANT TO BE VERY CLEAR ON THE ONES I AM DISCUSSING NOW. I AM NOT DISCUSSING THE KIND OF SECRECY WHICH IS USUALLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF WAR PLANS. IN A SITUATION OF CLEAR AND PRESENT NATIONAL DANGER SUCH SECRECY IS UNDERSTOOD AND SUPPORTED BY MOST CITIZENS.

NO, ON THE CONTRARY, THE KIND OF SECRECY THAT I AM TALKING ABOUT HERE - AND I USE THE WORD SECRECY ADVISEDLY - IS THE KIND CURRENTLY ASSOCIATED IN THE MINDS OF THE PUBLIC WITH EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE; WITH WHAT SEEMS OPPOSED TO THE PUBLIC "RIGHT TO KNOW" LAWS. TO BE FRANK ABOUT IT, SUCH SECRECY IS ANTITHETICAL TO THE DRIVE OF PRACTITIONERS IN THE COMMUNICATION PROFESSIONS, AS WELL AS TO THE DEMANDS OF VARIOUS SEGMENTS OF SOCIETY. BUT, IN MY OPINION, AT SOME LEVEL OF DECISION-MAKING IT MUST EXIST.

THERE IS A NEED FOR BALANCE BETWEEN SOME SECRECY IN ARRIVING AT DECISIONS, AND THE PUBLIC'S NEED AND RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT JUDGMENTS WHICH AFFECT THEM. NO INDIVIDUAL CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MAKING DECISIONS AFFECTING OTHERS CAN BE, OR SHOULD BE, ALLOWED TO AVOID THE CONCOMITANT ACCOUNTABILITY TO THOSE AFFECTED BY THE DECISIONS. BUT PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DECISIONS ONCE MADE IS NOT THE SAME AS A PUBLIC RIGHT TO OBSERVE DECISIONS IN THE MAKING.
NO MORE IS THE "RIGHT TO KNOW" THE SAME AS A RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE. WHILE WE CAN DEMAND A GREAT DEAL OF OUR PUBLIC OFFICIALS, AND OUR CORPORATE LEADERS, AND EXECUTIVES IN ANY POSITION OF AUTHORITY WITHIN THE PRIVATE OR PUBLIC SECTOR, WE CANNOT EXPECT THEM TO BE MORE THAN HUMAN. IT WOULD BE SUCH AN UNREAL EXPECTATION OF SAINTLINESS, IF NOT DIVINITY, TO THINK THAT ONE CAN BALANCE NUANCES AND VESTED INTEREST PARAMETERS IN PUBLIC WHILE MAKING PORTENTOUS DECISIONS.

THE PROBLEM I WISH TO POSE TO YOU, THEREFORE, IS CREATED BY TECHNOLOGY'S INCREASED ABILITY TO OBSERVE, AND INSTANTANEOUSLY TO TRANSMIT, DECISIONS IN THE MAKING. AND THE WAY I WISH TO POSE THE PROBLEM AND THEREFROM TO PRESS A PLEA FOR PROTECTION OF SOME MINIMUM OF SECRECY SURROUNDING SUCH JUDGMENTS IS TO REMIND YOU THAT JUDGMENT IS A REVERSIBLE ACT, TAKING HUMAN TIME, WHILE TRANSMITTING THAT JUDGMENT WITH MODERN TECHNOLOGY IS AN IRREVERSIBLE ACT, TAKING ESSENTIALLY NO MACHINE TIME.

THE ESSENCE OF ARRIVING AT A JUDGMENT IS THE WILLINGNESS ON THE PART OF AN OPENMINDED AND HONEST PERSON TO LISTEN TO ALL INFORMATION AND TO DECIDE, REVERSIBLY, TO ACT IN ANY ONE OF SEVERAL WAYS, DEPENDING UPON THE RELEVANT INFORMATION. THE ESSENCE, ON THE OTHER HAND, OF COMMUNICATING THAT JUDGMENT IS FINALITY. IT IS OF NO CONSEQUENCE OR INTEREST TO TRANSMIT INSTANTANEOUSLY TO THE WHOLE GLOBE THE AGONY INVOLVED IN MAKING A JUDGMENT FAVORING FIRST THIS COURSE OF ACTION, THEN ANOTHER - EXCEPT, OF COURSE, AS HIGH DRAMA. WE ARE THUS FACED WITH A DILEMMA IN INSTANTANEOUS GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS. IF THESE COMMUNICATIONS ARE PREMATURE, UNDER THE EXCUSE OF DRAMA, OR RIGHT TO KNOW, OR COMMERCIAL PROFIT, THE VERY ACT OF COMMUNICATING THEM MAY BE SUBSTITUTING FOR HUMAN JUDGMENT, BY BEING IRREVERSIBLE.
NOW, IN POSING THIS DILEMMA TO YOU, WHICH I AM LABELLING A NEED FOR
SECRECY, AT LEAST AT SOME LEVEL IN JUDGMENT MAKING, I DO NOT INTEND IN ANY
WAY TO LEAVE YOU WITH THE IMPRESSION THAT I FAVOR SECRECY IN ANOTHER SENSE,
NAMLY, COVER UP AFTER THE FACT. THIS IS A MATTER OF CURRENT INTEREST, OF
COURSE, AND IS WHAT I WOULD TERM AN ABUSE OF EXECUTIVE SECRECY. THERE ARE
OCCASIONS WHEN EVEN AFTER THE FACT OF JUDGMENT SOME DETAILS SHOULD BE KEPT
CONFIDENTIAL. TO MY MIND, THIS MIGHT MOST NORMALLY ARISE IN CONNECTION
WITH INDIVIDUAL ADVISORS OR WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF FOLLOWUP JUDGMENTS. BUT
I HOLD NO BRIEF WHATSOEVER FOR A CLAIM OF EXECUTIVE SECRECY IN ORDER TO
COVER UP MISTAKES.

PRIVACY

IN CONTRAST TO THE IDEAS INVOLVED IN WHAT I AM CALLING SECRECY, WHICH
NORMALLY INVOLVE PUBLIC OR AT LEAST ACCOUNTABLE FIGURES, I WISH NOW TO TAKE
UP A TOPIC USUALLY ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUALS IN THEIR OWN CAPACITY. THUS,
I CALL IT PRIVACY, HOPING THEREBY TO UNDERSCORE THE INDIVIDUAL MATTER OF
THE SITUATION AS OPPOSED TO THE SECRECY ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

OF COURSE, THERE ARE BORDERLINE SITUATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND PUBLIC
CONSIDERATIONS. ONE OF IMMEDIATE INTEREST WOULD BE WHAT I CAN LABEL
JOURNALISTIC PRIVILEGE, OR IN MORE CURRENT JARGON, THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF
PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION. THIS MIGHT INCLUDE HOT TIPS OR LEAKS WHICH
NEWSPAPER MEN OBTAIN. IT ALSO INCLUDES WHAT ARE RECOGNIZED AS PRIVILEGED
DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN A LAWYER AND HIS CLIENT, AND HUSBAND AND WIFE, AS WELL
AS LESS CLEARLY DEFINED PRIVILEGE BETWEEN DOCTOR AND PATIENT, OR PRIEST AND
PENITENT. THE FUZZINESS ABOUT THESE KINDS OF PRIVILEGE COMES WHEN WE LEAVE
THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND DRIFT TOWARDS ACCOUNTABILITY
TO THE PUBLIC. THUS, FOR EXAMPLE, THE PRIVACY DEMANDED BY A JOURNALIST WITH
REGARD TO HIS SOURCES IS SUPPORTED AS WELL-NIGH ABSOLUTE AS LONG AS REVEALING THESE SOURCES IS NOT IMMEDIATELY RELEVANT TO A LARGER PUBLIC QUESTION. BUT IF THERE IS A POSSIBILITY IN THE EYES OF A REASONABLE MAN THAT THE CLAIM OF PRIVILEGE BY A JOURNALIST IS A PRIVILEGE WHICH COVERS UP A CRIME, THEN THAT CLAIM IS NOT ONE OF INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY, BUT IS ONE WHICH AFFECTS OTHERS. THE ETERNAL QUESTION FOR A REPUBLIC SUCH AS OURS, OF THE BALANCE BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY AND PUBLIC GOOD, THEN SPRINGS TO THE FORE.

THIS FUZZINESS WHERE PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL CONFIDENCES IMPINGE ON THE PUBLIC WEAL CAN BE EXTENDED TO SUCH MATTERS AS COPYRIGHT PRIVILEGE OF AUTHORS. IN ALL SUCH CASES THERE IS AN INCREASING DEMAND PLACED UPON THE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY AND ITS PRACTITIONERS TO EXERCISE GOOD ETHICS IN DECIDING WHERE TO DRAW THE LINE.

IN THESE CASES, IN PARTICULAR WHERE MEMBERS OF A COMMUNICATIONS PROFESSION THEMSELVES CLAIM PRIVILEGE, IT IS UNSEEMLY IN MY MIND TO PRESS THEIR CLAIM OF PRIVACY TO THE EXTREME IN THEIR OWN FAVOR WHILE FIGHTING A CLAIM OF PRIVACY ON THE PART OF ALL OTHERS. AS WALTER LIPPMANN WROTE 38 YEARS AGO ABOUT JOURNALISTS WHO WERE HOUNDING THE LINDBERGHS OUT OF AMERICA:

THE LINDBERGHS ARE THE IMMEDIATE VICTIMS OF CRIMINALS, CRANKS, AND JOURNALISTIC PANDERRERS, BUT FINALLY THEY ARE THE VICTIMS OF OUR FAILURE TO HAVE MADE DOMINANT IN THE MORAL TRADITION OF THIS COUNTRY THE ANCIENT WISDOM OF THE HUMANISTS - THAT EXCESS IS THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTIC OF VICE AND THAT IN ALL TRUTH, BEAUTY, AND GOODNESS THERE IS PROPORTION, MODERATION, AND RESTRAINT. THUS A JOURNALIST WHO RESPECTS HIS OWN LIBERTIES WILL RESPECT THE LIBERTIES
OF OTHERS—KNOWING THAT ON ANY OTHER TERMS HIS
FREEDOM WILL BECOME A TYRANNY TO HIS FELLOW MEN.

I WISH NOW TO TAKE UP A TOPIC WHICH IS SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT FROM THE
CLAIM TO INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY MADE BY JOURNALISTS, AUTHORS, DOCTORS, AND PRIESTS.
CONSIDER THE INCREASING PROBLEMS FACED BY ALL OF US AS PRIVATE CITIZENS.

IF WE LOOK AT THE OVERWHELMING ADVANCES OF MODERN COMMUNICATIONS
TECHNOLOGY, THE CAPABILITY FOR INVADING INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY IS EXCEEDING OUR
ABILITY TO STAVE IT OFF. WHETHER WE ARE FIGHTING AN INVASION OF PRIVACY
BY TECHNOLOGY IN THE FORM OF MINIATURIZED BUGS OR TAPPING OF TELEPHONE;
OR WHETHER IT IS INVASION OF OUR PRIVACY IN ANOTHER AREA OF TECHNOLOGY WHERE
HUGE PERSONNEL DATA BANKS ARE COMPROMISED; OR WHETHER IT IS AN INVASION OF
PRIVACY IN THE MOST PERSONAL SENSE REPRESENTED TO MANY CITIZENS BY THE TIDE
OF PORNOGRAPHY INCREASINGLY FLAUNTED IN PUBLIC—ALL OF THESE INVASIONS OF
PRIVACY, AS I CHOOSE TO CALL THEM, ARE BATTLES FOUGHT BY INDIVIDUALS FOR
THEMSELVES, AGAINST MODERN COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY.

WHAT IS THE ETHICS BY WHICH THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY GUIDES ITSELF IN
ACQUIRING AND TRANSMITTING INFORMATION ABOUT INDIVIDUALS, OR TO INDIVIDUALS?
WHO SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO THE DATA BANKS? JUST WHERE SHOULD THE PROFESSION
DRAW THE LINE ON PICTURES AND PRINTED WORDS WHICH NONE OF US WOULD LIKE OUR
CHILDREN TO SEE, EVEN THOUGH IT MAY BE LEGAL TO CREATE THEM? JUST HOW FAR
COULD COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES LEND THEIR TALENTS TO ELECTRONIC SNOOPING
ON INDIVIDUALS?

I WOULD PUT TO YOU THAT ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS IN THE AREA OF SECRECY
FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS, OR PRIVACY FOR ORDINARY CITIZENS AS WELL AS PROFESSIONALS,
THAT ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS ARE WORTHY OF YOUR EARNEST CONSIDERATION. FOR I
put to you that the communications fraternity is facing the same kind of ethical questions that physical scientists faced a generation ago, and that life scientists are also facing now. scientific knowledge and technical capability have been, are, and will remain technologically neutral in and of themselves. i would go further and claim that in a higher sense, human advancement of knowledge and technological capability is also neutral, although we all know it may be motivated by ethical or unethical demands.

but the utilization, as opposed to the creation, the utilization of physical or life sciences or of behavioral and social sciences, of information in communication technology, that utilization, i maintain, is far from neutral. it is when we use our expanded capabilities that we are in need of a code of ethics for guidance.

the need for ethical guidance in the communications professions is not a new need. it is just being felt with renewed poignancy because of the dilemmas posed above which are sharpened by new technology: a need by humans for time to consider and judge vs. no time needed by machines to transmit the thought; an inherent individual right to privacy vs. the mechanical simplicity and industrial gain in its invasion. the problem of individual need vs. common good is always with us, and the only universal ethic that history shows is applicable to all situations is moderation.

the practitioners of communications technology must exhibit moderation - good taste if you will - in pressing home their demands to obtain or purvey information. but constant self-restraint is difficult for all of us. for an entire profession it becomes doubly difficult - because technology makes lapses in good taste so easy; and because maintaining professional ethics requires cooperation of more and more people as the profession grows, while destroying ethics requires only a few disrupters.
IN MY OPINION, WE ARE TODAY WITNESSING MANY SUCH BREAKDOWNS IN PROFESSIONAL ETHICS BECAUSE OF SUPER-GROWTH OF THE PROFESSIONS TO IMPERSONAL SIZE. EVEN THE ANCIENT PROFESSIONS OF MEDICINE AND LAW CLEARLY NEED RETHINKING IN THEIR ETHICAL STANDARDS. TEACHING, BUSINESS, POLITICS - ALL ARE GOING THROUGH HARD TIMES WHICH I CLAIM ARE ETHICAL IN NATURE.

HOW DO THESE PROFESSIONS - AND YOUR PROFESSION - SET REASONABLE STANDARDS OF MODERATE CONDUCT AND GOOD TASTE? HOW DO YOU MONITOR YOURSELVES? AND, DILEMMA OF DILEMMAS, HOW TO IMPOSE MODERATION WITH MODERATION!

AS YOU STAND ON THE THRESHOLD OF EXPLOITING NEW TECHNOLOGIES; AS THE GROWING COMMUNICATIONS ARTS BECOME ALL-PERVASIVE - I URGENT TO NOT TO LOSE TOUCH WITH THE CIVILIZING INFLUENCE OF ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS. IN CONTRAST WITH THE SCIENCES - PHYSICAL, LIFE OR SOCIAL, WHERE AT LEAST IN PRINCIPLE APPLICATIONS CAN BE CONSIDERED DEVOID OF CONTACT WITH ACTUAL SOCIAL SITUATIONS - IN YOUR PURSUITS THERE IS NO WAY TO AVOID ACTING IN THE REAL SOCIAL MILIEU. THAT IS WHY YOUR ETHICAL PROBLEM IS DIFFERENT FROM THAT FACING THE PHYSICISTS IN THE 40'S. THEY COULD LEAVE THE ETHICS TO THE POLITICIANS. YOU CAN NOT.

I PRESS THIS CHALLENGE OF THE INSEPARABILITY OF ETHICS FROM THE COMMUNICATIONS ARTS IN NO SENSE OF DESPAIR. RATHER, I WISH TO CLOSE BY EMPHASIZING HOW INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT TO THE TRUE MEANING OF CIVILIZATION IS THE CLOSEST ASSOCIATION OF THE ARTS OF COMMUNICATIONS PROFESSIONS, AND THE HUMANITIES OF PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS. IT IS NOT FARFetched TO REMIND YOU OF THE COMPLEMENTARITY OF GREEK DRAMA AND GREEK ETHICS; OF THE ANCIENT MIDDLE AND FAR EAST RELIGIONS AND THEIR PLASTIC ARTS AND ARCHITECTURES; OF EUROPEAN RENAISSANCE ARTS AND CHRISTIANITY. ONE DOES NOT IMPLY OR FOLLOW THE OTHER. RATHER, IT IS THE COMBINATION OF ETHICS AND ART THAT IS THE HALLMARK OF LASTING CIVILIZATIONS.
MODERN COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY DEVOID OF ETHICS WILL BE OPPRESSIVE OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS TO PRIVACY, AND DESTRUCTIVE OF GOOD PUBLIC MANAGEMENT. WITH EXPLICIT ACCOUNT TAKEN OF THE ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF MODERATION AND GOOD TASTE, YOU MAY BE THE ARCHITECTS AND THE HISTORIANS OF A NEW ERA OF GLOBAL CIVILIZATION. AS YOU GO ABOUT THE HAPPY TASK OF MOVING COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTO THE 21ST CENTURY, I URGE YOU TO KEEP THIS CHOICE IN MIND. IT IS THE SPIRIT OF MAN WHICH ILLUMINES THE DARK PAGES OF HISTORY - NOT HIS SCIENCE OR TECHNOLOGIES.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.