DOSSIER

PRIVACY AS AN ALTERITY PROBLEM DIMENSION:

analysis of ten journalism dictionaries[1]

ROGÉRIO CHRISTOFOLETTI
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil

ABSTRACT – The social nature of journalism forces this activity to take place only in the face of alterity and from it. To narrate the facts, the journalist resorts to the Other - as a source of information - and the product of this work is destined to another Other, the audience. Information publicity and privacy regimes are related to alterity in journalism. Privacy is an individual right that can constrain a collective right, for example. To deepen the debate, this article identifies how privacy presents itself in the academic bibliography and ten area dictionaries over five decades. The results point to rarity, outdatedness and insufficiency in the treatment of the subject in journalism.
Keywords: Privacy. Journalism. Dictionaries. Professional Jargon. Journalistic Lexicon.

PRIVACIDADE COMO DIMENSÃO PROBLEMÁTICA DA ALTERIDADE: análise de dez dicionários de jornalismo

RESUMO – A natureza social do jornalismo obriga esta atividade a se efetivar apenas diante da alteridade e a partir dela. Para narrar os fatos, o jornalista recorre ao Outro - como fonte de informação - e o produto desse trabalho se destina a um outro Outro, a audiência. Regimes de privacidade e publicidade das informações relacionam-se à alteridade no jornalismo. A privacidade é um direito individual que pode constranger um direito coletivo, por exemplo. Para aprofundar o debate, este artigo identifica como a privacidade se apresenta na bibliografia acadêmica e em dez dicionários da área ao longo de cinco décadas. Os resultados apontam para raridade, desatualização e insuficiência no tratamento do tema no jornalismo.
Palavras-chave: Privacidade. Jornalismo. Dicionários. Jargão Profissional. Léxico Jornalístico.

PRIVACIDAD COMO UNA DIMENSIÓN PROBLEMÁTICA DE LA ALTERIDAD: un análisis de diez diccionários del periodismo

RESUMEN – El periodismo sólo se realiza en la otredad y a partir de ella. Para narrar los hechos, los periodistas buscan el otro - como fuentes de información - y el resultado de este trabajo es un otro Otro, la audiencia. Las políticas de privacidad e publicidad de las informaciones refuerzan la otredad en el periodismo. La privacidad es un derecho

individual que puede desconcertar un derecho colectivo. Para una mayor discusión, este artículo identifica como la privacidad se presenta en diez diccionarios de la área en cinco décadas. Los resultados indican tratamiento raro, obsoleto e insuficiente acerca de la privacidad en el periodismo.
Palabras clave: Privacidad. Periodismo. Diccionarios. Jargón Profesional. Léxico Periodístico.

1. Introduction

Companies and journalism professionals are not concerned "only" with the global economic recession, with growing intolerance and fanaticism and with increasing social inequality. The loss of confidence in the institutions that spills over into journalism itself, the evasion of advertising resources and some disorientation about function in complex societies, all this, turns on the emergency lights in newsrooms and management summits. The diagnosis points to a broad and paralyzing crisis context, since it reaches in full the financial sustainability of the sector, promotes a dangerous detachment from the public expectation and, to a certain extent, reduces the reason that would justify journalism as an important actor in societies.

While seeking ways to balance accounts and keep business, journalism organizations and their professionals also strive to re-attract the attention of audiences, demonstrating relevance and utility. The development of new narrative forms, the supply of customized products, and the search for process innovation are the most visible aspects of this salvation enterprise. Journalists want to continue doing journalism, though audiences turn their heads in the direction of entertainment, social media, and the post-truth labyrinth of fake news.

This is not the first crisis of journalism, and possibly not even the last one, even if its duration and intensity are frightening. In addition to meeting solvency solutions, reactivating the interest of audiences and repositioning journalism in the correlation of political forces, we cannot fail to reflect and understand this activity in its foundations. Asking yourself what journalism is today, and how it settled in the earlier times is necessary. Inquiring into the values that shaped this practice is also imperative. Understanding the transformations in these values is strategic.

In this sense, we remember that journalism is, at the same time, a form of knowledge, an institution, a field of knowledge and practices, an arena of circulation of meanings, a memory machine and of incessant writing of the times that crosses us. It is something that does not happen in the individual scope, being debtor, therefore, of the public acceptance, of the social reception. In practical terms, journalism is effective on the collective scale: news has social value when it is shared, making some knowledge about characters, scenarios, situations and objects common. Thus, journalism is effective only in front of and from the alterity, from the relationship with the Other, which can be a source of information, the audience to which it is directed, or other groups interested in the communication process. The establishment of such relationships - which may be associative, collaborative, competitive or adversarial - immediately establishes ethical relations. "When the other enters the scene, ethics is born," Umberto Eco wrote in an engaging exchange of letters with Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini (Martini & Eco, 1999).

The complexity of these ethical relations produces a plot that is, at the same time, shaping the subjects and indicative of the many varieties of their deviations. Journalism does not escape this. It is made by humans, with humans and to humans. Next, we will problematize an ethical dimension of journalism - privacy - that helps both to constitute it and to destabilize it.

The information publicity and privacy regimes are constituents of journalism. To problematize how these regimes work is essential to keeping journalism in line with its text and space in the societies for which it is directed.

2. Human construct, subject to change

Privacy is a social creation, the result of intense and permanent negotiations of the limits for human actions. Therefore, it has a historical, social, cultural and geographical character. What we consider public or private changes over time differs as the locality changes from the action of various forces and spreads our ways of acting and living (Solver, 2008; Blatterer et al, 2010; Vincent, 2016).

Archaeological records indicate that 3,500 years ago most of the houses had no separation between the rooms. The rooms were large and of unrestricted circulation, and the members of the family slept all together. When beds were adopted, they were collective, standard that followed until the 18th century. At that time, individual beds were rare because they were expensive, and so only the noble and powerful rested alone. The fact that families share the same resting room does not mean that privacy was neglected in antiquity. At least since the Roman Empire, there were already concerns about privacy, as Ariés & Duby (1990) point out. Only the borders separating the individual from the group were distinct.

Until the 13th century, reading was not silent. It was collective and out loud, therefore shared, made public. Over time, the church encouraged silent reading and other isolation rituals, whether for religious meditation, prayers, or confessions. Reading quietly will become a practice of recollection, self-preservation, and decorum. Aware of their failures, believers will seek priests not only to communicate their sins, but to obtain acquittals. This ritual is scheduled; it is done in a low voice and in a specific place, the confessional.

In the 14th century, Black Death will devastate Europe, killing almost half of its population. It was common for patients to divide their homes with uninfected relatives, which facilitated contact and contagion. Isolation of the sick allowed combating the disease, even if instinctively, which means that privacy has already saved lives.

In the United States, the first privacy law will emerge in 1710. The Post Office Act will bother to preserve mail. It is true that envelopes were already used to protect letters from rain and other weather, and they provided information of who had issued them and to whom they were addressed. With the new rule, opening other people's envelopes becomes a violation of privacy.

From the envelope to the telephone, all communication

technologies allow not only privacy but also excite the curiosity to violate them.

At the end of the 19th century, the rise of mass media and photography intensified concerns to preserve intimacy. Motivated by these advances, Warren and Brandeis (1890) will formulate the idea of privacy as the right to be left in peace, something to be protected by law and to be compensated in case of moral or material damages.

Privacy as we conceive it is not even 150 years old, therefore. It is a modern product and it is constantly changing. The episodes mentioned above help to realize that as the idea of privacy changes, we change our rituals, our human relationships and even the architecture of our homes. Today, one of the most common forms of housing is the apartment, whose word derives precisely from apart, separate. Among the objects of desire in urban life is the "closet", a room in the intimate area of a house that points to a reserved place, restricted circulation.

The intensification of individualization has thickened the walls of the privacy building, but for half a century, construction has suffered setbacks as the media's presence in social life grows and private existence spectacle spreads. Not surprisingly, several authors have already predicted the deterioration and death of privacy in dystopic scenarios now catalyzed by geolocation applications, systems and internet algorithms that collect, store and commute our data without authorization, and which structure census, political, cultural and consumption (O'Hara & Shadbold, 2008).

Although privacy is historically a less priority concern than survival physiological conditions, more essential to life, it is also observed that it - privacy - is commonly negotiated for economic gain, fame or recognition, personal security and third party, or other conveniences (Petronio, 2002; Nissenbaum, 2010; Boyd, 2010; Beresford et al, 2010). Even resized, privacy still matters and raises important discussions about the life challenges in society. Tubaro, Casilli and Sarabi (2014) and Sarat (2015), for example, offer contributions to the debate in the context of social networks, Big Data and the global surveillance revelations made by Edward Snowden from 2013.

John & Peters (2016) investigate the hyped end of privacy addressed in 101 journal articles from 1990 to 2012. The study explains that the persistence of the privacy death thesis lies in the very negative conception of privacy, formulated in the end of the

19th century by Warren & Brandeis. John & Peters conclude that the right to privacy arose from the conditions for their violation and not their realization.

Far from being pacified, the subject assumes irreplaceable importance for journalism, given the centrality of communication in contemporary life, and the impacts that new technologies have brought on sociability since mid-1990s.

3. Privacy as a journalistic problem

In 2004, Naomi Campbell won a three-year lawsuit against the British newspaper Daily Mirror. The model accused the publication of having invaded her privacy by posting pictures of her leaving a clinic after a Narcotics Anonymous meeting. The Daily Mirror had also published a detailed report on the treatment. In the announcement, the jury justified the newspaper's right to report that the model was drug addicted and was on treatment, but could not have specified the procedures of the therapy or publish pictures of her when leaving the clinic. The case set precedent for other celebrities to take action when they felt intimately raped.

In 2006, the L'Anedocte and La Meteo newspapers in the Republic of Cameroon published a three-page dossier listing names of politicians, communicators, singers and famous sportsmen who would be homosexual. Under the laws of that country, relating to people of the same sex is a crime, and can lead to sentences of six months to five years imprisonment, plus fines.

In Brazil, the following year, photo reporter Roberto Stuckert Filho, from *O Globo* photographed e-mail exchanges between Federal Supreme Court Justices Carmen Lúcia and Ricardo Lewandowski. The newspaper published the material.

In 2008, photographer Jason Fraser was convicted in Paris of an invasion of privacy. He had taken photos of Princess Diana and her boyfriend Dodi al Fayed kissing on a yacht in one of the couple's last images before the accident that killed them in the French capital in 1997.

In 2009, Queen Elizabeth II, annoyed at the paparazzi always behind the British royal family, sent a letter to the newspaper editors warning them of the limits to privacy listed in the ethical code of the profession. Apparently, the action did not work. In July 2011, after the

revelation of illegal staples and espionage of celebrities, politicians and anonymous people, the centenary newspaper The News of The World was closed, causing arrests and a strong reaction from the Parliament, justice and the market itself that needed to review its mechanisms of self-regulation (Davies, 2016).

The examples mentioned are just a few from an extensive list.

Privacy is a concern for journalists from a very early age, and it is intensifying as new technologies and data collection processes and media for mass dissemination emerge. Such advances, on the one hand, strengthen journalism as they provide for expansions and deepening, but also leave room for legal and ethical violations. Mills (2015) states that violations of privacy are more frequent in the media than in the state. The diagnosis is based on the United States society, where laws and courts end up protecting more the rapist/intruder in the name of freedom of information and expression than the potential victim. That is, in the weighting of rights, it stands out the one that guarantees access to information, the possibility of being informed, to the detriment of the individual right of the shelter. According to Mills, the many definitions of privacy and the absence of clear and reasonable boundaries of action make it a fertile field for academics and a minefield for lawmakers. To address issues of privacy and media disclosure, the author proposes a questioning matrix that can help make decisions about whether to go ahead (and publish) or not:

- Where did the intrusion occur?
- Who owns the information or who controls it?
- How did the media get the information?
- Is it true, false information or opinion?
- Was the information disclosed naturally private or reserved?
- How was the information disclosed?
- Who was the target of the disclosure?
- What is the target's intent? What about the media?

Applying a matrix such as Mills' (2015) would not solve all the tension involving journalism and privacy, but it would contribute to newsrooms as it offers a kind of checklist to follow, a simple and easily absorbed procedure in a productive routine as that of journalists.

In the current media context, new machines and systems also allow capture - often inadvertently - of static or dynamic images and

collection of audios, and digitization of these processes, leads not only to a large set of possible changes - ranging from editing to manipulation - but also allow the multiplication of files, generating potential uncontrollability in the face of potential (and undesirable) leaks.

In fact, this is another emerging topic on the ground that opposes privacy and publicity: the increasingly incisive presence of figures that transcend the profile of mere information sources: the whistleblowers. Unlike conventional sources in nature, function and motivations (Bielby, 2014; Christofoletti, 2016), these denouncers allow us to rethink concepts such as anonymity and information leaks (Carlson, 2011) and act as catalysts for the processes of public data disclosure, moving in a landscape of war against privacy (Klosek, 2007).

The subject of privacy is complex, and at the same time intrinsic to journalism. After all, it is done with the information publicity that previously had restricted circulation. A linear, incomplete, and therefore sophistical reasoning is what makes us think that journalism is effective when it violates one's privacy. In some situations, this is true. In others, it presents itself as a transgression, because it contradicts the ethical orientations of the profession.

I propose to think privacy in journalism in two dichotomies, which work at the same time and in a complementary way: privacy-publicity and privacy-security.

In the first approach, privacy presents itself as the inverse of the gesture of making something public and known. The scenario is an opposition of two consecrated rights: to be informed and to have one's privacy protected. On the one hand, it is natural that the journalist is expected to reveal, narrate, report, and bring to light stories or hidden characters. On the other hand, it is also accepted that the journalist maintains reserved information or even the identity of his or her sources when motivated for security reasons or for strategic reasons. If the source is at risk of being attacked, persecuted or killed, it is tolerable to keep it within a private circle, a protective instance. If the information is still embryonic, if it needs more confirmation or elements of support, it is also permissible to keep it stored until it is sufficiently verified, and that it reaches a robustness that the initial questions blunt.

Clearly, this is not a high-contrast picture where you can only see black and white. The reality of journalism is not limited to deciding whether to publish something or to keep it hidden. Petley (2013) offers a set of recent episodes that have clear ethical

complications, ranging from the tension between public interest and media exposure, to police coverage (and the high visibility given to crime suspects) and notorious people's sexual scandals, among other subjects. The concern is to contribute to more visible contours for what must come to the fore in society, taking into account the effects of mass exposure, such as public embarrassment, humiliation and stigmatization.

Concerns are welcomed given the complexity of the subject. But one cannot lose sight of the social purposes of journalistic actions. Tracking the agenda of politicians or public office holders, scrutinizing powers, contesting official information, exposing public interest data, hidden by celebrities, all these functions are the primary responsibility of reporters and editors. They cannot be waived to meet demands for more privacy.

A permanent challenge is to balance the role of the media with the individual right of people in society, acknowledges Australian Communications and Media Authority (2011), which even edited a set of guidelines on privacy to TV journalists. The document presents general guides from Australian business codes, mentioning special care for children and vulnerable people, public figures, public domain material, for example.

If in some situations the media exploits too much the intimacy and life of others, in others it seems to shield certain public figures. A priori, it is not possible to indicate which criteria are decisive in the newsrooms to choose which journalistic treatment to give to a notorious personage to the detriment of other possible coverings. There is, however, some relaxation or even lack of standards in some cases. Sörensen (2016), for example, surveyed how the German presidents were portrayed in the media from 1949 to 2012. The author analyzed ten presidents reported in Der Spiegel magazine. The assumptions were that the media visibility of these presidents would have increased over time and that the focus of coverage shifted from the public to the personal aspect. The results, however, were surprising to show that the German president is treated more as an ordinary citizen with a protected personal life than as an occupier of a public office. Journalistic coverage of this character has increased over the decades, but the author has failed to identify a mediatic tendency to politicize the intimacy of the office.

Plaisance (2011) considers privacy as the ability of someone to accomplish things in their life without public scrutiny. For this

reason, the author defends the need for journalists to understand the limits of this terrain. Those who do not properly understand this can cause both unethical intrusions and weariness in their credibility, a decisive factor for their social survival. That is why reporters and editors should be able to discern which public interest is being served in a subject and why it prevails over claiming one's privacy. In this sense, there is a shift of the decision center about a gesture to be made. No more is asked about the weight or the contours of the right to privacy, but about the effective existence of a public interest that justifies the actions, even if these constitute violations. Operated displacement results in a certain emptiness of privacy as a civil guarantee or fundamental right.

Ribeiro (2003) points out that in the sphere of civil law, intimacy and privacy life have been preserved as a right of the personality, and that in constitutional law, it is a fundamental right. In a broader classification, privacy is also a human right. In an extensive way, privacy is a non-patrimonial, non-transferable right that cannot be disposed of, innate, inalienable, lifelong, necessary and essential.

For McStay (2017), privacy is not about staying hidden or hiding or defending against potential threats. For the author, privacy has to do with how people relate and how they connect and interact with others, and how they control and manage access to themselves and those closest to them. That is, the concept of privacy is based on the control and administration of one self and his or hers data, which some authors call informational autonomy (Mills, 2015).

In this sense, it is now up to the second dichotomy that I propose, which links privacy to security. Privacy here is no longer treated as a ghost always present in journalism (private that is opposed to public) nor as a threat (what, in order to remain private, prohibits communication). Privacy can also be understood as a condition of protection from sources, information and the journalist himself. As a security measure, privacy would also work as an asset for individuals to protect themselves from mass surveillance systems. For example, Meinrath and Vitka (2014) argue that a crypto graphical war is under way, counteracting users who defend their privacy at all costs and governments and corporations who want to reduce these personal spaces. Combating human rights violation, child pornography and terrorism are the justifications most used by companies and governments to advance on other people's privacy.

In professional daily life, if the journalist relaxes in the

implementation of filters or devices that guarantees him to operate in private, it can endanger his sources, his own information, his environment or himself. Ignoring this new reality or neglecting it increases the dangers to privacy and security. From this perspective, privacy is seen under the "threat model" focus. Newsrooms are encouraged to implement protection systems and professionals are encouraged to take additional procedures. There are several references that assist in training journalists: from practical guides (Ochoa, 2013; Carlo & Kamphuis, 2014; Fernandez & Mancini, s/d) to further studies, which cover aspects such as mass surveillance and attempt to control the newsrooms by the governments (Slobogin, 2007, Stalla-Bourdillon et al, 2014, Sloan & Warner, 2014, Dimov & Jusenaite, 2015, Thorsen, 2016).

In a context where they feel watched by the state, monitored by corporations or spied on by others, journalists are forced to change their security standards, Glenn Greenwald (2014) confided from his experience with Edward Snowden. Concern over the storage of digital content in the cloud, the use of technological resources to increase the security in the exchange of messages and the navigation incognito in the Internet are some of the recommendations most given by specialists in network security and by of journalist protection organizations. Media vehicles change their routines as well. In August 2016, The Intercept launched the Brazilian version of its website and published a tutorial to guide sources on how to securely send reports or information to the newsroom.

The intensification of the intelligence apparatus for combating terrorism after the events of September 11th, 2001 and Snowden's denunciations of global espionage has raised privacy to an international level. So much so that the UN Human Rights Council has created a special rapporteur on the right to privacy in the digital age, responsible for gathering information on the subject, reporting violations and identifying obstacles to its promotion and protection.

Among security procedures, the adoption of encryption in archives is also essential for journalists, but not alone. Ciberativist Jacob Appenbaulm argues that public and private institutions must be clear and that citizens need to have their privacies secured. For the author, cryptography is a resource to guarantee both conditions (Assange et al, 2013).

As journalists raise security levels to secure their jobs, governments and technology corporations advance citizens' privacy.

The outlook is worrying for intimacy advocates. For Mills (2015), it is hard for privacy to prevail in contemporary times because it is not a dominant and well-established principle such as free expression, for example. On the other hand, the global nature of the new media and the inconsistency of laws weaken the permanence of privacy in practical situations. This is because the responsibility of internet service providers is still quite limited and society feeds a low expectation of privacy, argues the author. To counteract difficulties and to encourage journalists to set professional ethical standards for the new media, Mills recommends a combination of decency and common sense, together with the operation of punitive measures for those who violate and commit crimes (such as defamation), preventive and educational. The author does not show pessimism, but does not cool in the worries; after all, the challenges are many, for example, to consider violations of privacy committed also by non-humans, such as equipment and systems.

4. Privacy in Dictionaries

To deepen the discussion, let's identify the privacy factor in reference works, notably media dictionaries, journalism and communication. It is well known that this enterprise allows a superficial approach to the presence of the concept in the journalistic canons, but it is one of the modules of a wider observation, still directed to journalistic ethics guides and codes of ethics. Even so, detecting privacy in dictionaries reveals some of their visibility schemes. In addition, the study contributes to understanding how the idea assumes importance in the professional lexicon, becoming not only an entry but feeding in its surroundings an orbit of other related terms.

In this sense, we have made an extensive survey on Portuguese, Spanish and English language titles available in libraries, data banks and in sales outlets. The result was an initial list that surpassed two dozen works, which was reduced to a roll of ten dictionaries. Refinement was based on the following inclusion/exclusion criteria: geographical representativeness, tradition, amplitude, actuality and origin. Thus, the list contains national and foreign releases, titles of the last five decades, generalist works and with recognition and editorial reputation.

The sample was then composed of six Brazilian dictionaries, three edited in English and one in Spanish:

- Jornalismo: dicionário enciclopédico (Ramos, 1970)
- Dicionário Básico de Comunicação (Costa Lima et all, 1975)
- Dicionário de propaganda e jornalismo (Erbolato, 1985)
- International Dictionary of Marketing and Communication (Jefkins, 1987)
- Diccionario del Periodismo (Algar, 1990)
- Dicionário de Comunicação (Rabaça & Barbosa, 2001)
- Dicionário Multimídia: Jornalismo, Publicidade e Informática (Mello, 2003)
- Dictionary of Media Studies (A & C Black, 2006)
- Dictionary of Media and Communications (Danesi, 2009)
- Dicionário de Comunicação (Marcondes Filho, 2009)

After defining the sample, we formulated a word cloud, whose terms should be searched in the dictionaries. The starting categories were: Privacy, Confidentiality, Source Secrecy, Source Protection, Information Secrecy, Secret, Journalist Security, Anonymity, Anonymous Sources, and Off the Record.

In the search for the entries, we also take into account some variants that were contained in the semantic fields of the starting words. So if by searching for "secret" we found "secrecy", we would accept the entry key in the dictionary, recording the occurrence. We recognize that this choice allows a greater degree of subjectivity, but it also allows for the widening of the visual field for eventual occurrences of entries not listed in the original word cloud.

From this, we tracked the cloud terms in the sample dictionaries. In foreign works, the categories were evidently translated into English and Spanish, following their occurrences in those languages. The results are presented and discussed below.

4.1 Privacy

The word that refers more directly to the subject of this study - "privacy" - was located in only three of the ten sample dictionaries. In none of the cases, there is an explicit link between the entry and the practices of journalism, whether through references to daily

journalism, to specific care or to the profession. Jefkins (1987), for example, relates "privacy" to advertising alone. The dictionary presents itself as an international reference work of marketing and communication, but it ignores journalism in the entry "privacy". In the meaning, it mentions the British Code of Advertising Practice limitations (BCAP) for the retraction or reference to live people in ads without their express permissions.

A & C Black (2006) presents meanings for the entry: one related to marketing (citing the Privacy and Electronic Communications Directive that limits unsolicited direct marketing in the European Union) and another imprecise and not very explanatory. In it, he states that observation and interference in people's lives may "sometimes" be protected by law. The treatment given to the subject is quite distant, cold, almost protocol, which can be disappointing to the reader given that the work is self-titled a dictionary of media studies and was edited in a historical context of new media and communication centrality in life social.

Of the occurrences recorded, Danesi (2009) is the one that most approximates current meanings when it comes to the entry "privacy". The dictionary has two broad but relatable meanings. Privacy is "the right to be left in peace, to be free from the vigilance of the State, official institutions or citizens" and it is "the right to control the exposure of personal information." Nevertheless, it is noticed that there is no specific mention to journalism or directed to its professionals, and that there is no indication of other entries that could be directly related to it, such as "invasion of privacy".

The low presence of the word in the analyzed sample - a rate of 30% - can lead to the interpretation that the topic has limited relevance in the lexicon of the area. In a more in-depth assessment, with the reading of the meanings expressed in the dictionaries, one perceives a total disconnection of the expressed meanings with journalistic practice, as if the entry did not concern it.

4.2 Confidentiality

The term and its variations (as "confidential") were identified on three occasions in the sample. Erbolato (1985) lists the entry "confidential", but does not unfold its meaning, referring only to another entry - "off the record" -, which we will discuss below.

For A & C Black (2006), the term appears in the business orbit. Thus, it appears in the dictionary as "commercial confidentiality", explained as the "reasons not to allow the publication of information, as it may harm commercial interests". Although it is known that this type of interdiction can occur in newspaper companies, when advertisers and/or vehicle owners interfere, we infer that the mention in the work refers only to advertising or marketing aspects. There is no connection between "confidentiality" and preservation of sources, for example. Therefore, it is possible to affirm that the meaning of A & C Black (2006) is outside the semantic domains of journalism or that it ignores the amplitude of the meanings related to the field. It is necessary to register, however, the occurrence of the adjective "leaky" that refers to something that can be leaked, "prone to allow violations in secrecy or confidentiality." This entry dialogues more with the journalistic field and contributes to the visibility of privacy in the area.

In Danesi (2009), the entry is broad and covers journalism. Confidentiality is "the practice of media professionals to keep secret the names of those who provide them with information."

The low rate of occurrence of the "confidentiality" entry - identical to "privacy" - and the fact that they are complementary, analogous words, close to synonymy, reinforce the interpretation that, at least in the dictionaries selected for the study, the subject has little visibility and limited importance in the journalistic lexicon.

4.3 Source confidentiality and Source protection

Among the terms searched in the dictionaries, "source confidentiality" was the one that had the highest incidence, reaching 60% of the works. The term "font protection" is also part of the word cloud of this study and as both expressions are contiguous, we regroup their results, which raise the idea of guaranteeing secrecy or protecting the source at an expressive rate of dictionaries: it appears in seven of ten works.

Ramos (1970) records the expression "source confidentiality", but its ballast is basically legal. Thus, the entry refers to the Brazilian press law - which lasted from 1967 to 2009 - and which provides source confidentiality to journalists. However, the author makes a

point of remembering that, if the practice is allowed by law, it can also lead to liability of the professional, if it is proven "press crime".

Erbolato (1985) also limits to the Brazilian reality and follows parallel track. In his dictionary, the expression "source confidentiality" is not an entry, but as "secrecy", and in it, the press law is once again quoted, now as a guarantee that "no journalist or broadcaster (...) could compelled or coerced to indicate the name of their informant or the source of information, not being able to suffer any direct or indirect sanction or any penalty. "

Jefkins's (1987) "Fourth Power" entry challenges journalism and democracy by citing an episode in which the United States Supreme Court arbitrates against the protection of sources. For this reason, we account for this occurrence.

In Algar (1990), "source confidentiality" has a laconic but direct meaning. This is "professional secrecy". Rabaça & Barbosa (2001), in turn, do not offer the same entry, but the term "source", and it is observed that "in compliance with international principles governing the matter, the law assures journalists the right to maintain confidentiality as to sources or origin of information received". A & C Black (2006) and Danesi (2009) also attribute this type of protection to a legal shield, present in North America - notably the United States - and legislated at the state level.

The incidence in dictionaries of different geographies and the frequency distributed in all periods covered - from the 1970s to the first decade of the 21st century - demonstrate relevance and permanence of the articles that deal with secrecy or source protection, highlighting the idea within the journalistic lexicon.

4.4 Information secrecy of and Secret

Methodologically, we also group the records related to the term "Information secrecy" and "Secret", since their semantic fields are overlapped and confused. The entry "information secrecy" appears in three works. Ramos (1970) links secrecy to purely juridical and circumscribed criteria of State dominance, ignoring the fact that society is not limited to it. For the author, there should be restricted circulation of the information provided in Decree No. 6041/67, legislation that defines criteria for confidential matters. This decree

was repealed in 1977 and reissued four times, with 2012 being the most recent version. When it comes to the "secret" entry, Ramos (idem) also resorts to other legal provisions, such as the press law (Law no. 5250/67), the Federal Constitution (1967) and Decree No. 898/69, prevailing at the time, but updated in the last decades.

Erbolato (1985) treats "secret" in the entry "State secret", which refers to the entry "Crimes", and in its description, cites crimes of opinion, provided for in the press law, in force at that time.

Jefkins (1987) and A & C Black (2006) also refer the notion of secrecy or information secrecy to personal data protection rules in the United States (1986) and in the United Kingdom (1984), respectively. The references have two distinct aspects than the previous ones: (a) what should be preserved is the information of the individual and no longer the one that serves the state reason, except when it can be used by a country enemy, and (b) is concerned with emerging technologies such as computers, for example.

Algar (1990) does not offer the entry "Information Secrecy ", but only "Official secret", explaining directly and without legal justification: "what the government does not let publish".

Mentions of "secret"/"information secrecy" were detected in half of the samples, which indicate the presence and visibility of this unfolding of privacy in the journalistic lexicon. In a comparative way, we can also see the historical evolution of the legal anchoring of terms. That is, the secret keeping of a data remains a concern over the decades, but the legislation that gives it guarantees is gradually modernizing. Dictionaries follow these changes.

4.5 Journalist safety

If the source and the information are constant security concerns in the sample dictionaries, the same is not true for the journalist's own condition. In no work, it was found an entry devoted to this. It must be noted, however, that there is an indirect mention of the subject. Danesi (2009) offers an entry for "cryptography", which defines how to "make or decrypt messages in a secret code that has a key, a method, and that allows identifying hidden message (...) This term is especially used in journalistic jargon." Thus, cryptography is understood as a journalistic resource to ensure its work, to achieve a temporary concealment result for its practice in order to achieve

its function. This is an inference from us that intends to extend the interpretation of the word "cryptography", incorporating in it some trace, even if residual, that refers to journalists protection with respect to privacy. As it lacks further elements to be confirmed, the occurrence is not being considered in this study as a record of the term "Journalists' Security" or its variations.

4.7 Anonymity, Anonymous sources and Off the record

One of the conditions for guaranteeing privacy is acting in an unknown condition. Therefore, we try to detect the presence of three related terms: "Anonymity", "Anonymous sources" and "Off the Record". The expressions occur in seven sample works, and signal an evolution of the amplitude of the meanings contained therein. Ramos (1970) and Erbolato (1985) restrict the question of anonymity to a forbidden practice by the State, being prohibited by the press law and/or by the constitution, in force in those decades. In Erbolato (idem), there is also an "unauthorized source", an expression that is closest to the one sought, since its definition is "a person who gives unofficial information to journalists, some very important, but without mentioning his name when published". In the same reference, "off the record" has a specific entry, which translates to "confidential; what should not be published ".

Algar (1990), in turn, circumscribes the meaning of the word to the formal aspect: "anonymous is a writing that does not bear the author's name", similar to Danesi's (2009) designation, although this author extends the semantic domain of anonymous sources to terms like "whistleblower" (person who discloses to the media information, scandal or occult event) and "leak" (information leak). A & C Black (2006) also offers entries for "whistleblower" and "*mole*" ("source of a journalist who is secretly reporting on the activities of an organization").

Typical of journalistic jargon, the expression "off the record" was found in half of the sample analyzed. Jefkins (1987) describes it as "a statement made to the media by an authorized person who does not wish to be named," and who may be, for example, a politician who is willing to speak as long as the data is published without attribution. Mello (2003) offers similar meaning of information "out of register", stressing "the commitment that the source is not revealed".

The meanings of A & C Black (2006) and Danesi (2009) for the expression "off the record" keep some distance from the others.

In them, the content of the declarations of anonymous sources does not end immediately. Thus, A & C Black (idem), it is not intended that the information in off is "published or used by a journalist but only as a starting point or further investigation, protecting the source." For Danesi (idem), they are "made spontaneously and not destined to be published or transmitted".

As far as the domains of incognito action are concerned, it is clear that the more recent works offer broader meanings for the expressions searched for. Dating from the early 21st century, these dictionaries emerge in more permissive cultural and technological contexts, where file and data sharing practices are more common, and where information control is less effective. Even the practice of "off the record" is seen as a resource that requires additional checks and not a form of data collection, without attribution of sources or informational source.

The semantic evolution of these terms surreptitiously points to changes in the improvement of journalism and the very status of anonymity in contemporary sociability.

5. Conclusions

Edward Snowden's denunciations of espionage systems and mass surveillance have caused not only public constraints on US governments and their allies but also blunt reactions from heads of state and global authorities. In 2013, the UN rapporteur on freedom of expression, Frank la Rue, publicly condemned the practices of the intelligence services and made a stern defense of privacy. According to him, without privacy there can be no freedom of expression because the absence of the first results in a form of intimidation of the second. As freedom of expression is seen as one of the foundations of democracies, the offensive on the privations of others is a concern that transcends borders, languages, currencies, and warlike arsenals.

Privacy is essential to understand the concept of personality and to realize the very notion of freedom, or civil law. In the present context, privacy and personal data protection support the ideas of autonomy, self-determination and dignity.

In the specific field of journalism, privacy is a problematic concept because, on the one hand, it can be complicating to information publicity of collective interest, but it can also gather guarantees for source security, information and the journalist himself.

As it is a concept that has undergone intense and rapid changes in the last decades, privacy must also present refractions in the journalism.

The study we presented did a bibliographical review that points to the need for these debates, and analyzed how the subject of privacy - unfolded in a cloud of ten words - appears in a dozen established dictionaries of communication and journalism. In most cases, the results showed low rates of occurrence of terms and expressions related to privacy, which leads us to conclude that the subject assumes importance and intermediate visibility in the journalistic lexicon.

Attention was drawn to the fact that there is a complete absence in the dictionaries of the linkage of privacy to journalists' security, a subject that is growing in importance given the advances of governments and corporations to track, monitor, spy on and oversee newsrooms using uninformed technological systems.

More recent dictionaries have absorbed terms that tend to amplify the semantic domains of privacy in the field, highlighting potential transformations in journalistic practice and notions of anonymity and leakage, for example. As it is about changes still in process, it would be advisable to follow future editions of dictionaries to document a historical series that reveals the effective evolution of the concept of privacy, both in the aspect of its presence and in its relevance to the area jargon.

As already mentioned, this study is part of a broader investigation aimed at detecting the tension that changes in privacy can cause in journalism. In another study (2017), we have already analyzed a set of journalistic ethics guides published in the last three decades. We have detected that the subject of privacy is a concern present in the guides and dealt with in some depth. However, the issue is controversial, with ambiguous guidelines and presenting significant gaps in professional safety and job guarantees for journalists.

The conclusions we have reached in the analysis of the dictionaries reinforce some of those already achieved, but above all they point out the rarity of the terms related to privacy in the journalistic lexicon and the lack of visibility that the subject has in the professional linguistic universe. Dictionaries are usually the systematization of the vocabularies consecrated by social groups. In this sense, if the works of journalistic reference bring few references to a subject, it can be considered that it is of little interest, because it translates into scarce terms or expressions, and mobilizes fewer meanings.

Journalism is effective before and after alterity. The regimes

of information publicity and privacy are constituents of this social practice, consecrated a few centuries ago. To problematize how these regimes work is essential to keeping journalism in line with its text and space in the societies for which it is directed.

*This paper was translated by Audrey Frischknecht.

NOTES

1   This article is the result of the Privacy and Journalism research: dilemmas, surroundings and concept updates, funded by CNPq.

REFERENCES

A & C Black (2006). *Dictionary of Media Studies.* London.

Algar, A.L. de Z. (1990). *Diccionario del Periodismo.* Madrid: Ediciones Pirámide.

Ariès, P.; Duby, G. (eds.) (1990). *História da Vida Privada 1*: do Império Romano ao Ano Mil. São Paulo: Cia das Letras.

Assange, J.; Appelbaum, J.; Müller-Maguhn, A.; Zimmermann, J. (2013). *Cypherpunks:* liberdade e futuro da internet. São Paulo: Boitempo.

Australian Communications and Media Authority (2011). *Privacy Guidelines for Broadcasters,* dezember.

Bielby, J. (2014). *The Heritage of WikiLeaks:* A History of Information Ethics. Dissertação de Mestrado na Universidade de Alberta, Canadá.

Blatterer, H.; Johnson, P.; Markus, M.R. (2010). *Modern Privacy:* shifting boundaries, new forms. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carlo, S. & Kamphuis, A. (2014). *Information Security for Journalists.* The Centre for Investigative Journalism: London.

Carlson, M. (2011). *On the condition of anonymity*: Unnamed sources and the battle for journalism. Urbana-Chicago-Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Christofoletti, R. (2016). Ethical, risks, informers, whistleblowers, leaks and clamor for transparency. *Brazilian Journalism Research*, vol. 12, n.2, pp. 54-73.

Christofoletti, R.; Torres, R.J. (2017). *La evolución de la privacidad en las guías de ética periodística.* 4ª International Conference on Media Ethics, Sevilla, Universidad de Sevilla.

Costa Lima, L.; Doria, F.A.; Katz, C.S. (1975). *Dicionário Básico de Comunicação.* Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Danesi, M. (2009). *Dictionary of Media and Communications.* London: M.E.Sharpe.

Davies, N. (2016). *Vale-tudo da notícia.* São Paulo: Intrínseca.

Dimov, D. & Juzenaite, R. (2015). *Privacy and Security of Modern Technology.* Infosec Institute.

Erbolato, M. L. (1985). *Dicionário de propaganda e jornalismo.* Campinas: Papirus.

Fernandez, N.; Manicini, P. (s/d). *CryptoPeriodismo.* Manual Ilustrado Para Periodistas. Retrieved from http://cryptoperiodismo.org

Garfinkel, S. (2000). *Database Nation*: the death of privacy in the 21st century. Sebastopol: O'Reilly.

Greenwald, G. (2014). *Sem lugar para se esconder.* Rio de Janeiro: Sextante.

Jefkins, F. (1987). *International Dictionary of Marketing and Communication.* Glasgow/London: Blackie.

John, N.A. & Peters, B. (2016). *Why privacy keeps dying:* the trouble with talk about the end of privacy. Information, Communication & Society, pp. 1-15.

Keeble, R. (2001). *Ethics for journalists.* London and New York: Routledge.

Kieran, M. (1998). *Media Ethics.* London and New York: Routledge.

Klosek, J. (2007). *The war on privacy.* Westport-London, Praeger.

Koops, B-J. & Leenes, R. (2005). "'Code' and the Slow Erosion of Privacy",12 Mich. Telecomm. Tech. L. Rev. 115. Retrieved from http://www.mttlr.org/voltwelve/koops&leenes.pdf.

Lamay, C. L. (ed.) (2003). *Journalism and the debate over privacy.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated.

Marcondes Filho, C. (2009). *Dicionário de Comunicação.* São Paulo: Paulus.

Martini, C. M.; Eco, U. (1999). *O que crêem os que não crêem?* Rio de Janeiro: Record.

Mcstay, A. (2017). *Privacy and the media.* Los Angeles/London: Sage.

Meinrath, S.D. & Vitka, S. (2014). "Crypto War II". *Critical Studies in Media Communications* 31()2, Jul., pp. 123-128.

Mello, J.G. (2003). *Dicionário Multimídia:* Jornalismo, Publicidade e Informática. São Paulo: Ed. Arte e Ciência.

Miller, A.R. (1971). *The assault of privacy:* computers, data banks, and dossiers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mills, J. (2015). *Privacy in the new media age.* University Press of Florida.

Nissenbaum, H. (2010). *Privacy in context:* technology, policy and integrity of social life. Stanford: Stanford Law Book.

O'Hara, K. & Shadbolt, N. (2008). *The spy in the coffee machine:* the end of privacy as we know it. Oxford: Oneworld.

Ochoa, P.P. (2013). *Cómo funciona Internet?* Nodos críticos desde una perspectiva de los derechos. Santiago de Chile: Derechos Digitales.

Petley, J. (2013). *Media and Public Shaming:* drawing the boundaries of disclosure. London: I.B.Tauris.

Pew Research Center. (2014). *The Future of Privacy*, December. Retrieved from http://www.pewInternet.org/2014/12/18/future-of-privacy

Plaisance, P. L. (2011). *Ética na comunicação:* princípios para uma prática responsável. Porto Alegre: Penso.

Rabaça, C.A.; Barbosa, G.G. (2001). *Dicionário de Comunicação.* (2ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Campus.

Ramos, J.N. (1970). *Jornalismo*: dicionário enciclopédico. São Paulo: Ibrasa.

Ribeiro, D. V. H. (2003). *Proteção da privacidade.* São Leopoldo: Editora Unisinos.

Rosenberg, J.M. (1969). *The death of privacy*. New York: Random House.

Rotenberg, M. (2016). *The Privacy Law Sourcebook 2016*. Washington (DC): Eletronic Privacy Information Center.

Sanders, K. (2003). *Ethics and Journalism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sarat, A. (ed.) (2015). *A world without privacy*: what law can and should do? New York: Cambridge University Press.

Siapera, E. & Veglis, A. (2012). *The Handbook of Global Online Journalism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sloan, R.H. & Warner, R. (2014). *Unauthorized Access*. The crisis in online privacy and security. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Slobogin, C. (2007). *Privacy at risk:* the new government surveillance and the fourth amendment. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Sörensen, J. (2016). "The German federal president in the press: Public officeholder or private citizen?" *European Journal of Communication*, Vol 31, Issue 3, pp. 1-17.

Stalla-Bourdillon, S.; Philips, J.; Ryan, M.D. (2014). *Privacy vs. Security.* London: Springer.

Sykes, C. J. (1999). *The End of Privacy:* The Attack on Personal Rights at Home, at Work, On-Line, and in Court. New York: Saint-Martin Press.

Thorsen, E. (2016). "Cryptic Journalism: News reporting of encryption". *Digital Journalism,* 5(3), pp. 299-317. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21 670811.2016.1243452

Tubaro, P.; Casilli, A.A.; Sarabi, Y. (2014). *Against the Hypothesis of the End of Privacy*. London-New York: Springer.

Vincent, D. (2016). *Privacy*: a short story. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Warren, S. & Brandeis, L. (1890). *The Right to Privacy.* Harvard Law Review, 193.

Whitaker, R. (1999). *The End of Privacy:* on Total Surveillance Is Becoming a Reality. New York: The New Press.

Rogério Christofoletti is a professor at the Journalism Department and Postgraduate Program at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), Brazil. Researcher at CNPq. Coordinator of the Journalistic Ethics Observatory (objETHOS). E-mail: rogerio.christofoletti@ufsc.br