

CESC 2013

# The communication of the NGO with the target public. The professional ethics

Ștefania Bejan\*

*'Al. I. Cuza' University, Carol I Blvd, Nr. 11, 700506, Iași, Romania*

---

## Abstract

The expressions “professional ethics”, “children in need”, “approach” bring together sensitive areas of the contemporary human existence, social group, adequate behaviour in challenging situations (often, extreme ones); what principles govern the dialogue (including the practical action) of the actors “casted” in daily tragedies maintained by suffering, inequity, indifference, poverty, precarious education, halting legislation? Can “Potter’s box” be operated in various “life stories” with the certainty of its efficiency? Do the loyalties that end the chain of decision thresholds remain faithful to the moral values that are at the foundation of deontological reasoning? Love of neighbour, solidarity, empathy, courage, wisdom remain key elements in the kingdom of ethics... About all these, in the study entitled “The Communication of the NGO with the Target Public. The Professional Ethics”.

© 2014 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer review under the responsibility of the West University of Timisoara.

*Keywords:* 'Children in need'; professional ethics; social responsibility

---

## 1. Introduction

At least conveniently placed in the contemporary discourse regarding democracy, if not successfully formulated and responding to some aesthetic exigencies, value judgments such as: 'the citizens of a democracy must be willing and able (...) to assume responsibility for the public life, i.e. to be involved in it in a certain quality, measure and manner of their choice. They must be free, social, ethical and moral beings' (in *Idea of Civil Society*, Adam Seligman finds inseparable the development of the idea of 'civil society' and the context 'ensured' by ethics and morality. P. Gross exploits this position, up to the possibility of civil society thanks to the generalization of trust and its universalisation) or 'the moral and ethical dimension constitutes the kernel of civil society...' (Gross, 2004, 29)

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +4 074 3036890.

E-mail address: [stefania.bejan.uaic@gmail.com](mailto:stefania.bejan.uaic@gmail.com)

give both analysts and practitioners serious reasons to think. The attributes of the 'tenants' of liberal democracies (representative or participatory), that we can only find in the public space, have the gift of creating communities founded on values, attitudes, behaviours corresponding to the democratic finalities. Freedom of choice (how to be, what actions to undertake, which group to be part of) depends on the individual-institutions reciprocity game, why not (Locke said it!) citizen-government, when some request (formulate), and the others consent to intervene according to the requirements of the social partners. Any open society, seen by a Ralf Dahrendorf (*Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*) not as a system, but as 'the open spaces of some potential infinite perspectives', doesn't aim for perfection, but rather for the democratization able to allow views and ways of living, the opposition against the market logic, minorities and groups that make their mark though their own majority, a power more or less 'attentive' to the wishes of the governed. The common good associated with modern democracy doesn't exclude competition and participation, dimensions intrinsic to the process investigated by Robert Dahl in terms of the intersection of social norms and behaviours. In the line of S. Huntington, the 'vague norms' of democracy refer to civic virtues found in the slogan of the French Revolution (1789), to 'the fairness and honesty in politics, the informal and rational deliberation, the equal participation and power' (Huntington, 1991, 9). We could think that the preliminaries of a civil society (be they cultural, institutional, economic...) smooth the elites-ordinary citizens joint actions, the behaviour claimed by social changes, the understanding of particular and general stakes in a certain moment of evolution in a given space. Exercising citizenship means, increasingly obvious, the presence of 'active links' able to ensure the 'checks and balances' (Edmund Burke, James Madison), the joint formulation and implementation of the interest and facts of groups, organizations, associations in which the constituents are placed in a network. Ernest Gellner's irony (*Conditions of Liberty*) that 'What distinguishes civil society (using the term to describe the whole society) or a society *containing* civil society (in the narrow sense) from the others is the fact that it's not clear who is the boss' doesn't affect the conclusion according to which civil society gives free reign to individuality, but also 'teaches' the lesson of social learning the coexistence: solidarity, the value of group action, the spirit of citizen duties, as they sound at a J. Kean, dedicated to the idea of democracy.

## 2. Conceptual delimitations. Dignity in the professional field

In a social arena with the claims quoted above is not strident to talk about professional ethics, especially in fields or situations in which the subjects bear the burden of difficulty. Therefore, it is appropriate to resort first to conceptual delimitations, explanatory in the issue of concern. Admitting that *ethics* systematically studies the *principles* on which human behaviour is based, we shall identify what makes some people professionals (competent, dedicated, masters, experts, having an excellent level of performance etc.) in working with children in need (physical or mental sufferings, educational or housing discomfort, deprivation of parental affection or community support and so on). Are targeted NGOs with projects put into operation in the city of Iași, Romania, but the mechanism is valid wherever the environment requires such voluntary social interventions. In the absence of the application of some principles with universal area of recognition, one would hardly distinguish the ethics; in other words, we would limit ourselves to the airy field of theory, the distance to the 'Terra' of practice not having a justification: to what purpose to define, formulate, stipulate if the lucrative footprint doesn't stand as witness to the analysis?! Thus, we accept *moralis* as means (modality), regular behaviour, and *morality* as what refers to *practice*. It is, therefore, *deontological* (deon = duty) to proceed only in a manner that portrays you as moral being, strictly related to ethics...

Coming into the world 'free and equal in dignity and rights', people consider that their ethical treatment from others shouldn't be a privilege, but an element of their human condition itself; people consider, and most international documents in the field - from 1945 onwards - recognize, usually in the preamble/first article - The UN Charter, 1945 (Preamble); The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948 (Preamble, Article 1); The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966, (Preamble); The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, 2000 (Preamble, Article 1 - Human Dignity) etc. (*Principalele instrumente internaționale privind drepturile omului la care România este parte*, 2003). How is it, then, that some depart from dignity, excluding themselves from the communities to which they belong? (However, conceptually, a person doesn't depart from their dignity, but it is 'taken away'). A possible answer was formulated by the specialists in psychology, deciding that *dignity* is above *human rights* and *freedom*,

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1112459>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1112459>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)