

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

Prepared by Dr. Sherihan Mohamed

Lecture 2

جامعة الجميع الذكية

تسعى لتكون الكيان الأول الذي يتبنى مبدأ المجتمع التعليمي
التعاوني ويقدم العلم مقابل العمل لتنمية وبناء المجتمعات.

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

CHABTER 01

تسعى لتكون الكيان الأول الذي يتبنى مبدأ المجتمع التعليمي
التعاوني ويقدم العلم مقابل العمل لتنمية وبناء المجتمعات.

مزيد من التفاصيل

**** (Ethical) life in the (post-)digital age:**

1. Digital media, analog media: convergence and Ubiquity.
2. Digital media and “greased information”.
3. Digital media as communication media: fluidity, ubiquity, global scope, and selfhood/identity.



- ** Digital media ethics: How to proceed?
- ** Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope
- ** How to do ethics in the new mediascape: Dialogical approaches, difference, and Pluralism.
- ** Further considerations: Ethical judgments
- ** Conclusion



DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

CHABTER 02





At first glance, developing such **an ethics** would seem to be **an impossible task**.

First of all, **digital media** often **present** us with **strikingly new sorts of interactions** with one **another**.

So, it is not always clear whether – and, if so, then how– ethical guidelines and approaches already in place (and comparatively well established) for traditional media would apply.





But again, as emphasized in the term “post-digital,” digital media remain analogue media in essential ways – the music arriving at our ears remains analogue, etc.

And so, the life worlds of human experience that digital media now increasingly define remain connected with the analogue life worlds of earlier generations and cultures.

* In addition, digital media as **global media** thus **force** us to **confront** culturally **variable views**, regarding not simply basic ethical norms and practices but, more fundamentally, how ethics is to be done.





In particular, non-Western views challenge traditional Western notions of the primary importance of the individual, and thereby Western understandings of ethical responsibility as primarily individual responsibility.

This means, more specifically, that multiple actors and agents must work together to make specific acts (both beneficent and harmful) possible.

Hence, in parallel with the distribution of information via networks, our ethical responsibility may be more accurately understood in terms of a distributed responsibility.





This understanding of “**Distributed Responsibility**”

is, in fact, not an entirely new idea.

Rather, it is one **shared** with both pre-modern

Western philosophies and religions and multiple

philosophies and religions around the globe.



Certainly, this is a Very Good Thing: it suggests **important ethical norms** and **practices** that can be **shared** among the multiple cultures and peoples now brought into **digital communication** with one another.

But it represents a **major challenge**, especially, to Western thinkers used to understanding ethical responsibility in primarily individualistic terms.

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

CHAPTER 02



Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope

Chapter 02

Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope

When we first begin to grapple with digital media ethics, the tasks before us may seem to be overwhelming and perhaps simply futile.



But both our collective experience with earlier technological developments and more recent experience in the domain of information and computing ethics (ICE) suggest that, despite the considerable challenges of **Developing new ethical frameworks for new technologies**, we are nonetheless able to do so.

Chapter 02

Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope

Indeed, this experience provides us with a number of examples of **ethical resolutions** that “work” both **globally** (as they involve discerning shared norms and understandings) and **locally** (as they further involve developing ways of interpreting and applying shared norms in specific cultural contexts).



Chapter 02

Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope



As a primary example: the European Union has drawn up and now implemented more rigorous privacy protections than were defined under previous data regulations.



In 2015, the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) established an Ethics Advisory Group, assigned to develop a “new digital ethics” to help guide the specific implementations of the GDPR, including sustaining the rigorous EU privacy protections vis the emerging Internet of Things and growing uses of Artificial Intelligence (AI).

Chapter 02

Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope



This **new digital ethics**, however, turns squarely on two ethical frameworks we have begun to explore here.

Namely, **Deontology** (roughly, an insistence on human autonomy and thereby basic rights, including the right to privacy) and **Virtue ethics** (briefly, a focus on achieving good lives of flourishing through the development of our best capacities).

Chapter 02

Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope



For example, the EDPS Ethics Advisory Group (EAG) foregrounds the central importance of autonomy and freedom, including as these are grounded in the philosophical work of Immanuel Kant.

Similarly, both the EAG report and the more philosophical account of the key ethical pillars of a “Good AI Society” foreground the central aims of virtue ethics – namely, flourishing, well-being, and good lives.

At the same time, these ethical frameworks are (also) applied in a pluralistic fashion.

So, the EAG asserts that basic norms and values – such as **autonomy**, **dignity**, **equality**, and so on – are both central “to the European project”.



Chapter 02

Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope



These examples suggest that digital media ethics – as likewise requiring us to address the ethical dimensions evoked by developing new technologies, including how these implicate diverse cultural norms and traditions – is nonetheless a doable project.

Moreover: extensive evidence argues that with few exceptions, as enculturated human beings, we are already deeply ethical.

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

CHAPTER 02



These examples of the [AoIR guidelines](#) and recent [EU law](#) and [ethics](#) further offer important suggestions for how to proceed – specifically, as both examples share two elements in common.



Chapter 02

How to do ethics in the new mediascape



To begin with, they each incorporate what we can think of as dialogical approaches – approaches that emphasize the importance of listening for and respecting differences between our diverse ethical views.

Chapter 02

How to do ethics in the new mediascape



Such approaches are called Ethical absolutism or ethical monism. These may work well in certain contexts and with regard to some ethical matters.

But, especially in a global context, a severe consequence of such ethical monism is to force us into thinking that one – and only one – particular ethical framework and set of norms and values are right, and those that are different can only be wrong.


Ethical relativism argues that beliefs, norms, practices, frameworks, etc., are legitimate solely in relation to a specific culture, time, and place. In this way.

Ethical relativism allows us to avoid the intolerance of ethical monism and to accept all views as legitimate.




Chapter 02

How to do ethics in the new mediascape



Such an approach is especially attractive as it prevents us from having to judge among diverse views and cultures: we can endorse all of them as legitimate in at least a relative way.

Ethical pluralism in both internet research ethics and EU law and ethics surrounding privacy and data privacy protection shows how such pluralism stands as a third possibility – one that is something of a middle ground between absolutism and relativism.



Chapter 02

How to do ethics in the new mediascape



That is, to begin with, such pluralism avoids the either/or of ethical monism – an either/or that forces us to choose between two different views, endorsing one as right and the other as wrong.

Rather, we can thereby see that many (but not necessarily all) different views may be right, insofar as they function as diverse interpretations and applications of shared norms and values.



Chapter 02

How to do ethics in the new mediascape



But if the only way we are able to think about ethical matters is in terms of the either/or of ethical monism, then we literally cannot conceive of how to move beyond the right/wrong dualisms with which it often confronts us.

Chapter 02

How to do ethics in the new mediascape

We will find it difficult conceptually to move toward pluralism and other forms of middle grounds, because our either/or thinking insists that we can only have either unity (shared norms) or difference (in interpretation/application), but not both.



DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

CHAPTER 02



Another difficulty with the “moral panics” approach to ethical issues in the new mediascape is that it suggests that “ethics” works like this:



1. There are clear, universally valid norms of right and wrong that we can take as our ethical starting points – as premises in an ethical argument.



2. All that “ethics” really involves is applying these initial premises to the particulars of the current case in front of us – in a straightforward deduction that concludes the right thing to do, as based on our first premises.



3. Once we have our ethical answers in this way, we can be confident that our answers are right; those who **disagree** with us must be **wrong**.



Chapter 02

Further considerations: Ethical judgments



This approach to ethics is not necessarily mistaken; on the contrary, it seems that much of the time, most of us in fact do not perceive an ethical problem or difficulty in the situation we're facing – because our ethical frameworks already provide us with reasonably clear and straightforward answers along just these lines.

At the same time, however, this **initial understanding** of **ethics obscures** a number of important **dimensions** of **ethical reflection**.

There is **no general rule** for discerning which values, principles, norms, approaches apply before we can proceed to any inferences/conclusions about what to do.



That is, we will find it difficult conceptually to move toward pluralism and other forms of middle grounds, because our either/or thinking insists that we can only have either unity (**shared norms**) or difference (**in interpretation/application**), but not both.



Aristotle referred to this kind of judgment as “practical judgment”.

For Aristotle, the development of this sort of practical judgment is an ongoing project that continues throughout one’s entire life.



Chapter 02

Further considerations: Ethical judgments

Analogously, our first efforts to grapple with difficult ethical issues that require **practical judgment** do not always go well:

We are caught in the ethical “**bootstrapping**” problem of needing precisely the ability to judge that will be robust enough to help only after it has been developed and honed through many years of (sometimes hard) experience.



- ** Digital media ethics: How to proceed?
- ** Is digital media ethics possible? Grounds for hope
- ** How to do ethics in the new mediascape: Dialogical approaches, difference, and Pluralism.
- ** Further considerations: Ethical judgments



Thanks for
listening

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS

Prepared by Dr. Sherihan Mohamed
Introduction

جامعة الجميع الذكية

تسعى لتكون الكيان الأول الذي يتبنى مبدأ المجتمع التعليمي
التعاوني ويقدم العلم مقابل العمل لتنمية وبناء المجتمعات.

DIGITAL MEDIA ETHICS