

## COMMUNICATION IN THE MEDIA INFORMATION SOCIETY

**Regis-Mafteiu ROMAN, Assoc. Prof. PhD.**  
„Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad  
[regis\\_roman@yahoo.com](mailto:regis_roman@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** *The article performs a analysis of communication. Speech, natural communication, epistemological discourse translate self-referential analysis into a paradigm. The quest for fundamentals is transposed into fallacious and improvable statements which are placed in an absurd field. I have already proven the fact that the human mind and thought acts in a binary manner. This idea belongs to the psychology of conformity. Consequently, communication is simplified both culturally and in terms of civilization. Obviously, we have not evolved much culturally or in axiological terms since the Antiquity. The result is today's society which is ideologically-unethical, morally-unaesthetic, competitively-equal or properly-false etc. basically, a phenomenological analysis of the fundamentals of speech is enough to understand the current humanity.*

**Key words:** *communication; epistemological discourse; etich; morallity; argumentation;*

I would like to add another definition to the more than 300 already existing ones (Ripp, 1998: 217). It is a definition that belongs to a simple but efficient function in terms of understanding the social grounds of speech. By analysing the implicit social fundaments, I suggest an axiomatic approach of the idea that speech carries in its inner structures the grounds. Self-reference is indifferent to linguistic families and it reveals itself by means of three implicit cases that can be found in proto-languages and are specific to human nature: conformity, the desire to overcome conformity, and both of them guided by intentionality. Conformity would find its correspondence in natural speech, which is schematic and binary with linguistic clichés as sublayer. Linguistic clichés are used by any manner and any communication species, irrespective of the speaker's status and role and irrespective of the most commonly used argumentations. These argumentations have mostly a cognitive nature or on the contrary, an affective one. From politeness statements to wooden language and passing through axiological ideas, the humanities are part of the repetitive act, spoken or written with an unacknowledged lightness. We are totally free to utter imitations that we accept but only if we consider paradoxically or stupidly, that they have a certain amount of originality, semantically or at least stylistically interiorized. Only the meaning and the infinity of interpretations bear the mark of individuality, subjectivism and the common man's unique way of being.

By its nature, conformity has a binary nature (Roman, 2007: 290-299) of acceptance or rejection, true or false, good or bad, knowledge or lack of knowledge, existence or inexistence etc. which are based on the reflexive schematic character of humanities. Life is mostly regarded in an alternative manner. We constantly need to make choices, we place ourselves between me and the other, between Ego and nature, between time and space, disintegrative ontogenesiological stability and instability. Binary schematism is an innate construction but also a cultural construction that reached its peak in the manifestations of historical reasoning in the modern age. In this respect, we can make reference for an epistemic exemplification to the fundamentals of cognitive psychology, to the computer metaphor and even to the development of calculation machines, etc. If we assess speech, we would fall into its specific trap, therefore we only note that it exists. The opposite, the desire to overcome conformity is something different from any non-systemic status. It reveals a sort of existential indignation or even rebellion. The intention of going beyond any unspecific breakage is shown so that the

difference between the self and something else is equalised or shaded off in a new manner. The binarity is replaced by a multitude of polymorphic meanings. It is not only about a trivial Hegelian synthesis like the bound between thesis and antithesis which is based on duality and pre-set prejudices. Nor is it about symbolic writing, namely ideographic writing which involve dual conventionalism assumed culturally and civilizational.

Going beyond conformity describes the intention of reaching one form or another of creation through a pre- or post-Wittgenstein open notional game that can be associative or epistemic, etc. Or, in other words, ludic attitudes become epistemic, i.e. pretty serious, inviting to an initiatory baptism of new notions. Overcoming conformity contains, therefore contradiction, contrariety against a pre-existing language, or the need to impose specific notions concerning reality or thinking, which tend to expand mostly at intentional level due to the lack of such notions. The dynamics of cultural acts, crystal works, more or less perfect, paradigmatic or historical research theories bear the authors' intentionality as implicit initiation. The most frequent conflicts, misunderstandings, reasoning errors, structural-semantic crisis emerge at this point. Hermeneutics, empathy, comprehension are tools of sadness to be found everywhere and we tend to overcome them all the time, at least, fractionally. Overcoming conventionalisms can bring about irritation or it becomes casuistically unhealthy. Moreover, counterarguments can be found in the same binary thinking, which is typical for traditional and pragmatic logics. Fixed ideas, conventionalism are stronger than alternative, new statements. Social crowd psychology has proven it statistically. Social innovation needs hundreds of years to be accepted by the society. Intentionality embraces the nature of individual subjectivity. The way a person lives in a Heideggerian manner in language is a defining tool in terms of relative onto-gnoseological truth, reduced mainly to phenomenological anchors. Many studies and authors have tried to argue about the existence of a type of objective, unintentional, neutral speech. These beliefs understood as David Hume refers to them, have emerged as consequence of modernity and binary thinking, of the delusion about the existence of a pure (neo)Kantian reason, and even about the existence of unintentional and potential speech. These ideas have been referred to briefly in U. Eco's studies on metaphor, or in P. Ricoeur's paradigms of interpretation, etc.<sup>2</sup> However these unjustified attitudes impel the man in a utopic world and end up being overwhelmed by the impoliteness of certain ideals or forms of absolute unprovable potentials. Integrative linguistic analyses are demanding but do not transmit anything different from the modern ones. However, they are so frequently used that become obsolete because of their binary reception and interpretation. Dual dichotomies and perspectives are only the same reductionist manner that continues the state of incompleteness. For instance, the quarrel of universals remains a methodological non-sense in projection and potential analyses as nominalism reveals more than it is able to do and realism is limited to its own sufficiency that renders subjective incompleteness. Both tools are necessary to an equal extent for speech analysis when we take into account the degree of involvement in textuality and subtextuality, simultaneously. *In essence, communication is, ab initio, the minimal form of manifestation of subjectivism and each individual's subjectivity staged by historical, concrete cultural symbols.* The definition has been reduced to a synthetic, elementary statement that makes reference to any type of communication without taking into account the interlocutors' ethical, axiological and status premises. It comprises simultaneously natural and epistemic communication as there is no strategic difference between them. Only socially hierarchical roles bring about stupefaction, yet the differentiations belong exclusively to the semantic classes used by the interlocutors. Cognitions, associations and transfers concerning the relation between words and meanings are

---

<sup>2</sup> There are so many examples that we would have been unable to refer to all of them; the selected ones are only for practice and inference purposes

not as varied as believed at a hereditarian level. Education is the consequence of current historical policies, remaining in the same inconstant sadness in the end.

One first strengthening re-argumentation can refer to the speaker or the sender of a message. The limitations of Wittgenstein's thinking are also the limitations of the language used. Similarly, the principle bears away vice and reasoning errors that exist in the inner structure of thinking. Intentionally, conservatives oppose conventional changes, the novelty bringer seeks a way of re-understanding things and mediating them. The conflict which arises is relatively irreconcilable as there is the same semantic indeterminacy that emerges with translations from a language into another. The compromise is tolerated. Secondly, the virtual interlocutor, fundamental by relation to extreme cases, can be placed on the same level. In easier words, both scientists and common men relate to the same perceptive scheme: binary or multivalent! This happens because the initiatory baptism and summed up or synthetic recognition of a varied number of notions, smaller or bigger, does not stand for a maximal assessment grade or individual value in terms of the reasoning values that we have analysed. It only stands for adaptation to the process of recognition, namely of understanding notions through old or new perceptive richness that has been used only for social segregation such as trivial power games. Different social roles and statements of interlocutors with a different social status are always placed under the category of authority's sophism. It is not a criterion of truth the fact that a superior, educated ego, a value state something but the independent judgement and the judgement assumed by the Ego. The Aristoteles correspondence with facts is another cliché of the naivety of humanities as facts are mostly interpretative, therefore they are historically subjective and not subjective as positive, disinterested universe. The third argumentation can be made as we understand that communication has always an ethical implicit basis. However, ethics depends on the degree of indoctrination and on the values, called absolute that guide it. Absurdity has an utopic nature as a perpetuum mobile. It exists only in informative experiences and experiences formalized by the modern intentionality. For instance, many generations have worshiped the idea of pure Kantian reason, namely the German idealism that used the policy of superior state reason not to the detriment of the individual but of the social groups with implicit adverse effects. We refer to the theoretical core of communism that does not realise today, in democracy the ethical hostile consequences of humanities. It is explainable why the old continent is self-defined through unified forums like practicing a meritocracy dictatorship within closed groups. At least, this is the way it is self-characterized.

Forth, in any act or form of communication, the most important part is the message itself. It is important how it is transmitted, the binary or tertiary correspondence with the truth, the pragmatic productivity but among all these, the most important part refers to intentionality. The work, the process, the final phenomenon that reality focuses on without being actually uttered. I say „Hello!”, aiming at something conscious or on the contrary!, I describe a metaphor (Battistini & Guaragnella, 2007: 445-466), or an intentional paradigm (Grady, 1999: 100) or a vulgar politeness form. Any of them share an intentional state that brings about something, define a proper notion or a fake, improper, indifferent one. Unselfish communication does not exist at any level because it is not a mere instrument of anchoring in the informal mundanity. It is an instrument used to possess an universe considered hostile at the beginning in a conservative perspective. We answer in the same manner, we double our own limitations with a finite similar gender because we cannot overcome binary, no matter what we do.

In argumentative terms we can exemplify by a multitude of philosophical, linguistic, philological, logical, psychological, anthropological etc. studies that refer to the apparent neutrality of discourse and speech as objective, instrumental and secure genders. Discussions are held on metalanguage, self-reference as a (un)human and necessary or (un)knowable

universe that exists in ideal and static worlds, untouchable universes, global semantic systems thrown into the ideal, into Nirvana, about autistic worlds that use disabled communication, completely unserious and hilarious exercises to such extent that they do not even deserve citation. For instance, pragmatic approaches on communication focus on a judgement according to which “there are no universal interpretation issues but rather particular ones that can be solved with normal research techniques” (Habermas, 2000: 27). These ideas have been overcome in the 70s by introducing into the academic world the paradigm of interpretation as effect of: relative authority of logical positivism, the development of phenomenology, of philosophical hermeneutics and critical theory, of structuralism (anthropological, linguistic and sociological), of socio-biology and eco-biology, of belief in the possibility of finding an explanation to civilizational universal traits „rather through human being’s nature than through rational infrastructure of knowledge, action and human language, namely of the culture itself (Habermas, 2000: 28). Language has been regarded from the beginning as a form of power<sup>3</sup>, of persuasion, influence and manipulation of the other real and not abstract, inborn or potential, nothing more than a deliberate induction in error, that sometimes we try to change out of interest. The message is no longer important, only the transmission medium as formula of complete denigration of communication, as we find out in the Anglo-Saxon literature. Propaganda receives a major explicit role as it addresses to a growing number of people. Lie is elevated to virtue, as the alternative is minimized and mocked! I did not say that the truth is an alternative nor that it isn’t a choice! Knowledge, epistemology, science that developed gradually are circumscribed to this phenomenon of accepting primary axiological statements, irrespective of their field: mystical, religious, ideological etc. In this respect, it is an utopia not to imagine the existence of an objective, neutral universal language, without taking into account the rhetorical implication of influencing the other through intentional means of communication. Not even by using a wooden language in direct communication can we transmit neutral messages, even if there isn’t a state of intentionality and conscious persuasion from the interlocutors’ side. This characterization re-describes an initiating foundation of language as manner of manifestation and not as theoretical and theorized gender which indicates a minimalist form of subjectivity. Language through humans becomes a form of domination, of power, going beyond the causes and forms of manifestation or cultural species by gender, conscious or not, belonging to each individual through a formal analysis of the effects of subjectivism. Archetypally, language means persuasion, influence, community power not only collectively subliminal. As language is not inborn it cannot be an unconscious dream common to all humanities.

In the fifth case, when going from subjectivism to individual subjectivity, different languages transpose in translation and their understanding in syntactic, semantic and pragmatic terms. To a larger or a smaller extent. In terms of communication reference, the difference is insignificant. Inadequacies, lies, sophisms are kept according to the same algorithm. In natural language, they are more easily recognized, being easy and common to everyone. Empirical analysis is an explicit attribute of the entire society. But in language of type II<sup>4</sup>, the case of meritocrats, elite, epistemologists, when formally analysing the judgement errors it is possible but not compulsory to recognise them. It is a criterion common to a smaller community and not to the entire society. The efforts, even if they are less visible to the great mass of people, affect everyone to the same extent. Reduced to representative, initiating schematism as elementary foundation of language, admitted or not admitted errors do not differ according to

---

3 We find the idea at Claude Lévi-Strauss *Tristes tropiques*, Paris, 1965, for whom the main and primary idea of discourse, *of written communication is to ease enslavement*, reduced to written language, unnoticed the importance of social interception of texts, their latent effect by releasing them into society is used by J. F. Lyotard, *Condiția postmodernă*, Editura Idea, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, pag. 11.

4 According to *Noam Chomsky’s classification*

the speakers' social role. The understanding of communication basis is not a differentiated analysis but on the contrary, it tries to grasp the common place of manifestations. Consequently, it is the same thing if we communicate directly and send the same message using neologisms specific to a scientific field, to a vocational or elitist one. The clothes differ but the representations are the same. The idea of communicational conformism is identical when uttered by a common man and by a scientist. The clichés are the same, differences emerging only in terms of frequency of fashionable statements and number of receivers. The opposite of communicational conformism, the denial of social clichés or of restraint communities that make us think about uniqueness, stylistic formulas, creativity through creation are developed on identical rational, associative, contradictory and contrary that build something like an open critical thinking. In this last case, one should mind the professional deontology of the one who brings novelty as immediate ethical fragment. An analysis of immediate, superficial and explicit causes should be performed as well as of intermediary, virtual and implicit effects.

In conclusion, we can say that linguistically we are close to the statement in which we play with nothing, or we should call it<sup>5</sup> a constant variable of apparent language. Clichés do not stand for anything. However, today, philosophy is sentenced by our present society not to talk about anything. It has become a positive, binary discourse used by the socio-humanities if they accept a sort of parallel or imaginary reality (sentenced to disappearance by the humanities) and a negative discourse if they deny this post-physical relation (positivism and pragmatism). But, it is immoral to imitate and state at the same time, that you are original! Moreover, is it moral to state that you have overcome imitation? Generally, the conformist man, the man of clichés imitates himself through a phenomenological another, through the hermeneutical self or through a historical-cultural model. Man as novelty and new provider tries to impose the same quasi-reality, which is socio-conceptually related. However, he is still a piece of reality! The individual imitates and reproduces as faithfully as possible the natural phenomenon, believing that it is different or that it exceeds him. He behaves as if he were not a piece of reality! The last judgements show that at semantic level, the issue is intuitively paradigmatic due to the process of denying self-reference or due to the inability of solving what we naturally accept as the universe of unprovable statements or the universe of tautologies. Ironically, in the human semantic field, both universes are accepted according to the binary nature of the universe. But, any universe considered necessary leads to the emergence of new immoral consequences – because in both cases, the subject is placed in a position of structural and ontological incompleteness up to the point he ascertains his own fundamentals.

#### References:

- Battistini, Andrea, Guaragnella, Pasquale (ed.), *Giambattista Vico e l'enciclopedia dei saperi*. - Lecce: Pensa multimedia 2007, - (Mneme; 2) PDF
- Grady, J. A Typology of Motivation for Conceptual Metaphor: Correlation and Resemblance, in Gibbs & Steen (eds.), 1999.
- Habermas, J., *Conștiință morală și acțiune comunicativă*, Editura All, București, 2000.
- Lyotard, J. F., *Condiția postmodernă*, Editura Idea, Cluj-Napoca, 2003.
- Ripp, B., Safford and Margaret Irby Nichols, (ed.), *Guide to reference materials for school library media centers*, 1998.
- Roman, R., *Fundamentele limbajului. Premise referențiale și autoreferențiale*, Editura Argonaut, Cluj-Napoca, 2007.

---

5 We make reference to the constant Heideggerian effort of building nothing or to the question: why rather the Being than Nothing? to propose phenomenology and philosophical hermeneutics.