

Trivent Publishing

© The Authors, 2016

Available online at <http://trivent-publishing.eu/>



Series: *Philosophy, Communication, Media Sciences*

Volume: *Communication Today: An Overview from Online Journalism to Applied Philosophy*

The Lesson of Democracy: Nescience, Inability, Dissimulated Refuse?

Ștefania Bejan

Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences,
“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași, Romania

Abstract

The present paper is particularly interested in analyzing the role of mass media (if a legitimate one!) in “teaching” the “lesson” of democracy, for which the exam is only passed with suffering and patience. Who invested mass media with this noble mission, what is the recognized profile of the teacher-authority bearer in this field of communication? With what strategies (arguments, rules, finalities and so on) does one stand at the negotiating table on the seductive, yet so thorny topic of democracy?

Keywords

The new public space; cathodic agora; mediatic device; space of demonstration; telecracy; post-television; crisis of representation; “social identities;” “electronic democracy.”

This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) license, which permits others to copy or share the article, provided original work is properly cited and that this is not done for commercial purposes. Users may not remix, transform, or build upon the material and may not distribute the modified material (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

DOI: 10.22618/TP.PCMS.20164.349021

I. Introduction

Democracy has long ceased to be an option. It is an obligation for the individual “struck” of any form of personal freedom; it is a genuine social “condemnation” for the post-communist world; it is a “passport” for European coexistence (at least), assumed with no turning back. Impossible to experience in a lack of knowledge of the general and particular conditions, of the social actors, of the mechanism (sometimes difficult to apply, often difficult to bear), in a word, in the nescience of the lesson about true democracy.

The richness of terminology regarding “direct democracy”, “participatory democracy”, “new mass democracies” (A. Le Foulgoc), “cathodic democracy” and so on facilitates to the postmodern consumer of media message - especially of neo-television - the understanding of a mutation that took place in the past two-three decades: the replacement of the expertise from the shows developed from debates (in Romanian specialized literature referred to as “emisiuni de cuvinte” - D. Zeca-Buzura) with the story - featured in a “ludic, spectacular, participatory” manner. Either only a “ublimation of the banal” illustrated in a talk show, in a reality show, or the prediction of some alterations of the personality of the individual who is circumscribed to post-television, we are dealing with instances of democracy (including the questionable figure of telecracy - E. Morin). More than an expression assorted with the end of the twentieth century, the desideratum of diversity proves to be a guarantor, paradoxically, of the consequence of globalization, namely the unifying presentation of some informational products accepted by the “mass.” We support this, since precisely the receptor heterogeneity increases, as the number, quantity, density of what we call “the general public” get to weigh seriously in the economy of cultural industries.

The combination (to some researchers, a genuine mutant) between information and spectacle in affective-compassionate television is not, we strongly believe, an epidemic or an incurable malady for the seeker of democracy in the mass media area. It is a framework, a possibility, an easement, so that a form of participation, deliberation regarding stringent or at least interesting matters would not be missed. Not to be forgotten: we are in a time of impatience, of diminution of civic responsibility in election moments and stakes, of augmentation of seductive strategies from the instances of communication socially active and recognized as such. Besides, fidelity no longer constitutes a virtue of the devourer of information. Nomadism becomes a mark of the era and the techniques of attracting the users are refined; the effect of communication strategies matters more than ethics. The analysis of television formats performed both in commercial media and in those in public service prove the legitimacy of the struggle for conquering audiences, in the complicated context of the insidious domination practiced by the media system. All of this, in contempt of the attempts of the moderators, TV hosts to prove complete freedom (or a certain degree of professional independence) in exercising social roles assuming originality, creativity, responsibility, uniqueness.

II. The problematic of the democratization of mass media in the context of the new public space

The logical association between the personal freedom of the individual living in postmodernity and democracy sends, on a practical level, among others, to the contribution of mass media (“venerated as vehicles of democratization and condemned as tools of the devil against it”¹) in the social desideratum

¹ Peter Gross, *Mass media și democrația în țările Europei de Est* [Mass Media and Democracy in Eastern Europe] (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2004), 11.

of “people power.” The beginning question, recalling agora as place of performing the democratic behaviour in Ancient Greece, is: Somehow, is the new mode of democratic experience found in mass media formats, thus justifying expressions such as “electronic agora,” “catholic democracy,” “new mass democracy”?

One of the authorized voices in the field of communication, generating a real critique of the contemporary media discourse (Dominique Wolton) referring strictly to television, “decrees” that the incitement of passions and the rousing of reciprocity confer it the force of targeting “the very essence of democracy.” The French author, preoccupied with the difficulty of organizing communication, the key concept of “otherness” in communication (through cultural diversity) and not least the threats of the political tyranny of electronic communication, warns about the solitude of interactivity in the new paradigms of communication. The type of researcher involved in the public area, D. Wolton chooses “not to mumble, but to shout in the ears of the deciders”² regarding the falsehood of producing a new individual due to the Internet, the error of quantitative evaluation (since the result can be none other than standardization), the image of a plasticized-pasteurized world in which we are now living! As for the strict area of communicational action, the one who brings an *Eulogy to the Great Public* invokes the utopia based on the supposition of equality between the partners in communication. Wolton believes, on the contrary, that there is a clear hierarchy, some being on a superior position (even though, at a superficial glance, this difference of essence is not noticeable - N/N). To be noted, in the critical theory of the media assumed by the leader of CNRS, the idea of hypostasizing television as source of social cohesion: “Its participation to the problematic of the social bond is much more subtle (than institutions such as the school, the army, the church - A/N) since it refers, mostly, to entertainment and leisure activities”³. Along with Jean-Louis Missika, the specialist in communication (including political communication) opines that cultural disparities have been privileged by the media, these disparities proving the power of popular or commercial culture, but in a paradigm on the opposite side of the one of “„educator of the people” - promoted by the elites of the seventh decade.⁴ Approaching a very sensitive and controversial topic - “the new public space” - the said authors participate in a necessary and present debate, having as a starting point the assessment (definition) of public space as „place of argumentation and exchanges.”⁵

In the present endeavour, the thread between sociability and hypostases of the public space bears the mark Jürgen Habermas, signer of the anatomy of the public sphere. Identifying a “social substratum of the public space”, the author relates the political socialization (source of citizen’s attitude) with elements such as: the reference to cultural goods, the sociability within the family, the entertainment associated with leisure time - all of these in the competent wording of a sociologist of journalism, Érik Neveu.⁶ Agreeing with the idea of ruling (even in a tyrannical form) the public space (joinder of those who, publicly, use their reason for accomplishing the common good) by mass media, we find rightful É. Neveu’s idea regarding the individual and social substrata of the public space. The decade of the European great sociocultural movements brought an inversion in the “issue” of the

² Dominique Wolton, “Mondialisation, diversité culturelle et francophonie”, Conference held on March 27, 2015, within “Les imaginaires de la Francophonie”, 20th edition, Iași, Romania, March 27-28, 2015.

³ Dominique Wolton, *Éloge du grand public. Une théorie critique de la télévision* (Paris: Flammarion, 1990), 126-127.

⁴ Jean-Louis Missika, Dominique Wolton, *La Folle du logis* (Paris: Gallimard, 1983), 141.

⁵ *Spațiul public și comunicarea* [Public space and communication], ed. Isabelle Pailliar (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2002), 201.

⁶ É. Neveu, “Științele sociale față în față cu Spațiul public, științele sociale în spațiul public” [Social Sciences Face-to-Face with the Public Space, Social Sciences in the Public Space], in *Spațiul public și comunicarea* [Public space and communication], ed. Isabelle Pailliar (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2002), 50.

public-private binomial: people with notoriety seek refuge in an own comfort zone (“private”), while the common problems of the regular people penetrate the public space. In Paul Béaud’s terminology, we are dealing with “the intellectualization of private life.” The next step is inventorying the topics of the debates from the public sphere, thus noticing the allowing, in formats of the audiovisual media, of expressing the emotions and feelings reserved, until then, to the intimate space (implicitly, considered unimportant for public exposure); the general interest would come from their extrapolation to the level of the society in its complexity and, then, would give birth to *reality shows* - so enjoyed in post-television. In other words, the functioning of the public space depends as well on the acceptance of some public micro-spaces, as on the non-contempt against TV programs “populated” with sources of some “insignificant” significations. Next, in his analysis, Neveu mentions the existence of the public space through two coordinates: plurality and partiality. Concurrently, he claims that individuals advocating various causes or groups „acquire varying civic competences and a capacity to express their opinion through socialization, in a social context, in spaces of interdependence, in social «fields»”⁷. Finally, the dissection of the citizenship formation mechanism directs the researcher towards institutions of socialization in which the school has primacy (here one learns the social promotion, reproduction and stability), but is joined by syndicalism, protest and so on, with attribute of “compulsory transitional moments in order to give the notion of crisis of representation a different status from the one of asylum of ignorance”⁸.

In the same direction of investigation (the intersection between the private and the public space in the field of media communication), I Pailliant lists “the new television”, NTIC (*Nouvelles Technologies d’Information et de Communication*), the public prevention campaigns etc., with their role of re-configuring the boundaries between public and private, imposing the idea of the inseparable „commitment” - „lived experience”; the stake of recreating „a common world rather than participating in an argumentative device”⁹ motivates the action of the social actors specialized in communication. Although maintaining discussing the public space exclusively in its political dimension is not productive, it serves our topic to mention that the anatomy of the public space circumscribes power relations, often partially visible „thanks” to the symbolization function exercised by mass media; the same organizations of mass communication, strategically choosing the mixture of the public and private spaces, guarantee, according to I. Pailliant, the symbolic separation between the universal and particular dimensions that accompany, in different manners, the individual-citizen. Dominique Schnaper, approaching *The Community of Citizens*, stated: “What founds the principle - and, in the same time, the values - of the democratic nation is the opposition between the universality of the citizen and the specificity of the individual as private person, member of the civil society”, Hence, the association of representation with the universal character of those who love democracy. At all incidentally, even in the case of representation, we are inclined to submit to attention the slippages from the good representation from the political actors, whom we deem traitors to the expectations of the electorate, interested in their own agendas, indifferent to the imperative of good governance or legislative practice. The downside is translated by the formation of “social identities” in the mechanism of representation - as Pierre Rosanvallon argued, in an interview published in *Le Monde* (1993). When the public expression of the citizen is rare or even absent, the diagnosis sounds simple: crisis of social identity.¹⁰

⁷ Ibidem, 52.

⁸ Ibidem, 53.

⁹ I. Pailliant, “Prolungiri” [Prolongations], in *Spațiul public și comunicarea*, ed. Isabelle Pailliant, 202.

¹⁰ J. Mouchon, “Spațiul public și discursul politic televizat” [The Public Space and the Televised Political Discourse], in *Spațiul public și comunicarea*, ed. Isabelle Pailliant, 185.

Crisis is a frequent term in the public sphere, from credibility, representation, identity, to communication, in general, in the political field, the field of media etc.¹¹ It is part of “the lesson of democracy.” especially since the debates regarding the gear of democracy include, inevitably, a medium such as television. “The crisis of representation” denotes a diseased democracy, status maintained by the complicity of political institutions with those representing mass communication: “...refracted in a spectacular or caricatured manner through the mirror-magnifying glass of the cathodic screen, the original effects of the mediatization of political communication - which participate in a more general transformation of the symbolic mediations of the social bond - are translated first by a «jitter» of the conventional codes of democratic representation”¹².

III. The television of the invaded affect - “territory” of exercising democracy

Vigilant theoretician of the critical space, Paul Virilio incriminates the information transmission speed in the electronic media and its effects on the interaction and social exchanges; the conviction expressed in *Le Monde* (January 28, 1992) is based on the rule of democracy “which presupposes going towards others, discussing, ensuring time for reflection and sharing the responsibility of the decision.” The functioning of democracy becomes impossible when enough time is no longer allocated to sharing responsibility, because of “the fatality of acceleration”; thus, the outcomes are translated, first of all, by the lack of interest in politics, „namely of a system of representations and delegations in total contradiction with the «telepresence.»”¹³ The harshness of the ideas expressed by P. Virilio is compensated by D. Wolton, four days later, declared defender of “mass democracy”, since “Never before have so many citizens participated in political life, expressed themselves and voted in an egalitarian manner. Who besides mass media, among which front-rank is television, can ensure this equality indispensable to exercising democracy? Television is not, therefore, a brake to democracy, but, on the contrary, a condition of its exercise” (*Le Monde*, February 1, 1992).¹⁴

P. Lecomte treats the trio communication, television, democracy within the borders of the “reshaped public space of the cathodic agora” through a double filter: the science of politics and sociology of communication. In this way, a sophisticated puzzle becomes obvious: “anthropological mechanisms of exchange and of social bond, specific logics of mass televisual communication and of the media system, political dynamics of the institutional mediations within representative democracies.” The “social medicine” practised by Lecomte doesn’t target the manifestations of the definitive degradation of representative democracy (in its ideal portrait, due to the Golden Century of Greek culture), but, rather, “faces” of mass mediation in what concerns political communication: “from electoral «show» to spectacle-State going through the televisual duel, the strategy of notoriety or the «star-system» of power.”¹⁵ Interested in the personal strategies of communication, political leaders see in television an instrument through the “set-ups” of which they would preserve their legitimacy and popularity; let us not forget, a quarter-century ago, J. Gerstlé was reinforcing the idea, opining that the main elements regarding government are subject of a genuine staging, in “the

¹¹ In "Introduction" [Introduction] to *Comunicare, televiziune și democrație* [Communication, television and democracy] (Bucharest: Ed. Tritonic, 2004), 7, Patrick Lecomte mentions the cause of the crisis of the political system - central topic of the public debated starting with the 90s – “the inability of completing the deficit of legitimacy that the increasing distance between power and society, government and the governed would inexorably fill.”

¹² Ibidem, 8.

¹³ Ibidem, 9.

¹⁴ Ibidem.

¹⁵ Ibidem, 11.

television theatre,” and the question in need of an answer is who is the puppeteer, in other words, who controls the stage. The new symbolic political system - according to an expression of F. Brune - the new way of producing „the legitimate social reality” (P. Lecomte) as a sum of spectacles in a “society of the spectacle” (G. Debord), giving mass media free rein in transforming democracy into an „event canvas”, confers meaning to a liberal democratic system in which communication, spectacle production and consumption occupy the forefront¹⁶ (shall it be about a dissimulated refuse of the „viewers” to notice how spectacle and consume become conditions of a social existence specific to the hypermodern era, named by Gilles Lipovetsky of “hyperconsumption” - in fact, of democracy?). The ability of television to depict a “social world” through a specific device („a strategic combination of symbolic, logistical, material and discursive elements”¹⁷) depends on a chosen topic, a framework intended for dramatization, professional rituals, identities and roles of the media actors and their guests. “The battlefield” is situated behind the screen, in an “arena” represented by experts and “voices of the people”, affines in terms of ideas or opponents, moderators (“conductors of words”) and the setting suitable to each subject. In this serious game of mediatization, most of the times, the innocent is the public - imagined as “discourse effect” of the device designed by the media - and, perhaps, more importantly, indicating a “**manner of understanding** the events, a projection of the journalistic discourse: it is a strategy of media discourse through which the media «interprets things as if they would be seen by others» or highlight the things «that matter» for the other.”¹⁸

We find ourselves on the “territory” of public space, undoubtedly, detecting dialogue and controversy in the gear of communication - mark of the interaction of social actors in representative democracies; along with the binder between individuals with dissimilar opinions (the interaction), equal access (doubled by the lack of coercion) and the mediation between individual interests and the interests of the community contribute to the portrayal of a public space that is perpetuated, expanded and fragmented, “hounded from all sides” (Bernard Miège), loyal to the “picture” offered by J. Habermas as early as his first writing on the *Public sphere and its structural transformation* (1962): the vulnerability of the boundary between private and public life, state and society no longer implies a relation of equality, the mass media “twists the knife in,” participating in the “refeudalization” of society and of the political field, generating, in the same time, a public space that “takes on feudal features.” How is, then, possible the authentic social dialogue, in which deliberation reconciles the speakers, in which “communicational action” outperforms “strategic action” (the former advantaging through the use of argument, the latter aiming for success at the cost of competition and manipulation).¹⁹ Habermas’ theory of the public space makes democracy a paradise of the reasonable consensus, of the dialogue based on the functioning of the argument, of the debate in its almost pedagogic sense. The German author of *The Theory of Communicative Action. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, but also of *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* reconsiders his position of holding media accountable for the erosion of the public space, finding that the media can honour the role of mediation between different categories of public, in order for mediated communication to be at the heart of the public space’s functioning.

¹⁶ Ibidem, 109.

¹⁷ Camelia Beciu, *Sociologia comunicării și a spațiului public. Concepte, teme, analize* [The Sociology of Communication and of the Public Space. Concepts, Themes, Analyses] (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2011), 81.

¹⁸ Ibidem, 82.

¹⁹ Jürgen Habermas, *Sfera publică și transformarea ei structurală: studiu asupra unei categorii a societății burgheze* [The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society] (Bucharest: Ed.comunicare.ro, 2005), 226.

It is the time to enter into equation the issue of the democratization of mass media (as a result of deliberative communication), social actor become a real tyrant of the new public space, both through its structural evolution and by the specific practices of mediatization of the issues of public character. Bringing into attention the post-Habermas literature in the “matter” of the mediatic public space, Camelia Beciu emphasizes the critical sliding from criteria such as professional deontology to **discursive criteria** at all foreign to the occurrence of „electronic democracy”, the imposition of “the logic of commercial mediatization,” the “Americanization” of the discourse of contemporary media. The enumeration of the “corrections” of the media public space includes: the criteria of public visibility, the forms of exposure in the public space, the critical dialogue, the forms of knowledge, the relation between the Internet and the accessibility of the public space.²⁰ Advantages and disadvantages are inevitably confronted: interactivity - the fragmentation of the public space; the primacy of the individual to the detriment of the citizen; the non-encouragement of deliberative-civic communication in contradiction with online activism. We find at Peter Dahlgren a conciliatory attempt, in the idea that the proliferation of public spaces in the virtual environment manages to have an insignificant influence on the political sphere and decision-making sphere.²¹

In our opinion, given the passing of a decade since the publishing of the conclusion belonging to the author of *Journalism and Popular Culture*, and, especially, the acknowledgement of some victories in the field of social action, “signed” by the online community, “the Facebook party” etc., we find the expression “chaotic populism” (as a “child” of the Internet) as too harsh and the disappointment regarding the pale pressure exerted by the users preoccupied in politics on this particular field as overcome. Whether in discussion are traditional formats or online avatars of the press, the crossroad between the strategic character (implicitly manipulative) of media devices and the deontological imperative retain their topicality. Regardless of whether the profession of communication is the prerogative of some stars or the daily bread of the journalistic “infantry”, the exhortations of Claude-Jean Bertrand remain in international Codes and, sometimes, in the conscience of journalists. Sharing the freedom of speech with their public, the mass media employees bear the burden of achieving the “socially responsible” press,²² which can mean “to not satisfy the curiosity of the public instead of serving its interests (...) to fight against injustices and to speak on behalf of the unprivileged (...); to not cultivate immorality, indecency or vulgarity; to not encourage the vile instincts; to not glorify war, violence, crime.”²³ The hypostasis of “public clowns” does not honour the agents of social change, not even for the sake of the media users who are “voyeurs of the events”, because the duty of the journalist is “to explain (...) the mechanisms of the modern world and to relate the daily events to the game of the deep forces that determine the destiny of society (...), to detect the precursory signs of the fundamental changes in all fields”, as stated in the “Journal de Genève” Code.²⁴

Considered the most conventional means of communication, television - “framed” in the metaphor of the fox that kills, in their own shelter, more hens than hunger dictates - brings a major injury, along with captivating the public for a long time, namely „the freedom of decoding according to the

²⁰ Camelia Beciu, *Sociologia comunicării și a spațiului public. Concepte, teme, analize* [The Sociology of Communication and of the Public Space. Concepts, Themes, Analyses] (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2011), 88-89.

²¹ P. Dahlgren, “The Internet, public spheres, and political communications: dispersion and deliberation”, in *Political Communication* 22 (2005):147-162, quoted in Camelia Beciu, *Sociologia comunicării și a spațiului public. Concepte, teme, analize*, 89.

²² Claude-Jean Bertrand, *Deontologia mijloacelor de comunicare* [The Deontology of the Means of Communication] (Iași: Ed. Institutul European, 2000), 39.

²³ Ibidem, 85.

²⁴ Ibidem, 105-106.

collective option.”²⁵ John Fiske and John Hartley explain the futility of the manipulative strategies of the audiovisual media through the dependence of the messages, modalities and significances of television on general cultural processes, which leads to the idea of similarity between our cultural environment as reality and television as constructed reality, from the point of view of the manner of perceiving specific to the viewer. The argument of the two theoreticians comes from Cl. Lévi-Strauss in *Sad Tropics*: “the understanding consists in reducing one type of reality to the other”. In a recent publicistic endeavour, Daniela Zeca-Buzura claims (and proves) the same thing; the confusion between television and daily life is the subject of genres and formats such as the talk show and the reality show. Following the sensational and the political dispute, the talk show argues, risking a double illusion typical to neo-television: the unrestricted access of the consumer to the liberty of speech and the consolidation of a new type of agora (the TV studio) where the message of the power is consumed. We are dealing, the author says, with the edification of the direct democracy myth (“telecracy”), over and over again the verification of the method of generalization of the personal drama through the mechanisms of media communication, perversely legitimizing.²⁶

Attached to its ideal of “bringing the mountain to Mohammed,” namely to transport the world to the home of the media message consumers, the televisual device will generate “spaces for the viewers” speeches”, in which the strategy of “extimacy” inheres the attribute of authenticity of the conveyed informational content. We stand, in fact, in the „realm” of Michel Foucault, consecrating the televisual device as strategy (sum of „said and non-said” in an eclectic embodiment of legislation, bureaucracy, speeches, institutions, architecture, philosophical ideas etc.), characterizing „positions of power” that we see not only in the performance of shows developed from debates, for instance, but also in the manner of consumption of these communicational offers. It is the time of post-television, of a medium become substitutive and compensatory,²⁷ transformed, after the 1980s, from “window” into “mirror” - revealing its technical and editorial backstage through images depicting the electronic equipment, the dynamic of the operators, the *off the record* dialogues, all in real time, namely at the time of performing live broadcasts. The chance that television grants itself is self-irony as form of the self-critical discourse (revealing images from own productions hit by imperfection), doubled by the transparency of its professional acts. Also called “the Pygmalion television”, neo-television turns the traditional viewer into an actor playing, inside the screen, his own life, offering it to the other members of the **great public**. This form of catharsis acquires the valences of generalization and social telejustice, compensating for various institutional insufficiencies in the era of mass culture. The release beyond and on this side of the “contact medium” (the TV screen) tames the relationship between the press and its faithful with exigent tendencies, becoming mark of the democracy of the public.

IV. Conclusions

From the serious family of the debate, the talk show makes a title of glory (within the “television of the invaded affect”) of “staging a deliberative space, in which a journalist-moderator and a variable number of guests (...) approach, in the conversational and convivial register a topic of public

²⁵ John Fiske, John Hartley, *Semnele televiziunii* [The Signs of Television] (Iași: Ed. Institutul European, 2002), 192.

²⁶ Daniela Zeca-Buzura, *La taclale cu idolii. Talk-show-ul- dispozitiv strategic și simbolic al neoteleviziunii* [Chatting with the Idols. The Talk Show - Strategic and Symbolic Device of Neo-television] (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2015), 226.

²⁷ Ibidem, 14.

interest.”²⁸ The matching with drama and sensationalism, the exploitation of the emotional register departs the consumer from the cultural pretention of some media productions. The “media army” fights, after the 1990s, “...to conquer a wider audience, offering viewers raw products, the paradigm of which is represented by talk show: slices of life, the scurrilous exhibition of some lived experiences, often extreme, able to satisfy forms of voyeurism and exhibitionism”²⁹ The completion of the portrait of this new type of opinion as an „indispensable complement to democracy” belongs to Noël Nel (who characterizes the mediatization device by: heterogeneity, network, strategy) and sends to two forms of social representation: the spectacle-State and the television-State causing socialization simultaneously to the performance of the shows developed from debates.³⁰

Why so much insistence on the talk show from a multitude of experts in communication? Because it uses two levels of conveying message, D. Zeca-Buzura claims, of picturing and of representation; then, because it possesses structural principles such as: a) the transposition of an institutional logic in communication projects and the stimulation of interaction through the significant degree of unpredictability; b) having the value of a strategic, but also symbolic device, it presupposes dimensions unitary to the genre - finality, evaluation perspective, framework of interaction; c) located at the crossroad between **television as reality** and **television as spectacle**, proves to be a product of the “protean purposes” and the pleasures circumscribed by the public to journalism as a communicational territory,³¹ having the gift of stimulating interest and producing public reactions; d) shakes the rapport between the contract of information/formation and the one of seduction/captivation, tipping the balance in favour of the latter. The impression of the viewer that truth and reality occur from the shows developed from debates sends into desuetude the “old,” “paleo,” traditional, television, pedagogic-type, based on values and principles considered outdated by that homo videns warned by Giovanni Sartori of the danger of imbecilization through television and the danger of post-thinking.

References

- Beciu, Camelia. *Sociologia comunicării și a spațiului public. Concepte, teme, analize* [The Sociology of Communication and of the Public Space. Concepts, Themes, Analyses]. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2011.
- Bertrand, Claude-Jean. *Deontologia mijloacelor de comunicare* [The Deontology of the Means of Communication]. Iași: Ed. Institutul European, 2000.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Despre televiziune* [About Television]. București: Grup editorial Art, 2007.
- Dahlgren, Peter, and Colin Sparks. *Jurnalism și cultură populară* [Journalism and Popular Culture]. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2004.
- Dahlgren, Peter, "The Internet, public spheres, and political communications: dispersion and deliberation", *Political Communication* 22 (2005): 147-162.
- Fiske, John, and John Hartley. *Semnele televiziunii* [The Signs of Television]. Iași: Ed. Institutul European, 2002.
- Gross, Peter. *Mass media și democrația în țările Europei de Est* [Mass Media and Democracy in Eastern Europe]. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2004.

²⁸ Ibidem, 51.

²⁹ Pierre Bourdieu, *Despre televiziune* [About Television] (București: Grup editorial Art, 2007), 52-55.

³⁰ Noël Nel, *Le débat télévisé* (Paris: Armand Collin, 1990), 9, in D. Zeca-Buzura, *La taclale cu idolii*, 52.

³¹ Peter Dahlgren, Colin Sparks, *Jurnalism și cultură populară* [Journalism and Popular Culture] (Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2004), 32.

- Habermas, Jürgen. *Sfera publică și transformarea ei structurală: studiu asupra unei categorii a societății burgheze* [The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society]. București: Ed. comunicare.ro, 2005.
- Lecomte, Patrick. *Comunicare, televiziune și democrație* [Communication, Television and Democracy]. București: Ed. Tritonic, 2004.
- Missika, Jean-Louis, and Dominique Wolton, *La Folle du logis*. Paris: Gallimard, 1983.
- Mouchon, Jean, "Spațiul public și discursul politic televizat" [The Public Space and the Televised Political Discourse]. In *Spațiul public și comunicarea* [The Public Space and Communication], ed. Isabelle Pailliat, 179-192. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2002.
- Nel, Noël. *Le débat télévisé*. Paris: Armand Collin, 1990.
- Neveu, Érik, "Științele sociale față în față cu Spațiul public, științele sociale în spațiul public" [Social Sciences Face-to-Face with the Public Space, Social Sciences in the Public Space]. In *Spațiul public și comunicarea* [The Public Space and Communication], ed. Isabelle Pailliat, 37-63. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2002.
- Pailliat, Isabelle, ed. *Spațiul public și comunicarea* [The Public Space and Communication]. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2002.
- Pailliat, Isabelle, "Prelungiri" [Prolongations]. In *Spațiul public și comunicarea* [The Public Space and Communication], ed. Isabelle Pailliat, 193-202. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2002.
- Wolton, Dominique. *Éloge du grand public. Une théorie critique de la télévision*. Paris: Flammarion, 1990.
- Wolton, Dominique. *Mondialisation, diversité culturelle et francophonie*. Conference held on March 27, 2015, within „Les imaginaires de la Francophonie”, XXth edition, Iași, Romania, March 27-28, 2015.
- Zeca-Buzura, Daniela. *La taclale cu idolii. Talk-show-ul - dispozitiv strategic și simbolic al neoteleviziunii* [Chatting with the Idols. The Talk Show - Strategic and Symbolic Device of Neo-television]. Iași: Ed. Polirom, 2015.