

Communication Law - a soft axis of Communication discipline

Ștefan Vlăduțescu

University of Craiova, 13 A. I. Cuza Street, 200585, Craiova, Romania

E-mail address: stefan.vladutescu1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study is circumscribed to Communication Science Fundamental specialty. It aims to highlight the place of Communication Law in the communication system as an academic discipline. For this is taken as reference system The Theory and Standard of Communication Axis previously developed by Ștefan Vlăduțescu (2013): communication universe is organized, at the moment, compared to 15 fields of communication; these differ by the central axis, the type and consistency of structure and the cords that generate the movement (the internal development in field). The Communication Law is the field of knowledge organized around the law axis. This is a soft axis of Communication discipline.

Keywords: Traditions Standard-Matrix R. T Craiova Axes Standard-Matrix; Communication Law

1. INTRODUCTION

Thomas Kuhn is the one who introduced in the ontology of the science the paradigm concept. He shows that the concept has to use "in two different senses": "on the one hand, it stands for the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of the given community. On the other, it denotes one sort of element in that constellation (the concrete puzzle-solutions employed as models or examples, can replace explicit rules) on a basis for the solution of remaining puzzles of normal science" (Kuhn, 1998 p 175). We extract from here the irradiating significant concepts: "paradigm" and "community". "Community" is the scientific community, that the wide assembly of those dealing with science or a science: "a scientific community consists (...) of the practitioners of a scientific specialty"; communities can even be structured as "schools in the science" (Kuhn, 1998, p. 177). So, the paradigm, as postulated T. Kuhn has two coordinates of scientific catagraph. But we see it as a whole in which the senses are melted and for which the theoretical scission does not mean inconsistency. Our interpretation makes from paradigm a synthesis of the features of a rigorous science and robust, that is strong and well anchored in the scientific environment. A rigorous and robust science/theory is a strong science/theory.

In paradigm we find the most of the major components of a "strong science". The paradigm is the constellation of certain shared options for maintaining or reforming of a science. In constellation we have to decipher the springs of revolutionary replacement of some of the "normal science". To revolutionize the science, it starts from the "normal science". The

tracks of development start from its core, consisting of its defining components. The core of a science consists of which makes it to be what it is and not something else and what else gets without leaving the quality of what science itself is. We sustain that the first meaning distinguished by T. Kuhn ("beliefs, values, techniques") is the one that includes "epistemology" ("beliefs"), axiology ("values") and methodology ("techniques"). The second meaning highlighted ("models or examples") involves ontology ("models", "examples"). In other words, the paradigm results as a constellation of ontological, epistemological, methodological and axiological changes of the "normal science".

Besides of T. Kuhn's point of view there are also other relevant, some of them are applied to communication. For example, J. A. Anderson considers that a complete theory has four components: ontology, epistemology, praxeology and axiology: The ontology of a theory makes a claim about what is. (...) The epistemology of a theory makes a claim about what we know. (...) The praxeology of theory makes a claim about how it is done. (...) Finally, the axiology is the study of value" (Anderson, 1996, p. 2). Also, Robert T. Craig talks about "epistemology, ontology, axiology and praxeology" (Craig, 2013, p. 5).

2. COMMUNICATION AXES STANDARD-MATRIX

Finn Frandsen și Winni Johansen (2014) take as a reference system R.T. Craig's thesis concerning "communication theory as a field" and thesis of „seven traditions of communication theory”. In connection with these nuclear theses addressed several questions: a) “Is communication theory a field or a discipline? If yes, how coherent is this field? Does it have to be coherent? Is it one field or several fields?"; b) regarding the seven traditions: “But what happened to public relations, organizational communication, business communication and corporate communication?” (Frandsen & Johansen, 2014, p. 24). Resulting in the alternative idea is that the questions are questioning two sentences. This idea is convergent with the position expressed by our article “A Completion of the Traditions Matrix-Standard-R. T. Craig, Induced by the Transformation of Communication-as-a-Field Membrane in Communication-as-a-Universe Membrane”. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(10), (2013). There we show that through theses, Robert T. Craig gives profile to an ideational configuration that we called Membrane of the Field; that centers on the idea that communication is a field: accessible, ordering, homogeneous, clear delimited and robust configured. We understand “membrane” as an elastic, coherent, dynamic, and vibrant ideational configuration that modulates the trans-paradigmatic thinking of a scientific community. Membrane indicates, more than a paradigm shift, a substantial and radical change of the mode of thought (in an area of study)”. However, we mention in the article that the image "communication as a field" is a conceptual membrane that turned into "communication as an universe" membrane, "communication as a multi-field". Also, we underline that "The communication is multi-space structure and multi-universe" (Vlăduțescu, 2013).

Appearance almost consolidated is that in communication domain there is not an ontology, an epistemology, a methodology, an axiology. The reality is that, in various stages of development, all of them exist. Hard work of researchers made to base some components or "branches" of the communication discipline. Raul Fuentes Navarro talks about four dimensions of communication: "gnoseological, teleological, praxeological (...) ethics" (Navarro, 1999, p. 64).

On the development of a communication disciplines, Robert L. Heath and Jennings Bryant highlight: “An academic discipline grows because of what its scholars share. To this

end, scholars need to understand the discipline history, have a common sense of the object of inquiry, focus on similar and compatible questions, agree on the best methodologies, and create a common terminology, or lexicon, with which to discuss the discipline ” (Heath & Bryant, 2000, p. 89). As we see the issue of ontology ("common terminology or lexicon") is placed last, even it is decisive. There are evoked, epistemology ("object of inquiry", "questions"), methodology ("methodologies") and history ("discipline's history").

Stephen W. Littlejohn and Karen A. Foss think epistemology, ontology and axiology as "philosophical assumptions" that "every theory, explicitly or implicitly, includes" and refers to the "nature of knowledge and how it is obtained, what constitutes existence, and what is valuable" (Littlejohn & Foss, 2008, p. 16). The two reputed experts enumerate each epistemology, ontology and axiology and treat them in this arrangement. On the other hand, they conceive the three elements as "the branch of philosophy." That is, they see them as foreign branches. We conceive them as internal axis. In addition, we talk not only about 3 axes, but 15.

For a discipline to be imposed and to develop are required at least one well-defined ontology and a realistic epistemology, and besides them a methodology and axiology, how retarded they are. The accreditation process is conditioned by their sharing of a broad community of scholars, researchers, theorists, scientists. Ontology, epistemology, methodology and axiology are primordial. We can say that these four are hard axes of communication: ontology-A1, epistemology-A2, methodology-A3, axiology-A4. Soft Axes are 11, that is: history-A5, psychology-A6, sociology-A7, anthropology-A8, hermeneutics-A9, praxeology-A10, ethics-A11, logics-A12, ecology-A13, philosophy-A14, and communication law-A15.

Communication has integrated in its self autonomous existence as social science 15 axes: communication ontology (ontology of communication), communication epistemology, communication methodology, communication axiology, communication history, communication psychology, communication sociology, communication anthropology, communication hermeneutic, communication praxeology, communication ethics, communication logics, communication ecology, communication philosophy, communication law. We can talk, within communication, about 15 fields of communication. Robert T. Craig retained the whole communication as a single field, and communication theory "as a dialogical-dialectical field" (Craig, 1997, p. 199). We consider that communication is not only a field, is not only a space, is not only a multi-faced object. We sustain that communication is much more. Communication is multi-space and multi-structure universe. We see communication as a systemic universe with 15 intersected fields by different consistency and various levels of cohesion. Communication is an irregular and heterogeneous universe: multi-space and multi-structure. Each field is crystallized around an axis and appears as an area with a certain systemic location, a specific orientation, with a certain internal coherence of the structure. In the center of the field is an axis. The field strength is the force axis. No axis is of the field, but the field is of the axis.

Our opinion is that the 15 components, branches should be considered axes of communication, trails, tracks of theoretical constructive-cognitive-cogitative crystallization and practical-applicable of communication. Axes are also, pillars and specialties of the discipline of communication.

Our reasoning is as follows. Philosophy until Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Immanuel Kant was an integrative discipline of science, generally of knowledge, because the great philosophers were also great scientists. Once with the most important philosopher of the nineteenth century, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Philosophy is isolated of science and is

installed as autonomous discourse which no longer incorporates science, but explains it. The integrative philosophy and explanatory philosophy were presented as coherent cogitative system: ontology, gnoseology, axiology, logic, ethics, aesthetics, etc.. Once arrived at Martin Heidegger and Ludwig Wittgenstein, philosophy enters the implosion. The system idea collapses completely. Philosophy is developed as interrogation, as reflection on the major themes of existential condition proximity and social of mundane human; focuses strongly on language issues. So it is that the system decays: some of its elements are self-sustaining, while others remain as "dead branches" of philosophy.

Our idea is that "dead branches" can be green. They must be revived. Be reformed and transformed into useful tools in theory and practice. From components of philosophy ontology, epistemology, methodology, axiology, praxeology etc., become components of theories and sciences. It is a process of grafting. Dead branches are grafted, they are grafted on the alive trunk and strong of the science. Meditation- philosophy lives his destiny of philosophy, but, alternatively, as a fractal, is also becoming an internal branch of science of scientific cogitative system or of the cogitative theoretical system. Having lost branches, philosophical trunk forms with them a useful set of branches able to be restored to a new life. New sciences, new cogitative systems absorb as own components the branches of philosophy and absorb generic as branch the reflective method of the philosophy. Since taking over the branches of a separate construct that tends to keep them, the new cogitative system integrates them as axes. We conceive axis as internalized polarizing branch of specific knowledge.

On this preliminary argument we base the cogitative cogitative constructive approach. This is guided by ordering axes thesis: communication sets 15 internal constitutive axes around which crystallize communicational synchronic cognitive and diachronic, and do it systemic and procedural functional. Research led us to the conclusion that over time, communication was approached from 15 perspectives: ontological, epistemological, methodological, axiological, historical, psychological, sociological, anthropological, hermeneutic, praxeological, ethics, logic, ecological, philosophical and legal. It was investigated on crystal structure of the 15 axes that are actually internal fundamentals pillars of communication. The overall internal communication perspective is observed. Observed approaches are centered on the axis of internal communication. Communication was structured until today on 15 axes and made incidents 15 approaches.

The 15 axes organize whole communication domain: it unify, give coherence as communicational space (the multi-space), give it cohesion as structure (the multi-structure), give it the possibility to integrate further communicational emergency. All studies and all theories of communication can be distributed on one of axis or on inter-axial zone: we can speak of communication ontology studies, ontological theories of communication, ontological standards of communication, it may retain communication epistemology studies, theories of communication epistemology etc. Each communicational concept can receive an axial determination: ontological communicational concept, epistemological communicational concept, hermeneutic communicational concept, ethics communicational concept etc. Each ontological model of communication will get a specific axial attribute: epistemological model, axiological model, hermeneutic model, ecological model etc. Contributors of the axes are defined as reference systems establishers. Communication ontology believe that all communication is ontology, communication epistemology considers that all communication is epistemology. Pan-communicators behave as if everything would be communication. How is natural, to focus on communication history axis, communication can be seen as the history of communication: "A discipline is the history of that discipline" (Dobrescu & Bargaoanu, 2007, p. 20). The standard of communication axes envisages that are accredited at least 15 approaches

that mutually support communication and which emphasize the polymorphic nature of the communication field.

Around each axis revolves strings. Taxonomic they can be opened: if they touch tangentially the axis or lie at least one end in the zone of topic irradiation of axis. Or they may be closed: if their vibration or their extension falls entirely on the magnetic zone of the axis. In the field of communication, the axes are clearly delineated. They do not intersect only in volcanic core that means "communication". For example, communication logics axis and communication philosophy meet only which means distributed mutual idea that is the core of communication. To consider like C. G. Christians, one of the reputed specialists in communication ethics, that communication ethics would be "a branch of applied philosophy of moral value and rules" (Christians, 2008) means to subsume one axis to another axis and call it a specialty of the discipline. It is true that Ethics was a branch of philosophy. But philosophy has lost the power to direct the ontology, epistemology, ethics, and the other parts of it. Branches were removed from the trunk and live independently. Communication ethics is one, and the philosophy of communication is different. It is true that some of the open strings of the communication ethics axis or communication logics axis touch and can vibrate consonant with the open strings of the communication philosophy axis or other axes. In such cases we deal with inter-axial research, multi-axial, trans-axial. These complex researches are not multi-disciplinary.

They record only analog in transdisciplinary theory of Basarab Nicolescu (2008): the axes are not disciplines, but specialties of a certain discipline. In our case, the discipline is communication (no matter what we call, communication science, communication theory, communicology, communication studies, communication study or sciences de l'information et de la communication) (Zhaoxun, 2005; Zhaoxun, 2007). The discipline is communication, axes are specialties of communication: communication ontology, communication methodology, communication history etc. By establishing the standard of axes, by axiology, avoids what Andrew Abbott called "the chaos of disciplines" that disorder in "disciplinary system" (Abbott, 2001, p. 122).

"Axi-alization" of communication leads to the constitution of a multi-space of communication and gives coherence and cohesion to the global field of communication. Beyond a default unification in the communication thinking on 15 axes will avoid the risk of disorganizing fragmentation by ordering fragmentation.

Diagrammatic representation of the idea that lies behind the ordering axes thesis appears as a sphere in which they meet each 15 vectors bidirectionally. Axes have one end which, as vectors, meet each other in the core of extended spherical, permeable and flexible of communication. While at one end vector comes to nuclear meeting, the other end extending in a direction of non-meeting the communication space. Communication appears thus as multi-space. Since the structure has on each space created around and along each axis and a different consistency, we can speak of a heterogeneous structure. The heterogeneous structures have intense structuring nodes and nodes of structural relaxation. Consequently, the axes will reveal in the global structure of communication regional structures with recognizable profile. After creating a multi-space of communication, our axial perspective enables also highlighting of multi-structure.

The Communication Laws Axis – A15 polarizes and unifies the research regarding social relations with respect to communication, regarding their completion and licensing. "The law, in general, shows Maria Năstase Georgescu (Georgescu, 2004), is a set of rules of conduct and principles sanctioned and guaranteed regulating social relations essential to society at a time to ensure social order and determination freedoms and rights in society". Among the experts in

this area of communication, there are: A. Meiklejohn (1948), T. I. Emerson (1970), J. A. Barron (1973), C. Edwin Baker (1989), K. Middleton, R. Trager, B. F. Chamberlin (1999), L. Day (1999), D. T. Popa (1999), I. Muraru (1999), V. Dabu (2003), M. C. Eremia (2003), Laura Stein (2006), J. J. Hemmer (2006), C. Edwin Baker (2007), K. H. Youm (2009), M. Năstase-Georgescu (2009), P. Siegel (2011), Cristina Anca Păiușescu & Oana Duță (2011). M. Kent, W. E. Lee (2012).

3. CONCLUSIONS

We see the 15 approach axis not as external branches of other sciences or theories, but as internal coordinates of communication domain. Understanding that any theory that will deliver someone will enroll voluntarily or involuntarily in irradiation of an axis, we can work freely in communication and to develop its study on what direction we want. In addition, an extended framework allows any para-consistent views or contradictory to find inside, not outside of communication a mediator. Axes are organizers infusers and cognitive mediators. They wrap convergent the spectrum of research so far. However, let open divergence venue for open minded.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was partially supported by the grant number 33C/2014 awarded in the internal grant competition of the University of Craiova.

References

- [1] J. A. Anderson (1996). *Communication Theory: Epistemological Foundation*. New York: Guilford Press.
- [2] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 14 (2014) 7-17.
- [3] T. Kuhn (1998). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. (3rd ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- [4] Sebastian K. Janusz Grabara, Michal Kolcun, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 15 (2014) 1-6.
- [5] K. H. Youm (2010). Journalism Law and Regulation. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch, (Eds.), *The handbook of journalism studies* (pp. 279-294). Routledge.
- [6] L. L. Smith (2006). *Speech rights in America: The First Amendment, democracy, and the media*. University of Illinois Press.
- [7] S. W. Littlejohn, K. A. Foss (2008). *Theories of human communication*. (9th ed.). Belmont, CA, Thompson Wadsworth.
- [8] M. Kent, W. E. Lee (2012). *Law of Public Communication*. (8th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- [9] A. Meiklejohn (1948). *Free Speech and Its Relation to Self-Government*. New York: Harper & Row.

- [10] W. Johansen, F. Frandsen (2014). *Communication Theory as a Field, but which Field? Revisiting Craig (1999)*. Welcome to Nordkomm.
- [11] J. J. Hemmer (2006). *Communication Law*. University Press of America.
- [12] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 14 (2014) 33-41.
- [13] D. T. Popa (1999). *Dreptul Comunicării*. București: Editura Norma.
- [14] K. Middleton, R. Trager, B. F. Chamberlin (1999). *The law of public communication*. (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- [15] A. Abbott (2001). *Chaos of disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [16] A. Traistaru, M. Avram, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 13 (2014) 79-88.
- [17] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 4 (2013) 70-74.
- [18] R. L. Heath, J. Bryant (2000). *Human Communication Theory and Research: Concepts, Contexts and Challenges*. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- [19] M. N. Georgescu (2004). Dreptul Comunicării: Aspecte Metodologice. *Revista de Drept Public*.
- [20] A. Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 11 (2014) 1-168
- [21] P. Siegel (2011). *Communication Law in America*. (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- [22] M. C. Eremia (2003). *Dreptul Comunicării*. București: Editura Credis.
- [23] T. I. Emerson (1970). *The System of Freedom of Expression*. New York: Random House.
- [24] C. Edwin Baker (1989). *Human Rights and Freedom of Speech*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [25] P. Dobrescu, A. Bârgăoanu (2007). *Întrebări incomode în debutul unei cercetări istorice*. In P. Dobrescu, A. Bârgăoanu & N. Corbu (Eds.), *Istoria comunicării*. București: comunicare.ro.
- [26] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 2 (2014) 110-121.
- [27] E. Duteux (1990). *Droit de la communication*. Paris: LDGJ.
- [28] P. Dobrescu, *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 3(10) (2013).
- [29] V. Dabu (2003). *Dreptul comunicării*. București: Editura SNSPA.
- [30] R. T. Craig (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory* 9(2) 119-161.
- [31] C. G. Christians (2008). *Ethics in Journalism*. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford, UK, and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- [32] R. T. Craig (2013). Constructing theories in communication research. In P. Cogley & P. J. Schulz (Eds.), *Theories and Models of Communication*, pp. 39-57. Walter de Gruyter.

- [33] B. Ślusarczyk, A. Broniszewska, Entrepreneurship of Women in Poland and the EU-Quantitative Analysis. Polish Journal of Management Studies.
- [34] S. Chirimbu, A. Dejica-Carțiș, E. Savu (2014). What skills do foreign languages teachers need in the 21st century? An intercultural configuration. Professional Communication and Translation Studies.
- [35] J. Tabor, Place of Non-formal Education in the Career Building Process. Polish Journal of Management Studies.
- [36] I. Muraru (1999). Protecția Constituțională a Libertăților de Opinie. București: Lumina Lex.
- [37] Janusz Grabara, Michal Kolcun, Sebastian Kot, *International Journal of Education and Research* 2(2) (2014).
- [38] Andrej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 3 (2014) 69-74.
- [39] M. Năstase-Georgescu (2009). *Dreptul Comunicării*. Editura Universitară.
- [40] Aurelia Traistaru (2013). *Consolidation of the green market profile in current austerity period*. Jokull.
- [41] J. A. Barron (1973). *Freedom of the Press for Whom: The Right of Access to Mass Media*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [42] J. H. Gasderell, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 22 (2014) 85-91.
- [43] A. Herbuś, B. Ślusarczyk, *Polish Journal of Management Studies* 6 (2012) 234-240.
- [44] Vlad Roșca, *Management & Marketing* 9(1) (2014).
- [45] R. F. Navarro (1999). *La investigación de la comunicación en América Latina: condiciones y perspectivas para el siglo XXI. Diálogos de la Comunicación*.
- [46] Cristina Anca Păiușescu, Oana Cătă (2011). *Dreptul comunicării. Considerații teoretice și legislația relevantă*. București: Editura Universitară.
- [47] Răzvan Barbolescu, *Romanian Economic Business Review* 7(2) (2012) 77-86.
- [48] Vlad Roșca (2012). *The Political Economy of World Heavyweight Boxing during the Great Depression*. Theoretical and Applied Economics.
- [49] Dan Dragăș (2008). *Illegal and Harmful Content on the Internet: Or Substantial Offences and Jurisdiction: Comparative Analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Carol Davila" Bucharest).
- [50] B. Bolescu (Ed.). (2008), *Transdisciplinarity: theory and practice*. Hampton Press.
- [51] Song Zhaoxun, *Journal of International Communication* 3 (2007) 010.
- [52] V. Boureanu (2013). *Tradiție și modernitate în comunicarea internă din bibliotecile universitare românești*. Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica.

- [53] S. Zhaoxun (2005). *Contemporary Chinese organizational culture in hero storytelling: A rhetorical analysis*. Excess & Organization.
- [54] Ion Stavre (2011). *Comunicare audiovizuală: aspecte ale europenizării societății românești*. Tritonic.
- [55] Jason L. Powell, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 7 (2014) 22-30.
- [56] O. Băluță, A. Dragolea, A. Iancu (2007). *Gen și interese politice. Teorii și practici, (Gender and political interests. Theories and practices)*. Polirom, Iași.
- [57] Jason L. Powell, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 16(2) (2014) 177-183.
- [58] Jason L. Powell, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 17(1) (2014) 1-60.
- [59] Donovan A. McFarlane, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 4 (2013) 35-44.
- [60] Paul Bukuluki, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 7 (2013) 27-44.
- [61] Kinga Dziwańska, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 7 (2013) 96-112.
- [62] Tomáš Hes, Anna Poledňáková, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 2 (2013) 18-31.
- [63] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 3 (2013) 46-53.

(Received 10 July 2014; accepted 16 July 2014)