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ABSTRACT

The study radiographs the scientific contribution of Professor Odile Riondet in communication domain. It is ascertained that the standard R. T. Craig, of the "seven major traditions" of "communication field theory", is inapplicable. The method that is used is the axis of segregation of problems after expressed ideational. It emerges that Odile Riondet as advocate of SIC (Sciences de l'information et communication), is positioned by default in "communication science". It results that she has meritorious contributions to communication epistemology, communication ethics, communication philosophy and communication anthropology. It is concluded that in the communication horizon, Odile Riondet can be remembered as outstanding specialist of the "communication anthropology" axis.
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1. INTRODUCTION

To reach the field of communication, one must stand in the communication horizon. This position induces subsequently a structured looking, up and away. The communicational looking is, in fact, both a vision of the field of communication, and one of communication itself, as science, theory and practice. The presence of the researcher in the communication horizon is not a wandering one. Each researcher is living his story of relationship with communication by installation of milestones, of "stars", of visions, concepts, constructs and theories.

In the study "Communication Theory as a Field" (1999), Robert T. Craig states that "seven major traditions" have established this "field of communication theory": rhetorical, semantic, phenomenological, cybernetic, socio-psychological, sociocultural and critical (Craig RT, 1999, pp. 119-161) (opinion is then iterated in Craig R.T., & Muller HL (2007). "Theorizing Communication: Readings Across Traditions"). This article ("Communication theory as a field") was awarded by the International Communication Association as the best article in the communication field. At its center lies the intention to unify the theories of communication in a meta-model, on the course of the "seven major traditions". In our opinion, the study is exceptional; it was and remains today in part useful to the organization of the communication field. However, it induces a rigid perspective that, although targeting, however it does not allow the unification of communication theory space. We found:
1. That some traditions are not traditions, because a tradition is establishing at least two
generations of intellectual: in the 1940s, when communication is defined "per se"
tradition had only Rhetorics (a strong tradition) and Semiotics (a weak tradition);

2. That some of the traditions are not sustainable for communication, because they have not
tradition neither for themselves: for example, Cybernetics was formed in 1948, i.e.
simultaneously with communication as a discipline, as well as Social Psychology; So
they had not their tradition that to induce in communication;

3. Certain traditions records as communication field a zone of concerns that does not take
account of preparadigmatic evolution and, further, paradigmatic of communication; for
example, Rhetoric and Semiotics are retained as communication traditions, although
they can be evaluated only as provider of ideas, theories and concepts
preparadigmatic communication;

4. As well for the delimitation of a nation or a people, themselves those targeting
qualification / classification must be wondering in what the tradition fall; communication
specialists know, principle, where they are in the communication field; in the same vein, the question is, for example, whether any part of the cybernetics
tradition of the communication; we do not think anyone considered as belonging to this.

Although at the time of accreditation, the Craig traditions standard was welcome, today
it turns out rigid: it does not permit the development, growth, renewal, because it brings
everything from the past. In the communication field, in addition to traditions are recorded
spontaneous phenomena and theories, unconventional - non-traditional and emerging
phenomena and theories, relatively unexpected and unexplained.

The Craig standard was taken into valuable work of Stephen W. Littlejohn and Karen
A. Foss (2011, tenth edition) and P. A. Griffin (2011, eighth edition) or fundamental
encyclopedias, W. Donsbach (2008), S. W. Liddlejohn and K. A. Foss (2009), W. F. Eadie
(2009).

Our point of view is that a flexible standard of radiography and catagory of
communication field is an axiologycal standard of communication field. In communication we
record 15 axes: communication ontology, communication epistemology, communication
methodology, communication sociology, communication history, communication psychology,
communication sociology, communication anthropology, communication hermeneutics,
communication praxeology, communication ethics, communication logics, communication
ecology, communication philosophy, communication law. On each axis are registered
communication strings vibrating alive and concrete. On hard axis (communication ontology,
communication epistemology, communication methodology, communication aiology) the
vibration is strong, instead, on soft axes (communication history, communication psychology,
communication sociology, communication anthropology, communication hermeneutics,
communication praxeology, communication ethics, communication logics, communication
ecology, communication philosophy, communication law) the vibration and number of strings
are extended. Our perspective, of axiologycal standard, solves some of the Craig standard
issues. Primordial, our standard allows each researcher to enroll on an axis that usually
represents a specialization in the discipline of communication (The axes standard we present
in the book "Ontology of Human Communication", in course of issue at LAP Lambert
Academic Publishing, Saarbrucken.)
2. A RADIOGRAPHY OF THE PRESENCE IN COMMUNICATION HORIZON

It would be difficult to frame Professor Odile Riondet contribution in one or more of the traditions Craig standard. Attached of the axes standard we will emphasize in relation to this, communicational positioning and Odile Riondet scientific contribution in the communication field.

First of all, Odile Riondet, according to the Franco-Swiss orientation, consider communication within SIC (Sciences de l'information et communication), see (Riondet O., 2007c), (Riondet O., 2009b), (Riondet O. 2010b), (Riondet O., 2011d).

Basically, investigative spirit is placed in "le champ general de SIC" (Riondet O., 2010d). In the English language, on the communication space there is a large and discreet rupture. It is generated by the location of the two "membranes" of communication, two great intellectual armies: "communication science" (C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, D.R. Roskos-Ewoldsen J.O. Greene, B. R. Burleson, J. K. Burgoon etc.) and "communication theory" (S. W. Littlejohn, K. A. Foss, R. T. Craig and others). For Odile Riondet this major ontological-epistemologic issue is solved: as part of the SCI, communication is in the center of a science.

In the O. Riondet’s conception, science is "définit par son objet, ses méthodes, ses concepts, son regard, son éthique, sa finalité, mais aussi par la confrontation de tous ces éléments dans une communauté qui a son histoire" (Riondet O., 2007b). Projecting the definition elements on the range axes, results some interesting elements. Generally, ontology is the object domain ("objet", "concepts" in Riondet’s definition) as is the domain of conceptual organized knowledge; it is the picture of existences. Epistemology looks the knowing subject in relation to the known object, with the possibility, efficiency and limits of knowledge. Methodology is the set of methods of scientific cognitive system ("méthodes" as marks O. Riondet). If we think about any looking is by definition, we can retain the "regard" from the definition as a statement of axiology (value and evaluation). The definition radiography and "éthique": this is part of communication ethics axis. The phrase “sa finalité” leads us to the practical aspect of communication and communication praxeology axis.

We interpret "communication" of the scientific community of communication: court that authenticates, legitimate and acquires. Alongside the issue (thematic, ideational, solving methods), the community sets the coordinates system of the current paradigm of communication: Veritable Geometry-Constructive-Transactional Paradigm, P3.

There is a science of communication and "sciences de l'information", says Riondet (Riondet O., 2007a)

Odile Riondet's obvious propensity is, between the hard axis, to the communication epistemology, and of the soft axis, to the communication anthropology ("anthropologie de la communication"). O. Riondet finds the existence of three "dimensions épistémologiques": "Nous distinguerons ici trois dimensions: celle des configurations épistémologiques (les différences d'articulations de méthode, concepts, auteurs, champs d'applications caractéristiques d'une discipline), les représentations de la science des chercheurs (du positivisme le plus strict à toutes les formes d'herméneutique) et les anthropologies ou représentations de l'homme sous-jacentes, qui jouent souvent le rôle de présupposé ou d'hypothèse" (Riondet O., 2011d). As seen, at O. Riondet we deal with an extended epistemology presiding also in areas of ontology, methodology, hermeneutics, and anthropology. From the perspective of the movement in the "communication et religion" field (Riondet O., 2011d), the solution is correct, because religion does not allow a clear segregation between the ontological-epistemological-axiological-hermeneutic anthropology: creator of the world set picture of existence, the limits of knowledge, values, interpretation and rites, and no one can change them. In connection, it
speaks of “l’épistémologie actuelle” (Rindet O, 2009b) and about three interpretations of “épistémologie des (N)TIC”: “définition de la science”, “comme manière que les SIC ont de faire de la science” and “théorie de la connaissance” (Riondet O., 2007d). Also, it is insisting on “culture épistémologique plus ou moins explicite” (Riondet O., 2004).

Communication ethics axis is consolidated by examining “La question éthique dans les technologies de l’information” (Riondet O., 2010c şi Riondet O., 2007c) and revealing of ethic aspects of communicational thoughts of Jurgen Habermas (Riondet O., 2009c).

Hermeneutics opening is confirmed by thorough study “Interpretation, compréhension et construction scientifique de la connaissance” (Riondet O., 2010a). Her hermeneutic approach is based on W. Dilthey (explanation-understanding ratio), N. Whitehead (perception-interpretation relationship), P. Ricoeur (the idea of recognition) and U. Eco (limits of interpretation).

Of the communication philosophy axis, the Odile Riondet’s researches are marked by revealing the connection between "les SIC et la philosophie" (Riondet O., 2010b), the link "communication et les philosophies de la connaissance" (Riondet O., 2010a), and existence of "concepts philosophiques dans le SIC" (Riondet O., 1999).

Although she has meritorious contributions on several axes of the communication standard, Odile Riondet is, above all, a remarkable anthropologist of communication, of culture (Beciu, Camelia, Drăgan, Ioan, Popescu, Dana, Riondet, Odile, 2009a). Citable for their major relevance and originality are on this line three ideas. First is memorable "hypothèse anthropologique" that issue: “un être humain travaille sur lui-même, c'est bénéfique, les relations aux autres ne menacent en rien la découverte de lui-même, mais y aident” (Riondet O., 2011c). The second idea consists of clarification of the meanings of "anthropology de la communication" ["faits de la communication", "désigner des notions d'anthropologie (le mythe, le rite)" and "les images de l'homme "] (lecture at the University of Craiova, April 10, 2012). The third idea consists in revealing philosophical anchoring of communication anthropology: “cette discipline a aussi un soubassement philosophique” (lecture at the University of Craiova, April 10, 2012).

Outside the axial research space of communication, we highlight notable contributions concerning the report communication-religion (Riondet O., 2011b), (Riondet O., 2008), organizational communication (Riondet O., 2011a) and archive and library information (Riondet O., 2008).

3. CONCLUSION

The radiography of presence of Odile Riondet in communication horizon indicates a specialist in communication domain with a solid philosophical basis (aside great philosophers such as Im. Kant, P. Ricoeur, E. Levinas, M. Foucault, we find quoted Constantin Noica and Lucian Blaga), with an extensive communicational culture and a thinking capable of exquisite and original inferences.
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