

## COMMUNICATIVE MESSAGE AS NUCLEAR THINKING OF AN ASPIRATIONAL DESIRE

Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU, Associate Professor, PhD, University of Craiova

*Abstract: The paper is positioned in the Fundamentals of Communication Science zone. The approach is message-meanings centered and assumes that, at meta-analytic level, the message is the nucleus of communication.*

*The first axiomatic finding is that, on semantic dimension, the message is an edifice of meanings. A second axiomatic finding is that, on operational dimension, the message is common construction of communicators. A third axiomatic finding is that, on ontological dimension, the message has no independent existence; as volatile as the meaning, the message takes the concrete form of discourse. A fourth axiomatic finding is that, on the pragmatic dimension, efficient and effective message is given that speech with which it is trained is planned and prepared in advance. Finally, fifth axiomatic finding is that the message is articulated threefold: cognitive, affective and volitional, ie communicative message is nuclear thinking of an aspirational desire.*

*Keywords: message, communication, Fundamentals of Communication Science*

### **We consum discourses**

Contemporary reader has lost the innocence of messages consumption. It is insidious and eternally unsatisfied. The only therapy for such a consumer is constituted by the discursive excess. Actual reader does not consume pure message, but discourses. As a matter of fact, with the installation of literature (the epic) as a form of communication and cognition, the pure message just disappeared into the discourse. This phenomenon could be shown with a pill which therapeutic content is bitter, but which, in order to be ingested is encased in a soft seductive. Originality of discourse is rushed by the banality of the designed message. In these circumstances, vital luxury that means looking for originality will be always and decisive in progress. Together with history, as much as blasphemed, rhetoric is growing. So, delight has a solid rhetoric base and logical. The idea of message banality conservation arrives to be the threat under which is constructed the discursive originality. The terror of banality requires to productive thinking supplementation of its ascertain sub codes. Achieving safety the message transfer is an ideal that as many times is achieved, so many times is improved and as many times is seen under pressure of fear of lack of effect. Rhetoric terror has two consequences: pushing the limits of language and violating of rules that sets the circumstance of a certain cogitative logic. On these lines, each school and each period means a cogitative evolution and language. However, the apparent is in fact that schools and literary periods limit literary communication, philosophical communication, theological communication etc. to a controlled horizon, observed and ordered by a thinking way (a type of cogitation and some language). At the beginning of the world are not given all messages, so that those who have not taken part to the genesis of logos of human being to be forced to be entertained only of new discourses that bring old messages. Messages are generated permanent and also permanent the way that "logos" includes the discourses in which messages are originated are changed (Capurro, 2003;

Dobrescu, Bârgăoanu & Corbu, 2007; Capurro, 2011; Holgate, 2011. It appears new messages and new discourses. In their expectations are established new languages and new cogitation forms. It is unavoidable to reiterate that, in discursively, the designed message is, voluntary or involuntary, distorted, mystified, altered, hacked. Each of these operations is based on the idea that the initial banality must be transformed into an originality which to transfer exactly the designed message.

The will of message is to be sent immediately, direct. Reality requires it to be induced mediated, leased through discourse (Naaman, Boase & Lai, 2010; Frunză, 2011; Cojocaru, Bragaru & Ciuchi, 2012). Discursive mediation brings the originality (Beciu, 2009; Vlăduțescu, 2012). The mediation instrument has two forms: language (line rhetoric) and cogitation (logic line or logically).

### **Thinking and aspirational desire**

Any communication opens a hermeneutical situation whose main axis is represented by the presence and recognition of the other. The message is advanced to alterity. The message is transferred hard: this effort of modulation, modeling and communicative writing has a motivation below. The message is an effort for the other, for the recognition of alterity. What does mean this waste of energy on behalf of alterity? The discourse, is observed, it is the work of a desire, of a love, even when it is under the pressure of a need for expression (Berger, 2000; Berger, 2010; Tran & Stănciugelu, 2003; Tîrziman, 2003). When, as in the case of philosophical message, the message counts as wisdom, this wisdom is mobilized also of love, if by chance even by of love is triggered. While philosophy is love of wisdom, the philosophical message is a loving wisdom. The simple writing is a falling in love language-cogitative. The philosophical discourse constitutes a love letter. Similarly, philosophical message, loving wisdom, it appears to be a declaration of love. That is philosophical discourse develops as message also a declaration of love. The love of wisdom is made by wise declarations (Vlăduțescu, 2013; Vlăduțescu & Ciupercă, 2013). Original message, designed one, which we have to write to another, recognized, it has to be changed, but it throughout putting in the discourse irradiates in us. Under the light of designed message is constructed, language and cogitative, the discourse. In every discourse irradiates a message. The fundamental message of any discourse is a predictable desire: peace message, love message, moral message, philosophical message etc.

At the root of any message lies a thinking aspiration, a thinking desire. This aspiration is engaged in discourse with different functions: the grievance, the appetite, the challenge, the advice, the recommendation, the aspiration, the passion or impulse. Taken generic, these forms that align language and cogitation, appear as platitudes. The message pare transformed in luxury communication called discourses, writings. The message being increases as discourse. The figure of creative spirit is delimited the in this effort to put the message in discourse. This figure is distinguished as a movement of productive thinking in designed message field performing (O'Keefe & Delia, 1982; Jackson, 1992; Marinescu, 2011). The message is wrapped in discourse. Specificity of any message does not come so of language or of cogitation that are aligned, but of the fundamental elements of the message aspiration. These structuring elements are: mitem, philosopheme, themes, topics, motifs, ideas, spiritual figures, semiotic and ideational configurations etc. In relation to these elements, from specific

character of message is developed a discourse with the same specific. Considering the instrumentation of the discursive production, the language and cogitation take over structuring elements. Thus, attracting of the philosophemes in a message and their development in a discourse, determines the philosophematic character, philosophical of designed message, philosophematic character, philosophical of resulted discourse and the same character for recovered of consumption cogitative spirit. Consumption message comes after, it being the result of discourse interpretation. This is the true message. Sometimes in it is irecognoscible the designed message, first, original message. Taking into account all of these, we must note that in relation to the consciousness that one has about its own first message, productive thinking has tendency to allocate also language and cogitation instrumentation of a similar nature. Jacques Derrida is, after Nietzsche, first who in the use of discursive instrumentation allocates to a literary designed message a philosophic instrumentation, and sometimes, to a philosophematic designed message a literary instrumentation. This is a form of deconstruction: the difference between philosophical and literary fades away, the traces are attenuated, indexes, indicators and signs of discursive specificity are obscured (Borchin, 2001; Dillard & Solomon, 2000; Donsbach, 2006). A dual designed message is dual developed. In any case, the aspiration of designed message, as detached of its message would present the creative spirit, has no reconciliation until the discourse is not closed as compelled of the original message perfection (Rus, 2002; Ritt, 2002; Burleson, 2010; Sandu, 2012; Greene, 2013). The fundamental aspiration of the message is always affected, the message development as discourse, of other affective-cogitational energies: anxieties, concerns, dreams, resignation, ambitions etc. As long as the message has not become discourse, the message is unvoiced. The discourse is the only expression of the message. The force of discourse consists of the message: the message is a force of words. The discourse starts as unvoiced and ends as decibel limits. A name is the first and hardest lingual operation. This operation precedes the message. Unvoiced must be named. From here starts putting the message in discourse. Philosophy just thematizes this process. The message structural force of aspiration initially appears as inexpressible, "where you'll find the word to express the truth" wondered Eminescu. The words have to be extracted from the original force of message, from aspiration. The original of lexemes that make the message - project is a flat language. In this point is formed first the ineffable, then the ineffable intervenes as limit of language. In the rest of the message discursive development controls the expressible principle formulated by U. Eco (1976) and J. Searle (1985): everything can be signified by words. Umberto Eco called it general expressibility principle. The raw material of the message is called un-named, further from the designed message will be profiled that the material of the discourse would be unnamed. What has been named becomes unable to impose. Then named from the designed message is deconstructed by un-named. The message is not transformed algorithmic in discourse. There is not on productive level a rule by which a particular message to become a certain discourse. The designed message is coming from a first language in which the words are found easy (Greene, 1997; Greene, 2000; Fârte, 2004; Tudor, 2013). The message "Know thyself" contains unnamed words. The difficulty appears when this message must be put in discourse and imposed as effects and influence. The message must be reshaped by a common aspiration to that which itself generated first message. When we want to send a message we must realize that we install on a field where language and cogitation precede us. Language is

anterior us. Discursive cogitation is encountering us. To stay away of repetition, first our contribution would be lingual and cogitative and then second of philosophematic nature.

### **Logoi – prepared discourses**

Perfect messages are messages developed as perfect discourses. As can be achieved as messages, the messages should be done first as discourse. As such, effective messages are messages that have passed through the discourse sample (Vlăduțescu, 2004; Wilson & Feng, 2007; Whiting, Maynes, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2012). In general, spontaneous messages are doomed to failure. Only genius saves spontaneous Effect messages are messages that radiates from prepared discourses messages. Most messages are spontaneous. Communication specialists say that messages must be prepared, the messages must be constructed. As an aspirational desire, messages are spontaneous (Bratosin, 2007; Craig, 1999; Agabrian, 2008; Craig, 2009). In fact, be prepared not messages, but discourses. Discourses must be prepared. Let's remember that the ancients had permanent prepared discourses (logoi) for different occasions. That prepared discourses (logoi) was the perfect form in which message can be almost perfect translated in discourse. N. Berdyaev says that no one begins with his own thinking. Our start messages are borrowed messages. Our contribution will only be lingual and cogitative, not an imposition one. Language, cogitation and some thinking precede us. Unlike some thinking, original thinking grabs from silence a mitem, a philosophem, a theme, a subject only after he detached from the tangle of raw words offered by learning, the existence, the history (Norris, Curtice, Sanders, Scammell & Semetko, 1999; Kemper & Kertes, 2000; Peterson, Wellman & Slaughter, 2012). There is before everyone a comprehensible waiting in language and cogitation. First, this comprehensible must be taken as message and pun in discourse. Broadening the comprehensible sphere is fast fate, only for few thinkers. Philosophical message should consider this: it is forced to start from what language and cogitative won as comprehensible (Berlo, Lemert & Mertz, 1969; Ciupercă, 2009; Copley & Schulz, 2013). Only then must under its principal aspiration to probe to the limits of discursively. As human beings, we come into not in a certain world, but in a saturated world of language. We open the eyes in a world rated lingual by the others. We acquire a language and a thinking that are not ours. However, to find ours, we must to bring to the limit of exhaustion the language and cogitation that greeted us. At the arrival we find a ready-made linguistic code and logic, the first duty is to get into them. We are born into a world of logoi. We have the obligation to follow our own logos, to appropriate logoi of others. So we let us crossed by the logos of the world, creating the possibility that arrived at the limits of discursively to overcome them and carry on the humanity logos. In the personal logos we must express incomprehensible up to us (Bradac, 1988; Craia, 2000; Craia, 2008; Gîfu, 2011; Gîfu & Cristea, 2011). Incomprehensible becomes logos through our message. Logos is unable to express the speechless. Apophasis, defined as refusal to exhaust the truth by its formulation, is a part of discursively. Apophasis is shown to be the negative side of the inexpressible. Neither the message nor the discourse give being to a thing before the language. Both the message and the discourse are produced post- lingual. Not preceding and not coming once with the language, using the language for setting, they are post- lingual. If the message comes after the language was created means that by using the language it repeats in a walk unseen the evolution of language from the start. On the other hand, between the

message and discourse there is a distance. The message however cannot stay away from the discourse than under the dream constellated as a simple repetition, as platitude. The discourse is profiled, from this point of view, as an eradication of platitude, and rhetoric - as development technique substitution, revelation and the displacing of meanings message. Rhetoric actions in message transforming in discourse both at frastic level by well-known figures of speech and tropes, and level, we say, transfrastic irony (Averbeck & Hample, 2008). Among rhetorical transfrastic constellations are called: irony, collusion, lying and joking. From the message to discourse the road is covered by rhetoric and logic and logical modeling.

### Conclusions

The radiant core of the message is an aspirational desire. Practical, message is a desire that aspire toward something. The aspiration is the message direction. In itself, the desire-message in design has a poverty lingual, and the cogitation is embarrassed to it. An impoverishment would transfer if the designed message project would be transferred exactly as it was projected. Message is genuine thinking that irradiates like discourse. In any discourse irradiates a message.

### References

- Agabrian, M. (2008). *Strategii de comunicare eficientă*. Iași: Institutul European.
- Averbeck, J. M., & Hample, D. (2008). Ironic message production: How and why we produce ironic messages. *Communication Monographs*, 75(4), 396-410.
- Beciu, C. (2009). *Comunicare și discurs mediatic*. București: comunicare.ro.
- Berger, C. R. (2000). Goal detection and efficiency: Neglected aspects of message production. *Communication theory*, 10(2), 156-166.
- Berger, C. R. (2010). *Message Production Processes*. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication Science*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B., & Mertz, R. J. (1969). Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 33(4), 563-576.
- Borchin, M.-I. (2001). *Paradigme ale comunicării: limbaje și limbi*. Timișoara: Editura Excelsior.
- Bradac, J. J. (1988). (Ed.), *Message effects in communication science*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bratosin, S. (2007). *La concertation dans le paradigm du mythe*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Burleson, B. R. (2010). *The nature of Interpersonal Communication*. In C. R. Berger, M. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen, *The Handbook of Communication Science*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Capurro, R. (2003). Angelitics, a Message Theory. In H. H. Diebner & L. Ramsey (Eds.), *Hierarchies of Communication* (pp. 58-71). Karlsruhe: ZKM.

- Capurro, R. (2011). *Angeletics - A Message Theory*. In R. Capurro & J. Holgate (Eds.), *Messages and Messengers: Angeletics as an Approach to the Phenomenology of Communication* (pp. 5-15). Vol 5. ICIE Series: Munich, Germany.
- Ciupercă, E. M. (2009). *Psihosociologia vieții cotidiene*. București: Editura ANIMV.
- Cobley, P., & Schulz, P. J. (2013). *Introduction*. In P. Cobley & P. J. Schulz (Eds.), *Theories and Models of Communication* (pp. 1-16). Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Cojocaru, S., Bragaru, C., & Ciuchi, O. M. (2012). The Role of Language in Constructing Social Realities. The Appreciative Inquiry and the Reconstruction of Organisational Ideology. *Revista de Cercetare și Intervenție Socială*, 36, 31-43.
- Craia, S. (2000). *Teoria comunicării*. București: Editura Fundația România de Măine.
- Craia, S. (2008). *Dicționar de comunicare, mass-media și știința informării*. București: Editura Meronia.
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119-161.
- Craig, R. T. (2009). Reflection on "Communication Theory as a Field". *Revue internationale de communication sociale et publique*, 2, 7-12.
- Dillard, J. P., & Solomon, D. H. (2000). Conceptualizing Context in Message-Production Research. *Communication Theory*, 10(2), 167-175.
- Dobrescu, P., Bârgăoanu, A., & Corbu, N. (2007). *Istoria comunicării*. București: comunicare.ro.
- Donsbach, W. (2006). The Identity of Communication Research. *Journal of Communication*, 56(3), 437-448.
- Eco, U. (1976). *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fârte, G. I. (2004). *Comunicarea. O abordare praxeologică*. Iași: Editura Demiurg.
- Frunză, S. (2011). Does communication construct reality? *Revista de Cercetare și Intervenție Socială*, 35, 180-193.
- Gîfu, D. (2011). *Violența simbolică în discursul electoral*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință.
- Gîfu, D., & Cristea, D. (2011). Computational Techniques in Political Language Processing: AnaDiP-2011. In *Future Information Technology* (pp. 188-195). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Greene, J. O. (2000). Evanescent Mentation: An Ameliorative Conceptual Foundation for Research and Theory on Message Production. *Communication theory*, 10(2), 139-155.
- Greene, K. (2013). The Theory of Active Involvement: Processes underlying interventions that engage adolescents in message planning and/or production. *Health communication*, (ahead-of-print), 1-13.
- Holgate, J. (2011). *The Hermesian Paradigm: A mythological perspective on ICT based on Rafael Capurro's Angeletics and Vilem Flusser's Communicology*. In R. Capurro & J. Holgate (Eds.), *Messages and Messengers: Angeletics as an Approach to the Phenomenology of Communication* (pp. 58-89). Vol 5. ICIE Series: Munich: Fink.
- Jackson, S. A. (1992). *Message effects research: Principles of design and analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kemper, S., & Kemtes, K. (2000). Aging and message production and comprehension. *Cognitive aging: A primer*, 197-213.
- Marinescu, V. (2011). *Introducere în teoria comunicării*. București: C. H. Beck.

- Naaman, M., Boase, J., & Lai, C. H. (2010, February). Is it really about me?: message content in social awareness streams. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 189-192). ACM.
- Norris, P., Curtice, J., Sanders, D., Scammell, M., & Semetko, H. A. (1999). *On message: Communicating the campaign*. Sage.
- O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. (1982). Impression formation and message production. *Social cognition and communication*, 33-72.
- Peterson, C. C., Wellman, H. M., & Slaughter, V. (2012). The Mind Behind the Message: Advancing Theory-of-Mind Scales for Typically Developing Children, and Those With Deafness, Autism, or Asperger Syndrome. *Child development*, 83(2), 469-485.
- Ritt, A. (2004). *Introducere în comunicare*. Timișoara: Editura Mirton.
- Rus, F. C. (2002). *Introducere în știința comunicării și relațiilor publice*. Iași: Editura Institutul European.
- Sandu, A. (2012). *Metode de cercetare în știința comunicării*. Iași: Editura Lumen.
- Searle, J. (1985). *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tîrziman, E. (2003). Științele informării și comunicării, domeniu de cercetare. *Studii de Biblioteconomie și Știința Informării, Library and Information Science Research*, 7, 43.
- Tran, V., & Stănciugelu, I. (2003). *Teoria comunicării*. București: comunicare.ro.
- Tudor, M. A. (2013). *Epistémologie de la communication, science, sens et métaphore*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2004). *Comunicologie și mesagologie*. Craiova: Editura Sitech.
- Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2012). Seduction as operation in persuasive communication. *Revista de psihologie*, 58(3), 250-260.
- Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2013). Feedforward irradiation in Psychology, Psychopedagogy and Communication. Principle of Feedforward. *Revista de Psihologie*, 59(3), 254-263.
- Vlăduțescu, Ș., & Ciupercă, E. M. (2013). *Next Flood Level of Communication: Social Networks*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Whiting, S. W., Maynes, T. D., Podsakoff, N. P., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2012). Effects of Message, Source, and Context on Evaluations of Employee Voice Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 182.
- Wilson, S. R., & Feng, H. (2007). Interaction goals and message production: Conceptual and methodological developments. *Communication and social cognition: Theories and methods*, 71-96.