Media and live together, the last hours we? sociology of media system of living together

Introduction

The relationship between the media and living together is a real scientific temptation and a push-to-crime functionalist insofar as it inevitably leads to this theoretical approximation double causality bankrupting doubt on the functionalism of the ability to reduce everything to social functions. By encouraging among other concerns to wonder for example what conditions the media would make it possible to live together, it presupposes that to live together is a reality to which the contribution of the media is one of the possibilities. The media in this regard would arise as a criterion, a factor or a category of living together. But if one tries to reverse the proposal, assumptions resulting invite to exceeding functionalist principles. They could then appear as suggested answers to the following main question: how do the media participate in the redefinition of living together? By removing the reflection of functionalist fatality, this issue offers the prospect on the postulate that living together has a variety of formulations including the history of nations is likely to account for a part, and also the media is one of the signs and one of the preferred media of this reformulation. It leaves finally imagine that living together in contact with the media is likely to move away from his common sense and adopt unexpected variations imposed by media categories themselves conditioned by the different forms of living together.[1] to live together, we chose to include this discussion.

To understand the relationship of the media to live together must both be located at both levels, ethical and practical upon which run media, while addressing the theoretical frameworks that were used to build the different dimensions of living together. From the outset two terminals can then be used to frame the discussion. On one hand, the utilitarianism that we basically qualify ethics which Bentham was the precursor and which considers the collective well-being, as the sum of individual well-being as the target of any action. Think the media in this perspective of the welfare of aggregation can lead to stray into a philosophy of media action and question the contribution of the media and journalists to the collective well-being, he is not sure whether successful for debate. The second terminal, more pragmatic, is to assume the dishonor that periodically hits the media and journalists whose only occupation to resistance to social decline nevertheless constitutes a denial unacceptable. It would dishonor in this case, evidence of the practice that the media are adversaries or enemies of the collective well-being and living together. The restriction of their freedom in proportion to social issues would be a reasonable

Dr Mrs Michèle Ngoyon-Mekeme,[1] Laurent Charles Boyomo Assala[2]
[1]Advanced School of Mass Communication, University of Yaounde 2, Cameroon
[2]Department of Communication and Civilization, University of Yaounde 2, Cameroon

Correspondence: Laurent Charles Boyomo Assala, Department of Communication and Civilization, Professor ESSTIC- University of Yaounde 2, Cameroon, Email cboymo@yahoo.fr

solution. Between the two sides, thinking can lead first to carefully consider the place of the injunction to live together in its various formulations communicative thought and as a condition of existence of the media (1) then to question the humanist ideal and the notion of media broadly as conceptual pillars and sets the requirement of living conditions (2). This theoretical framework led to work on the basis of two principles of freedom and equality that have shaped the history of living together.

Communication as a base of living together

Historians of communicational thought consider the roots of the word communication as central to understanding what it is. Two words have indeed led to generate either the Latin communion that evokes the fusion, communion, and supine communicare that evokes the idea of exchange, share, the two ideas are not, far must be synonymous. If the first is rooted in the Christian approach of communion where the word made flesh in the merger of the bread and wine led the faithful in unity with the Almighty as a condition of sanctifying purity; the second assumes the idea that diversity is the principle of humanity is not an obstacle to the agreement but rather a source of opportunities But freedom is irreconcilable with the merger, as well as equality is irreducible to segregation and segmentation. These two ideas, however, have never ceased to characterize the communication and its main theoretical derivations and practices. Though paradoxical, they served as a base for the production of the technologies we observe the applications at once unifying and distributive, but at the same time separatist and confrontational. Appeared in the middle of the seventeenth century in Europe, the media ensured continuity. Both ideas seem indeed characterize the evolution of human societies. So when Gerald Cohen[1] they served as a base for the production of the technologies we observe the applications at once unifying and distributive, but at the same time separatist and confrontational. Appeared in the middle of the seventeenth century in Europe, the media ensured continuity. Both ideas seem indeed characterize the evolution of human societies. So when Gerald Cohen they served as a base for the production of the technologies we observe the applications at once unifying and distributive, but at the same time separatist and confrontational. Appeared in the middle of the seventeenth century in Europe, the media ensured continuity. Both ideas seem indeed characterize the evolution of human societies.

---

[1]P. Champagne, "power of the media" and "power over the media." The reasons for a recurring debate. In Georgakakis D. and JM Utard, Science Media. Signposts to political history, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2001, pp. 195-212. Dominique Wolton believes that these are two meanings coexist in the etymology of the word and distinguish two senses: that of sharing it approaches the idea of normative communication and the transmission and distribution, close to what he calls functional communication. It is clear that we depart from the woltonienne perspective since for us, the sharing is not a natural given rights, but political will (cf. Wolton, Think communication, paris Flammarion, pp.16 ff.

So when Gerald Cohen[2,2] criticizes John Rawls[3,3] to accommodate inequalities incentives pretext that they are likely to create, he refutes the idea that freedom is the first condition for achieving equality.

A historiography: living together as free use of the common

For two inverse movements have always been used to set up the world we live in: an integration movement, reminiscent of communion and fusion in the Nations unit erected by Empires and Kingdoms formerly Republics and today that 'they are socialists or federal, as before the fall of the Berlin Wall, unitary and indivisible, first; and a political and cultural movement segmentation, according to Maurice Godelier[4,4] "Divides and subdivides, often violently, the existing political-economic groups and gives birth to new states which must then turn into nations" on the other. If the first is the problem of freedom in the unified entity, the second part in turn the question of equality centrally, since the differences are recognized in consolidated entities. Thus, the proliferation of free and independent States, entering turn in the UN system has not eliminated inequalities between them in terms of influence, economic power or political autonomy. Quite the contrary. The list is long, the massacres committed in the name of human essence, of the unity of a human group, the will to purify society of everything that is not consistent, uniform. Globally, the integration of the capitalist economic system increasingly globalized, goes along with the multiplication of new nation states and the reassertion of multiple local identities, ethnic and religious. Between freedom and equality, the choice is difficult to make and many theorists clashed on the priority to one or the other. Much of modern classical philosophy as focused his gaze on this aspect, although the communication has not been the main concern of the studies. By combining theoretical looks libertarian nineteenth century and égalitaritariennes analyzes of the same time, it is possible to re-question the relationship between freedom and equality anew. To summarize the first, we must start from the idea that the just society is one in which institutions respect and protect the freedom of each individual to exercise full ownership over him and the property rights he has lawfully acquired on external goods. For freedom and equality are at the heart of human and philosophical reflection since the dawn of time.

The different formulations of freedom in particular, have given over to endless debate that it is not easy to summarize except sketch the outlines. One must the philosopher Isaiah Berlin[5,6,5] one of the most challenging formulations; it operates in the distinction between positive liberty and negative liberty, while his British counterpart Thomas Green in the premises had formulated a century before distinguishing freedom from and freedom to. Negative freedom is in

Berlin, the absence of constraints, and political point of view, "the field within which a person may act without seeing its action blocked by others." This is a "clean sphere of liberty" of which an individual can enjoy "safe from any interference of others," says Norberto Bobbio.[7,6] It is for Hayek and in clearer terms "state in which a man is when not subjected to the stress of the arbitrary will of others." Positive freedom opens meanwhile the individual to act according to its fundamental interests, driven by conscious goals and not by external causes. It covers "issues and forms related to individual and collective self-determination, freedom to determine oneself rationally, to be the instrument of his own will and not the will of others," observes B Libois.[8,7] Positive or negative, this conception of freedom does not find favor with libertarians who say, from the nineteenth century in the thought of Wilhelm von Humboldt, that no one can take the initiative of physical force against an individual, his person or its property. For them, the reduction of the state or its complete disappearance as a coercive force in favor of a free and voluntary cooperation is a condition of achievement of freedom. The fate of liberty in relation to equality was less theoretical developments. This subject, however, been a significant development in the work of Amartya Sen.[9,10,8] Taking the concept of "freedom of property" -being discussed by writers as different as Roemer,[11,9] Arneson,[12,10] Pogge[13,11] Theorists of utilitarianism and welfarism in particular John Rawls, like those of the capability approach,[1,14,15,] Sen proposes to distinguish between the operation (the Beings and the doings of a person, his ways of being and acting), and capabilities, that is to say the real opportunities in the view of the life we lead. Consequently the concept of negative liberty is for him reductionist, but even more, by confining itself to consideration of only formal rights of individuals, that doctrine is likely to endorse "catastrophic moral horrors such as famines." Sen[16] addresses here without opposing them, the economics of coexistence that free does not mean that way. For taking the example of the famine, he considers that the deprivation suffered by starving people are not the result of undue interference in their sphere of freedom, but a freedom of action nipped in the bud by a structural lack of various resources of order. His approach by Entitlements focuses on the capacity of people to have food by legal means available in society, including the exploitation of production possibilities, shopping opportunities, vis-à-vis rights State and other methods of acquiring food. Armed with the concept of Entitlements, Sen[16] establishes his distinction between freedom of welfare (well-being freedom) and free agency (agency freedom), the latter involving the person enjoys real autonomy, which is for him quality of life. Although that concept Sen implies the moral values of society, it can just as well be interpreted as the need for

[2](A) Cohen, GA "Equality of What? We Welfare, Goods, and Capabilities"

(B) Cohen, GA, Rescuing Justice and Equality, Harvard University Press, 2008.

[3]John Rawls, Theory of Justice, Paris, Threshold, 1987.

[4]Godelier, M., the foundation of human society. What we teach anthropology, Paris, Flammarion, Essays Field, 2010, 336 p.

[5](a) Berlin, Isaiah, (a) Four Essays on Liberty, Oxford University Press, 1969. Trans. fr. "Two Concepts of Liberty," Praise of Freedom, Paris, Calmann-Levy, 1990

(B) Berlin, Isaiah., A against the current. Essays on the history of ideas, Paris, Albin Michel, 1988

(C) Rosenfield To understand the paradoxes of the concepts of positive liberty and negative liberty cf. Damien Theillier, "Two Concepts of Liberty by Isaiah Berlin," Philosophy, 1986 December 11, 2013. Accessed September 5, 2017.

[6]Bobbio, N., Il futuro della democrazia (1984, 2005), trans. fr. S. Gherardi and JL Pouthier, the future of democracy, Paris, Seuil, 2007, p. 221.

[7]Libois Boris, "Redefining the freedom of the press," The media between law and power, Brussels, Ed. University of Brussels, 1995.

[8](A) Sen, AKDevelopment as Freedom, op. cit.P. 77 and "Human Rights and Capabilities"Journal of Human Development, 6 (2), pp. 151-166.

(B) Sen, AK, Democracy others, why freedom is not an innovation of the West. Paris, Shores, Pocket 2006.

(C) Béricourt, E., Amartya Sen: a critical review, in The Notebooks of political economy 2007/1 No. 52 pp 57a 81.

[9]Roemer, JE, Theories of Distributive Justice, Harvard University Press, 1996.

[10]Richard Arneson Luck Egalitarianism and Prioritarianism, "Ethics 110, No. 2 (January 2000).

[11]Pogge, Lorenzo Valla, Flavio Biondo, Leonardo Bruni: humanists Debates on the language spoken in antiquity (text established and translated by Anne Raffarin) Paris, ed. Les Belles Lettres, Coll. "Humanism of the Classics" (No. 44), 2015, 306 p.

access to food in the broadest sense, materially decent conditions. The emergence into the hands of human rights the right to food and the symbol of the recognition of this necessity. One could however object to this thesis Sen one can not equate equal values in capabilities of a separate gender real opportunities (its capabilities), that is to say the possibility for individuals to act against the circumstances in operating other choices. Where there are no possibilities of choice, equal values with other contexts is no other analytical usefulness. The emergence into the hands of human rights the right to food and the symbol of the recognition of this necessity. One could however object to this thesis Sen one can not equate equal values in capabilities of a separate gender real opportunities (its capabilities), that is to say the possibility for individuals to act against the circumstances in operating other choices. Where there are no possibilities of choice, equal values with other contexts is no other analytical usefulness. The emergence into the hands of human rights the right to food and the symbol of the recognition of this necessity. One could however object to this thesis Sen one can not equate equal values in capabilities of a separate gender real opportunities (its capabilities), that is to say the possibility for individuals to act against the circumstances in operating other choices. Where there are no possibilities of choice, equal values with other contexts is no other analytical usefulness. One could however object to this thesis Sen one can not equate equal values in capabilities of a separate gender real opportunities (its capabilities), that is to say the possibility for individuals to act against the circumstances in operating other choices. Where there are no possibilities of choice, equal values with other contexts is no other analytical usefulness. One could however object to this thesis Sen one can not equate equal values in capabilities of a separate gender real opportunities (its capabilities), that is to say the possibility for individuals to act against the circumstances in operating other choices. Where there are no possibilities of choice, equal values with other contexts is no other analytical usefulness.

Although it is not common in the literature to oppose freedom and equality, it is possible to maintain that freedom, positive or negative, are not always open to equality and vice versa. Generally, a comparative analysis of social policies practiced in Europe and the United States clearly shows that if one side the focus is on the management of fragile, disadvantaged by nature and unemployed Outre Atlantic is the freedom that seems to prevail. The formal equality principle used here means to mitigate deviations of conditions through various institutional and legislative changes, there or elsewhere, freedom is built in tamper standard left to accept the inequalities that may result due to the birth or fortune. Even some European policies tend to join the defenders of the actual maximum freedom and their proposal for the principle of a universal allowance and a state intervention in exceptional cases such as rationing and restricting certain freedoms, positional differences are quite noticeable. Starvation phenomena of exclusion and racial inequalities, economic, social or cultural in nature quite different and target different social groups, and especially minorities, women, disabled, black or pygmies of the world, are not a juxtaposition of the theories applied to a potentially indefinite series of objects independent of each other, but the result of a complementary historical system of exclusion and domination, interconnected. The media's role is particularly emphasized in contemporary continuity. Freedom and equality are a mainspring and an essential condition of possibility. It is therefore not surprising that freedom and equality artificially linked by the Enlightenment philosophers in particular, have been broken down differently in history. In particular political equality and economic equality were disjointed in contact with human

rights including the Universal Declaration sets forth the equal rights, suggesting that the property law, international economic law built as a falling rights of the second generation rights (economic and social rights) are not necessarily civil and political rights which primarily holds the principle of freedom. Economic freedom is in that sense a more limited freedom that political freedom. Moreover, such freedom without equality is empty defect substance to be meaningless. The subjugation of economic equality in restraints disclaims advocacy as well as political freedom emancipated from economic equality. The translation of this relationship in media law is in principled terms, the acceptance that the freedom to create media is a necessary constraint of economic resources and the nature of the media system -reporting selected for the print media and authorization for the media audiovisual. The second principle resulting from the legal anchoring of this formulation is in many cases as in Cameroon, equal access to the media (and not of their creation) become equal access, resulting in party representation in Parliament. They were not only intended to denounce the wealth gap in the name of equality of opportunity between people. The subjective dimension of living together can really be objectified in the consideration of poverty and its ravages and inequalities. They call to turn away from the utilitarian mind that between two people, one is disabled, it is valid person who should be awarded more since it would make better use and which would increase the total utility. The subjective dimension of living together can really be objectified in the consideration of poverty and its ravages and inequalities. They call to turn away from the utilitarian mind that between two people, one is disabled, it is valid person who should be awarded more since it would make better use and which would increase the total utility. The subjective dimension of living together can really be objectified in the consideration of poverty and its ravages and inequalities. They call to turn away from the utilitarian mind that between two people, one is disabled, it is valid person who should be awarded more since it would make better use and which would increase the total utility.

Freedom and equality in communicational thought: a sketch

Clearly, in terms of the communicative theory at least, the concerns for freedom and constitutional equality are less studied than issues of access of all citizens to the democratic expression, thus doing away with discussion of social equality to equality and communicational media. One could to embrace synchronic and syncretic way the ideas of freedom that have marked the history of media and communication, evoke the libertarian Version scope of freedom of communication. To understand the meaning of these developments, it is worth recalling the concept of freedom carried by the current. In principle, Libertarians believe that the state should be concerned only negative liberty and should not especially take steps to promote positive liberty. For the State, this amounts to fetch the resources in some people and give these resources to other individuals so they can buy what they want, as observed Aaron Ross Powell.[12] In other words, for libertarians, the state must protect mainly negative freedom to be concerned the most of the positive freedom of the poor. But reports of these concepts in communication and media are not only metaphorical as are similar analyzes that relate to it, procrastination social approaches and regulations and conditions of reasoning and professional practices. The issue of freedom of communication in the context of living together is at the theoretical level, the exact point between freedom and equality

---

[12](at) Aaron Ross Powell, the Hole of Aaron ....2011 permited Press
(B) individualism ....2015 GH Smith & Mr Moore editprs.

on the one hand, between the dynamic of communion and sharing the other. It implies better understand the issues of freedom (political and/ or economic?) And equality (political and /or economic?) Which is then refers to living together. Equality and freedom are not primarily political or purely economic. As these concepts are not exempt from a certain ambiguity since they can lend itself to arbitrary manipulation, what does not deprive the dominant media-journalistic circles. The journalistic interpretation of the freedom of communication in its ideal-typical release poses indeed that journalistic freedom, confused with that of the media, is the first condition for the realization of all other forms of human freedom. All the normative system of the profession based on the fact that the development of mass democracy in the West coincided historically with the promotion of mass media to the rank of dominant institutions of public space. The concept of public space is the first form of theoretical extension of mass communication. Used as a synonym of both public and news media even though it is an analytical category developed by Jürgen Habermas, it has very quickly been so popularized that has forgotten that it is a conceptual tool to highlight specific historical conditions and not an immutable reality. The concept of the bourgeois public sphere refers indeed Habermas a specific social space, whose advent coincides with the development of capitalism in Western Europe. The historical circumstances of its appearance and the phenomenon of class size are important for understanding the meaning as its author. The ideas of liberty and equality are there already underlying the decline notably in said space as described by Habermas, namely its disintegration in the welfare states of the developed capitalism. The latter thus realize both the ideal of freedom and equality since private individuals using their reason, become public thus giving citizens all equal opportunity to debate the exercise of state power. What should we conclude? The theory of the bourgeois public sphere decline has been much criticism on which we will not return here. For the economy of this text we shall resume as those related to our subject. It should be noted at the outset that access to public space as well as regards the substantive conditions for realization of citizenship by voting that as regards the right to democratic expression (direct or indirect) is not granted to all. Habermas himself has worked to highlight the contradictions between the ideal of formal equality advocated by the liberal doctrine and social inequalities generated by the market. Moreover, the idea that power could be subject to the popular will is opposed by many liberal philosophers such as Tocqueville or Mills to Habermas the critical role of journalism is eclipsed by the rise of advertising and public relations in the early twentieth century. Made by the survey institutions and marketing, the public no longer has that deliberative function assigned Habermas said new spheres of public opinion far western bourgeois eighteenth century appear, pushing to the hypothesis of a proletarian public sphere.[17,18] Now living together is gripped by two opposing movements: the first is characterized by identity dynamics unfolding in hybrid media spheres and increasingly open to questions from the world.

The humanist ideal and the reality of hectic media

One of the most radical critics of the thesis of Habermas grows to exceed the theoretical framework that has developed and to consider what Peter Dahlgren[19,13] calls "the sense of creating processes that are implemented today"; especially when it interacts with the universe and

the media culture. However Dahlgren, the category of public space can help us to order consistently specific institutional configurations to the dominant social order and its media. The criterion from which would be possible with access and citizen participation in the political process. In contemporary communicational thinking, of living together plan presupposes to consider this possibility as realized thanks to the means offered by the Internet and its extensive media applications. Now the paradigm of media equality as a precondition for the equality of citizens suffers from several shortcomings.

The media inequalities and their social effects

The medium term generally refers to a set of very different objects by their shapes, their organization, their mode of operation and their social roles. Today the explosion of multimedia networks is a major phenomenon of our age, which has nothing in common with traditional media, press, radio and television whose social impact is constantly declining. The competition that engage the major communication groups and have at stake the control of three industrial sectors of this technology (computer, TV and telephony) almost completely obscures the public debate on the consequences of the increasing industrialization of the media and the gradual disappearance of the media under their old forms. A lot of questions yet accompany these changes: Internet he promotes pluralism and ethics of information? The current techno-media empire did not he generates "new barbarians of online information"? Uninterrupted economic growth targets (world economy), integral and direct democracy of general progress, covered by technological prowess they are not produced by modernicistes mythologies? The live together if there is more accomplished in the synergy observed between different media which interact with others, serving a global story made for a user turned actor and producer of the audiovisual world (Jenkins)? In the era of storytelling (storytelling) and the convergence of technologies and practices that have emerged new concepts such as trans-media,[14] Cross-media and cross-media[15] next multi and hyper mainstream media and what is now called media literacies to indicate the de-professionalization of the media committed today? These practices do not they change the meaning and do not they redefine the concepts of freedom and equality anew? These devices have in any case result, widespread interconnection of economies and societies beyond the borders of nation states in which the principles of freedom and equality have formed. "All these media, and many others, take turns to materially and symbolically connect the different parts of the world distinguished by an international division of ever increasing labor," notes in this Katambwe.[16]

It is obviously not possible to provide answers to all these questions in the context of a text on the nature of it. As observed Mathien[20,17]

---

[13](A) Peter Dahlgren, 'The public space and the media: a new era?' in HERMÉS nr. 13-14, 1994.
(B) Dahlgren, Peter, Televison and the public sphere: Citizenship, Democracy and the Media; 1995.

[14]The term transmedia storytelling is as wikipedia or a new form of storytelling that is characterized by the combined use of several media to develop a universe (a franchise). This new form of storytelling allows to reach different audiences and promotes the circulation of the audience from one medium to another, the viewer can for example discover the history of the Internet, keep in touch daily on the mobile and follow weekly on television. The cross-media means of information technology, promotional or informative, combining several types of media (editorial, visual, video, audio ...) broadcast on terminals used by the public. This is an approach to.
[15]The cross-media term comes from the intermediality invented by Jurgen Ernst Muller of the University of Amsterdam.il is a multidisciplinary design approach focusing on the relationships and interactions between mediadistinct within a work and developing "in specific social and historical contexts." It is to focus on the production of meaning that emerges from these media convergence and thus stop viewing the media as isolated from each other.
[16]Katambwe ....
[17]Mathien ....

"Media Studies (...) cannot be satisfied with a simple approach, let alone unilateral, from the perspective of a single scientific discipline, albeit it a media science that would build". Moreover, these questions do not always relate directly to media in relation to freedom whatever the imposed extension to this concept the technical and social developments to which we have alluded. However, it is important to remember in what terms there is the irreconcilability of freedom of expression and media institutional and economic inequalities media. Freedom of expression is a principle of universal application. It is not only a constitutional right in most countries of the world, but also one of the most revered cultural or political symbols. Living together so guess in theory it is possible to hold a public debate on all issues relating to democratic self-government at least. This implies that this principle should lead to overhaul both the libertarian distinction of negative freedom which requires a person to be abandoned by others to act as it wishes, and positive freedom which "implies a process of voluntary assistance designed for a person voluntarily in a position to pursue a goal." From the perspective of media theory, living together will interpret the economic and institutional plan with the idea that the government will take no action to prevent the creation, operation and expression of media. In that case, should it take to help both their creation to accompany their operation? The freedom of the media does not then risk being confused with the individual freedoms of expression, movement and receiving information and ideas as enshrined in the rhetoric of human rights? It would then be necessary to operate as the United States, a distinction between the initiatives of creation of the media, which is the exclusive prerogative of a private nature and which falls within the individual entrepreneurial freedom on the one hand, and access to the public debate through the media that falls within the state order, order part. If the inequalities in the creation of the media are assumed to be the name of free enterprise, equal access to public debate in the media is guaranteed by the government, in particular to safeguard such access both types of threats seen there as plants: those from the government, and those who hold the tyranny of the majority. These threats are related to worldwide economic and political modes of creation and functioning of the media, which were preventive treatment object from contrasting institutional and legislative changes in many countries make it difficult but not living together with and through the media. Given the limitations imposed on it by the economic structure and the political environment in the media system, they grow to wonder what could be the fate of the independence and autonomy of the media if journalists were freed of political and economic forces pressures. Would they be more effective in the definition and organization of living together?

Self-injunction and the imperative of living together

The sociological approach to the relationship of living together media puts meanwhile highlight different models, whether resulting scientific observations or ordinary considerations of professionals whose developments have modeled in turn imaginary journalists. Functionalism has contributed significantly to building the legitimacy of the democratic paradigm the media carrying the debate on diversity and pluralism as conditions of legitimacy and legitimizing the same function as journalist freedom operator. Again two views seem to clash, namely that due to the concentration of ownership a prerequisite for putting the media immune to the pressures of interest groups and to allow them to broadcast a diverse and pluralistic information; and the other, generally supported by the journalists, who consider the concentration as a limit to the spectrum of views that have access to the public space of the media. Placed at the heart of this debate, journalists are an object of interest to understand the different formulations of the principle of coexistence in contact with the centrality and importance they enjoy. Although they are not far from it the exclusive agents of the media system, their aura has been built for centuries and their place in the heart of ideologies that have dominated long activity and justifies Bourdieu,[21] that their grip on companies gives them a substantial prestige in the definition of media objects and dissemination of know. Erosion of information Journalism power was initiated however both sides of this size by removing them all at once the monopoly of access to information and the treatment of news. She however accompanied by significant limitations that appear on the borders of the profession and extend the scope of activities in sectors increasingly broad. Science journalism, cultural journalism, business journalism are now closely followed by other forms and other practices, to the point that the current citizen journalism, born in South Africa marks the final form of this expansion involved the redefinition of the social function of journalists. A new media humanity is born from the extension of thinking media to digital and claiming its share in the dissemination and sharing of knowledge. It is intended primarily as a materialist critique of the journalistic world, its ways of doing things and its institutions and thus fits gradually in living together and the media. At a time when contemporary developments of individualism is based on the injunction to be yourself and take part in the redefinition of living together, the information and communications technology multiply the relationship and communication equipment by the distribution of the benefits from the bet between oneself, digital communities increasingly fragmented and increasingly isolated at the same time. Face book, flikr, Realty and tools of the same type are given as the very new generations of media and very close in age and imaginary. These tools often take the form of cognitive artifacts[22,18] giving to see information relating to the ongoing process (chat window), or relational artifacts "that mediate the rise in the immediate vicinity of distant people as signs, indices, alarm, perceptual benchmarks treated as solicitations and projecting as an appropriate response, says Christian Licoppe.[23,19] Today a number of paradigms such as conversational analysis of publicized speech by computers[20] extend studies argumentative interactions conducted in the last century to account for such devices as discussion forums, weblogs, blogs and alternative pureplayers.[21]

What conclusions can be drawn for a continent where most states are unable to provide basic services to the population? In Africa, where infrastructure development and more particularly the media are totally disparate, regulatory mechanisms and distribution of wealth and failing shaky democratic practices, democratization remains notoriously not subject to ensure the sustainability of governance credible to ethnic groups increasingly huddled on their identities. If the open space by the media are now provides the biggest alternative to word public increasingly covered by digital networks and opens people's attention on more efficient development experiences elsewhere, it also carries the seeds of rejection by the people of the claim too quick elites to mobilize social complexity to remove them from public discussion and set themselves up as guarantors of the general interest. More than any other political or economic changes, they are extensions of media technologies and practices that lead us to reinvent a different and alternative model to nation states whose tax as

---

[18]Norman...... ..
[19]Licoppe ....
[20]Doury ....Marcoccia........................
[21]The pure players phrase was popularized to mean only companies working on Internet and is often defined as such.

sovereign authority is everywhere contested and involves reviewing policies categories use before. From "neglected intellectual," in the words of Fabien Eboussi,[22] African media would thus be freed from the exclusive grip of journalism and professional citizens to acquire media status. For now, journalists are facing a new problem: how to account for differences without involving the identity stereotypes assigned to them without help build. Perhaps is it in this reinvention of living together with and through media redefined themselves that could then register the currently individualistic dynamic to the test of globalization, in a world that seems to escape us. We know that the web has greatly contributed to the evolution of public discussion. "*By allowing* 'Against-public',"[24,23] Whose speeches were absent from major media scenes, to enjoy for exchange and mobilization.[25] "It will have contributed to some, the excitement of the public debate, and other containment and the" Balkanization "of the swap space it spawned, notice Badouard.[21,24]

Conclusion

If as observed rightly Rieffel[26,25] "There is hardly any field, it seems, that escapes the influence of the media," empowerment the public on the media notably through media literacies is one of the first conditions of epistemologies living together with the changes associated with globalization encouraged to move the focus: rather than a worldview live sets we expose media content, it is to focus on how the media represent live sets through their forms and socioeconomic regimes, cultural and legal, including their identities and subjectivities. This reconceptualization helps rehabilitate live sets plural without letting them overwhelm the injunction of unification is a comfortable resort for nation states often breathless and incompetent to solve identity claims that overwhelm them.

Acknowledgments

Conflicts of interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Cohen GA. *Equality of What? We Welfare, Goods, and Capabilities. Economic Review.* 2007;56(3/4):357–382.

2. Cohen GA. *Rescuing Justice and Equality.* USA: Harvard University Press; 2008. 448 p.

3. John Rawls. *The theory of justice. Threshold.* 1974;17(1):59–63.

4. Godelier M. *At the foundation of human society. What we teach anthropology.* Paris: Flammarion, Field Testing; 2010. 336 p.

5. Berlin Isaiah. *Praise of Freedom, Paris, Calmann–Levy, original title: Four essays on liberty.* UK: Oxford University Press; 1988. 30 p.

6. Berlin Isaiah. *Against the current: Essays on the history of ideas.* Paris: Albin Michel; 1990. 350 p.

7. Bobbio N. *The future of democracy (Trans. Fr. S. Gherardi and JL Pouthier).* Paris: Seuil; 2007. 304 p.

8. Libois Boris. *Redefining the freedom of the press: The media between law and power.* University of Brussels; 1995.

9. Sen AK. *Democracy others, why freedom is not an innovation of the West.* Paris: Shores, Pocket; 2006. 24 p.

10. Béricourt E. Amartya Sen: a critical assessment. *Les Cahiers political economy.* 2007;1(52):57–81.

11. Roemer JE. *Theories of Distributive Justice.* USA: Harvard University Press; 1996. 220 p.

12. Richard Arneson. Luck Egalitarianism and Prioritarianism. *Ethics.* 2000;110(2):1–18.

13. Poggio, et al. *Humanist debates on the language spoken in ancient times (Trad. Anne Raffarin).* Paris: Coll Humanism of the Classics publishing; 2015. 306 p.

14. Nussbaum M. Tragedy and human capabilities: A Response to Vivian Walsh. *Review of Political Economy.* 2003;15(3):413–418.

15. Wolton D. *Think communication.* Paris Flammarion.1999.

16. Sen AK. Development as Freedom, and "Human Rights and Capabilities. *Journal of Human Development.* 2005;6(2):151–166.

17. Dahlgren Peter. *Televison and the public sphere: Citizenship, Democracy and the Media.* Sweden: Lund University; 1995. 285 p.

18. Eboussi BF. Cameroon transit Democracy. Paris: L'Harmattan; 1997. 352 p.

19. Peter Dahlgren. The public space and the media: a new era? *HERMÉS.* 1994. 14 p.

20. Nussbaum M. *Upheaval of thoughs. The intelligence of emotions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2004. 768 p.

21. Badouard R, Mabi C, L Monnoyer Smith. The debate and its arenas. *About the materiality of chat rooms.* 2013;30(1):7–24.

22. Nussbaum M. *Democratic emotions. How to train the citizens of the 21st century.* Paris: Flammarion, Climates; 2011. 208 p.

23. Rieffel R. *What are the media? Practices, Identities, Influences.* Paris: Folio Actuel; 2005. 529 p.

24. Cukier Alexis. *Martha Nussbaum, Democratic Emotions. How to train the citizen of the XXI century?* Paris: Flammarion, Climats; 2011. 208 p.

25. Rosenfield. To understand the paradoxes of the concepts of positive liberty and negative liberty cf. In: Theillier D, editor. *Two Concepts of Liberty by Isaiah Berlin. Philosophy.* 1986.

26. Rieffel R. *Sociology of Media.* Paris: Ellipses; 2nd ed. 2005, 223 p.

[22]Eboussi F. Democracy transit in Cameroon, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1997, p. 352.
[23]Fraser .... .333
[24]Badouard R., Mabi, C., L. Monnoyer-Smith, The debate and its arenas. About the materiality of chat rooms; communication issue, No. 30, 2013, pp. 7-24.
[25](at) Rieffel, R. What are the media? Practices, Identities, Influences, Paris, Gallimard, coll. "Folio Actuel", 2005, 529 p.
(B) Rieffel, R., Sociology of Media, Paris, Ellipses, 2nd edition, 2005, 223 p.