

On the instance of live image

EUGÊNIO BUCCI

*Journalist, Professor at the graduate
and Post-graduate Program of ECA-USP.

He wrote, among other books,
Sobre Ética e Imprensa (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000)
and *Em Brasília, 19 horas* (Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2008).

ABSTRACT

This article tries to summarize the hypothesis of the «instance of the live image» in its connection with the public space, which is conceived as a communicational space, rather than an institutional or a legal one. The instance of the live image is displayed not as the live image itself, but as the plan of representation in which the live image takes place. This plan is put as the main factor of unification of the public space in its broadest sense. According to this hypothesis, the new technological possibilities of the digital age do not revoke this plan: they just reinforce it as they put new questions about it.

Keywords: instance, live image, public space

The history is well known - and always repeated: in the last century, as the television was getting popular as a household appliance, the public space started to go through deep changes. Some foundations of these changes, nevertheless, had not been focused with the deserved attention. The main ground culminates with the entry of the invention of the live image into the public space. From then on, we are able to state that the communicative relations change from one level to another; in an irreversible way.

The colors would come following the TV path, which was born with black and white monitors. Soon the satellite transmissions would appear. The live image coverage area reached entire continents and, next, the whole planet. With this, the way of registering facts was definitively modified, or, still, if preferred, the constitution of reality through discursive practices: Yes, the reality is a discursive construction; it is not a thing, it is not something that could be really handled, but a representation that acquires capacity to designate things – the ones that, once named, we can grab with our hands. The live image, in short, brought a new statute to the forms of representation – especially to the journalistic forms of world's representation.

If in the XIX century the printed word in daily newspapers occupied the support place from the factual truth's inscription - it carried the news and the information and hosted, sovereign, the vertex of the public opinion making – after the second half of the XX century, another instance bursts, the one that would become the social communication's biggest shrine: the “instance of live image”. During this change, the “instance of printed word” lost its centrality for the “instance of live image”.

The notion of instance

Lets consider what we call here as “instance”. Inside the legal field, the concept refers to a procedural relation between parts that dispute an agreement, that once it is proclaimed by the third party, who is in charge to judge, it will be valid for everyone. Yet at the communication field, however, this term has another kind of proposition: it designates a communicative relationship between subjects regarding

signification processes that do not crystallize; they reproduce themselves permanently reviewing their own terminology. The idea of instance in the communication field it is not attached to the notion of final sentences, but to what serves as headquarters for a succession of signifier's fixations and slippages in such way they make a transitory meaning for the subjects. For us, therefore, the concept is more from the linguistics area than from the legal one.

Lacan also uses this word when he deals with the "instance of the letter in the unconscious". Lacan says: "By letter, we designate that material support that the concrete discourse borrows from the language" (Lacan, 1996: 225). It is particularly revealing how the author refers regarding the letter, in this special case: he sees it as "material support" and not purely as "signifier". So, the letter would provide the base for fixing the discourse, and then, glue itself to meanings that, notwithstanding, they will be unglued, hereinafter, to search new fixations. But, attention: the concept of instance in Lacan is not reduced to this direct understanding, even though not incorrect. He defines, more than the letter itself, the "place" that it occupies. This place is there; open, even before the letter arrives. Without a doubt, the letter would function as support, but, as support it sets at the emptiness that awaits for it- the same one that cannot do without the letter.

The Lacanian perspective helps to illustrate the understanding of the term as it is invoked here: a "support" that fixates the meanings through the discourse, but it does not self exhaust in this signification, since also sustain, the signifier slippage (being them letters, in the case of the "instance of printed word", or scenes with movement, in the case of the "instance of live image"). And is this slippage that allows the incessant recombination between signifier and signified.

The printed word

In the case of the printed newspapers – supports, for excellence, of the establishment of national public spaces, most notably in XIX century and the early XX century - the pace of displacements coincided with the complete revolution of the planet around itself: 24 hours. Religiously, the newspapers circulated, as today, one day after another, marking at their mode the very passage of time. Whatever has happened, they continue to circulate. They register in their regular cadence the "last word" about the understanding of facts and ideas. After 24 hours, they revoke themselves, establishing the new "last words".

How can we visualize, how can we "see" the face of the instance of the printed word? Maybe a possible allegory for this is the assumption of a fictitious newspaper, a pile of paper, which circulated a beautiful day with absolutely no trace of paint, completely blank. There would be a first visage of the instance. Or nearly there. Yes, because that support of the printed word "without" the printed word – it is not, itself, the very instance. It is situated yet one step further.

The instance has to do with the beam of the regard, emerging from a spatial clipping area - geographical, to be more precise – that is deposited over it, forming it. The notebook with blank paper "materializes" the impact of that look, sustaining the public credit that is crystallization. The instance is therefore an abstraction (the social look) that materializes to give support to the significant.

As it demarcates a temporal cycle, the instance of the printed word marks, too, a spatial region, meaning a human contingent that has it as a reference of a communicative relationship. Its borders are limited, obviously. The first and sharper limitation to this instance comes from the limits of the language. Only literate citizens in that language have a granted ticket. Similarly, only those citizens who are in the area covered by the physical distribution of the newspaper participate in it. Therefore, the instance of the printed word mobilizes the daily the imaginary collection of this community, dialoguing around the themes of their immediate interest. This is how newspapers have been able to act in making public spaces more or less national or regional, being the latter ones (the regional) wider or narrower than the countries

themselves, according the geographical and idiomatic situations. The people there are covered subjects of the communicative relationship called the body of the printed word.

From the train line to the celestial dome

The transition of the instance of the printed word to the instance of the live image deserves a short previous consideration. In the XIX century, it was through the daily newspapers that the citizens debated the issues of public interest. The emergence of the printing industry increased stridently the number of printed copies. The institution of the advertising has made the unit price more affordable. The development of the railway allowed an increase at the distribution areas. The population taking part at the social communication was able to grow, which brought, as a result, more power to the instance of the printed word at the public space. The nations unified their political identities and strengthen their democracies by means of the printed newspapers.

Already in the XX century, with the cultural industry and the mass media communication endowed with visual resources, the written text is no longer the mandatory scrutiny for men and women had access to news and opinions. The illiterate mass comes into the scene, driven mainly by the consumption of entertainment. The news and opinions loose their relevance in this new industry – so, it will be said that the culture industry, the public (active and critical) expands as a mass (passive and uncritical), as mentioned by Habermas at the work, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (which we will see ahead).

First through the movies, with the moving image, and then with the television, with its live images, the entertainment has reached an unprecedented power. The common space, before mediated by the newspapers, it turned into an enormous virtual playground and, in this evolution, the “instance of the live image” started to occupy its center, leading to irreversible effects about the forms of factual chronicle. The instance of the live image installed itself as the oracle of the society, a massified oracle that presents itself as the highest form of record of that told reality for a civilization that will have at its eyes the main criterion for the verification of the truth. “A picture will be more ‘credible’ than a figure”, said Régis Debray, “and a videotape more than a good speech” (Debray, 1993: 354).

Gradually, the “seen” starts to occupy a fringe of the function of the “knowing”. The look advance over the thinking. The imaginary takes on territories that belonged to the symbolic domain, that is, through the mechanisms from the own order of the imaginary - which consists not only with visualities, as is well known, but incorporates the vast accumulation of myths and meanings that speakers use, in a direct way – they tend to replace the specific processes from the symbolic - that require reading and writing, that is, require abstraction, thinking, implementing the planning and the law.

There are other developments that operate from this transition. The politics, that already contained elements of spectacle, and the newspaper report, which had in its constitution the aesthetic resources and emotional appeals, surrendering largely to the entertainment laws to reach, seduce and captivate the audiences. The reason, as envisioned by the Enlightenment men, looses ground. The Public space made by the “instance of the live image” is born, finally, as a distinctly aesthetic space. Through it, nothing less than the national identities will be reworked at firsthand (a phenomenon which the Brazilian case is exemplary). What once was weaved through the newspapers, through the text, when the printed word was the highest instance, started to be made by the live image. The limits of the language, unsurpassed by the written word, dissipate. The cyclic time from the daily updates loses power to the instantaneousness: the temporal intervals tend to zero. The public space starts to become into a dome, as large or as small as the blue sky that covers the Earth.

Communicational nature of the public space

This is how the public sphere, in the words of Habermas, manages to expand itself. We do not have to get lost here in discussions about the possible concepts of public space -specifically, at the relevance (or not) to talk about a world wide or global public space. Renato Ortiz, for example, sees the emergence of a “world culture” (1994), as Octavio Ianni sees a “global civil society” (1998:39 and 107). That is not the focus of this article. The essential point now does not need to go beyond the most basic finding: that the issues of public significance, more and more of a common border or if you prefer, planetary. Citizens around the world identify themselves, gradually, as belonging to a common agenda, with topics concerning with themselves, whatever their nationality is. Although the word, written or spoken, exerting there an indispensable function, what unifies them is the “instance of the live image”.

What matters now, more than anything is to understand the “communicational nature” of the notion of public space - so that can be assimilated in these terms, the passage of the “instance of the printed word” for the “instance of the live image”. It is the communication that establishes the public space - never the contrary. It is the dynamics of this communication that defines the public space.

This does not mean that their constitution occurs through the processes stripped of the contradictions and even stress, starting with those with the power. On the contrary: the public spaces are defined as environments where the communicative relation supplies itself with the contradictions - historical, social, economic, and political; in addition, of course, to the communicational ones. They do not present itself as “peaceful” arenas of “consensus”, but weave themselves, above all, from what is contentious and unstable.

To make it clearer these features, we need to go back in time. Thus, we return to the “instance of the live image” and we can approach it as an arena marked by problematizations - especially those that will be launched by the emergence of the called interconnected networks from the digital age and from the Internet.

More than vehicle – communicative relation

Before we dive in recoil of time, it should be noted, preliminarily, some defining aspects of the “instance of the live image”. As it was mentioned, it radically changed the poles of spatiality and temporality. It was what gave the opening for what we see today as the new face of the public sphere.

Here have to get away from the mystification of technology. This is not what expands the public sphere, but the social use of the technology - generated, in fact, by the social relations – in the communication. By the way, the impulse - or the natural tendency to expand the public sphere - comes before the television. By the way, the emergence of the television technology was already proposed - it was already required - by this impulse of expansion. The “instance of the live image”, so, it is not a mean, not a vehicle, but a standard.

It is not a “mean” or a “vehicle” for the simple fact that does “not carry ready contents from a pole (sender) to another (recipient)”, but acts at the constitution of the communicative relationship, which emulates the social relations, as we will see.

How about the Internet? She does “not revoke the instance of the live image”. Instead, they just deepen it, because it shortens even more the distances and shortens the deadlines – an imperative trend that was imposed by the expansion of the public sphere from the instances of the live image. The possibilities brought by the digital era carry the problematization of the own public sphere. The imperative trend that leads to expansion through this problematization, it is due both to the demands of the capital (which requires the ubiquity and immediacy at the level of the financial movements) as the demands of the show

(which requires the same ubiquity and instantaneousness at the level of representation). The Internet does not revoke this trend, boosting it.

And it is a tendency, the television, as well as databases or car dealerships, have a propensity to merge with the Internet. You can watch TV through the Internet, and buying groceries using the computer is already a commonplace routine. All of this does not mean that the “instance of the live image” is buried. The Internet as electronic screen and as interactivity persists with the television, a performance begun by the television set. Advances, as noted above, because it comes to problematize it, by what some people call “interactivity”, or by the feedback mechanism effect has on the processes of producing, broadcasting, and the assimilation and re-creation of the images.

In short, the “instance of the live image” is placed as a loop that is simultaneously technological and social. It is indifferent whether this communication happens through the Internet, by conventional antenna, via satellite dish, by means of optical fiber, or even by a system that combines all of them. It focuses a communicational link (technological and social) among the subjects.

By “instance of the live image”, it must not be strictly understood as the advent of the so-called live broadcasts. It must be understood the immediate and permanent condition be live at any moment: “the instance of the live image” is not the live image itself, but the social place used by the live image as headquarters, from which it irradiates and for which it converges. The on-line is, therefore, part of this instance, since it prolongs the instance.

Lets discuss, going back on time, a recapitulation from the concept of public space as fundamentally communicational.

A Market of Informations

According the genealogy conceived by Habermas, the public sphere, as it is known today, emerges next to the formation of the bourgeois society. The most remarkable characteristic about this origin it is not the association between the public sphere and the literary criticism (a well commented association), but the historical and material link between the public sphere and the capitalist market (relation that is relatively neglected). While the first aspect can not be neglected, we will start our discussion with the second one.

The public sphere is the public expression of the capitalist market in formation. It does not appears as an institution or as a convention more or less juridical, agreed among agents moved only by the reason, but as the public side of a private economic activity. It is a product from history, rather than desires.

The public sphere and the rising capitalism market are twin brothers. The primal public sphere of the bourgeois can be thought as a metamarket, that means, as that embryonic forum that projected to the public visibility what citizens vocalized, the ones whose roots dipped in capitalist (or pre-capitalist) private commercial occupations. That is: at the public sphere, the bourgeois trader buys the projection of citizen dialoguing with other citizens.

It is worth to mention: this genesis must be understood as a historical process, it is neither a sudden advent nor an intentional construction. While in the economic level the capitalist-subjects trade exchange goods, in terms of public sphere formation, these same subjects, now citizen-subjects exchange goods, at the level of the public sphere in formation, these same subjects, now citizen-subjects – because the holders of the rights take place not only at the private ambit, but progressively at the public one - begin the communication nets exchanging informations. It is the imperative of the information exchange - a structural necessity, demanded by the same capitalists business - which will precipitate the first tryouts of the construction of a public sphere.

This need is embedded in the pre-capitalist relationships. Indeed, Habermas finds the imbrications among goods and informations already at the pre-capitalism: “Here we think about the elements of the new trade system: the exchange of goods “and of information” engendered by the large pre-capitalist commerce” (1984: 28).

So far, the formation of opinions (and the public opinion as such) it is not done. The informations exchanged from the pre-capitalism that sails in direction to the big commerce does not resemble at all to the discourses that engender value judgment about the power or about the State organization. These informations are only correlated to the data related to economic activity itself: Offers, prices, transportation routes, and numbers transmitted though correspondence. The public space that starts to be formed assumes the characteristics, as well, of a trade system analogous to that market from which emanates, where the information already start to be shown as pre-goods - since they concentrate an incipient trade value - which flow reinforces, guides and complements the course of the same goods. Habermas himself remarks: “The information exchange is developed at the goods exchange path” (1984: 29). He proceeds:

With the expansion of the commerce, the commercial calculations, oriented by the market, needed, at a more frequent and accurate way, informations about events spatially distant. Therefore, from the XIV century, the ancient practice of exchanging commercial letters was transformed into a sort of corporate mail system. (...) More or less contemporary with the appearance of the stock markets, the mail and the printed press had institutionalized permanent contacts of communication (ibid.).

Strictly speaking, only by talking about mail as the mail service and delivery of written messages become accessible to the general public - the same way, when the press printed the news is finally converted into a public good, that is, apt to be bought and read by every citizen. The peculiar dynamics of the public sphere has, therefore, a analogous dynamic to the market, as if it were a reflex from the last one, a deployment, a reelaborated mirroring capable to reflect and reconceive the market, operating, in return, at the market.

The social and exchange relations reflect themselves, the rising public sphere had already placed on scene the tensions with the power. They are ambiguous, but tensions. Reunited in public, its members consubstantiate to a new pole of political pressure. It opens inside the State power, from the outside to the inside and from the bottom to the top, arenas relatively informal (if compared to the closed functioning from the institutions from then), but relatively effective in interfering in that power. The authority sees itself pressured (or seduced) to negotiate, to dialogue and seek new forms of legitimacy. The authority starts to see the journalists as vehicle for their State reasons.

Still in March, 1769, a decree about the press made by the Viennese government testimony the style of this praxis: “In order to the editors from the newspapers could know what kinds of decrees, dispositives, and other things that occur are suitable for the public, these news will be collected every week by the civil servant provided to the journalists” (Habermas, 1984: 36).

At the same time as the authority is encouraged to assimilate the public sphere, regulating it, trying to equipped it, the same authority finds itself, also, challenged to accountability.

The bourgeois public sphere can be understood initially as the sphere of the private persons gathered in a public, they claim this public sphere regulated by the authority, but directly against this same authority, in order to discuss with it the general laws of the exchange at the mainly private sphere, but publicly relevant laws, the goods exchange and the social work (Habermas, 1984: 42).

We can clearly see that there is an episodic contradiction: while it starts to get visibility and political weight, the public sphere requires to the State authority to “sanction” it, to bless it, and, at the same time, commences to press it from the public side. It brings the political debate, that was only knew, if so, the

palatial cabinet, into daylight, ventilating, through the dialogue, process that only moved following second despotic logics.

Because of the reason and the dialogue that come presupposed in this historical displacement, is correct to state, as does Jean-Marc Ferry, that “the modern public space is a creation of the Enlightenment” (1998:15). It was born with the vocation to promote the emancipation of the subject against the absolutist dominium. But, again, it must be draw attention to the contradictions that mark the naissance: it is, rather, an emancipation movement and, at the same time, an emancipation that legitimates the same power it wants to break free.

In the beginning, the bourgeois public sphere not even corresponded to the institutionalization of a critique that employed the moral means to reduce or “rationalize” the political domination. In the context of that period, this would signify to “impugn the absolutist principle” (Ibid.).

There is another aspect of the same contradiction, which opposes the “public domain” from then to the rising public space. According to Ferry,

the public domain [the “public” here being the “State reason”, public domain, according to Hobbes’ acceptance] had not self presented to a public space: it was confined to that space somewhat paradoxical from the “State reason” and the “State secret”. What creates the opening of the Advertising and operates the transubstantiation of the public domain in public space is the external force of the critique (Ibid.).

For this to happen, the autonomy of conscience, of opinion and faith, from a private nature, should vigorate:

The impulse does not come from the top. It arrives from the bottom, when the people, reunited at the halls, cafes and clubs constitute the first bourgeois “public spheres” to interchange experiences. The private autonomy of the individual conscience, the nucleus of the modern public space, acquires its own force of criticism (ibid.).

The public sphere is born, therefore, as a projection of market relations, which gain public resonance inside the State and in the form of decision-making in the public domain. At a certain perspective, it turns the reasons from the market subjects into interlocutors from State reasons, at the time that “publicize” the State, it also contributes to “privatize” the society. The “State reasons”, before hostages from the restricted and closed ambit from the absolutism, are pressured to no longer resolve without accountability to the public. The State, in the same perspective, before a public tool in the service of the private reasons from the monarch, it is forced to assimilate wider consensus.

Why promote this recapitulation, rather long and, worse, seeming something already seen? The reason is simple: a specific web of contradictions, as well as the necessary connection between the dynamics of the rising public sphere and the market (information flow equals to the flow of goods, freedom of enterprising and property, like the freedom of religion belief and opinion, and so on), has not been thought with the due attention when is about to understand what we can call public space nowadays. Conceived merely as a social constructo, as a pact among several interests, like a game whose rules are the product of negotiation, or even as a grammar with conscious ruling, the public sphere is rarely discussed as a historical category, materially engendered by the same production mean where it lays roots. Not that it can not - and should not - be also understood, as pact, game or grammar, not that did not exist, within it, normative structures to discipline the interaction among the subjects: these various dimensions can not be forgotten, but here, what it must be observed is that, first of all, the public sphere is a historical materiality.

Back to the materiality

Something that contributed to its materiality being, perhaps, overlooked, so to speak, the very “charm” of the other side of the origin of the public sphere, more romantic, surrounded by a certain bohemian mystique and even a sensual one. This other side is woven at the cafes, the taverns, among glasses of wine

and tobacco smoke, at the conversations in the dark that took place around the tables, at the louder laughs, at the more sarcastic comments. The public sphere reaches its long-lasting and most elegant outlines at meeting halls of the court, in which young captains fell in love with widowed Countess in the course of literary soirees, evening concerts, and colloquies cheered by writers, invited by the aristocracy. This is where is usually identified the germ of the public opinion: at environments where the citizens of the public could conspire.

The connections between literary criticism is practiced are widely known, practiced at prestigious journals and extensively honored by aristocrats and the rise of public opinion. It is as if public opinion was the literary criticism rebelling and starting to articulate speeches more-than-aesthetic, that were not pleasing the monarchs anymore. "The political public sphere comes from the literary one; it intermediates, through the public opinion, the State and the society needs" (Habermas, 1984: 46).

The strengthening of the press opinion would definitely mark the establishment of the public sphere as the nucleus of the first democratic societies. This is what reminds us Bernard Miège. The dates vary from country to country, but England, in this process, it is comparatively ahead of the United States and the European continent. In general:

in the middle of the XVIII century, this form of press is available, despite the opposition more or less permanent made by most of the rulers, it is produced in an artisanal way, the printing runs are reduced, the frequency is irregular and the pagination is variable. The polemical style, with a violence of language that makes us feel fear merely imagining it, it is what animates this press and political discourse is closely linked to the literary proposals: the writers become publicists, assuring the reputation of newspapers where they collaborated (Miège, 1995: 163-175).

The newspapers began to do politics, and this is how they would self position, before turning into a business - the business of selling information to an extensive audience - and, after that, into an industry, already at the XIX century. It is in this context that the "instance of the printed word" would be established. The public sphere, as states Habermas, was born as a common communicational space. Open to the public. Made of public.

This communicational nature of the public sphere will be emphasized by Habermas himself at his subsequent works:

The public sphere can not be conceived as an institution and certainly not as an organization. (...) [It] can best be described as a network for the communication of information and points of view" (Habermas, 1996: 360).

He continues:

The public sphere distinguishes itself as a communicational structure that is related to a third aspect of the communicative action: it refers neither to the functions nor to the content from everyday communication but to the "social space" generated by the communication (Ibid).

In the XX century, the so-called mass media would promote the expansion of the public sphere:

"Compared with the press of the liberal era, the means of mass communication reached the one hand, an extension and an incomparably more effective and thus the very public sphere has expanded" (Habermas, 1984: 221).

Let us halt briefly here, in this image: with the extension and efficacy incomparably higher, the public sphere expands. Note the image of the almost physical expansion that resides at the phrase of Habermas. If it is true that, with more extension and more efficacy, the vehicles of mass communication expand the public sphere, then it is true that the dimension of the public sphere is given by the (spatial) coverage and by efficacy of the propositions that the media vehiculates. In other terms, we can affirm that its dimension is given by the quantity of subjects included by the communication. Going ahead, we find that the public sphere has the exact perimeter from the effective coverage of the vehicles of its communication.

The advent of the mass media marks, therefore, a jump. For the bourgeois public sphere from the XIX century, mediated by the printed press, the newspapers were a system that promoted the circulation of ideas, information and opinions, but this sphere emerged as a field prior to the very newspapers action. As for the public sphere, “expanded” by vehicles of mass communication, the agglutinating factor is no longer the emergence of the subject from the private life, but the action of the same vehicles itself. At this moment, the public sphere is no longer reflected (critically and dialectically) at the printed press: it is manufactured, as the audience, by the vehicles. Before this, the public sphere was the force that generated the press with opinion. Now, the (mass) media, an expression of capital in the form of communicational force, are generating their public sphere.

That is why it would be said, from this point, that the public sphere loses its critical potential. The public self denatured in mass. At the last sigh of *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Habermas refers to C.W. Mills to give the certificate of this denaturing:

In a public, affirms Mills, (...) the opinions formed through such discussion (3) quickly find an exit at the effective action, even against - if necessary - the dominant system of authority. And authoritarian institutions do not penetrate the public, that it is more or less autonomous in its operation. (...)

On the contrary, the opinions lose in terms of public character to the proportion that is attached to the communication context of a “mass” (Habermas, 1984: 289).

And then, he introduces the definition of “mass” written by Mills:

In a mass (1) far fewer people express opinions than receive them, because the public community becomes an abstract collection of individuals who receive impressions from the vehicles of mass communication. (2) The communications that prevail are organized in such a way that is difficult or impossible for the individual to answer immediately or with any effectiveness. (3) The carry out of the opinion in action is controlled by authorities that organize and control the channels of such action. (4) The mass does not have autonomy regarding the institutions; on the contrary, agents of authorized institutions penetrate this mass, reducing any autonomy it may have at the opinion construction through discussion (Ibid).

At a first moment, the “instance of the live image” will lead to the extreme this criticism emptying. At the end of the XX century, with the networks interconnected mentioned by Yochai Benkler, the voices diversity will remind the early days of the public sphere, lighting, at some few enthusiasts, a spirit of resurrection of the Enlightenment ideal present at the naissance of the bourgeois public sphere. He says: The interconnected public sphere allows many more individuals to communicate their observations and their viewpoints to many others, and to perform this in such a way that can not be controlled by the owners of the communication vehicles and it is not easy to be corrupted by money as at the times of the mass communication means (Benkler, 2006: 11).

In fact, the diversity is in the air, or rather, the network. On the other hand, the common spaces of communication, the ones that without them there is no possibility of identification among the subjects as belonging to the same entity – to a shared instance – still remain. And those are the ones that proceed presided by the instance of the live image, that the interconnected networks problematize, ventilate and, again, to destabilize. The contradictions with the power now are manifested in relation to the power of the money and to the typical hierarchies of the State. These new tensions, however, do not revoke the structural necessity from the common space of communication, where the live image - or its possibility, its imminence, its living presence, potential or latent – still affirms itself as the most comprehensive unifying binder, passing over the boundaries of language and nationalities. This instance is more and more populated by words, and for sure, that promotes inside it several different mediations. But fundamentally, it remains on - and reinforced by emergencies that problematize this same instance.

REFERENCES

- BENKLER, Yochai (2006). *The Wealth of Networks*. New Heaven, Conn: Yale University Press.
- DEBRAY, Régis (1993). *Vida e morte da imagem*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- FERRY, Jean-Marc (1998). *Las transformaciones de la publicidad politica*. In: Jean-Marc Ferry, Dominique Wolton e outros. *El nuevo espacio publico*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa. 2nd reprint.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen (1984). *Mudança Estrutural da Esfera pública*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.
- ¬_____ (1996). *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- IANNI, Octavio (1998). *A Sociedade Global*. Sexta Edição, Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- LACAN, Jacques (1996). *A instância da Letra no Inconsciente*. In: *Escritos*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 4th edition.
- MIÈGE, Bernard (1995). *L'espace public: perpétué, élargi et fragmenté*. In: PAILLART, Isabelle (org.). *L'espace public e l'emprise de la communication*. Grenoble: Ellug.
- ORTIZ, Renato (1994). *A mundialização da cultura*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Versão em inglês por Silvia Cobelo.