

INFORMATION SOCIETY BEYOND PESSIMISM AND OPTIMISM

Henrieta Anișoara ȘERBAN¹, Claudiu ȘERBAN²

Abstract. *This study investigates the role and the stakes of the concept of Information Society, nowadays. Anthony Giddens or Ulrich Beck approach a rather optimistic vision in what concerns this concept, although seen not in idealistic terms and within the context of contemporary postmodern society, where the technological information is considered in our westernized societies to be similar as role and importance with the steam power within the societies of the industrial revolution. This concept of Information Society should be studied with the ideological complex context of globalization stirring up the optimism and the pessimism of certain positions beyond which incontestably remains the stake of information as power as it appeared clearly in the working documents from the World Summit on Information Society in 2003 and 2005 and most certainly in 2009, too.*

Keywords: Information Society, ideology, globalization, World Summit on Information Society

1. Introduction

Could Information Society go beyond the optimism and the pessimism they trigger toward a more democratic reality? And which are the interests and the stakes related to a settlement of the Information Society? The stakes and the interests orient this theoretical approach, and not a sterile feverish cataloguing of some points of view, either optimistic or pessimistic. Thus, the apparent orientation toward the optimism stirred up by the subject is in fact nuanced by the selected ideas presented, characterized by a moderate, rational realistic and sensible optimism, if any, extremely suitable in emphasizing these stakes and interests animated by the race of globalization.

2. Information Society: Revolutionized or Runaway?

Information Society has revolutionized our world. This is a clearly different one from that anticipated by the founding fathers of the modern society, namely the great figures of enlightenment who had a straightforward idea of the ends concerning the industrial revolution (related mainly to the control of nature for human benefit) and from the anticipations of the Marxist view on the change of history itself, as well for the benefit of the human being, and why not, seen in order to control even the future.

¹ Senior Researcher, Institute of Philosophy and Psychology „Constantin Rădulescu-Motru” of the Romanian Academy

² Physicist, RONEXPRIM Bucharest

Such preliminary considerations bring this approach closer to the perspective sustained by Anthony Giddens, but also by Ulrich Beck, according to which technological information represents for contemporary societies something similar to the power of the steam for the societies of the industrial revolution. At present, this is an idea that we consider already common heritage in the consciousness of the people, “freed” of its complex philosophical sources, into the depths of society.

Meanwhile, one can notice that we are far from mastering our fate, well beyond the rather abstract perimeter designed by the democratic citizenship’s freedoms and rights, while the world we inhabit is far from being ordered, escaping human control in several occasions.

These two authors present two truths simultaneously sustainable: on the one hand, it is about the revolutionary power of computerized and technological information, as well as of that of technology itself, that could be interpreted in the sense of a humanity currently inscribed on a direction of progress (that is not necessarily a linear one, a simplistic progress without obstacles, turns or regress), and on the other hand we relate to a world where not only the future, but also the present are characterized much more by the uncertainties than by control. Both observations are included in the phrase *runaway world*, proposed by Anthony Giddens.³

This perspective acquires interesting meanings the moment one understands that this is not solely a remark, “Oh, the world we live in is characterized by uncertainties,” but it is to understand the fact that the source of the uncertainties seems strictly linked to the very progress of knowledge.

Thus, nowadays dilemma would be that the world seems more difficult to unhidden than during the hegemony of the optimism induced by Enlightenment and, meanwhile that it seems that the very attempts to comprehend only add to the uncertainties, emphasizing the present-day value, for instance, of the Socratic philosophy, Lucian Blaga’s philosophy and of the scientific discoveries of the quantum physics in the 20th century.

For A. Giddens, this line of reasoning sends to the introduction of the concept of „risk” in sociology, in correlation with the idea of uncertainty, a concept with interesting philosophical dimensions, too. He comments on two types of uncertainties or risks - „external” and „manufactured.”

Accordingly to the vision sustained by Giddens the world evolved from one of the „external” risks toward one of the “manufactured” risks. Briefly put, the “external” risk originated in the external world, in nature and tradition (in the realm of the usual

³ See Anthony Giddens, *Modernity and Self-identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991, Anthony Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1994 and A. Giddens, presentation on the BBC radio, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/events/reith_99/

forms of manifestation and action). The “manufactured” risk poses the question of the effects that human action has on nature, on social world, and even on the emotions that we experience in the contemporary world in a strict correlation with the phenomenon of globalization.

Interesting is the fact that the British sociologist extends the definition of globalization beyond the aspects concerning the systematic tendency of the Western society to spread throughout the world, and beyond the impact of the global electronic market or the free market, including the changes, the series of changes that modify the manner in which people live nowadays, where the revolution observed in communications is considered a more important factor than the mere economic one.

Another author preoccupied by the risk society is Ulrich Beck⁴. He analyzes, as Giddens does, the society of late modernity as a “risk society.” Nevertheless, for this author, more apparently than with Giddens, the society of late modernity, although it is as well characterized by a progress and a dynamics influenced by technology and by the informational globalization, it has a significant potential of producing catastrophic risks.

Unlike Giddens, Ulrich positions mass media as an agent of a maximal importance within the processes unveiling risks, as well as in relationship with the processes of the social contestation of knowledge, which by itself induces risks, or with the processes correlated with the social challenges caused by the „ risk society.” Paradoxically, his ideas tend to be rather ignored by the researchers from media studies and risk communication, as well as by the specialists in environment and ecology. In a similar manner as with Giddens, the analysis of the „ reflexive modernity” sends to an analysis of the conditions of contemporary society offering valuable coordinates for the investigation that could be capitalized upon by the mass communication specialists, too.

Giddens recalls significant details in this respect, such as the fact that the first satellite was launched by the end of the 60s, by the United States, although it was just an experimental satellite and only afterwards, there were the hundreds of satellites revolving around the Earth. On the one hand, the United States launched their first artificial satellite, Explorer 1, at 31st of January 1958.

On the other hand, it is extremely interesting to notice that the first satellite ever, was called Sputnik 1 and launched in fact by the Soviet Union at 4th of October 1957. This observation opens a parallel discussion about the technology and Information Society as ideological and propagandistic tools and about the interests guiding knowledge. Giddens’s affirmation indicates simultaneously a Western protochronism and the Western attitude toward East. One may say that even the most objective scientists are influenced by this cultural hegemony characterized by a demeaning attitude of the

⁴ Vezi mai ales Ulrich Beck, *World Risk Society*, Polity Press, 1999.

West toward the East that set the context of their socialization and have difficulties in associating the progress of information and technology with the backward East.

The changes brought about by globalization affected also our emotions, our sense of self, the personal lives, the marriage and the family, the friendship and, actually, all the sectors of everyday life.

The technological changes, the impact of science and scientific innovation are as well to be considered, provided they affect people lives at present, and they also have a huge potential of influence in the global future. The technological changes do not suppose just the hegemony of global technological information or the endowment of all the offices with PCs, but also the emergence of a new social class, specific for Information Society: the class of the “wired workers.”

This class is different both from the former class of workers and from the new middle class. They are neither clerks and they are different from the other traditional classes, entertaining complex political views, rather left-wing oriented on certain subjects, and right-wing oriented in what it concerns others. Thus, the technological change imposes a change of the class structure of Western societies, changes that seem to transfer to the other countries, these with democracies more recently set on the path of democratization, in relationship with the degree of technological development. Such tendencies are imposing global Western-like changes.

Giddens notices also that science itself tends to become global. He comments the aspect that scientific innovation affects the lives of the people more directly and more universally than before. In this respect the current technological age is also a cultural age.

As a foundation for this idea of cultural age one may observe that, nowadays, there are many more scientists than before, and that they are to a greater extent connected due to the globalization of communication. At present, science does not function in the same insulation from everyday life as a generation ago.

Again, for Giddens, science has become a sort of tradition. The more alert rhythm registered by the innovations and by science, generally, is an outcome of the globalization of the economic life, while the impact triggered by communication determines people to be more interrogative and to engage in more interrogative and dialogical relations with science and technology.

These are not entirely a different world as before, and people do not depend anymore on experts to filter the discoveries for them, because they have to know *right now* and to be ready to react *right now*, although to a different extent than a scientist, all engaged in this turmoil of science and technology. Everyone learns from experience the abstract and philosophical principle of Karl Popper stating that science, as a particular form of the critical thought, is not based on the accumulation of certainties, but on the courage to question everything, and on the ability to either sustain or dismantle arguments, accordingly to the case.

Science is built on quick sand, theories are merely the most adequate explanations of the moment, scientists having the role to either rationally and adequately criticize or replace these theories and not to sustain them at all costs, as most of our fellows already know, from experience in what concerns contemporary world. As an example, people do not raise children and teenagers as 50 years ago. The rules and interdictions are nuanced and changed. Critical attitude becomes to a greater extent a normal part of everyday life.

Tradition and customs determine now our lives less than before. People can live together without facing the same social reactions as a generation ago. Neither bachelors nor spinsters are at present cast outside the system. Marriage and love are now a part of the greater puzzle of uncertainties that has engulfed the entire human existence during the current age of the global information.

Yet, it is not the globalization of the information that is inducing uncertainty and confusion, but the fact that everything appears much more complex and much nuanced than before. The globalization of the information decreases the redundant character of the information that becomes both nuanced and entropic.

The questions raised under such circumstances are related to the manner in which people should answer to this entropy, to this “manufactured” world of uncertainty, artificially created. We are not fighting anymore against the uncertainty provoked by the natural forces, but with that determined by the more reputable force of the “manufactured” uncertainty released by the technological and information globalization, and then, only as a consequence of these two, by the globalization of the Western life style and of free market economy.

Meanwhile, we should emphasize the question of how we should conceive the role of the governments in answering these changes. Anthony Giddens appreciates that at the level of daily life one should notice the phenomenon by which lives are daily reshaped at an emotional level (see marriage, family, and raising children as examples of emotional reconfigurations). Sexual relationships either heterosexual or homosexual, as well as friendship, are submitted to changes at the emotional level and they are interesting mostly because they generate “untraditionalized” relations, or post-traditional relations, that co-exist within an intricate fabric of benefices and advantages, where the opening toward the other and the structuring and the maintaining of the relationship occupy the central place.

Within this perspective of the opening toward the other we understand today as well the human intimacy, based on this sort of opening where both the relationship based on trust and the activation of trust replaces almost entirely the passive performance of the traditional roles. And the return to a more traditional system, notices Giddens, is not expectancy except for the cases of fundamentalists or of people living within a more traditional culture and society, less affected by these contemporary changes.

Although such people and cultures exist, the transformations triggered by the information societies and by the information and technological globalization are taking place already at a global level. Returning to the example of the traditional family, and of the transformations experienced by the families nowadays, the author underlines that certain traditional elements are definitely tending to be maintained (such as, we would say, the role of mother, or certain traditions, for instance, to take a weekend meal in the family, or the close family relationships).

3. The Democracy of Emotions and the “Good Conductors of Information”

Giddens approaches the topic of the emergence of the democracy of emotions, as a manifestation of a specific contemporary civic culture and civic life complementary to the traditional ones and added to the current democratic life from the public sphere.

We would explain these by the metaphor of the “laboratory” represented by the family life during late modernity. This “laboratory” is the place for the implementation of the late modern democratic values with relevance in the actualization and realization of the rights of women or of these of children, the new masculine roles, the rights of homosexuals and lesbians, or even the ecologist values.

Within these contemporary families that are successfully lasting, the good relationships flourish, relationships between/among peers, based on communication, active trust, the capacity to respect the opinions of another person, all extremely valuable elements, both for personal life and for the public life, in democracy.

These aspects may appear as far too optimistic and they may especially trigger critical reactions expressed more or less on the lines of the ideas voiced by Jean Baudrillard in his work named *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities*.⁵ The majorities are rather absent with this author, for the mass absorbs all the social energy, but no longer refracts it nor reflects it more like a black hole of the social.

It is characterized by unbearable silence, uninterested by information and just “good conductors of information.” Also, majorities do not have conscience and are without unconscious, therefore there is nothing further the idea of engagement or civic spirit. Within the Information Society the mass just enjoys the spectacle of politics, the ecstasy of communication. In their lack of civism these majorities are interpreted as terrorists. Baudrillard considers that any revolutionary or progressive message was hijacked by the media and the state, becoming now just a communication communicating itself.

⁵ Jean Baudrillard, *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities* [*A l'ombre des majorités silencieuses*] Semiotext(e), 1978, ed.a 2a, 2007.

In our view, this criticism is a metaphor underlining that the so-called “silent” majorities have often their own agenda, based on *jouissance* rather than on the civic sentiment of a fulfilled duty, more difficult to be disciplined than the Enlightenment majorities or than the modern ones. Postmodern majorities might just have their own agenda and consider more the values related to resistance, particularity, refusal of state, sometimes on bases of under-education, poverty, lack of civic and political culture, but not necessarily.

Most often the attitude of resistance transcends levels of education and economic well-being, in a postmodern need to turn toward more or less well articulated and understood neo-anarchist views, in front of the disappointments related to the limited power of democracy to eradicate corruption and poverty, less successful in instituting itself as a regime of human dignity.

From this perspective, the lament about the so-called declines of contemporary either Western or Romanian society is with more clarity a sterile one. Hedonism, the characteristic fingerprint of the contemporary culture is post-moral and it is only reasonable to see it composed, from a perspective sustained by Gilles Lipovetsky⁶, of the composition of two “opposed tendencies.” On the one hand, we have the tendency to relax and give in to the immediate pleasure: sex, drugs, pornography, craves for the accumulation of objects and media programs (“consumerism”).

As a manifestation of the individualist cult, this manner of manifestation, this hedonism, undermines the value of work, sustaining the phenomena of de-socialization and marginalization of the ethnic group members of the metropolis areas and suburbs. As well, the obsession of quality and excellence is considered an expression of hedonism: related to the time management and to the management of the body, but also in attaining professionalism (first of all, obviously, in profession, and then, in every enterprise). These two forms of manifestation for hedonism are not mutually exclusive.

Lipovetsky exposes the new portrait of the sinner, the “zapper,” rather anxious and stressed out than with a guilty conscience. For this character, duty is but an option among so many, and, the lack of a “happy face” or presenting his person out of shape are the real sins.

This author points also to the apathy of the Western contemporary democracies. He identifies in the decentralized mobilization of contemporary democracies the complementary elements proving that, at present, the citizen has the position of the sports supporter both against public life and the moral dimension of politics.

The same citizen of the present times tends to gather diverse competences unrelated directly (or necessarily) to the public life – the citizen became a jurist and a lobbyist.

⁶ Gilles Lipovetsky, *Le Crépuscule du devoir (The Twilight of Duty)*, Gallimard, Paris, 1992, *passim*.

As a consequence, the democracy that such a citizen promotes is a “more modest democracy,” benevolent, ethical and narcissistic, yet, “dialogic.” “Modest democracy” is therefore characterized by dialogue and by the proliferation of the ethical codes and committees.

Ernesto Laclau points out to the matter of the bleak versus optimistic perspectives on the Information Society in the chapter entitled „The Politics of Mass Media”⁷ in terms of the question „Information Society: salvation or damnation?”.

The author approaches the perspective of the effects of emancipation that Information Society may have. He shows that the modern Enlightenment discourse conceives communication as free and undistorted, considering at the same time that it has also a powerful emancipator effect. Yet, this effect needs to be protected from anti-monopoly regulations, a critical education in what concerns the media and through heavily, ethically biased discourses, considering such requirements, and also the rather anarchical character of the Internet and intra-net networks a greater attention for the critical analyses of media in schools, public debate and scholarly debates might make a difference.

The unregulated access to mass communication devices and the unveiling of the distortions present in all the forms of communication are perceived as manners to enlighten the “oppressed” and help them see the “light.” For Laclau, transparency (communicational, institutional and political) and revolution are two faces of the same coin in the discourse of modernity.

On the other hand, the author notices that there is no absolute free and undistorted communication, the paradigm of constructivism, considering that all messages circulated through media are discursively constituted, in and through the power-knowledge complexes, points to the serious demand both for undistorted messages and for the act of freeing of the essentially human aspirations from the repressive forms of power unfolded and perpetuated through mass media that nevertheless remain.

For this reason one has to ask which could be the field for the strategies of resistance, disagreement and pragmatic experimentation in what mass media is concerned, so that the current state of affairs to change further more in an closer agreement with the values we cherish? Which is the potential for a mobilization of the subjugated forms of knowledge, for the confrontational situation of the different values and for the advancement of the new political projects?

During the last decades the answer to these questions was extremely pessimistic. Thus, the theories about media manipulation flourished during the 60s and the 70s, when media was described as the almighty force of social control, capable of

⁷ Ernesto Laclau, „The Politics of Mass Media”, în Jacob Torfing, *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1999, pp.210-224.

imposing a tight ideological domination over the population. Indeed present day theories still sustain the possibility that media impedes somehow on the progress of the internalization of the political values that proved crucial for democracy, such as freedom and equality, by promoting nationalism, racism and sexism and by a naturalization of the current state of affairs, justifying the totalitarian tendencies, the lack of freedom and inequality.

Nevertheless, the fragmentation of the public today in such a multitude of types of public allows for a relatively efficient resistance in front of the dominant effects of media configuration, by allowing more room for personalized interpretations and meanings. The content of the messages disseminated through the hegemonic media structures are only partially fixed.

As a consequence, there is always a surplus of meaning and a multiplicity of voices, destabilizing the dominant meanings, providing material for the articulation of new ones, involved in the alternative political projects.

The intellectuals in many countries have now a cheaper access to the means of text reproduction and mass communication devices. Within this context, a computer mediated communication could have the hoped democratic potential, although the realization of this aim depends heavily on the progress of the interactive forms of communication and on the degree of either political empowerment or disempowerment of the people throughout the world.

Against this extremely optimistic vision, the author calls the attention for the fact that capitalism, mass media and technology combined to support the concentration of money, control and facilities in the hands of the multinational mass media corporations. These negative developments are to be met with resistance, on all the levels, and to be counter weighted by alternative forms of relation and alternative media networks.

Even so, to the extent mass media corporations become more and more determined to capture the minds and the hearts of the types of public, the more the messages reticulated gain the form of generalized noise, emptied of meaning, triggering a generalized lack of trust and attention from the numerous types of public.

As well against of the optimism related to the computer age, Laclau notices that the new and computer-mediated forms of communication tend to produce an ambiguous effect, offering not only the autonomy and diversity to an increasing selection for choice, but also new forms of surveillance and control.

The control of the Internet has proved to be difficult up to this point, but not necessarily an emancipator, since the lack of censorship has mainly facilitated an intense circulation of discriminating and abusive texts. With time, we consider that the Internet shall either sustain or infirm both the thesis of the freedom of expression and that of the goodness of the human nature of the (neo-) anarchism. Meanwhile, neither the totalitarian fears, nor the hopes of emancipation related to the emergence

of the Information Society are so clearly a fate in the absence of articulated grass root political projects.

4. Globalization and the Information Society

Returning to Giddens, Information Society is a powerful factor that reshapes national identities. Globalization diminishes the economic power of the nation rendered “too small to solve global problems.” Meanwhile, globalization creates as well pressure for local autonomies, regionalism and nationalism all over the globe, as a reputable fragmenting force.

Globalization creates new regions, new cultural and economic areas unrelated to the national borders. Catalonia both is and it is not a part of Spain, shows Giddens. The argument of the sociologist structures a plea for the „cosmopolite nation.” Such a nation is characterized by the fact that it sustains its own identity, its cultural past that it cherishes, without the „reflexes of jealous territoriality” encountered at the “traditional nations,” accepting a world of multiple sovereignty. These multiple sovereignties are at Giddens interpreted as positive effects. The solutions offered to the tense situations such as that in the North Ireland would never be implemented unless this fuzzy and/or multiple overeignty. The structure of the peace agreement is based on the fact that everyone can simultaneously be a citizen of the North Ireland, Ireland and Europe.

Information Society needs to take globalization seriously based on the profound transformations marking contemporary world, transformations as profound as these during and following the 18th century industrial revolution because it has to answer globalization at a global level and not only national or local one. This answer could be forged within a second wave of democratization, inscribed in the construction of the second wave of democratization, inscribed in the construction of the *world information society*.

In a global Information Society, there is much more difficult to maintain a closed political system. In this respect, Giddens gives the example of Milosevič in Serbia, but one may find easily other examples for this reality, such as the tweeter revolution in the Republic of Moldova, where the anti-Romanian official versions of the events are already not so easily sustainable.

We would make the argument that the difficulty to maintain a closed political system is a consequence of the effect of democratization triggered by the Kantian and Habermasian role of the global public sphere which, to a certain extent, and not in absolute terms, plays the role of an ethical, democratic and critical forum.

Life in a global Information Society, explains Giddens, impedes the less democratic governments to use old forms of symbolism and tradition as easily as a generation or two ago, even if some of the less democratic governments of the world rely on old forms of symbolism and tradition as much as a generation or two ago.

Kenneth Gergen in „The Saturated Self: Persons and Relationships in The Information Age”⁸, shows that often we do not see the “costs” that come with the benefices of the new global technologies of the Information Society. There are multiple effects of the new communication technologies on social relations and personal identity. Nowadays personal relationships are electronically mediated, thus more numerous. People tend to maintain more friendships than generations ago. Unlike Giddens, Gergen states that people do not realize that also the knowledge they have of the others becomes more and more fragmented and the relationships less and less substantial.

His argument is that our attention for the others is mediated through television, emails and other new communication technologies with more relations, more obligations, less depth and more stress. The more human identity is solicited in multiple directions, the more relationships are diluted, and we suffer from „multiphrenia” termed after „schizophrenia.”

In what concerns the costs and the benefits of this (global) Information Society, Andrei Codrescu⁹ offers two emblematic perspectives worth presenting briefly.

On the one hand, there is this enthusiasm related to technology in general, spiritually described in the short story „The Dog with the Chip in His Neck.” There he emphasizes the progress toward a generalized connectivity and a communication man-machine and pet too, the conclusion of this approach being that to be a *chip* in somebody’s neck could become the highest compliment, since these devices will deservedly arrive at the centre of human existence. In the next short story he provides though the opposite perspective.

There is the horror and hate experienced by the human being in front of the machine, robot and computer, a monstrous intrusion undermining all humanity, workplaces (recall the *luddits* in England), etc. in relation to this second perspective one has to analyze the fear of globalized information and technology, seen as the most significant step toward the generalized, absolute and authoritarian control, for a dictatorship of a information and technology *Big Brother*, heralding the end of the private sphere...But this subject is on the one hand, rich in itself and would deserve a separate discussion, and, on the other, it is already eroded by the lament that surrounds it.

As stated above, global Information Society should answer to the globalization in a global manner within the context of a second wave of democratization, where the Resolution of the General UN Assembly no. 56/183 from the 21st of December 2001,

⁸ Kenneth Gergen, „The Saturated Self: Persons and Relationships in The Information Age” în J. Arthur, *Morality and Moral Controversies: Readings in Moral, Social and Political Philosophy*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 2002, pp. 592-601.

⁹ Andrei Codrescu, *The Dog with the Chip in His Neck*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, 1996, pp. 85-88.

supporting the realization of a **World Summit on the Information Society**¹⁰ or **WSIS**, with two phases. The first took place at Geneva, during 10 -12 December 2003, and the second in Tunis, 16 - 18 November 2005.

The objective of the first phase was to outline a clear declaration of political will in what concerns the UN position related to the global Information Society. The intention was to identify the steps to be followed in order to set the bases for a „ global information society (with benefices) for all,” reflecting as much as possible of the interests at play there, too.

To this end WSIS works involved almost 50 heads of state and government, as well as vice-presidents, 82 ministers, 26 vice- ministers, but also higher level representatives of the international organizations, from the private sector and from the civil society, offering political support for two documents: the Declaration of Principles from Geneva and Geneva Action Plan, adopted at 12th of December 2003.

The Summit and the collateral events gathered over **11,000 participants from 175 countries**. Geneva Action Plan was correlated with aspects such as the role of the governmental authorities and of all the *stakeholders*¹¹ in promoting information and communication technologies (ICT) for development, the development of the information and communication infrastructure, access to information and knowledge, building capacities, increasing trust and security in using the ICTs, the stimulation of the information environment, promoting ICT applications (e-government, e-business, e-health, e-employment, e-environment, e-agriculture and e-science), promoting cultural and identity linguistic and local substance diversity, the study of the relation among mass media and Information Society, the ethical dimensions of Information Society, as well as regional and international cooperation.

In the second phase, the aim was setting off Geneva Action Plan. This event involved about 50 heads of state and government, also vice-presidents, 197 ministers, vice-ministers, plus higher level representatives of the international organizations, from the private sector and from the civil society, in total, more than **19,000 participants from 174 countries**, in order to find the necessary solutions and arrive at understandings concerning good government, with the involvement of the civil society, business environments and of all the interested factors, using the Internet, with the analysis of the financing mechanisms to this end, as well as the continuation and further implementation of the documents from Geneva and Tunis.

These steps advancing toward an even more connected world engages mechanisms of motivation in a democratic engagement and also in forming the partnerships of cooperation, responsible for the management of the challenges from this ICT sector.

¹⁰ Vezi <http://www.itu.int/wsis/basic/index.html>

¹¹ This concept is not only borrowed from economy into the field of the theories of democracy with the reference to the awakened political identity, to the individual acting as if he or she has a personal and personalized stake in the good and democratic society.

The main challenge is the digital dichotomy of the world and the main related question posed by the UN summits is the following: Is this digital dichotomy going to become a source of opportunities for all, and how? The dedication of the world leaders is tested right now.

The countries are to exploit the potential of the ICT, many of them already progressing in fulfilling the connectivity ends promoted by WSIS. Problems appear in adapting the models and the policies proposed by the UN at these summits, as well as in what concerns the capacity to adapt themselves of the creators of policies and regulations at the national and local level. There is a data base with proposals and public policies related to this matter that might be extremely useful, although it already indicates the sustained efforts necessary to alleviate the digital gap among the nations, in order to offer the universal access to the ICTs. There is some progress concerning the offer of assistance in developing specific abilities and capacities, in increasing awareness related to the security of the informational systems and in preparing the emergence of a more sure and emocratic environment for an even better connectivity of the global information society.

In 2009, WSIS Forum is to reunite at Geneva, 18-22 May, exploring precisely what Giddens named the next wave of democratization, through up-to-date conceptualizations, for instance, in the attempt to analyze the implementation of the term „multi-stakeholder”.

in the good government, in the cosmopolite society, strictly connected with the global Information Society to which it relates with devotion.

The accent should be placed on the stake of either accentuating, or alleviating the gap between poor and rich, aggravated by the gap between the informatized and uninformatized. There is the danger that with global Information Society and the fragmentation it triggers, the world of the rich people to become even more „insulated” and the other part to be hit even harder by the „runaway world”.

R E F E R E N C E S

- [1] Baudrillard, Jean, *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities*, Semiotext(e), 1978, ed.a 2a, 2007.
- [2] Beck, Ulrich, *World Risk Society*, Polity Press, 1999.
- [3] Codrescu, Andrei, *The Dog with the Chip in His Neck*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1996.
- [4] Gergen, Kenneth „The Saturated Self: Persons and Relationships in The Information Age” in J. Arthur, *Morality and Moral Controversies: Readings in Moral, Social and Political Philosophy*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [5] Giddens, Anthony, *Modernity and Self-identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991.
- [6] Giddens, Anthony, *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1994.
- [7] Laclau, Ernesto „The Politics of Mass Media”, in Jacob Torfing, *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1999.
- [8] Lipovetsky, Gilles, *Le Crépuscule du devoir (The Twilight of Duty)*, Gallimard, Paris, 1992.
- [9] <http://www.itu.int/wsis/basic/index.html>
- [10] http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/background.asp?lang=en&c_type=res
- [11] <http://www.itu.int/wsis/follow-up/index.html>

Henrieta Anișoara Șerban, PhD from the Romanian Academy in 2006, is scientific researcher III at the Institute of Political Science and International Relations and at the Institute of Philosophy and Psychology “Constantin Rădulescu-Motru” of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest. Research interests: philosophy of communication, political communication, (soft) ideologies (feminism, ecologism, ironism). Authored books: *Limbajul politic în democracy [Political Language in Democracy]* in 2006 și *Paradigmele diferenței în filosofia comunicării. Modernism și postmodernism [The Paradigms of Difference in the Philosophy of Communication. Modernism and Postmodernism]* in 2007.

Claudiu Șerban, physicist specialized in microscopy and spectrometry, preoccupied by the aspects related to the philosophy of science correlated with the quantum physics. Translation: Roy Sorensen, *Experimentele mentale [Thought Experiments]*, in *Construcție și deconstrucție în filosofia americană contemporană [Construction and Deconstruction in Contemporary American Philosophy]*, coord. By Angela Botez, Henrieta Anișoara Șerban and Marius Drăghici, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 2006, p.329-355.