

**SOCIAL NETWORKS AND DEMOCRACY****\*Martinho Borromeu**

Post – Doctorate in Philosophy, Focus on Epistemology and Ontology Research at the Pontificia Universidade Católica Paraná (PUCPR) – Brazil

**Received** 11<sup>th</sup> January 2024; **Accepted** 17<sup>th</sup> February 2024; **Published online** 29<sup>th</sup> March 2024

---

**Abstract**

This article aims to describe an overview of the media, social networks and democracy. With the cyber democracy being used in order to guarantee the rights of the e-citizen, in which they demonstrate that these tools represent their interaction with issues related to politics. From a delimitation of current theoretical and conceptual research on this topic. In addition, taking into account a moment of economic and political instability. Therefore, this issue becomes even more relevant, for a better understanding of contemporary democracies.

**Keywords:** Media, Social Networks and Democracy.**INTRODUCTION**

It is noted that the Internet has brought great benefits for the development of human rights, especially for freedom of expression. Through social networks, any citizen can give their opinion, without limitations, in almost every country on the planet. However, there are excesses of this freedom of expression that have been causing the reaction of various governments, which ask for greater control and protection of their users. According to Umberto Eco, social networks give the right to speak to idiots who spoke for the first time only at the bar after a glass of wine, without harming the community. They were quickly silenced and now have the same right to speak as a Nobel laureate. It is the invasion of idiots (Eco, 2015). Although this comment developed by this author is quite critical, he points out how, in the current situation, anyone has the right to speak. Thus, democracy represents the expression of the will of the people through their rulers. This only occurs in societies where the rule of law prevails, that is, submission to constituted legality. This went on to guarantee freedom of expression in which everyone can express their opinion. Thus, democracy represents the expression of the will of the people through their rulers. This only occurs in societies where the rule of law prevails, that is, submission to constituted legality. This went on to guarantee freedom of expression in which everyone can express their opinion. A freedom is in fact interesting to guarantee everyone the same rights and duties, but to what extent freedom does not reach the other and in this case it hurts, attacks, etc. Thinking from this perspective, what would be the limit of freedom of expression?

**Traditional media and the popularization of social networks**

Television, and not press or radio, had the most decisive influence on democratic societies at the time of voting. A 1987 study by researchers Inyengar and Kinder, reviewed by Giovanni Sartori in his book "*Homo Videns*, the Remotely Controlled Society", concluded that television news has a decisive influence on the priorities people attach to national

problems and considerations, according to what political leaders value. In other words, the news on television has the capacity to modify the public's valuation indexes in relation to their voters and rulers (Sartori, 2013). On television we see people instead of speeches or programs by political parties. In their times, Hitler, Mussolini and Perón managed perfectly with the radio, the news projected in cinemas and in the elections (Sartori, 2013). This shows us the evolution of traditional means of communication, first with newspapers and magazines, then radio, until we reach televisions and computers. It was like this until the emergence of television, in which the character is the message: politics was translated into images, being based on the display of people. In this case, even with the massification of the internet, television would not become obsolete. Because the relationship is quite different with the passive spectator who watches it, while cyberspace is an interactive world, with dynamic users. It can be seen that neither will be excluded by the other, as they are different means. Images, videos, audios, texts and information of all kinds are transmitted over the internet and, mainly, bring about a dialogue between users and their opinion on the content conveyed by the media on the web, which is allowed. The internet produces a cultural growth among human beings, in theory it should be like this, the question is that the child who lived in the nineties and in the first decade of this century and who started on television, presents his cognitive interest not so sensitized to this abstraction. Thus, the internet could help this homo videns, already formed with television, to leave this world of images. And this has largely happened to millennials, a generation born between the eighties and the last decade, who largely don't remember what the world was like without the internet. Today's children, between 5 and 15 years old, spend at least 15 hours a week on the Internet (78 minutes more than in the previous year). This was noted in a 2016 study by Ofcom, the UK government's regulatory authority for telecommunications and postal services. However, television consumption times fell from 14 hours 48 minutes in 2015 to 13 hours 36 minutes in 2016 (72 minutes less). What British children consume the most in cyberspace, for 73% are regular YouTube users. There is a trend in which television does not have as many fans, as reported by the publication Puro Marketing Data from the study of the consumption of the Web

---

**\*Corresponding Author: Martinho Borromeu**

Post – Doctorate in Philosophy, Focus on Epistemology and Ontology Research at the Pontificia Universidade Católica Paraná (PUCPR) – Brazil.

Global Index in social networks in the fourth quarter of the previous year, published on the website Clases de Periodismo. On December 3, 2016, the numbers of 94% of online adults are revealing to have an account in at least one social network. In addition, almost all Internet users have visited or used a social network in the last month. The numbers show that younger users and growing markets stand out in 42% of users who connect to social networks to chat with friends and 39% to check the news. The main motivations are passive and involve other users who publish the content. At least 4 out of 10 users follow their favorite brands on social media and at least 3 out of 10 users follow their other media. Digital consumers are spending an average of one hour and 58 minutes a day on social media and instant messaging, meaning networks engage 1 in 3 minutes online. The highest values are found between 16 and 24 years old, in the 31 markets analyzed, the time spent online increased. In emerging markets, there is more long-haul activity compared to North America or Europe.

### **Internet case**

At least 82% of students cannot distinguish between "sponsored content" and real news on a web page, according to a Stanford University study of 7,804 students, published in Journalism Classes on November 23, 2016. The survey, cited by The Wall Street Journal, determines that many of the students considered the credibility of the news just because of having a photo and not because of the source. For example, two out of three students who could not find a valid reason to be suspicious of a post written by a bank executive argued that young people need more help with financial planning. And four out of 10 high school students believe, based on the title, that a photo of deformed daisies is strong evidence of toxic conditions near the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant in Japan, although there is no source or information for the Photograph. On the other hand, 88% of young people consult news on Facebook and other social networks, according to a study carried out in 2015 with 1,045 adults between 18 and 34 years old. This report was produced by the Insight Media Project. The celebration of women's Day takes place normally, on March 8, having a video recorded by a husband who discovered that his wife was cheating on him that went viral. He filmed her leaving a motel in Quito with another man, in the video she gets out of the car and asks her husband to stop filming her. Someone published the video on the web and through the internet, it reached as many devices and people as possible, its reach was so great that it reached the most important media in the world as news. Later, photographs of the man with the woman, with the child, wedding, vacation, etc., began to be published. Hundreds of images and videos were made mocking with this information, better known as "memes" in which the woman was also assaulted, with violent words for having cheated on her husband. Within hours, the hashtag LadyTantra, which referenced the video by the name of the motel where it was filmed, was trending nationally on Ecuador's most popular social networks. The "revelation" went so far that an international Twitter account of one of the largest Ecuadorian media (Ecuavisa Internacional) shared a note with the "memes" of LadyTantra. A few hours later, he deleted that post apologizing sincerely. After eleven o'clock in the evening on women's day, some network users even shared the LadyTantra mobile number with their names and surnames, commenting on this photograph, informing that people who "have already sent her a message". Thus, they laughed and encouraged network users to also send their opinions to this

woman. In everyday conversations at work, in the gym, on the street, more than one asked the question "Have you seen the video of the unfaithful woman? And if the other answered No, the first would send the video at that moment. Entire groups discussed the case, presenting their perspectives and opinions, the vast majority being insults. There was even an image on Facebook that said "If the video of the infidels did not reach you, it is because you do not have good WhatsApp groups". Alluding to the fact that it has reached the eyes or devices at all at the equator. It was part of the routine of Ecuadorians for a whole day, on March 8th. The same people who in the morning congratulated women as the most beautiful creation on earth, during the afternoon of the same day, would point to #LadyTantra with insults and humiliation. After a wave of complaints, eventually the backlash and criticism brought various opinions and comments. One Twitter user commented: "What is being said on social media in the #LadyTantra case reflects a curious 14th century society with 21st century technology."

The day after the stoning of #LadyTantra, the defamatory comments were gradually replaced by silence and criticism of those who stoned this woman with words. A week after the incident, few were talking about this new episode of defamation on social media, while most returned to the current issue of electoral politics. The Internet pages where this content was shared, such as "El Mercico", deleted the video. Former Uruguayan President José Mujica talks about social networks, that sometimes networks are the nest of cowards who don't show their faces. Given the series of attacks on people's privacy that are publicized as news, Germany proposes to impose fines of up to 50 million euros on companies responsible for social networks that do not remove content related to hate speech, illegal content and faked for political reasons, better known as the "Fake News", published the newspaper La Vanguardia on March 15, 2017. For his part, the creator and CEO of Facebook, Mark Zuckerberg admitted and lamented that "misinformation is a big deal" on his network. Likewise, it refuted the theory according to which Facebook benefits from fake news, resulting in more user traffic and an avalanche of clicks. For a few days now, the social network has been keeping active for a group of users the possibility of including a flag or a red label with an exclamation point next to news of dubious veracity. When multiple users mark them with this symbol, they are sent to external data verification supervisors that Facebook has agreements with, such as ABC News, Associated Press, FactCheck.org, Politifact and Snopes. News or pages that do not pass fact-checking will be visible, but publicly marked as "questioned by external fact-checkers." If they click on this link, internet users can find out why its veracity is in question. In addition, these stories will be relegated to secondary positions in the News feed (News list). It is also working to differentiate the news that is shared by users after reading only the headline and those that are shared after reading the full text, with this, the latter may be an indication that the story is coherent both Facebook and Twitter. Because they have in these platforms and measures established to collaborate with the authorities of each country, within legal frameworks. The German government regrets that only 1% of the requests we make to Twitter End in deleted content, for Facebook this figure is 39%. The freedom to disclose information instantly by any citizen is one of the greatest expressions of democracy, but with the excesses that are happening on the Internet, the world is coming to design a regulation that ends the debauchery that

dominates cyberspace in Ecuador was carried out the organic Criminal Code (COIP) with intellectual property laws and telecommunications regulations that are the tools with which the behavior of netizens can be sanctioned. Juan Carlos Solines, a lawyer specializing in digital rights, explained on April 4, 2016 in the newspaper *El Comercio*, that there is a scheme used by governments to restrict freedom of expression and information on the Internet. Having its three phases such as: blocking networks or a certain website, developing legislation to intervene and influence information flows and direct attacks. The norm that now becomes more effective is the criminal law typified in Article 396 of the Integral organic Criminal Code, COIP "Whoever, by any means, utters expressions of discredit or dishonor against another", (Penal, 2014, P.3). When there are cases of invasion of privacy and intimacy of people with its consequent dissemination in social networks such as # LadyTantra, the COIP typifies in Article 178 the following: "the person who, without consent or legal authorization, accesses, intercepts, examines, retains, records, reproduces, discloses or publishes personal data, data messages, voice, audio and video, postal objects, information contained in Computer media, the private or reserved communications of another person by any means, will be punished with a prison sentence of one to three years". (Penal, 2014, P. 5).

Other ways to sanction social media posts are through international intellectual property laws. In Ecuador, it was the government and its political movement PAIS that resorted to the Spanish company Ares Rights to remove the contents because the images used generally belonged to the presidency of the Republic or the Alianza Pais. As for example, reports *El Comercio*, in April 2014 it happened to the report of the tweeter Diana Amores for having published the logo of the ruling party, to this is added The Telecommunications Law, which dictates, in its Article 22, that the competent authority can, among others, limit or block the content or access of users to the Internet.

It is worrying that citizens are increasingly informed, or so they believe, through social networks. The problem is that they do it without differentiating what the source is. Information is diluted from one to another and this does not guarantee that we are better communicated. Because the errors, falsehoods, inaccuracies of the networks do not induce to take things more calmly, but to verify more quickly, says Miguel Ángel Bastenier, journalist, columnist and teacher at the *Diario El País* School. Social media coupled with serious journalism brings the best practices of the Criminal Code. There are no more recipes, says Bastenier, because we live in a communicative-informative flood in which the easiest thing is to splash instead of keeping your head above water. Faced with the "viral" flood of supposed events, we must know how to select today more than ever and despise what is not genuine.

In the digital world, traditional media has found an indispensable ally with social networks. As companies dedicated to the global distribution of information, Google and Facebook have new obligations. They are no longer mere technology platforms. In the same way that they veto certain content, be it hate messages or nude images, they must ensure that the news they contain is true. Denouncing and blocking lying Websites does not mean opening the door to censorship (El País, November 18, 2016).

We return to Umberto Eco to highlight a remarkable point of social networks, the Twitter phenomenon is on the positive side, think of China or Erdogan. Some even say that Auschwitz would not have been possible with the Internet, because the news would have spread virally. But on the other hand, it gives legions of idiots the right to speak (University of Turin, June 2015).

In the same way, it must be recognized that sometimes social networks, although chaotic and little reflective, become primary and valuable sources of information that traditional media do not reach. Another issue is that of forms, something that is not secondary. Often as a hasty transcription of a thought full of abbreviations, with the elimination of the orthographic signs, a phonetic writing, among other devices that reduce the quality are alerts of the credibility of the information. We make it clear that this is an obligation to remedy, because we are what we write even more than we speak. The other great challenge, the results of which are beginning to be seen, is to transform a passive and mediocre crowd into an active and intelligent crowd. And most importantly: not because social networks have become more plural and democratic means of communication than others, one should forget about the ethical responsibility to become an accessory of communication. As the Internet has allowed the creation of autonomous Opinion Media, large and small currents of opinion that political parties represented have been structuring and gaining presence. Interacting with them calls for a new kind of leadership that does not fear direct contact, is not influenced by partisan mechanisms.

The Internet offers a new horizontal communication model (without hierarchies and decentralized), in which senders and receivers sometimes draw confusing lines. Referring to the concept that Isidro Moreno introduced as "reader-author" as the maximum expression of a reader not only active, but also a participant in the narrative process. In this creative process, the training of the receiver is decisive (in our case, political parties) with a specific way of structuring and ordering reality. For Moreno, he defends with conviction the notion of digital interactivity with interactivity, typical of dialogue, it reaches a determining dimension in digital storytelling because it brings together the transmitter and receiver relationships typical of all face-to-face communication. (Moreno, 2001).

The possibilities that such technology can offer for the party's conversations with its militants are enormous. In fact, it is enough for us to propose to forget the word "militant" and open a broader sphere, that of the cyberactivist: a citizen interested in actively participating in politics and who knows that he uses various tools that new digital technologies have to reach him. This protocitizen has his own vision of politics and, although he feels on the right or left, he has a perspective capable of not marrying into any particular political party.

In Spain there are beginning to be some advances in relation to the subject, but many times, with the applications that are only attempts. As an example, we find the Llamazares campaign in SecondLife of which we will talk later and the efforts to create autonomous channels on YouTube, where you can post your own videos of the campaigns, demonstrations or messages to the citizen, questioning him face to face through the computer screen, a communication close to that obtained on television, but much more aggressive when looking at the viewer "in the eyes" and with the peculiarity that this new viewer can choose when to start and end the communication.

Digital culture is a wave of social reestablishment (hence its political packaging) that connects to the increasingly latent behaviors in our society: the taste for the creation of information and shared knowledge, the rejection of ideological indoctrination and vertical pyramidal hierarchies. They provide new ways of relating and socializing, with the recognition of leaders who create value, sensitivity and curiosity for the most everyday and personal topics and latent creativity as an engine of innovation. Digital software has been gaining category and users, eventually becoming something much broader: Web 2.0. This concept is very important and more vigorous insofar as it implies an evolution from an immature Internet (1.0), in which users were limited to Browsing passively and remotely, to a much more advanced one, in which participation is active and heterogeneous.

The new version (2.0) of the web proposes a participatory environment, with mixed authors and readers. It also proposes an active recipient who searches, investigates, links, hyperlinks, gives his opinion, responds, contrasts and creates content from others already existing. According to the creator of the term 2.0, Tim O' Reilly Web 2.0 is the Web as a platform, involving all connected devices. Web 2.0 applications are the ones that best take advantage of this platform, offering the software as a continuous update service that improves as the number of users increases, consuming and remixing data from different sources, including individual users, while generating their own data in a way that allows them to be remixed by others, creating network effects through a participatory architecture and leaving behind the metaphor of the Web 1.0 page, in order to offer more immersive experiences to the user. (O'reilly, 2000).

The IT tools used to reinforce the efficiency of online social networks ('social software') operate in three cross-cutting areas, the first would be communication (they help us share knowledge), the second community (they help us find and integrate communities) and the third cooperation (they help us do things together). (Caldevilla, 2009). The germ of social networks originates in the United States with the creation of [www.classmates.com](http://www.classmates.com). Randy Conrads wanted to be able to regain contact between former childhood and teenage companions, something very much to the taste of the new social user. But the possibilities of this type of portals have not yet been discovered, and it was only in 2002 that a variety of virtual spaces began to emerge promoting the networks of online circles of friends. We are, then, before the "social age" commonly called "Society 2.0". Some of the characteristics of Web 2.0 are the ubiquity for the user to be able to search for information and access it anywhere you have an internet connection (often wireless). Authoring user content, with user-generated content are an essential element of Web 2.0 and in many cases they are become your nerve center. This is the case of portals such as YouTube, social networks such as Facebook, blogs such as Blogger and a long etc.

The virulence would be the change of format forces the evolution of advertising media. Traditional advertising is disseminated by users themselves by word of mouth, who spread the company's products or services among their circles of friends or acquaintances through emails, blogs, personal or social networks. It is known as Marketing 2.0 or buzz marketing. Thus, greater engagement, loyalty and trust on the part of the consumer is achieved. The exponential hypertext interaction system multiplies advertising information

automatically. This means that, consequently, companies and institutions must change their relationships, both at a productive and communicative level, taking advantage of new social channels. With Web 2.0, the problem or defect of a product, or the poor quality of a service or the lack of seriousness of a seller will spread quickly (and always with more insistence than the dissemination of a positive element) causing terrible consequences, the design of the products can be specified from the opinion of the consumer (through forums, surveys and etc) which reduces the consumer's research budget) and still promote Networks related or addicted to products or services, thus skipping the legal problem of Data Protection Law. These advantages at the level of marketing, advertising and information are not only taken advantage of by internet users, companies and advertising campaigns, but little by little they are also serving as a new way of expressing political communication. The new political playing field cannot be submitted only to a web service, not even to a technology. The blogosphere is a heterogeneous terrain that involves dozens of "social" tools. A good example to explain the processes we are experiencing is the blog in its interaction with currents and SMS. It is important to remember that tools are not the epicenter of future changes, although they condition their content through the forms of communication they allow.

The most important of all these phenomena is undoubtedly that constituted by social networks as monumental deliberative spaces: networks of users who, thanks mainly to the Internet, they form their interaction according to a distributed topology that makes it practically unfeasible to filter the messages and the debate that take place in it. Its most profound impact on politics, we are only at the tip of the iceberg: for new forms of mobilization, leadership and rhetoric; new ways of approaching election campaigns; a different place and new obligations for political parties. It can be said that we are facing a new way of doing and thinking about politics, which understands the importance of dialogue and social interaction and cultural change towards virtual support as tasks at least as important as the exercise of Administration. The participatory environment itself is not a sign of political success. For it remains to combine good media planning and good media management to get the satisfactory results. It is not enough to open a profile on some social networks and devote yourself to gathering friends. Each social network has behavior guidelines and a form of communication and it is necessary to know them, understand them and execute them to be able to take advantage of these communication tools. 1.0 (or traditional) communication was characterized by its verticality and unique directionality, while 2.0 is characterized by horizontality and bidirectionality. As previously stated, Web 2.0 places the content creator and the user in a direct relationship. This provides a great opportunity for politicians: they can indulge in knowing and knowing in turn in the first person and automatically what voters think about their political decisions, in addition to having a multitude of tools to spread your message easily and effectively. It is worth noting that not all messages are applicable to all channels and it is known that there are much more effective communication formulas than others for the delivery of certain informative content. As a starting point for this "manual of good political use 2.0", for effective social communication, it is necessary to implement four basic communication mechanisms. The first of these is the Blog, they are personal, intuitive and simple tools for publications that, when disseminated, allowed the origin of the

first great distributed media: the blogosphere, a communicative and informative environment in which budgets, conditions are reproduced and the results of the plural universe. As with almost any initiative on the web, be it business, political, personal, institutional or of any other moderately formal nature, there must be a blog that conveys seriousness, sincerity, closeness, involvement, determination and transparency. This is vitally important that it is written by the same politician and that it is spoken on current issues trying to explain the position of his party or his team in a clear, concise and objective way. A good example to follow is to select a few news stories per week and give an opinion on them. openly. The result is that of an interview in any medium, with the difference being that the interviewee decides what he wants to tell. As a means of communication between the candidate and voters, close attention should be paid to reader comments. Whether these are favorable or critical; a moderation should also be carried out in which "politically incorrect" comments that harm the quality of the blog are not allowed. In Spain, blogging fashion is not yet very widespread. Although it is true that in the last elections to the Basque Parliament there were many blogging initiatives, today few are still active and up to date. Having a blog does not mean writing a few entries during the election period, it means an extra personal effort to keep content of general interest up to date.

In the social network presents the figure of the candidate on the Internet, which does not consist of creating a profile on Facebook, Twitter or any other social network and embarking on the race to win the largest number of "friendly friends". You don't have to weigh the importance of a political figure according to the number of followers they have on a social network. This tool is only useful if you use it as an alternative means of communication, not as a citizen affiliation survey. In Spain, today having a Facebook account to create events (rallies, meetings with militants, meetings and etc) and a discussion wall and another on Flickr with photos, which would be enough for a correct use of this tool. Microblogging is a kind of social network has its own section for its characteristics. A continuous update by the candidate is very important for it to be effective. A good political example for this section is the United left Deputy Reyes Montiel, who recently starred in a news about the use of this communication channel. (Jiménez, 2009). Video is a more widely used channel due to its proximity to the media. With traditional television channels in broadband penetration around the world is closely related to the growth of the use of video as a tool for online marketing (whatever it may be). In Spain it is estimated according to the latest study by the National Observatory of telecommunications and Information Society (ONTSI) that 60% of households do not have a connection to the network; but, as this number decreases, we will find a new market where the best will win prepared, and of course, at this time, if a political party does not count. (ONTI, 2009). With videos as a communication tool, you will be seriously at a disadvantage compared to others. Currently and globally, 52% of all internet traffic is for watching online videos. YouTube accounts for 12% of all Internet traffic, and according to The New York Times, more than 70% of everyone who visits a website clicks on the videos it contains for them to see (higher than the click-through rate achieved with advertising banners). The data does not lie: video is the best way to capture the attention of internet users. The visual impact of video on intuitive user understanding is greater and more effective than sending text messages on the Internet, print media or radio. To all this we

must add that, in times of crisis, the publication of videos on the Internet has a lower cost than in traditional media. It is therefore recommended that a technical team record the candidate's interventions at rallies and interviews and put them "on demand" from voters through YouTube or other video portals to be able to be played on demand from any computer at any time. Respecting the keys of the Internet (brevity, quality and relevance), these can be a great ally in political campaigns. In fact, in Spain all political parties are present in a certain way on these channels. As we have seen, it is about bringing together the political world and the government with the principles that Web 2.0 infuses and that we have indicated previously: transparency, openness and collaboration. The ideas that, inspired by the author himself, are very interesting in the Cluetrain Manifesto (considered by many as the Bible of Web 2.0), collected by José Antonio del Moral on his blog and that we reproduce below. (Del Moral, 2006). Democracy is a dialogue, so for 50 years politicians have become accustomed to communicating through the mass media. The use of these means of communication imposed a dominant model of vertical communication: impersonal, long, homogeneous and unidirectional. Each new medium generates its own rules of communication. In the 1970s, Nixon, Chaban-Delmas and Mitterrand realized this: the three they lost elections for not using television correctly. The political game consists of sending information from one point to an audience. This is the traditional model of communication, which follows the principles of the Telegraph: a sender sends a message to a receiver in the hope of influencing it. An unprecedented situation occurs on the Internet in which the receiver ignores the message, has control of what you want to hear, and will ignore it unless he gets the impression that the sender is addressing him as an individual.

The Internet promises an open information system that allows everyone to compare information with other sources, allows everyone to talk, addressing each in a personal way. A basic rule of political communication is to keep track of the message. But it is no longer possible to control the message with the classical techniques of Political Communication (Information Management, television communication, public relations) are beginning to suffer from the pressure of New Media. Using the Internet, we do not avoid the means of communication, but multiply them, since each Internet user becomes a possible source of opinion. More important than the Internet are the communities it structures. In this reality lie both the strength and complexity of the environment. Politicians have reason to fear the Internet if they cannot integrate the interactivity and rules of the medium. The network allows us to engage in the kind of dialogue that representative democracy has always aspired to. People can now find ways to make themselves heard. It is what has been known as "active surveillance", in an environment that favors humor in which parodies circulate faster than doctrines. Politics in the Internet age means that people become more organized and intelligent collectively. The network facilitates access to information and action if citizens and parties begin to participate in this new medium, the Internet will germinate the conditions for a new democratic practice. These principles, created in 2006, summarize everything that was previously discussed about changes in communication depending on the format. Without, however, Web 2.0 it has many implications that have not been addressed. The first is the suppression of intermediaries between politicians and citizens (thus separating the so politically influenced mass media). This creates a

paradox: consumers of information from a particular newspaper, television channel or radio station that they seek the contents depending on the political color of the medium and that those who reject. They are unrelated and can access other types of information without mediation. That is, get first-hand information with the protagonists, without the involvement of editors or news directors. The second consequence is the possibility for citizens to organize outside the parties or collaborate in administrative work or provide tools for the rest of the citizens to constantly control the activity of their representatives. We refer to videos posted by netizens of political meetings or lectures in which they participated, first-person references of events in which a certain figure participated and etc. The third is that political leaders have a greater responsibility in all their actions, because they will be "watched" by a greater number of people related or not to their political inclination.

### Final consideration

After our little analysis, there is no doubt that Web 2.0 is beginning to revolutionize all sectors of the digital society in which we live, starting from the most traditional, since it may be the most revolting policy. This has the consequence that political parties, in collaboration with universities, must study this phenomenon in depth to use this tool as one of the basic pillars for future general elections. So far some have been carried out that are far from the digital sociodemographic level and there is still a great way to work to adapt to the future (and not so future) communications that will flood the political future. As we emphasize, a good message, a good segmentation thanks to the large databases that make social networks available, a good use of these in a judicious, intensive and transparent way and good marketing techniques to disseminate the message in blogs, forums and "activate" the internet user, they will be fundamental in the next elections for political formations. Adhere to new technologies, encouraging the vote of the young public and bringing the virtual citizen closer to facilitate the transmission of the ideas of each organization in this new era of communication, the digital age.

The result of the next "digital" elections will most likely be in the hands of parties and social media users. Therefore, we believe that digital politics is a mere fad. As Méndiz collects, the concept of novelty, therefore, does not reside so much in the nature of its own formats, as well as the use that is made of them. The position is clear, the political-digital revolution in the world is near, only the future will allow us to see what its consequences will be. (Méndiz, 2007).

### REFERENCES

- CALDEVILLA, D. Los medios digitales en la comunicación política del nuevo presidente de EE.UU. Actas de IX Congreso de la Asociación Española de Ciencia Política y Administración (AECPA), Universidad de Málaga, 2009.
- DEL MORAL, J.A. Los principios de la política 2.0. Blogs Alianzo, 2006.
- JIMÉNEZ, C. R. Prohibido "twittear" desde la Comisión de Investigación de Madrid. El País Digital, 2009.
- MÉNDIZ, A. Nuevas formas publicitarias. Patrocinio, product placement y publicidad en Internet. Málaga, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga, 57, 2007.
- MORENO, I. Genoma digital. Anàlisi, v.27, n.112, 2001.
- O' REALLY, T. What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software.
- ONTSI, Observatorio Nacional de las Telecomunicaciones y de la SI. Datos recogidos del Informe. La Sociedad en Red 2009. Secretaría de Estado de Telecomunicaciones y para la Sociedad de la Información.
- PENAL, Código Orgánico Integral. Código Orgánico Integral Penal. Quito: Corporación de Estudios y Publicaciones, Legislación Conexa. Versión Profesional, 2014.
- PRIETO, Rafael Rodríguez; CABEZUDO, Fernando Martínez. Poder e Internet, un análisis crítico de la red. Ediciones Cátedra, Madrid, España, 2016.
- SARTORI, Giovanni. Homo Videns, la sociedad teledirigida. Prisa Ediciones, 15ª Edição, México, 2013.
- UGARTE, D. El poder de las redes. Barcelona, El Cobre, 2007.

\*\*\*\*\*