Enrico De Angelis
CEMAM UIR Webscience USJ
16 March 2012
Notes By Rita Chemaly

The social networks are not instruments
But new social spaces
With gvt that can be empowered by new media
But what kind of political discourse can be developed in those platforms?
The internet effects are like hammer or Germany?
Tim hardly (blogger) with the virtual architecture how they are shaping the political
behaviors in great Britain's sphere
We are engaging in information building
The society is changing

How the networks in the public sphere works
Role of technology= they create a kind of relationships
What types of social spaces emerge in Syria?
Is there good guys?
Is this helping the process of democratization?
The network of the public sphere
They are 2 positions
The technology enforces democracy, with a better culture on participation
With collaborative solutions
Marc lynch studying the arab blog sphere;
The concept of communities is very important
Collective participation and communities are emerging and changing the role…
Kings? New communities are defined though emotional investments
Its is the concept of collective intelligence
Each put the competency in the help of others

The public speaks abt themselves of collective …
Pple chose to share their information freely
There are many new ways of communications

Other authors raise critics:
Overabundance information (what is worth and not)
Broadcasting by tv, and blg nations, these media encourage fragmentation
How do we know who is credible and who give us information
Shapiro: the media oblige us to know what we want to see, and to read
With information cocoons and echo chambers
I am reinforce with the preexistent convictions
And I will avoid the dissonance

The speed of the media (image over text)
Reflexivity and the design of the efficiency,

Redundant ideas that invite us to think that each click is a significant intervention
React and follower, but are we thinking
Babel objection
The ecosystem is not only media
The media give credibility to actors from the media
Tunisia (symbiosis between media and old media) worked well
The msg were sent to a large section of society
Community with a rule an hierarchy insides
In Syria are we in a wikipedia revolution, but are we in a revolution
Are we in place to mobilize?
Everyone collaborate everyone is a hero
But wikipedia has a community and paid staff to guaranty the credibility of the content
Wikipedia without staff won't work and it would be chaos

Syria: they didn't have an organization before, so, they are more ready to follow the information biases with negative effect
In Syria Facebook and you tube were censored
The internet have to collaborate with the society
And the activists have to train themselves to go out of the online sphere to the street;
The geeks alaa abd el fatah began helping political movement and began to help them
And then they began to meet face to face meeting, during physical demonstrations
And the face of maturity: the blogger sphere began to grow
The connectivity was post ideological…
The core of the communities helped the net surfers to navigate for the web
The Syrian began using the net after and during the revolution
Pple didn't trust each other; pple didn't have a history on social networking
Pple don't know who I am
No body uses camera, it is very difficult for the credibility

The composition of the networks is made by very small groups
It is difficult to enlarge them because of the trust
They don't have a collaborative culture
This is one the communication bias
They video tape and talk to al Jazeera alone,
They don't shape a larger platform, such as nawaat,
They don't want to , there are a lot differences between them
There is a stronger fragmentation of the space
There is no nawaat ,
There is no kulna khaled said,
There is not chabka
In Syria there is web-showcases
Places to put the content
Chabka cham, and Syrian revolution 2011 founded by Muslim brotherhood
That have nothing to do with the uprising
Syrian revolution

They are not fragmented? Kif? There are a lot of groups and tansikiyat
But they are scattered on the internet with many fb profiles and twitter accounts
All work on anonamity
The weakness of hierarchies, there are no rules
In the community and outside, who are the most credible sources, and the less credible sources?
They are limited 2 3 practices:
Facebook pages, groups, small networks
They produce information
They upload the video, and than they sell it!
They have direct contact with professional journalist and media.
They give them camera, devices and so one;

These communications bias, are illustrated because in Syria Facebook is more important then twitter and other platform
Society = the larger society
Syrian don't know ghazzawi, page, …
They are disconnected from them.
The connection is between the activism on the field and the networks
The net is not used to mobilize pple directly
After daraa the revolution took another direction
 Conclusion
Lack of credibility, with lack of communities, lack of rules, lack of hierarchies
What is real, what is fabricated;
Exaggerations were revealed, zeinab hosni, her mutilated body was shown then we saw her body on tv;
This has repercussion on traditional media,
The incredibility with a lot of mistakes,
With overabundance of information, with videos with very little viewers
They are raw information
Because the information is not refined
This is very high-speed

It is not a public sphere there is no deliberation
In Syria some pbs arrived by the internet
 It is more important for the Syrian outside;
The inside are producing the videos
The activists are sending directly video to al Jazeera
The activists outside are distributing the information
Is the regime better organized than the opposition?