

Katherine Madden

Practicing politics in the cultural sphere, or the Internet, in this case, provides a false perception of the hierarchy of causes within the civil sphere. As in the case of marriage equality, the amount of stories in favor of marriage equality one can find in blogs, news sources, and social media does not necessarily equate to political action or progress. In fact, it works to give a false perception of progress. If I am seeing countless examples of pro-rights posts, then I am potentially less likely to demand rights for gay individuals, as I may have the perception that because it is in the cultural dialogue, it is also in the civil dialogue, or at least being discussed comparably in the civil sphere.

That being said, the very nature of the Internet is political. The Internet, hypothetically, gives a voice to marginalized individuals, or at least to marginalized individuals with enough economic capital to access the Internet. While the Internet allows for a platform for minority voices to be heard, it does not necessarily monetarily reward the labor of the curator. To be financially successful on the Internet, one must either be employed by one of the many media conglomerates with holdings of the Internet, or they must provide content that is apolitical: YouTube cat videos, for example. The Internet, social media, in particular, does however work to make the connection between the private sphere and the public sphere. Or to say that social media works to collapse the segregation of matters of the home with matters of the state. The debates on birth control in this recent election are an example of this. Women are able to post simultaneously about reproductive rights and mundane details of their lives, creating a collage of information that paints a fuller example of what it means to be a woman. Furthermore, a status update about having to pay twice as much for The Pill is seen as both a personal complaint and a social commentary. It thus becomes increasingly difficult in social media to think about the

person as an individual abstracted from the social, racial, classed, and gendered conditions that shape their political status.

While social media is able to house a space for women to come forward and discuss their reproductive rights, the Internet can at best be described as chaotic. Millions of videos, pictures, songs, stories, blog posts, and Tweets are posted daily, and it takes an army of paid and unpaid trolls to navigate through this material to give it meaning within a larger context, like the upcoming election. For example, the video of Mitt Romney speaking at his fundraiser and claiming that 47% of the country is dependent on the government was on YouTube for months before Mother Jones located it, contacted the person who had uploaded it, gotten hold of the entire recording, reedited it, and posted it to their site. Within hours, larger news organizations like CNN, Fox News, NPR, MSNBC, et al, had caught on and disseminated the clip through their own sites and television and radio channels. While this information had been available for months, it took the more established institutions to give it meaning and value to our society. Without these institutions, there is a mass of information that is unable to reach a mass audience in a strategic way. So yes, without the Internet, this information may have never been revealed, but ultimately we still rely on old media to maintain the national dialogue.

New Media is far from being the virtual embodiment of fairness and democracy that it was promised to be. Instead, it exhibits the same weaknesses and insufficiencies that Old Media has since its inception. While there are areas of promise, such as social media's ability to reveal the micropolitics of daily life, information is ultimately still owned by the same people. There is indeed nothing new under the sun.