Internet for the debate from the notions of rationality and liberty of Amartya Sen and Michel Foucault
Internet para el debate a partir de las nociones de racionalidad y libertad en Amartya Sen y Michel Foucault

Rosario Carvajal Muñoz. Universidad de Cádiz, España
rosario.carvajal@uca.es

Abstract
The Internet is of great importance to organize our social and private lives. From this context, we reflect on what margins the Internet leaves to exercise our rationality and freedom, through active and free participation, fundamental rights of citizens, understood as essential elements of the democratic ideal. It is based on what should be an ideal type of technology at the service of democratic values, using the Internet as a common good for citizens. From this perspective, the text reflects on the use of advertising and political marketing on the internet. It contains some interpretations of what would be a common space on the Internet as a democratic ideal. To make this analysis, the notions of rationality and freedom of Amartya Sen and Michel Foucault are used to contrast two dimensions of democracy, one more deliberative, which is in line with the idea of the common good of Ostrom (2000). It would correspond to a democracy by discussion, according to Amartya Sen. The other dimension would correspond to a democratic model with oligarchic touches, in a neoliberal economic context, more in a line of rationality linked to power relations and market interests, following Foucault. Freedom is important to both, based on the participation and public debates according to Sen and the critical attitude of the individual according to Foucault.

Keywords
Democracy; freedom; rationality; Internet; market; Sen; Foucault.

Resumen
Internet tiene una gran importancia para organizar nuestras vidas sociales y privadas. Desde este contexto se reflexiona sobre qué márgenes dejan Internet para ejercer nuestra racionalidad y libertad, mediante una participación activa y libre, derechos fundamentales de los ciudadanos, entendido como elementos imprescindibles del ideal democrático. Se parte de la base de lo que debería ser un tipo ideal de tecnología al servicio de los valores democráticos, utilizando Internet como un bien común para la ciudadanía. Desde esta perspectiva se reflexiona sobre el uso de la publicidad y del marketing político en la red. El texto contiene algunas interpretaciones de lo que sería un espacio común en Internet como ideal democrático. Para hacer este análisis, se utilizan las nociones de racionalidad y libertad de Amartya Sen y Michel Foucault, a partir de los cuales se trabaja para contrastar dos dimensiones de la democracia. Una más deliberativa, en línea con el ideal del bien común de Ostrom (2000), que correspondería a una democracia por discusión, siguiendo a Amartya Sen.. La otra dimensión correspondería a un modelo democrático con toques oligárquicos, en un contexto económico neoliberal, más en una línea de racionalidad vinculada a las relaciones de poder e intereses del mercado, siguiendo a Foucault. Para ambos es importante la libertad, basada en la participación y debates públicos en Sen, y actitud crítica del individuo, siguiendo a Foucault.

Palabras clave
Democracia; libertad; racionalidad; Internet; mercado; Sen; Foucault.

INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses its analysis on the functioning of the Internet, marked by economic interests, and even political ones. Political parties also use social networks on the Internet for electoral purposes. Faced with this reality, the text proposes a more democratic use of cyberspace, organizing the social based on the term of "Ostrom" (2000). This would involve the creation of spaces on the Internet where users can share in a common way, eliminating partisan and interested use of the Internet in the hands of a few.

Certainly, extending this common proposal on the Internet is a utopia today, although there are exceptions, and some examples are discussed here. However, this use of the common on the internet would allow an extension of our freedoms, both macro and micro. At the macro level, because it eliminates the restrictions on information that exist on the Internet while expanding our opportunities to contrast better the information and make decisions more accurately which would improve our democratic system.

Throughout the history of mankind, democracy has come to be considered the best political system imaginable, but it has its imperfections, and the use of new technologies does not guarantee the presence of the best democratic values by itself. At present, it is still representative democracy hat dominates in the world. It is a political model that was imposed in the West from the constitution of the capitalist economic model, this fact does not imply a relationship between economy and politics of mere coincidence, and this is an extremely significant relationship. Today we begin to imagine this overcoming of representative democracy by the hand of new technologies, despite the dangers they contain. In the face of the power relations also present in the field of new technologies, the exercise of spaces of the common good would broaden citizen participation, opening other options that could improve our democratic system. The existence of shared public spaces, which allow debate among diverse citizens, also fuels other spaces of freedom among individuals. But, as Dutton et al. (2019: 230) argue: "Fears have increased over whether the Internet and social media are actually undermining democratic choice by locking users into filter bubbles or echo chambers or exposing them to misinformation in ways that undermine their ability to make rational political choices".

With regard to the notions of rationality and freedom of Amartya Sen and Michel Foucault, and starting with the first, Sen highlights the importance of public debates for a rationality by discussion. Also because citizen participation, and public debates, expand our freedoms, understanding these as capacity. The ability is given when there are substantive opportunities for individuals and groups to choose their best options in life (Sen, 2004, 2000, 2010). The presence of these opportunities is what opens up possibilities of choice for individuals. Opportunities are essential for individuals and groups to do and be what they consider important in their lives. On the Internet these opportunities would mean, at a minimum, free access to information. Likewise, a freer Internet would imply the non-interference of others in our opinions, ideologies, or choice of products. This last aspect would link with a main theme in Foucault, the relations between knowledge and power, the result of a rational reading of reality in an interested way. For Foucault, this political and social construction of rationality is counteracted with resistance. This resistance comes from the practical exercise of creative freedom of the subject, based on a critical attitude, and concerned for himself, and the world around him. Of course, the Internet platform favors the active participation of individuals, and this translates, following Foucault's thought, into the possibility of situations of resistance on the part of the subject expressing their discomfort through protests on political, economic or social. But in turn, the Internet also opens spaces for more subtle power exercises in the field of political marketing, or the mere personalized marketing of companies. These strategies in the use of the Internet have their repercussions in the ways in which we interact with the virtual medium. It is also linked to the introduction of new dynamics and advertising strategies by the market, making use of the data they obtain from our profiles as users on the network.

This text is divided in three sections. The first section briefly describes some of the limitations that the Internet imposes on our freedoms. The second section stops at the conceptions of rationality of Sen and Foucault, relating it to the possible rationalities that dominate the Internet

space, and also contrasting with the economic proposal of Ostrom (2000) on common goods. To reflect on the repercussions that this common social organization can have on the constitution of a new approach to economic rationality, which implies a break with the prevailing capitalist economic rationality. The third section offers a comparison between the notions of freedom of Sen and Foucault, the limited spaces of freedom that the Internet leaves us in its current functioning, and what would be a common space on the Internet to expand our freedoms. This reflection on freedom and rationality on the Internet, and by contrast, in a common space, is related to the meanings that Sen and Foucault give to their notions of freedom and rationality.

Internet as a limiter of the citizen liberties

The social diversity is present on Internet, because Internet accommodates the greatest variety of social groups, in principle there are no limits in this regard. The Internet is made up of an amalgam of social networks that contain the most diverse social profiles, however, this does not guarantee in itself the recognition of diversity and the extension of our freedoms.

Social diversity also includes differences and inequalities between individuals and groups. The notion of freedom in Sen is linked to the recognition of social diversity, in a broad sense, which includes a plurality of aspects of our lives and concerns (Sen, 2010: 263). The study of diversity leads to the question equality of what? (Sen, 1979), based on the obvious fact of the association between heterogeneity and social and economic inequalities, which affects our freedoms (Sen, 1995: 135). We all belong to certain social categories, but we differ from each other by many other factors (Sen, 1995: 33), for example, the belonging of people to the same social category faces heterogeneity as a result of another multiplicity of variables (Sen, 1995: 13). In addition, sometimes the effort to establish some criteria of equality among humans implies a practical background of need to simplify (Sen, 1995: 14). On the Internet, the most popular social networks, such as Facebook or Twitter, convey an idea of equality, because there is no hierarchical organization, but there are differences among its members in the functioning of the network.

In addition, as Sen (1995: 35) observes, freedom and equality should not be seen alternately, since they are closely related: freedom is among the possible fields of application of equality, and "equality is given among the possible distributive schemes of freedom". Returning to social networks on the Internet, to a large extent the equality of belonging to the network is perhaps the most attractive and hopeful element for citizens. This dynamic of functioning circumscribes individuals in nodes of individuals who share the same affinities.

Diversity also indicates a recognition that people have different goals in life, according to their values and expectations (Sen, 1995, 2000, 2002, 1997), and that to achieve their achievements they must have substantive opportunities (Sen, 1997: 81-82). It is here that, returning to the topic of social networks, there are more inequalities between the members that make up the most popular social networks, such as Facebook and Twitter. The network offers information divided according to the social profile of Internet users. In addition, in the case of Twitter, the social impact is determined by the number of users that each individual has, Those Internet users with more followers have a greater impact on others. Although the case of Twitter is very particular, because it allows, at least, one person to express different opinions when introducing controversy in the debates opened by others. In a way, this type of social networks makes the impact of the positionality of Amartya Sen appears to be minor. But these tweets do not guarantee a communication of exchange of reasoned ideas, but rather an exchange of ingenious messages between network users. The positional objectivity explains, to a large extent, how our behavior is related to our beliefs, and these are the result of our personal and social circumstances. The role of positionality is particularly crucial in interpreting illusions and misunderstandings in public debates (Sen, 1993: 131).

The new technologies could be a very useful tool to improve democratic functioning, if the Internet were used as a platform for citizens to express themselves by exchanging ideas in a reasoned way. However, studies on the functioning of social networks show how they condition people's opinion towards similar opinions. Gómez de Agreda (2019: 27) points out that the

algorithms serve to make social networks channel the ads in a personalized way. And even the right moment will be sought for the ad to have a greater impact on the customer. It portrays well the functioning mechanism of personalized advertising, an advertising dynamic that is coupled with a change in rhetoric in advertising content adapted to the profile of each user (Zelcer, 2019: 12)). Here the company plays with advantages by having detailed information on our profiles compared to the limited information the user receives from the advertiser. This leads us to reflect on the consequences that these rhetorical contents of the advertising message can have on our lives, at least on how they influence our behavior as consumers.

The advertisers are who pay so that the algorithms direct the information that the audience sees on the Internet. To a large extent, the market continues to prioritize the configuration and control of cyberspace. In the background of this information control, which leads to directing the audience in the direction of commercial interests, are the extraordinary interests of those who earn money with this business. According to Gómez de Agreda (2019: 26), it is estimated that Facebook achieved revenues of 40,000 million dollars in 2017, money that comes from those who place the ads. Following this author, so that the information those customers buy can be sold (our data), we have previously made this information available to those who handle the information on the Internet.

In relation to the latter, González and Rodríguez (2015: 254) point out that it is now the individualization and not the mass that becomes the most valuable asset for companies. Digital marketing seeks to please the user in a personalized way. The authors also observe the symbolic power of memes on the Internet (González and Rodríguez, 2015: 259), for example, Twitter. The meme is understood as a conceptual idea that is transmitted at high speed among Internet users, through the use of any of its platforms (emails, social networks, blogs, information websites, etc.). Following the commercial imperative that prevails on the Internet, Martinez and Rodríguez (2016: 116) point out that the exercise of network power by private corporations is one of the most obvious manifestations of control that private companies can exercise over what is said or not in the network.

However, a socially useful production, which results in a more democratic use of the Internet, as would be a common space, responds to the premise of democratizing the economy (González and Rodríguez, 2015: 291). The authors say that it is about consolidating and reproducing an antagonistic rationality to the business rationality of capitalism.

Rationality, Internet and common space

The work of Ostrom (2000: 12) on the governance of common goods wants to be a proven demonstration, based on empirical data, that there are successful community practices in the management of common resources, which demonstrate that it is possible from a different rationality to the conventional rationality of neoliberalism. However, the imperative of commercial interests continues to be imposed on the Internet, with a marked neoliberal cut continues to impose imperative commercial interests on the Internet.

In addition, although diversity is integrated into the Internet, this diversity is not interrelated, which could facilitate a common goods space. To a large extent, as Castells (2003) says, the force of the Internet is chaos, and this chaos could be a guarantee of our freedoms, but it is not. Somehow, the operation of the Internet, despite favoring interdependence, is taking measures aimed at atomizing people between individuals with the same social profile. The operation of the Internet does not favor people to make rational decisions based on truthful information, often due to the dispersion of information. In some way, our reasoning capacity is sometimes limited by insufficient information, and even false information.

It should be noted, in broad strokes, following some of Sen's work (2004: 44, 1993, 1999, 2003, 2004, 2005), two aspects of rationality. First, there is rationality around the choices and preferences of individuals, also considering the preferences of solidarity and the diversity of reasons sensitive to choice based on what we value. Second, there is a rationality approach designed to understand what others are doing and why, but also what others know and what we can learn from them. There is in its conception of rationality an ethical background that implies taking into account the consequences of our decisions.

A fraudulent use of advertising, for example, limits our substantive opportunities because we start with information that is misleading which hinders our decision making. Reducing our opportunities for choice also implies reducing our freedom to become and do what we consider important to our lives, following the capacity approach of Amartya Sen. In this sense, the reference by Gómez de Ágreda (2019: 102), which details how in the electoral elections in Colombia in 2018, false profiles were built on Internet social networks to support certain political candidates, is timely. This use of new technologies to spread false information is illegal advertising. It is clearly a behavior far from ethical values, which has similarities with what is known as misleading advertising, and which according to Hugo Aznar (2000) represents a challenge for the law, which is the one that must respond by introducing mechanisms of control not always easy to set up.

From this perspective the functioning of the Internet does not favor rationality through discussion, Also because the users of social networks share their opinions among equals, which makes confrontation difficult. Only a minority of citizens do look for varied information on the Internet before making their decisions. So those Internet users interested in politics, and who have information search skills, are less likely to be caught in a filter bubble or locked in a political echo chamber (Dutton, et al., 2019). In any case, the research of these authors shows the unequal positions that users have in accessing information on the Internet, also due to the fact that not all citizens have the same Internet search skills. The presence of social diversity in the network is a reality that, as in society, is poorly combined with equality regarding access to information, because we start from unequal social and personal positions among Internet users.

In Sen (2000: 6) the recognition of diversity, which supports his idea of rationality, leads him to underline the plurality of variables that mark the differences between individuals, be they wealth, income, ownership, among others, that can be used in comparative perspective to define what equality is. The demands of equality, in different spaces, do not coincide with each other "precisely because we humans are so different that equality in one aspect (or variable) is accompanied by large inequalities in others" (Sen, 1995: 147). This difficulty in determining equality leads him to the confirmation of inequality as an expression of diversity, so present in all his work. In this sense, Sen (1995: 150) uses the term "internal plurality" to refer to issues that hinder the demarcation of equality: a) The heterogeneity of space in terms of how we define equality; b) The different ways in which we can measure distances and compare inequalities in the distribution of a variable. This diversity and social inequality is reflected on the Internet. Because the Internet accommodates social diversity, but paradoxically diversity is expressed in aggregates of individuals. Users give information about their lives, say, communicate, but they do not interrelate to develop and discuss an argument. Twitter is an emblematic case in this regard, users can participate with eloquent and funny phrases, but in reality they do not cease to be atomized expositions of opinions among Internet users without these contributions being interrelated in a reasoned way, because Twitter does not arrive at the argument of ideas.

Entering another aspect, as for Foucault, it places the power relations in contexts marked by inequalities in the relations of one another, marked by legal or traditional differences, status and privileges, economic differences, among many others, these differences make it possible for some individuals can act on others in order to maintain their privileges, accumulate profits, exercise a function or trade (Foucault, 1988.17). In this sense, rationality for Foucault is an effective instrument at the service of these power relations, but rationality is also expressed in practices of resistance to imposed power. This implies rationality linked to the freedom that invites the transformation or creative change of the subject. In the Internet field, the power relations are much more diluted, the power is imposed by the social agent, the institution or the media that have the greatest impact on the information that it emits according to its number of followers. This includes digital newspapers, political party leaders and, in general, leaders of any field and ideology. It is true that on the Internet we can all be, at any given time, transmitters of information, because we have instruments to participate in the network such as YouTube, tweets, blogs, etc. In this sense, the fundamentals that result from the arguments issued by instances of power, that is, the information issued by renowned media on

the Internet, can be counteracted by the critical attitude that the individual adopts against the imposed rationalities (Foucault, 1995: 7).This second rationality in Foucault is closely related to the practice of freedom. There is no antagonistic relationship between the exercises of power and freedom, but agony, of incitement, of provocation (Foucault, 2005). It is also linked to Castells' observation about freedom on the Internet. Freedom is possible because "as there is no global legislation, but there is a global communication network, the capacity for systematic and preventive control is diluted in practice" (Castells, 2003: 4). In addition, power is not only transmitted through greater recognition of information when it is issued by certain sources, there is also a sanctioning power on the Internet that occurs when its users can be repressed and monitored by the states (Castells, 2003), for example. This observation of Castells opens a whole controversy between security and freedom on the Internet.

The danger occurs when power prevails over knowledge, as Gómez de Ágreda says in his book (2019: 103) when he refers to the fact that there are realities that suggest that humans prefer power to the truth, and we justify it because we invest much more time and effort in trying to control the world than in understanding it. Foucault analyzes the power in neoliberal economic thought, and he observes that we live in a society with a multiplicity of forms of enterprise from the 1970s onwards. It is about achieving a society adjusted not to the merchandise and its conformity, but to the multiplicity and differentiation of the enterprises (Foucault, 2009: 161). This historical differentiation pointed out by Foucault is in coherence with two stages in the shaping of advertising in the 20th century, a first stage of mass advertising typical of the period that includes the 50th, 60th and 70th decades, mainly, compared to more diversified advertising, and which also responds to a more diversified production stage. Neoliberalism must ensure that individual interests, which converge with each other, do not constitute a danger to the interests of all (Foucault, 2009: 73-74). This implies a security problem for society, because the collective interest must be protected without reducing the individual interest. The functioning of the Internet shows the importance of this principle of preserving individual interests, and tries to make it compatible with the collective interest.

The Internet advertising companies have a wide margin of freedom to preserve their interests because they can make use of our data, although this may pose a danger to our collective freedoms. The use of personalized advertising is one more step in this direction; in this way the enterprises use the virtual space to influence users more effectively and efficiently for their interests. We run the risk that other organizations may also use the personalized advertising for less lawful purposes. This poses an even greater danger, if possible, to our freedom understood as capacity. Because if individual interests, or market interests, prevail, we have no secure guarantees to preserve our collective interests and this reduces opportunities for decision making. People need substantive opportunities to fully exercise their freedom, in the sense given by Amartya Sen to individual freedom.

On the other hand, the rationales that result from the relationships between knowledge and power are in a dynamic process of interaction with the context. The functioning of the Internet is also affected by this context, and it is transformed over time and events, just as power relations are transformed. In the field of advertising, the Internet opens the possibility for the consumer to interact by expressing their opinion on certain products or services, thus also expanding the areas of freedom for the user-consumer, ceasing to be a mere recipient of advertising. In this sense, as Pinto (1997) points out, in the relational marketing of virtual spaces there is a flow of communication in both directions between the advertiser and their receivers, while the advertiser can expand their strategies for adapting content advertising to the user.

Castells (2003, 6-7) does a historical balance of the Internet and refers to how in the beginning Internet designers, all of them from the academic world, deliberately sought the construction of an open computer network and without frontiers. In this sense, the origin of the Internet was based on a culture of freedom, very much in line with the proposal of rationality of the common good of Ostrom, favoring the free flow of information exchange between the academic communities. This changes when a new generation of entrepreneurs begins to use the Internet as a business, reaching its use in all areas of the economy and society. In this way, Castells continues, that

Rosario Carvajal Muñoz

although academic research invented the Internet, it was the enterprise that spread it to society three decades later. This business intrusion on the Internet has repercussions on its operating dynamics that affect our freedom. This commodified use of the Internet, as a clear expression of the criteria that mark the economic functioning, can be counteracted by an alternative economic model based on a useful social production. This would imply a new conception of rationality and freedom, developing ideas and organizational ways that stimulate the involvement of people to generate trust (González and Rodríguez, 2015: 295-297). Returning to Gómez de Ágreda (2019: 29), we are subjected to what is called a filter bubble (also called a bubble filter). Search engine algorithms present first of all the news that best fits our personal history. The guidelines that dominate the operation of the Internet distance it from what could be a common shared space, which recognizes diversity, and requires the active participation of citizens (Negrí and Hardt, 2004). For Laval and Dardot (2015a) the common should be articulated in a new political reason alternative to the neoliberal reason.

Gómez de Ágreda (2019) gives a general description on the functioning of Internet that demonstrates that we have access to the parceled information. This supposes a limitation of our perception of the reality. In what concerns here, this division of information minimizes the possibility of contrasting the information received. Athough the user can be participative in the network. As Muela-Molina (2008: 198) points out, Internet has radically changed the way of advertising, because consumers can take initiatives giving opinions about products and services, through a virtual dialogue with the company.

We could respond to this reality with procedure to put in practice the type of rationality by discussion which was proposed by Amartya Sen, with ethic and political implications. The rationality by discussion could apply on platform of Internet using debates. These would help to reflect on the truth contents of our opinions and arguments. But we need the collaboration of the political institutions to exercise this rationality, and the public participation of the citizen to be effective. In the political sphere, the Internet facilitates a greater participation of users to express their dissatisfaction with a certain political party. In this sense, Guevara et al (2011: 57-58) describe the use that was made of viral marketing in the electoral campaign in Mexico in 2007 using the means offered by the Internet, such as social networks, but mainly YouTube. This viral expansion of relational marketing in politics occurred at the initiative of citizens and political candidates of the National Action Party (PAN) against the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI).

For its part, Foucault sees the public rationality as a result of the link between power and knowledge. This leads the behavior of others by means of a government way. Overall, this rationality (or rationalities) describes a way to run the behavior of groups and individual, the community, the families, the soul, the sick's (Foucault, 1988:15). Foucault speaks of government; he refers to the political rationality of the governmentality of the neoliberalism (Foucault, 2008:58-59; 63-93). Currently, the rationalities, as a result of the power relationships, have been strengthened, even further, into the sphere of Internet. Principally, because the partial information, that arrives to the users, affects our perception of the world. It limits the possibility of the users to argue critically, about the partial information of the social networks. In this sense, Foucault (1984:267, 1994b) refers to other type of rationality that would have to be saved. He analyzed the relationship between subject and truth, and how the subject goes into a particular game of truth,but he also appealed to the critical posture of the individual as fundamental. This critical attitude is very important when we communicate on the web because of the limited spaces for the debates on Internet. In the field of advertising, the advertiser may have difficulty recognizing that consumers have alternatives when searching for information on similar products online (Muela-Molina, 2008: 187) Faced with this reality, the advertiser has to adapt by applying new advertising strategies different from the conventional one, imposing the particular interests of market society.

As detailed bellow, this text considers the limitations of Internet for our liberties. It provides some ideas about what an organization focused on the common could signify, following the proposal of Ostrom (2000), and for a functioning more democratic of Internet. The following section reflects as well, critically, on the basis of notions of liberty from Sen and Foucault.

LIBERTY, INTERNET AND COMMON SPACE

Freedom for Sen and Foucault is linked to a social and political context, considered of vital importance to enhance the practice of people's freedom. According to Foucault (1994b: 57) "the other is indispensable in the active life of the individual, so that the form that defines this practice effectively reaches its object, that is, the self."

The relevance of the political context is also made clear by Sen (1999b, 2006), stressing that democracy is the best system of government, provided that the necessary means are guaranteed so that individuals have the possibility of choice. The term capacity refers to a context that offers substantive opportunities, thanks to which individuals can choose to be and do what they consider of interest to their lives (Sen and Scanlon, 2004; Sen 2004,2000, 2003, 2010). This approach to capacity, transferred to the Internet, would suppose, above all, that network users have substantive opportunities to make better decisions, in order to achieve the objectives they consider valuable for their lives. The Internet, in this sense, becomes an instrument at the service of citizens, facilitating, for example, the procedures that users have to do with public and private institutions. From this perspective, the Internet is a positive instrument for citizens. Internet forums and blogs are also digital media that guide users in their decision making. Although it remains to be analyzed if in fact the information they offer fulfills this instrumental function that contributes to expanding these citizens' freedoms, from the perspective of Sen's capacity. But these freedoms on the Internet can also be reduced by misleading advertising, a form of illicit advertising that has taken on a special role in recent years (Muela-Molina, 2018: 4).

In this approach to capacity, as a space for freedom, Sen (2004) mainly highlights the interconnection between rationality and freedom, because rationality makes freedom possible, in the same way, freedom helps sustain rationality. Since without freedom, the idea of rational choice would be quite empty, and because, in addition, the concept of rationality must accommodate the diversity of reasons that can significantly motivate the election (Sen, 2004: 5). Returning to the previous example, the prevailing formal rationality against illicit advertising falls on the legal system, issuing judgments on advertisements harmful to consumers. But commercial law, following Muela-Molina and Agante (2019), is not familiar with advertising as the self-regulatory associations or bodies that deal only with this matter may be. Furthermore, these self-regulatory organizations (eg consumer associations) defend consumer rights more quickly, cheaply and efficiently. It is emphasized that without truthful information the user cannot make rational decisions, while the dishonest advertiser exercises his power on the network by imposing his particular interests on the collectives. In addition, If we reflect on these interrelationships between rationality and freedom in our highly technical societies, in which we have an excess of information until we reach saturation (and even with false news), then, it may not be so clear that the democracy we live in guarantee these spaces of freedom so necessary for the freedom and rationality of individuals. In this context, sometimes we have the impression that the superfluous is put before the important.

For Foucault (1988: 16), power relations allow a permanent relationship with freedom, a relationship that is not of antagonism, but of agonizing relationship with power:"At the very heart of power relations and "provoking it "constantly, is the stubbornness of freedom and the intransitivity of freedom. rather than talking about an essential antagonism, it would be preferable to talk about an -agonism - of a relationship that is both reciprocal and fighting incitement." (Foucault, 1988:16)Sen also recognizes these relationships between freedom and power when he says that "the lack of scrutiny, reflection or reasoning has led to the persistence of situations of exploitation of women throughout history" (Sen, 2000: 16). In another place, he emphasizes that "anyone who is immersed in the theory of choice can only be aware that the first task to be undertaken is to identify the limits within which one chooses." (Sen, 2001: 330). For this reason it is also important, both in the advertising and political spheres, that consumers and users exercise their right to refute, opine and contrast the information they receive on Internet.

These contextual limitations to freedom must be actively counteracted through social mobilizations, and in this both authors agree. For continuing with Sen, in one of his works he points out that "the role of activists is important, for contributing to criticism, including the

same anti-globalization protest (which is perhaps the largest globalized movement in the world today)" (Sen and Scanlon, 2004: 11). Castells (2003,6) emphasizes, in this same line, that ultimately it is in the consciousness of citizens and in the capacity of influence of the institutions of society, through the media and the Internet itself, in where the balance lies between the network in freedom and freedom in the network. This attitude of resistance is recognized by the French author as a confrontation of the subject with power relations, which has ethical and political implications, as can be seen from his words:

> This attitude, which is ethical but at the same time political, does not consist in simply saying I protest, but in making this attitude a political phenomenon that is as primordial or basic as possible, one in which those who govern, here and there, they will be obliged, sooner or later, to take it into account. (Foucault, 1984: 377).

Continuing with Amartya Sen, and along the same lines, it should be stressed that spaces of freedom are insufficient if they do not have the active participation of individuals. The fact that the context offers opportunities does not avoid individual responsibility, as a prominent component of living freely (Sen 1999, 2000, 2005). Rationality requires the availability of people to go beyond the limits of their specific interests. For this, access to information, the opportunity to listen to diverse points of view, to expose oneself to open to public discussion and debates must be guaranteed (Sen and Scanlon, 2004; 9). This critical position of the individual would contribute to improve the functioning of our democracy.

But the liberty on Internet is restricted because there is always a menace to our security. We are in risk with the possibility that a hacker disturbs our security, either stealing identity, our secret code, or inserting a virus into our software (Gómez de Ágreda, 2019). The experts recommend being prudent before we download whatever application, reflecting on advantages and disadvantages in opening an account of social network on the Internet.

These realities lead to us to reflect on the spaces of liberty on Internet. It is here where Martinez and Rodríguez (2016:117) wonder: What role can new technology perform? Specifically Internet, and what power does Internet have for the diffusion of different opinions, ideas, knowledge?

Naturally, the functioning of Internet seems to settle in around commercial interest, how it was said before, this make difficult to open a possibility for a space of the common, like sharing knowledge and mutual help. This functioning of Internet limits our liberties in a wide sense of the liberty word.

In advance, there are two different perspectives to understand the meaning of liberty: positive and negative liberty (Berlin, 2004). The negative liberty indicates absence of interference from others, and the positive liberty refers to the question: How am I governed? Whether I am governed by others, or by myself (Berlin, 2004:365). Carter (2010:17) says that negative liberty refers the person is not to be limited by the interference of other individuals and groups. However, the positive liberty is determined by internal factors, which gets to the point to individuals and groups can perform in an autonomous way.

This two different meaning of liberty are being interfered when we surf the Internet. We suffer the interference from others, large part, each time that we receive personalized advertising, and when it is only left to our scope certain related opinions to we are already thinking on social networks. The restrictions of information limit our positive liberty, the possibility of getting contrasted information to let us to think properly on the facts.

It could be said, in broad terms, that the question of the negative liberty is fully available by the businesses. Because the firms are assisted by the law, that eliminate obstacles getting our information. For example, at first, when we log into an application, this ask us if we cede our data, forcing us to accept it, if we want to enjoy the use of the application. This fact increases the negative liberty of the business, but not ours. In the field of Internet advertising, advertisers have a variety of instruments (blogs, social networks, YouTube, etc.) to broadcast their ads, in addition to detailed user information. In this sense, companies and other advertisers have

multiple opportunities, following the meaning of positive freedom of Amartya Sen, to exercise their freedom in decision-making for the benefit of their particular interests. This refers again to Foucault's reference to neoliberalism, referring to the difficult management between private and collective interests in a market society. What's more, even it is the fact that the operation of the Internet forces us to accept cookies in order to move around the network. This implies for companies and other advertisers an increase in negative freedom, because obstacles are removed for them to spread their advertising through different areas of the network, with legal backing, with hardly any restrictions.

On the other hand, to create spaces of the common on Internet would suppose a fundamental improvement for the extension of our liberties, as much in positive liberty as negative liberty. The spaces of the common would eliminate interferences for the acquisition of knowledge by the user of Internet which it is good for our liberty. And also, the spaces of the common would guarantee a more detailed and contrasted information nearer to the users and this is an increase of positive liberty. In this way, the user can make better decisions, and to lead our lives in the best way. In this line, it is important to highlight the contribution of some social researchers on the usefulness of communication for development and social change, promoting initiatives for social innovation, for example, which would enrich the capabilities approach as freedom as it is undestand by Sen (Lerner, 1958, Rogers, 1982, Scharamm, 1964, cited by Jacobson, 2016: 790). The work of Jacobson (2016) argues that the capabilities approach should be employed as an overarching framework for studios of Communication for Development and Social Change –CDSC-. This social value assigned to communication would reinforce the space paradigm of the common initially introduced by Ostrom, with all that it implies to improve the democratic functioning.

Empujando juntos is an example of the space of the common on Internet. It is a computer application that works with a free software license. The creators of this application participated in a workshop where they worked using technology to improve our democracy. It was organized by the cultural center Medialab-Pardo in Madrid in 2016. In the same line, Ahora Común is other example of the political of the common. It was created by the initiative of the citizenship in 2015. In this common space there are people with different political ideologies, but with the same goal: Making policy in a different way.

The ecosystem of the commons is represented by spaces of resistance that want to build reality from a new paradigm. This approach also favors the ability to work by debating, to promote rationality by discussion proposed by Sen. Also the paradigm of the common, as a social and economic organization of cooperation and solidarity, favors individual freedom. Understanding this freedom as a capacity (Sen, 1997: 86-87), that is, "as an aspect of freedom that occurs when there are substantive opportunities", and this opportunities refer to positive freedom according to Sen.

In its substantive aspects, capacity deals with the possibilities that people have in order to choice what they want to do and to be in their lives, in specific contexts (Sen, 2010: 51). This also applies to the Internet space, whose functioning, structured in a way that selects the information that comes to us, limits our choice of options, and therefore our capacity (freedom).

Foucault, on the other hand, speaks of a relative freedom, which is directly related to the moral rationality that is exercised in the conduction of oneself (Ramírez Zuloaga, 2015: 137). Foucault (1994b: 34-35) refers, in this particular, to caring for oneself, which implies for him: "the basic principle of any rational behavior, of any form of active life that aspires to be governed by the principle of moral rationality". This links with important issues in his work, which has to do with the subjectivation of the self, with the care and concern of oneself, and with the use of this practice of freedom for the creative remodeling of the subject (Foucault, 1988, 1994a, 1994b, 2011). This critical position of the individual is also of vital importance against personalized advertising, illicit advertising or viral marketing on the Internet.

The critical disposition of the subject, practicing his liberty, is, at the same time, a questioning of oneself, and the world around of oneself. In addition, this critical disposition is of a vital importance when we surf on Internet, because cyberspace carries us to an inertia when we are browsing into the social networks, without realizing.

Conclusions and implications

In short, the Internet could function as an open space with free access, with active participation of citizens. However, economic interests are imposed in its dynamics of its functioning. The functioning of the Internet is in the hands of shareholders of social networks and companies that benefit from the information they obtain from all of us. This reality limits our possibility for public debates. On the other hand, a common space, as the name suggests, would eliminate the privatization of Internet use, for the benefit of a few. The common goods on the Internet would foster dynamic communication processes of rationality by discussion; following Sen. Because a common space would mean using the Internet in solidarity, for the benefit of all all the participants. This opens a whole debate on the use made of advertising on the Internet, and in this sense it is important to resume Foucault's observation about the neoliberal market society that he observed in the early 1970s, producer of freedom to preserve individual interests as a guarantee of economic functioning, and in a game that is not always easy in the face of the danger of weakening collective interests.

We would guarantee our freedoms If we could enjoy more common spaces on the Internet, both in positive freedom and in negative freedom. In two directions: freedom as a capability, following Amartya Sen, and creative freedom as a critical position of the individual, following Michel Foucault. Likewise, the common space favors public debate, and therefore makes possible the rationality by discussion (Amartya Sen), while making it easier for individuals to be more critical also with the world around them.

In general, we tend to minimize the dangers of the Internet. It is true that the Internet is a useful instrument that facilitates life, for example, in our procedures with the administration. It is extremely useful to find information of all kinds, and as a means of learning in the most diverse topics, the Internet also allows you to use tools such as email and WhatsApp that bring us closer together. In this sense, the Internet expands our substantive opportunities for us to achieve our objectives, somehow, it expands our capacity, using the term Amartya Sen. Internet brings us closer to information and our family and friends. But at the same time that the Internet expands the windows to the world, accommodating diversity, it also introduces elements of differentiation and danger marked by the unequal positions of users on the network. The instances of power mark their passage because they know us better than ourselves: political parties, prestigious institutions, companies.

In addition, the complication is exacerbated by the fact that diversity and inequality combine on Internet showing an atomized organization in subgroups of individuals. This individualization, as atomization of opinions, makes it difficult for users to produce an exchange of opinions that leads to a reasoned argument of ideas.

The functioning of Internet makes it difficult to organize the common good, for instances, on fundamental themes of political decision issues. From this perspective, the values that prevail on the Internet are more related to the commercial, and entertainment. Social networks link our profiles to other users with ideas similar to ours. At the political level, some studies suggest that they condition the political information that they issue to the user according to the social profile. This reality is really worrisome, and it encourages us to consider that you have to be alert, that you have to make proposals and publicly express these dangers of the Internet.

REFERENCES

AZNAR, Hugo (2000): Publicidad y ética: la vía de la autorregulación. Revista Latina de Comunicación Social, 25. Recuperado el 7 de abril de 2020 de: http://www.revistalatinacs.org/aa2000yen/148hugoaznar.html

BERLIN, I. (2004), Sobre la libertad. Madrid: Alianza.

CARTER, I. (2010), «Libertad negativa y positiva». Astrolabio. Revista Internacional de Filosofía, n. 10, pp. 15-35.

CASTELLS, Manuel, (2003). "Internet, libertad y sociedad: una perspectiva analítica". Polis. Revista Latinoamericana. 4, 1-20.

DUTTON, William H., REISDORF, Blanca, BLANK, Grant, DUBOIS, Elizabeth and FERNÁNDEZ, Laleah (2019). The Internet and Access to Information about Politics. In Society and Internet. How Networks of Information and Communication are changing our Lives, by Mark Graham and William H. Dutton (ed.). Oxford. University Press.

FOUCAULT Michel (1984). "From Space, Knowedge and Power to Politics y Ethics: an interview". In Foucault Reader. (Ed.) Rabinow Paul., 239-380. New York: Pantheon Books.

—, (1988). "El sujeto y el poder", Revista Mexicana de Sociología, 50(3), pp.3-20.

—, (1994a). "La ética del cuidado de sí como práctica de la libertad". Dits et écrits (1954-1988). Paris: Gallimard.

—, (1994b). Hermenéutica del sujeto. Madrid: La Piqueta.

—, (1995). La verdad y las formas jurídicas. Barcelona. Editorial Gedisa

—, (2005). Historia de la Sexualidad. Vol. I. La voluntad de saber. Siglo XXI editores. Madrid.

—, (2008). Seguridad, territorio, población. Curso del Collage de France (1977-1978). Madrid: Akal.

—, (2009). Nacimiento de la biopolítica. Curso del Collège de France (1978- 1979). Madrid: Akal Universitaria.

GÓMEZ DE ÁGREDA, Á. (2019). Mundo Orwell. Manual de supervivencia para un mundo hiperconectado. Ariel. Barcelona.

GONZÁLEZ PASCUAL, A. y RODRÍGUEZ PRIETO, R. (2015). Caos Digital y medios comunes. Madrid: Dykinson.

GUEVARA, Melitón, SIXTO, José, TÚÑEZ, Miguel (2011). Redes Sociales y marketing viral: repercusión e incidencias en la construcción de la Agenda Mediática". Palabra Clave, 14, (1), 53-65.

JACOBSON, Thomas L., (2016). Amartya Sen`s Capabilities Approach and Communication for Development and Social Change. Journal of Communication 66, pp. 789-810.

MARTÍNEZ CABEZUELO, Fernando, y RODRÍGUEZ PRIETO, Rafael (2016). Poder e Internet. Madrid. Catedra.

NEGRÍ , a. y HARDT, M. (2004). Multitud. Barcelona. De Bolsillo.

LAVAL, Christian and DARDOT, Pierre (2015). Común. Ensayo sobre la revolución en el siglo XXI. Barcelona: Gedisa.

LERNER, D. (1958). The passing of traditional society. New York, NY:MacMillan.

MUELA MOLINA, Clara (2008). La publicidad en Internet: situación actual y tendencias en la comunicación con el consumidor. ZER. Revista de Estudios de Comunicación. 13(24), 183-201.

—, (2018). Nuevas aproximaciones al estudio de la publicidad engañosa. Methaodos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 6(1), 4-5.

MUELA MOLINA, Clara y AGANTE, Luisa, (2019). Autorregulación publicitaria. La protección del consumidor frente a la comunicación comercial. Revista Mediterránea de Comunicación, 10(2), 103-104.

OSTROM, E. (2000). El gobierno de los bienes Comunes. La evolución de las instituciones de acción colectiva. Fondo de Cultura Económica: México.

PINTO, S.K. (1997). Marketing de relación o la transformación de la función de marketing. Harvard Deusto Business Review, 79, 32-40.

RAMIREZ ZULOAGA, Luis Antonio (2015). El sujeto en los juegos del poder: subjetivación y desubjetivación desde Foucault. Revista de Psicología Universidad de Antioquia, 7(2), pp. 133-146.

Rosario Carvajal Muñoz

Rogers, E. (1962). The diffusion of innovations. New York:The Free Press of Glencoe.

Sen, Amartya (2010). La idea de justicia. Madrid: Taurus.

—, (2006). "Democracy isn´t Western". The Wall Street Journal, 124 March. WEB: http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB114317114522207183

—, (2005). "Why exactly is commitment important for rationality? Economics and Philosophy, núm. 21, pp. 5-13.

Sen, Amartya and Scanlon, Thomas (2004). "What´s the point of Democracy?" Bolleting of the American Academy, pp. 8-11. Available in: https://www.amacad.org/publications/bulletin/spring2004/sen.pdf

Sen, Amartya (2004). Rationality and freedom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

—, (2003). "Democracy and its Global Roots". The new Republic, vol. 229, n. 14, pp. 28-35.

—, (2000). "La razón antes que la identidad". Letras libres, núm. 23, pp. 12-18.

—, (2001). Democracy and Social Justice. Pp. 7-24. Democracy, Market, Economicsa and Development. An Asian Perspective. Farrukh Iqbal and Jong-IIYou editors. WEB: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/542051468748763203/pdf/multi0page.pdf

—, (1999a). "The Possibility of Social Choice". American Economic Review, 89, July 1999. pp. 349-378

—, (1999b). La libertad del individuo como compromiso social. Quito Ecuador. Ediciones Abuy-Yala.

—, (1997). Bienestar, justicia y mercado. Madrid: Paidós.

—, (1995). Nuevo examen de la desigualdad. Madrid: Alianza.

—, (1993). "Positional Objectivity". Philosophy and Public Affairs, vol. 22, núm. 2, pp. 126-145.

—, (1979). "Equality of what?" The Tanner Lecture on Human Values. Stanford University, 150-220

Sen, Amartya y Dréze, Jean (2002). India: Development and participation. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Schramm, Wilbur (1964). Mass media and national development: The role of information in the developing countries. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Zelcer, Mariano (2019). Publicidad en la Web: de la lógica de los medios masivos a los anuncios personalizados. DeSignis: Publicación de la Federación Latinoamericana de Semiótica FELS9, n. 30, 123-132.