

THE INTERNET: INSTRUMENT OF SOCIALIZATION AND PROMOTION OF THE DECISIONAL AUTONOMY

Riva Sobrado de Freitas¹
Daniela Zilio²

1 INTRODUCTION

The study has as main theme the internet analyses, verifying if this tool can serve as instrument to promote the decisional autonomy, and as a mean of socialization, despite of much talking about the social isolation that can happen because of its use.

The reason for this schedule is focused in first plan in the actuality of the theme. The internet is, surely, an essential tool nowadays, but the consequences (positives or negatives) of its use still generates polemics. Of its part, the decisional autonomy, considered from the socialized individual, is an innovating subject and that deserves attention. The connection of both themes takes to an extremely important reflection and, therefore, necessary.

The study's problem is in the following questioning: can the internet serve as instrument of socialization and as a mean of promoting the decisional autonomy?

It aims, in general, to investigate the possibility that the internet serves not as a mean of isolation, but of sociability, through the development of decisional autonomy, guided by the right to information. Specifically, to study the autonomy; the point of view according to which the internet can take to social isolation; and, afterward, make the counterpoint, investigating the internet while mean of socialization and achievement of autonomy. So, it has as focus to consider, in the present paper, the relation between internet and the sociability, and at the same time, that as a support tool to the construction of autonomy of each individual, according as enhances its power of decidability. As well, as a corollary, the right to freedom of speech deserves to be considered and investigated, always with parsimony, then it's known that, in no way the internet is, or can be, a "nobody's land", without punishment to the excesses committed.

Therefore, the study will be systematized so that, at first it will be realized the explanation of the autonomy, freedom, and freedom of speech concepts, entering specifically, in a new way of approaching the theme named autonomy, embodied in the decisional autonomy definition. In a second time, it will be verified the internet as tool that takes to social isolation. Finally, it will be made the comparison, considering the internet while a way of socialization and a mean to encourage the development of autonomy.

Highlights as main theoretical reference used to get on the pointed questioning answer, the ideology from the sociologist Manuel Castells.

Lastly, relative to the methodology aspect, the research is based on technical, rational and systematic procedures, with the purpose of scientific basis, providing logical elements to the investigation. It is, finally, about a bibliographical exploratory-explanatory, qualitative collection search, using the deductive method, and so that it aims to explore and describe the theme, ex-

¹ rivafreit@ig.com.br

² danielazilio@yahoo.com.br

posing the possible solutions to the presented confrontation, without, however, running out the theme.

2 THE AUTONOMY, THE FREEDOM AND THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH

At first, it's necessary to mention that, considered by the most critical points of view, the autonomy is not a concept of a unique meaning, neither has the ambition to be, neither in philosophy, nor in law and, nor in the common sense opinion.

About this, its comprehension was always searched, from the most ancient times, to the actuality, either it is treated by the own nomenclature of autonomy, or if it is named as freedom (analyzing both as synonyms, or searching some possible difference between the terms).³

With effect, etymologically, as retracts in Rodrigues Junior (2004), the expression autonomy, present in dictionaries since 1836, results from the conjunction of two Greek words, which are: *autós* and *nomói*. From the first it comes the self-idea, representing a quality or condition inherent and peculiar to a person. The second would correspond to the standard or rule. The union of both generated autonomy, that entered the vernacular probably by influence of the French word *autonomie*. Now Beauchamp and Childress (2013) explicit that the word was used in first plan to the reference as self-management and self-government of independent Greek city-states. Since then, it was extended to individuals and won different meanings, as the right of freedom and privacy, individual choice, freedom of will, engine of the own behavior, and belong to oneself.

From its part, the idea of freedom emerged from the revolutionary movements of XVIII century. This way, Bauman (2014) exposes that the freedom, as the ability of self-government, before "to be left alone" by the government, was a dream of the revolutionary movements that guided the Occidental world in modern history. So, the French Revolution (1789), had the intention to transform the "Third State" (the most part of the population, from whom it was denied the real influence through the execution of national topics) in a strength of free decision for all the public interest questions. In the same way, the American Revolution founders searched in their Declaration of Independence the guarantee of a space in that the freedom could appear (freedom understood as full right and universal participation in public topics).

So, it can be noticed that the wish behind a freedom that runs through the right of not being bored by the public topics, being, because, an unlimited right and exercised to manage them, it's not new, it has followed the modern societies since the beginning. The freedom, even, can be conceived as the flag raised by liberalism,⁴ as the man's supreme good, according to Wolkmer (1995).

Relative to the freedom of speech, right indeed famed when talking about internet, lists Chequer (2011) that, it has constitutional provision in Brazil since the Constitution of the Empire of 1824. In the Magna Letter of 1988, it is expressly provided in many devices: article 5th, items IV, IX, XIV and article 220th, § 1st. The same way, found prevision in international documents, like:

³ Clarifying that the present search works with the philosophical slope according which the freedom and the autonomy aren't divergent terms, but that they complement each other, being the autonomy, nothing else, than the expression of freedom.

⁴ According to Wolkmer (1995), the liberalism emerged as new global view of the world, formed for values, beliefs, and interests of bourgeoisie, social class emergent, in objection facing the dominance of aristocratic feudalism land, between the centuries XVII and XVIII, in Europe. According exposed by the author, this ideology converts to expression of an individualist ethic that turns to the idea of freedom that it is found in all the reality angles (philosophic, social, economic, politic, religious, and some more).

the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the European Convention on Human Rights; and the American Convention on Human Rights. Besides, in several countries it is consecrated.

The same way, the freedom esplanade can be glimpsed as the clearance to expression of judgments, critical and opinions, about staves in dispute, beyond facts, ideas and what more that can be looked and demonstrated in public and for the public, in the understanding of Clève and Lorenzetto (2016). It is noticed, consequently, its importance.

In this pathway, and finally, done this brief analysis about the concepts linked to autonomy: “freedom” because expression of autonomy, and “freedom of speech” because term that demand analyses when searching to treat about internet, it is timely the explanation of the innovative concept called “decisional autonomy”, so that, after, outfit of enough information, it can be analyzed with the idea of internet.

3 THE DECISIONAL AUTONOMY: THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY SCALED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF PERSONAL IDENTITY

The decisional autonomy represents an innovative way of analyses relative to the theme, and it embodies in autonomy that give weapons to the construction of personal identity of each individual, as it makes possible the externalization of personal desires when making important decisions of personal nature (that’s why it’s also known as decisional privacy), and contributes to the person’s empowerment about oneself, about the own body, and about the own decisions. Including, Jean L. Cohen (2012) conceives that such autonomy involves what it’s named as “privacy zone”. For her, still, this is an area of real conflicts and in which it’s contested the own principal of an individual right to privacy.

So, to understand the decisional autonomy, it’s necessary to understand the right that serves as foundation to it, which is, the “right to personal privacy”. This right has two important dimensions, according Cohen (2012).

The first of this dimensions doesn’t seem to bring big contestations. It consists in the right of being “left alone”, that is the right of not suffering interruption or supervision unless exists, at least, a fair reason. Related to this dimension, Freitas and Pezzella (2013) relate that it isn’t about the recognition of another individual right, in liberal terms, but about the protection of the person’s privacy, that exactly makes it unique and identifies it between all the others.

The second dimension, this really is, more polemic, it takes care of the “decisional privacy”, as appoint Freitas and Pezzella (2013). It is the right of not being submitted to the improper control, in an inclusive way relative to possible regulations by other people, as ponders Cohen (2012). It can be compared to privacy saw in Stacy (1991-1992), while right to make decisions that change (and only affect) the individual’s life in question.

So, the first dimension refers to the possession and dissemination of information, and the second, mainly to the decisional autonomy related to private aspects of each individual, covering even the intimate availability, according Cohen (2012).

The last dimension, then, reveals the decisional autonomy that aims to be considered. And it is in relation to her that the censures are weaved with more acidity.

By the way, the critical related to decisional autonomy almost ever bring the question about the possible excessive individualism, or about not concerning with the social, the collective, emanated from the fight for preserving the own rights of freedom.

In other words, as reveal Freitas and Pezzella (2013), considering the second dimension presented, the main critical related to individual rights in general, and specifically in relation to the rights of privacy, refer to the liberal model society/State, that, in supposition, would gain strength by the tutelage of privacy, while “decisional autonomy”.

It doesn't seem to be the case. By the way, Cohen (2012) wisely opposes to opinions that believe to be the deliberations guided in the autonomy of decision like deliberations that take into consideration a collection of separated individuals, isolated. Reports that the fundamental that individual rights of privacy, which protect the decisional autonomy, are compatible with the recognition of intersubjective character belonging to the processes of personal identity formation, and awareness of the historical and contextual sources of values.

So, according Freitas and Pezzella (2013), the right to privacy needs to be retaken from a different prism, especially in its dimension of decisional autonomy. According the authors, it denotes the individual as the heart of his own process of decision and it doesn't determine, therefore, an ethical or ideological choice to be followed, but just a ball of self-determination in which each person can and must perform the own real identity. The individual choices can be made by the own reasons, as means Cohen (2012) and, even, it doesn't exist the necessity that they be justified to the others.

In this way, the rights to personal privacy⁵ ensure areas of decisional autonomy to all the individuals, not generating a voluntary conception of the individual, in no way. So, when the question about autonomy appears in Courts decisions, it doesn't have to impose to them a voluntary idea of person. The attribution of decisional autonomy to an individual is simply contrary to the state paternalism.

Freitas and Pezzella (2013) also comment the recurrent critical related to the perception that the decisional autonomy, when protects the self-determination, would encourage the individual his rootlessness, making, afterward, that he breaks the communal values, breaking the solidarity bonds which surround him.

Surely, to the authors, the collectivity idealized as sum of people in which each one defends nothing else than the own interest, translates into denying the possibility of existing a social whole, and if so, the only possible identity between its members, as they explain, would be own a vocation, that intends inherent to “human nature”.

What happens is that this isn't the case when talking about decisional autonomy, according Cohen (2012). Freitas and Pezzella (2013) also let this very clear. To the authors, it doesn't seem to be timely to subordinate the right to privacy, specifically in decisional dimension, the connotation of rootless individual, once that, the core protection of personal autonomy would be really searched for, in face of the, as defined by them, “community rules” that, in certain circu-

⁵ Jean L. Cohen, in the text “Repensando a privacidade: autonomia, identidade e a controvérsia sobre o aborto”, aims to define a new way of privacy, transcendent to what's Known, where exactly the decisional autonomy contributes to the construction of identity and consequent subject's personal dignity.

mstances, could be abusive relating to personal decisional autonomy, and, the same way, in face of the own will of the majority, a lot of times disrespectful in relation to diversity.

So, the rights to privacy ensure, according Cohen (2012), to all people, pre-conditions so that they develop composed identities that can test as theirs. Other way, for ensuring everybody, in the same way, legal personality and decisional autonomy, these rights protect the demand of each concrete individual, no mattering if he is “different” of others. It also protects the individual’s personal dimensions of life in face of undue interference, and enshrine the processes of self-development and auto-realization involved in the identity formation.

Despite nothing, the decisional autonomy practice esplanade presupposes the right to information. Explaining: to be possible for the subject to do the choices based on his decisional autonomy, he must be well informed about the paths to be covered, as well of the consequences when making a decision.

This way is the understanding of Beauchamp and Childress (2013), who clarify that the respect to the autonomy agent implies the recognition of your right of having opinions, making choices and act grounded in personal beliefs. The respect esplanade involves an action, and requires, as well, more than obligations of not interfering on personal decisions, since it includes obligations to sustain the people’s abilities of choosing autonomously, decreasing the fears and other questions that can disfavor the autonomy exercise. This implies in enabling the people so that they act autonomously, informing them, afterward, and it is opposed to disrespect, that involve attitudes and actions that ignore, insult, or degrade the others’ autonomy and, afterward, deny the existence of a minimum equality between people.

Starting from, then, the autonomy through a positive perspective of freedom, it would not fit to the State interferes on decisions strictly personal of each individual, but it would fit, that yes, to inform and discipline the sensible using of personal autonomy, in favor of protecting the decisional privacy. In other words, the State cannot require that the people reveal the reasons to act in a domain in which they have the right to act for their own reasons, according Cohen (2012), but they have the obligation of information, so that the choices can be done with safety and responsibility.

Beauchamp and Childress (2013) clarify the necessity of information to the development of autonomy in a specific way related to the biomedical ethics, but it is worth it to bring here its weightings, by enriching, a lot, the discussion. For them, the autonomy establishes an autonomy right to control the own destiny. The authors consider, in a positive perspective of understanding the principal of respecting the autonomy, that exists an obligation, also positive, of respectful treatment in revealing information and consequent encouragement of decisional autonomy. So, a lot of autonomy actions demand help of other people, to make the options accessible. Especially in biomedical ethic, the respect with autonomy forces the professionals to clarify the information, as well verify and ensure the clarifying and the voluntariness, and encourage to make the right decision about the ideals and beliefs of each person.

In the same way and especially because it is relevant in strictly personal subjects, the decisional autonomy esplanade presupposes the control of each person over their own body, to save their personal dignity. Then, in decisional autonomy exercise, each individual deserves to take possession of the own body - seen this in a global and integrated way -, in face of opinions of the society, the community that they live, and even the own State, according as, if the individual

is the carrier of the right to decisional privacy, it doesn't fit to the State interfere in a such invasive way in their intimacy, but ensure conditions to the regulated autonomy right, acting, in this aspect, in a positive way.

Freitas and Pezzela (2013), by the way, show the reflexing question about decisional autonomy in relation to the right of the own body in the way of reintroducing this in the privacy theme. Not, obviously, in its dimension "individualist-possessive", as if the personal attributes, including the own body, were individual properties, or goods to be negotiated, but, as they exemplify, over the body's analysis as a self-territory. The same way, Freitas and Zilio (2016) mention the existence of a strong connection between the self-determination right over the own body, and the rights to personal privacy (in its dimension of decisional autonomy), and personal identity. Reaffirm that, respecting the personal privacy of a person is to respect the own right of self-determining, including corporally.

This way, including, it is worth mentioning the ever proper thought of Goffman (1971). According with the recorded understanding, the feeling of control over the own body is essential to a full perception of oneself, as well for the personal self-trust. Consistently, the control over the body is essential to the own identity's configuration, as it is for the preservation of personal dignity.

Therefore, it is clearly noticed that, the decisional autonomy pleaded, emanated as pillar of the right to privacy, aims to resize the dignity, building the personal dignity, through the discovery of the personal identity, and presuppose, so, the individual's control over himself, in global terms.

Moreover, it is noticed that such autonomy parts from the ideal of individual that makes his decisions consciously, however, acts as an individual rootless from the social, but as socialized agent who aims, despite this, the attendance of his interests in personal decisions. Since the moment that follows, furthermore, the study aims to realize an analysis of this socialization, questioning the relation between internet and the social isolation, and the possible construction of a pseudo-autonomy.

4 THE INTERNET AND THE SOCIAL ISOLATION:⁶ A "PSEUDO-AUTONOMY"?

At first, it is necessary to relate, as already lineated by Lévy (1996) that the virtual (here brought specifically in a computer way), can, really, have some affinity with the fake, with illusive and with the imaginary. Despite, this affinity is small, treating about the virtual, in detriment of this, in a way of being very fruitful, that has creation process, that build futures, and that open niches of meaning over the platitude of immediate physical presence.⁷

Saying this, it is necessary to list that the opinion that the internet does not make it easy the individual socialization, taking to a true social isolation, is extremely recurrent, and deserves consideration of the study. By the way, as ponder Lemos (2010), there is some tendency, in indi-

⁶ Another though critical related to the Internet's appearance refers to exclusion. Lévy (2000) relates the exclusion as a social implication that names cyberspace, mention that, the paradox of the universal communication information systems lives that they, consequently, can bring, in principal, an exclusion. However, for the author, this is not a reason to the people position themselves against the use of internet. Pierre Lévy mention, seems like a real critical, that, those who bring afloat, most times, the idea of exclusion and inequality, are not the real disadvantaged, but those who take the risk of losing a parcel of their power.

⁷ Lévy (1996) critics the affirmations that the virtually and reality are distinct balls, counterposed. The same way, Lévy (1999) questions, and critics, metaphorically, the question about the impact brought from the technology. In the author's point of view, the interpretation that the technology could be compared to a real bullet, and the society, or the culture, to a real living target, is inadequate.

viduals, to gleam the “adverse” effects, so to list, the technologies, in relation to the culture, politics, and, moreover, the social life.

This way, in the listed point of view, the internet in no way would promote the individuals’ emancipation process, but it would generate, surely, what in this study is named as “pseudo-autonomy”: the individual would act uniquely as “maneuver mass”, vehemently believing to be, really, autonomous.

Really, to recognize yourself as autonomous in time of a, as named by Bauman (2009), “liquid-modern society”, which the conditions in which act its members change in a shorter time break than the necessary for the consolidation of the ways to act, it seems to be a constantly challenge.

Certainly, nothing is pacific related to the interaction propitiated by the internet and its consequences. About the theme, the psychologist Dora Sampaio Góes, of the Internet Dependence Group from the Institute of Psychiatry of *Hospital das Clínicas*, University of *São Paulo* (USP), in interview to the *Globo Ciência*, in 2013, ponders that, yes, using too much technologies can bring riskiness to social life, according as it “disconnects” the people from the real world. To attain the quoted result, the professional mentions that not just the time wasted with electronics devices can be considered, but also the way as they are used, and the contexts.⁸

Second what is inferred from the opinion, the social isolation cases, possibly caused by the use of internet, pass through the individual’s compulsive behavior, that turns to be a real “addicted”.

However, to know until when the information received from the internet can influence the subjects, depriving them from own opinion in relation to certain subjects is an important point in the discussion.

It is known that not just the internet, but also all the media mass, can exercise, and, actually, they exercise, influence over the individuals. The media authority exercised in relation to the population gets to be ridiculous, but it is exactly there that, in the counterpoint of the question, aims to put the internet as a way to develop the subjects’ decisional autonomy: first because the autonomy defended here presupposes the right to information, as the well informed people don’t act while “maneuver mass”, but make their ethic choices according their values, built throughout their lives, and the internet can make easy, a lot, the access to information; second, because the autonomy pondered here doesn’t part from ideas of displaced people, rootless of the social, but socialized people, however that, about this, can bring their choices in detriment of “Community Standards”, that can be, and many times are, abusive about personal and particular choices, situated in the “intimacy zone”.

Considering, so, that the virtually socialized individual, can strengthen the social linkages emanated from “real life”, since the technological devices put in hand are used with parsimony.

Moreover, because provided of information and since socialized, the same individual can have in the internet a way of promoting the own autonomy. And, by the way, what it would aim to ponder from now.

⁸ The professional exposes that the technology can hold the people attention significantly, to the point, of, even, they disconnect themselves of what happen around them. This also must be considered, and not only the time factor.

5 THE INTERNET AS A WAY OF PROMOTING THE DECISIONAL AUTONOMY AND AS A MEAN OF SOCIALIZATION

It is evident the importance of somewhere else explicit in relation to the social isolation, but the opinions that consider the internet as a new way of social interaction, and, consequently, of socialization and as a way of building the autonomy grounded in the right to information, are every time more real and plausible.

About the relation between people's autonomy and internet, the conception of the sociologist Manuel Castells is timely. According Castells (2003), in one hand, when allowing to access all the information, the internet can increase the doubt, but, on the other side and at the same time, it is a key tool to the people's autonomy. More autonomous the individual is, more he uses the internet. The author reports that when a person has a strong project of autonomy, in any dimension, she uses the internet with much more frequency and intensity. And the use of internet reinforces, on the other hand, the autonomy of this person. With effect, the author ponders that more a person controls her life, less she attaches in the institutions.

It is clear and evident, as outlined opportunely, that the expression of decisional autonomy demands the right to information. The individual must, so, act his autonomy of decision since he is truly provided of the information that are reasonable to him, so that, really, he doesn't express what was named as "pseudo-autonomy", serving, moreover, of "maneuver mass", when considering himself autonomous, when, besides, just repeats what is convenient to the "elite", or, maybe, to the "majority".

Obviously, the overstatement in offering information⁹ in the internet can lead to a feeling of confusion. It is right, then, to do a filtering of what is brought so that the building of autonomy and the empowerment of decisions really happen.

As a corollary, it is considered, moreover, that the freedom of speech can be realized and instrumented through the internet. About such freedom, mention Versuti, Cunha e Cruz and Costa (2015) that, one of the instigator elements of the civilization expansion was the freedom of speech, to externalize the internal reflection. This way, the reflexive thought itself, dissociated from extern interferences, it is a mean of expressing the other freedoms, since the freedom to be expressed would be the base to the other humans' freedoms. For being an individual of articulate speech, the human can transcend the barriers of individuality and express himself freely.

With effect, according with what they put, with the communication and interaction, the individuals are able to save what they have already acquired, and develop themselves as elements part of the nature, converting themselves to the condition of intelligible beings, since the thought needs knowledge, and the knowledge walks side by side with the freedom. The authors relate that the human being noted that not just exist or live, but coexist and live together, in a way that need the other individuals to identify, build and develop himself.

The path from the isolation to the relationship, however, starts by the first medias, as the flow of thoughts and ideas is so indispensable to life in society, as the own physical freedom

⁹ Cebrián (1999), in this same pathway, it is questioned if the plenty of information makes the level of life better. To the author, sometimes it can mean confusion. The plenty of data, mainly when arrives to people in a messy and random way, can lead to a confused situation, and bring a real and powerful feeling of doubt.

is, according Versuti, Cunha e Cruz and Costa (2015). From what it looks like, the question about the relationship can be verified, primarily today, with the expansion of internet, - that intensifies, and a lot, this process.

Including, as ensure Clève and Lorenzetto (2016), today, the initial premise that guides the freedom of speech is that it hasn't got to talk about State interference in the subjects presented by the various medias. This makes that prevails, at first, beyond the idea of not having the State interference, the maximization of information freedom.

It is noticeable how much the notions about autonomy and, consequently, of freedom, and freedom of speech, over this point of view, can connect themselves with the notion of the internet idea, and the development of, how it is named by the sociologist Manuel Castells, "society in network,¹⁰" that is really fascinating and make it easy the development of humans' potentialities.

In this path, Castells (2003) reports that, the emergency of the internet as new media was connected to conflicting affirmations over the new standards of social interaction. In a vertex, the formation of virtual communities, guided in online communication, was interpreted as the culmination of a historical process of untying between places and sociability in the community formation, that is, new standards of social relation substitute the means of human interaction territorially limited. Sure that the social standards are distinct from those once. By the way, according already esplanade by Thompson (2011), the development of own media changed the space and temporal constitution of the social life, occasioning new ways of acting and interacting, that detach from the standard of being in a common place.¹¹

Then, about the sustention that the internet diffusion leads to a certain social isolation, as individuals without face practice an random sociability, leaving the interactions in real places, ponders Castells (2003) that, nowadays, the limitations are disappearing, and the people should be capable of evaluating the sociability standards coming from the use of internet, unless in developed societies, where exist an enormous diffusion. There is enough possibility of data and analyses to make safer the interpretations than the popular ones. However, apparently, the public debate is still subdued by simplistic and ideological dichotomies, that make more difficult the comprehension of the new social interaction standards.

About the version that the internet, mainly through the so widespread social networks, allows the existence of a place beyond virtual, unreal, where are built parallel realities, exposes Castells (2003) that the "role-playing" and the construction of another identity¹² as hold of online

¹⁰ About the society in network, Castells (2002a) specifies that there is a historical tendency that the functions and ruling in the information age to be each time more organized around the networks. These form the new social morphology of today's society and its logical diffusion changes substantially the operation and the results of the production process, and of experience, power and culture. The social organization in networks, as explains, existed in other times and spaces, but the innovative paradigm of information technology provides the material base to its penetrating expansion in all the social structure.

¹¹ Thompson (2011) questions that the development of the media beyond creating new ways of interaction, raises new ways of actions, that has very different characters and consequences. Explains that the most general characteristic is that they are responsive and oriented to actions or people that are situated in remote space contexts (and in remote temporal contexts), that is, the media development leaded to the appearance of new ways of acting far away, that, modernity, are every time more common. If in the oldest societies the actions and consequences were restrict to the contexts of face-to-face interaction, nowadays, it is not rare to see the people orientating their actions for others that do not share the same "temporal space" environment, and with consequences that transcend the limits of their contexts and localization.

¹² Castells (2002b) understands the identity as a source of meaning and experience of certain people. Related to the social actors, it is the building process of meaning based on a cultural attribute, or a group of them interrelated, that

interaction represent an almost insignificant portion of sociability based on internet. Since this kind of practice seems to be concentrated between teenagers. Including, there was a distortion, to the author, of public perception about the social practice of internet, showing it as preferential space to personal fantasies. Mostly, it doesn't show this, but the extension of real life, in all dimensions and over all modalities.

Repairing that, those who live parallel lives on screen are people limited by desires, pain and mortality of physic people that are behind. To Castells (2003), the role-playing is a valid social experience, however, in no way is a significant portion of social interaction of internet, nowadays. By the way, the author quotes that the internet users are more likely than non-users to get-together with friends and have a social life away from home. To him, if something can be told, is that the internet seems to have a positive effect over the social interaction, as it is more likely to increase the exposure to different means of information (that can make easier the decisional autonomy expression).

What can lead to an isolation (supposedly caused by internet), to the author, is an inexperience in the use of internet, and not the use itself. Such finding is based on serious scientific studies. Including, the sociologist relates that exists a constantly interaction between physical space and the internet.

Soon, Castells (2003) takes counter stance to the thesis that the use of internet leads to less interaction and more social isolation. What exist, to him, are evidences that in some circumstances, its power can serve as substitute to some social activities.

In the same line of reasoning, Castells (2003) proposes that the analytical step, necessary to the comprehension of the new ways of social interaction in the internet age, is having in mind a redefinition of community, in which it is given less emphasis to its cultural component, and more emphasis to its paper of supporting individuals and families, detaching its social existence of a unique kind of material support. The decisive point is the displacement of the community to the network with the central manner of organizing the interaction. At least in the tradition of sociology research, the communities guided themselves in sharing values and social organization. The networks, still, are organized by the choices and strategies of the social actors, who are individuals, families or social groups. So the big transformation of sociability in complex societies happened with the substitution of special communities for networks as fundamental ways of sociability. This in relation to the friendships, and, mainly, in relation to the family bonds, because the extensive family shrunk and the new media allowed keeping in touch with relatives afar.

Still, to the author, the individualism in network is a social standard, and not, as it may seem, an accumulation of isolated people. The individuals build their online and offline networks based on their interests, on their projects, on their values and on their similarities. Considering the flexibility and the internet communication power, the social online interaction plays a growing role in social organization as a whole, and the online networks can build virtual communities, that

prevail over other sources of meaning. Complements the author that to an individual, or to the collectivity, can exist multiple identities, and this plurality can generate tension and contradiction as in self-representation as in social action. This is necessary to distinguish the "identity" from what the sociologists commonly name as papers: papers are defined by rules established by institutions and social organizations; identities, by the way, are sources of meaning for the own actors, by them originated and established through an individuation process (the identities assume such condition since that the social actors internalize them, building its meaning grounded on this internalization).

are different from the physics, but not less intense or less effective in creating bonds and mobilization. Moreover, what can be observed on the societies is the development of a hybrid communication (physical place and cyberspace), to function as material support of individualism in network. So the internet brings a different way of communitarian organization, established through the virtual communities,¹³ that provides the sociability in a new model, established through the individualism in network.

Such concept connects to the question of the individual's decisional autonomy, not while autonomy of no intervention, on liberal mold, neither coming from communitarians' ideals, but while a real new way of approaching the theme, where the individual is socialized, sociable, belonging to the community where he is, but who exercises his autonomy, once he has the power of decision and has the right of expressing himself and taking the own life according to what he considers worthy for himself, despite from the values adopted by all.

See the relevance of placing the internet in this direction, that is, this really important tool serves as instrument to the human beings' expression while sociable individuals, but autonomous. Besides, the internet that we pretend to demonstrate here, is that which allows the sociability, but without losing the notion of individual (the own individualism in network, that does not fold that the people are isolated, but that they have individualities), of an individual who determines himself.

Moreover, the right to information is an assumption to the development of the real decisional autonomy, and, doubtless, the internet can serve as facilitator to the information access, helping, so, to build the power of decision, since that filtered out the excess offered.

Finally, it is evident that the internet "explosion" brought with itself polemic questions, and, in spite of being a recent event, the consequences of its advent have already permeated discussions for a long time. Rightly, it is not yet very clearly if the new ways of social interaction bring more detriments than benefits, but what looks right is that there was a break of paradigms, and the consequences of this break still need to be studied through the years.

6 CONCLUSION: FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Nowadays, more than in the past, the internet has been taking every day a more important space in people's life. In spite of a good portion of the population not having access to such tool (mainly talking about Brazil), in general it represents an important paper in individuals' life - its users.

It is right that there is, still, a lot to reflect over the questions emanated from the internet advent, and it was exactly because of this reason that the present study was built.

This way, the worry here was consisted in questioning if the internet can make easier the socialization, over a new way of social interaction, and also promote the individuals' decisional autonomy.

The sociability that was aspired to consider part of people's ideal who respect their own individualities, and the others' individualities, but that, despite this, join the idea of society and not of isolation. From this the idea of autonomy was pondered, based on the perception of the socialized individuals existence, but that respect their personal peculiarities and longings, and that,

¹³ Notice the dissemination of the named social networking.

having the right information, act according to their own values on decisions around their “intimacy zone”.

It is true that the use of internet, in specific circumstances, can bring riskiness to the development of people socialization, - further when the use happens in an uncontrolled way and even, compulsive. It is undeniable to consider that such effect can be caused, but seems to be the case to ponder how, the extent, and with what finality the internet is used. Either, it is not intended here to hypothesize that in no circumstances this tool can influence the individuals, but bring up that not just negative effects come from its use, but, otherwise, positive effects that, with effect, must take into account.

What can be considered with the approach, is that the internet, opposite from what the rule thinks, can serve as socialization mean, and not of isolation, according as, in general, the people, using internet tools, become more receptive to new sociability standards, and not necessarily are just in front of the computers’ screens isolated from the real world. That is, the internet serve as an easy way of connecting interpersonally that happen in “real life”, reflecting what they really are. Happen, with this, a different standard of social interaction. Then, maybe, all the polemic raised.

At the same time, the internet, over the information supply, can favor the autonomy expression in individuals. The real autonomous individual uses this media (internet) as supporter to his personal development, and not as a way that influences his decisions.

It is important to remember that the autonomy and consequently the freedom of speech can and must reach limits, including in the digital world, once in absolute the internet is what can be named as “nobody’s land”, where we can say and do what we want without having sanctions. An example of this can be concretize exploring the *Marco Civil* (Law # 12.965, from April 23rd, 2014).

With effect, can be highlighted that the internet world is not necessarily strange to the real world, and as pondered along the text, the life expressed in the internet, in most of the times, is reflection from the own real life, as in sociability as in autonomy expression, even because, both questions are complementary (notice the individual as socialized being, but having individuality and power of self-determination/autonomy).

Therefore, according to this understanding, the internet can base the individual while sociable being, but autonomous. Also, it can allow the sociability, but sit well the idea of individuality, of individual who precisely self-determine himself and aims realizing his intents, empowering himself of his decisions.

REFERENCES

BAUMAN, Z. *Liberdade*. Translation Silvana Perrella Brito. 1. ed. Santo André: Academia Cristã, 2014. Translated from: Freedom.

BAUMAN, Z. *Vida Líquida*. Translation Carlos Alberto Medeiros. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2009. Translated from: Liquid life.

BEAUCHAMP, T. L.; CHILDRESS, J. F. *Princípios de ética biomédica*. Translation Luciana Pudenzi. 3. ed. São Paulo: Loyola, 2013. Translated from: Principles of Biomedical Ethics.

CASTELLS, M. *A Era da Informação: economia, sociedade e cultura - a sociedade em rede*. vol. I. Translation Roneide Venancio Majer. 6. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002a. Translated from: The rise of the network society.

CASTELLS, M. *A Era da Informação: economia, sociedade e cultura - o poder da identidade*. vol II. Translation Klauss Brandini Gerhardt. 3. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002b. Translated from: The power of identity.

CASTELLS, M. *A galáxia da Internet: reflexões sobre a internet, os negócios e a sociedade*. Translation Maria Luiza X. de A. Borges. Technical review Paulo Vaz. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2003. Translation from: The internet galaxy: reflections on the internet, business and society.

CEBRIÁN, J. L. *A rede: como nossas vidas serão transformadas pelos novos meios de comunicação*. Translation Lauro Machado Coelho. São Paulo: Summus, 1999. Translated from: La red.

CHEQUER, C. *A liberdade de expressão como direito fundamental preferencial prima facie: (análise crítica e proposta de revisão do padrão jurisprudencial brasileiro)*. Rio de Janeiro: Lumen Juris, 2011.

CLÈVE, C. M.; LORENZETTO, B. M. Dimensões das liberdades de informação e de expressão: elementos do discurso público. *Espaço Jurídico Journal of Law*, Joaçaba, v. 17, n. 1, p. 83-98, 2016. Available from: <<http://editora.unoesc.edu.br/index.php/espacojuridico/article/view/9296/pdf>>. Access on: July 21 2016.

COHEN, J. L. Repensando a privacidade: autonomia, identidade e a controvérsia sobre o aborto. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política*. Brasília, DF, n. 7, p. 165-203, Apr. 2012.

FREITAS, R. S. de; PEZZELLA, M. C. C. As dificuldades da constitucionalização do direito ao corpo: liberdade de expressão e discriminação social. *Revista Brasileira de Direitos Fundamentais e Justiça*, Porto Alegre, a. 7, n. 24, p. 175-195, 2013. Available from: <http://www.dfj.inf.br/Arquivos/PDF_Livre/24_Doutrina_Nacional7_OK.pdf>. Access on: Oct. 26 2015.

FREITAS, R. S. de; PEZZELLA, M. C. C.; ZILIO, D. Os direitos da personalidade na busca pela dignidade de viver e de morrer: o direito à morte (digna) como corolário do direito à vida (digna). *Revista de Direitos e Garantias Fundamentais*, Vitória, v. 17, n. 1, p. 171-190, 2016. Available from: <<http://www.fdv.br/sisbib/index.php/direitosegarantias/article/view/733/281>>. Access on: May 23 2016.

GÓES, D. S. *Globo Ciência. Uso excessivo das tecnologias pode trazer sérios riscos à vida social*. São Paulo, Aug. 31, 2013. Available from: <<http://redeglobo.globo.com/globociencia/noticia/2013/08/uso-excessivo-das-tecnologias-pode-trazer-serios-riscos-vida-social.html>>. Access on: July 4 2016.

GOFFMAN, E. *Territories of the self. Relations in public*. New York: Harper, 1971.

LEMOS, A. *Cibercultura: tecnologia e vida social na cultura contemporânea*. 5. ed. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2010. 295 p.

LÉVY, P. A Revolução contemporânea em matéria de comunicação. In: MARTINS, F. M.; SILVA, J. M. da (Org.). *Para navegar no século XXI: Tecnologias do imaginário e cibercultura*. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Sulina/Edipucrs, 2000. p. 195-223.

LÉVY, P. *Cibercultura*. Translation Carlos Irineu da Costa. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1999. Translated from: Cyberculture.

LÉVY, P. *O que é virtual?* Translation Paulo Neves. Technical review Carlos Irineu da Costa. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1996. 160 p. Translated from: *Qu'est-ce que le virtuel?*

RODRIGUES JUNIOR, O. L. Autonomia da vontade, autonomia privada e autodeterminação: notas sobre a evolução de um conceito na modernidade e na pós-modernidade. *Revista de Informação Legislativa*, Brasília, DF, v. 41, n. 163, p. 113-130, 2004. Available from: <<http://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/item/id/982>>. Access on: Sept. 21 2015.

STACY, T. Death Privacy and the Free Exercise of Religion. *Cornell Law Review* 77.3 (1991-1992): 490-595. Available from: <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/clqv77&div=22&start_page=490&collection=journals&set_as_cursor=0&men_tab=srchresults>. Access on: July 21 2016.

THOMPSON, J. B. *A mídia e a modernidade: uma teoria social da mídia*. Translation Wagner de Oliveira Brandão. Review of translation Leonardo Avritzer. 12. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011. Translated from: *The media and modernity: a social theory of the media*.

VERSUTI, A. C.; CUNHA E CRUZ, M. A. R. da; COSTA, C. Contribuições ao debate sobre autonomia e liberdade de expressão em tempos de convergência e educação aberta. *Revista Iberoamericana de Filosofía, Política y Humanidades*, Sevilla, v. 17, n. 33, p. 125-150, 2015. Available from: <<http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=28238686006>>. Access on: Apr. 10 2016.

WOLKMER, Antonio Carlos. *Ideologia, Estado e Direito*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Revista dos Tribunais, 1995.