Sara Barbour talked about how student voting is at record highs in her piece. I think that this seems rather ironic, when placed in context with Flack’s essay where he says that the students of today are politically clueless. **We have no idea what's going on and yet we're voting more than ever! :)**

I have to say that I do agree with him. I feel that many students vote without really knowing enough info., or even correct info, about who and what they are voting for. Many students probably don’t even understand the way our government and the voting system works. **I'm curious to know how Prof. Flacks feels about the high voting records of the "politically clueless student body." Does he think that students should be voting without proper knowledge, or does he feel that it is bad for our nation to have so many politically uninformed students voting in the elections?**

The change in punishment between Foucault’s torture of Damien, and the modern mental punishment is interesting. It highlights the way in which we look people. We have separated the person from the body. No longer does punishment focus on the flesh but now it focus’ on the mind. What I wonder is if Dick Flacks and Sarah Barbour have missed a similar trend in youth politics. So my question is: **Has youth politics grown up, similarly to modern torture, where the body isn't the focus and rather the mind is what is important. Have we reached a level where we feel as if we don't have to show up and physically be there and rather all we need to do is emotionally and financially support the candidate.**

Dr. Flacks as much as I would like to disagree with you I completely agree. American youth are not as socially or politically aware as they should be, myself included. However, I don’t think it is just ignorance that is leading to this information gap I think it is time. **Students in college just do not have time anymore to honestly sit down and read an entire paper every day.** Perhaps on the weekends we can catch up but even then we are recovering from the five papers, three quizzes, and four hundred pages of reading that was due the week prior. I agree with you however because some students really are just that dense to name Jon Stewart as their primary news source when in fact the NY Times or some other legitimate paper should be filling us in on daily events. I have to admit that even I fallen victim to using our own school newspaper, The Daily Nexus, as my primary source to the outside world at times. The truth of it is is that students really do live in ‘bubbles’ and it is easier to stay comforted by the fact that
the worst thing that happened that day was that they got a ‘C’ on
their paper as opposed to hearing that 30 U.S. soldiers got killed
in Iraq by a suicide bomber. This is not saying this is a good thing
but sometimes when you can’t help it is easier to form a shield
around yourself. Now, another point you made is the fact that
students are never really in a certain place but always somewhere
else through their IPods or cell phones. I walk aimlessly, almost
robotically through school texting my friends who are states,
even continents away. Technology has made it so easy to not be
somewhere and live another life electronically. I suppose my
question to you Dr. Flacks is how did you step back and really
realize what is going on around us? How were you able to
recognize that the ‘children of the future’ knew nothing of the
present? And lastly how would you attempt to change this?

How would you propose we solve the problem of uninterested
college students? Is there any way that will encourage or give us
more motivation for being more aware of the world around us?
Do you believe that because of the increasing bias and awareness
of bias in the news today the college youth is choosing to use
online news sources such as Google and Yahoo because many
students do not want passively be told news stories which they
may wish to be ignorant to or because many student wish to rebel
against the influence and power media stations have in choosing
news stories? Finally, as a result of technology and the Internet,
freedom and independence has drastically increased in the world
today. However, why, from your findings, do we still continue to
pursue even more independent "separate worlds" that seemingly
further polarize people with opposing viewpoints? The Internet
does indeed allow many quiet activists to have a voice and thus
many take advantage of this opportunity, but why does our
generation want this voice and power more than previous
generations?

In today’s society there is much less college students protesting
then there used to be during the Vietnam War generation of
students. Although more students are against the decisions made
about the Iraq War (85% against) than students were against the
Vietnam War (60% against), there are much less political activist
today. Flacks argues that this “lack of radical activism masks an
increasingly liberal-minded generation.” My question is: Do you
think the downfall in political activism has to do with the
elimination of the draft? Do you think students are no longer
active, because they longer have to be personally concerned
about the war? It is said that students are more politically active
in the presidential campaigns then protesting the war. I believe
this is because presidential campaigns affect them more directly
then the war does (or at least I believe that students believe this). Flack argues that the “internet became a remarkable tool for collective action, for social capitalization, [and] for new social formation.” It is clear that the Internet is an easier, more accessible way to gain knowledge and communicate. And it was said earlier that students are more concerned with the government. So my final question is: How does this make sense? That we are more concerned and have better resources, but are actually cutting down on political activism? **Do you think it is possible that we are just doing a less radical, but more effective form of political activism?**

After reading the assignments for this week, it is evident how youth culture has evolved from the 60’s and 70’s to the present in regards to antiwar movements and political involvement. In the article written by Sara Barbour, she states how people are more politically involved using different forms of technology, such as Facebook groups, and the internet to promote their general interest in politics. As a student, I have witnessed many support groups being formed and different events that invite many students to support their cause and political views. It’s interesting to see many people gather politically online and voice their opinions throughout the internet in various forms.

However, in Dick Flack’s article, he states that many people do not protest out in public as much because it is seen as more of a trend than as an actual cause. One of the main points he made in his article is that protesting is not the same as how it was back in the 60’s and 70’s where people gather publicly. Although more people and younger college students are more politically involved, it is more likely to see support groups online rather than demonstrations out on the lawn or in public.

Question for Dick Flacks: After reading your article, it is evident that there are definitely more support groups and political demonstrations online rather than people protesting in public. **Why do you suppose students see demonstrating as more of a trend now? Do you think this is why more people are protesting online rather than in public? Do you think it is better that people are voicing their political opinions online or do you believe it would be more effective if the demonstrating was done in public by students?**

From the readings "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions” By Dick Flacks and "Takin’ it to the Web” by Sara Barbour, I found it interesting how our culture
today has been tremendously influenced by the technology available to us. New technology, as discussed by Flacks, has given today’s youth individual liberty. We can pick and choose which news we want to be informed about and from which source to get it from. We have a myriad of resources available to us. For older generations, however, it seems as if we have become disconnected from what goes on around us. New technology, such as ipods and cell phones, seems to take today’s generation away from the real world. Social interaction seems to be threatened. But it as Flacks questioned, is our society really threatened by these technological advances, or have we simply created a new way of becoming social actors? I believe it is both. The majority of today's generation does not read a newspaper on a daily basis and does not follow through with the news like back then. I agree that we are not all well informed of what is going on around us, but we have become more active in our society because of the advanced resources available to us. As Sara Barbour put it, a "fusion of pop culture and politics" has emerged. Students today have become even more involved. The internet has become an important tool for political organization and collective action. Students make their views known through t-shirts and bracelets and internet blogs.

Question for Dick Flacks: You noted that students who come from working class or low income families seem to be the more involved people in their community and students who come from upper-middle class families seem to be less aware, do you think that the students who come from the lower class are more likely or best suited to become the major political actors in our generation because they don’t want to continue living in a society with the economy as bad as it is, or in other words do you feel they are more driven to promote change in our society because the economy is having a bigger effect on them, than on upper-middle class students?

Flacks defines participatory democracy as something that ‘encapsulates what’s essential for defining the good society and for criticizing established institutions and practices, and for formulating a political agenda? (I). Is the media the main source of knowledge, particularly for young adults, in acquiring information regarding current events? If so, is there a greater chance that this advanced technology to harden cleavages of culture? or perhaps allow people to connect and form relationships and even assist in globalization (I)? Is reality really dissolving? or could it possibly be taking on a new form that allows face to face contact as well as technology based, when face
to face may not be possible? Has the individual’s ability to further tune out the world and his or her surroundings, as a result of technology, created separation from group experiences or perhaps, a chance for some needed peace in our chaotic world (II)? **Is it fair to say that students would rather be comfortable than challenged in this generation when already the average teenager/young adult faces many more obstacles and responsibilities than ever before (IV)?** Flacks strives to answer many of these questions through his research though it is apparent that there are equally accurate arguments to be had on each side of the issues. He seems to feel that the internet and media has harmed our generation in many ways and our lack of interest in the news is an apparent problem, however he also notes the development that has been fostered by such technology.

In Dick Flacks article, "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions," he discusses college students' lack of interest in current news issues. He writes "Indeed, I estimate that 40% of UC students are not really following the news at all." **Do you think that this lack of interest really stems from a difference in the students or the society they live in, or could it be that it is the issues in the news that are different?** One could argue that current world controversies have little affect on college student's everyday lives. **The things that people protested in the 60s and 70s were the draft and racism, things students experienced everyday. If something like the draft were to burst these students protective "bubbles" would they not be just as loud in their protest?**

Dick Flacks argues in his article "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy" as well as through Sara Barbour's article "Takin' It to the Web" that students today are much less politically involved and educated. He argues that they may be more liberal and anti-war, but perhaps less informed of the actual issues. While students rate themselves as more liberal and more against war, they are less likely to actively protest. Flacks and Barbour also quote statistics of students being more inclined to be accepting of alternative lifestyles such as homosexuality.

I would argue that perhaps the reason why students are less involved and less likely to publicly present their stance on issues is because they have grown more tolerant. **Perhaps in this day and age, students have stronger opinions, but also have stronger senses of respect for the opposition.** In the 1960's and 70's when the Vietnam protests were occurring, civil rights were also not in complete effect, so not everyone respected other
people's opinions. Now, *everyone is expected and almost demanded to accept and respect the opinions of other people, which may mean not protesting as publicly as formerly acceptable.*

I *would like to know...do you think this is a possible explanation for the reason in which young people today are not taking to the streets like they did in the 60's and 70's? Or is it possible that young people are just getting all of their views privately out on the internet and do not feel the need to verbalize them?*

---

Professor Flack asserts that a significant number of college students do not follow the news and political events. He states that, although some use the internet to acquire information about the world, few read newspapers or watch televised newscasts. His concern is not only that UC students are not informed/involved, but that they are highly selective about what news they regard as important based on what interests them and/or affects their lives, which may undermine the sense of community and inhibit personal growth by allowing students to stay in a **comfortable "bubble."** He also acknowledges that the internet is very useful in bringing people with similar political ideals together and organizing some traditional forms of political activism.

My question is **whether Professor Flacks has considered a change of culture in regards to strategies for obtaining "success" since the 60's and 70's as a reason for the prevalence of the internet as a means of political communication.** I wonder if many students act more docile now in terms of expressing political opinions because non-violence and self control has become so important to modern society. Could the anonymity provided by the internet be a survival strategy- an outlet for passionate students who fear how the legal and social consequences of their ideas could affect their future success?

Also, many students are so focused that they prioritize their time based on their schoolwork, jobs, internships, sports, clubs and physical activity and have little free time to spend on other things. Many students do not have a television or access to a "real" newspaper. And let's face it, reading a newspaper is not exactly a de-stressing activity. Maybe we are just too caught up in our own lives and goals for the future to put as much energy toward politics as previous generations (self preservation-working towards personal success). **How can we change an informed yet self-centered generation?**

Both these readings suggest that students now a days are less
politically enthusiastic and aware than years before. One of them also points out that the way in which students inform themselves of what is going on differs greatly. Most students claim to use the internet as a source for the news. Unfortunately, Flacks argues that this is not efficient because the sites they use are usually some such as, Yahoo, which only offer a headline. And in addition to that, the headline often pertains to entertainment news. What I would like to question however, is the claim that students are a lot less politically active than before. I am in no way disagreeing with this accusation. Nonetheless, I do believe there is a reason for it. Can the lack of political involvement of students not come from the fact that although we are in war, just as we were in the sixties, there was far more going on back then as well? For instance there was the civil movement going on not only within the black community but there was also the United Farm Workers Movement. Also, it is said that although this last new group of college freshmen are by far the brightest, they are also the most dependent on their parents. Can this attribute to the fact that they don't pay attention to the world news as much? Can it be that they rely on their parents to communicate to them of world affairs which is causing this lack of social involvement and development?

Flack’s last few paragraphs discuss the difference in class in reference to awareness. He claims that the lower-class or immigrant background students are the ones that take initiative to get involved in school activities, and concern themselves more with politics. He counters this statement with rich kids who don't care. My question is why would people who are wealthier be more prone to political disaffiliation, rather than conservative politics that support the top 1% of income earners? Would there be a reason an event like 9/11 would resonate more with moderately well off students in the form of indifference, instead of fostering activism?

These week's articles talk about the peculiar case of our generation’s increased participation in political functions, yet when surveyed, many college students have admitted to not reading any type of news. The articles provide various reasons for this apathetic attitude towards reading the newspaper or even having an interest of what is going on around the country and the world. One of the reasons the articles gives is that students purposefully ignore the news because they do not think the news is worthwhile and that they need to devote their time to other more personal issues. When surveyed, there was still a small minority that claimed to be aware of the issues around the world by being caught up in the news. One of their biggest resources
would have to be the Internet, but this poses yet another problem. Although the Internet provides new advantages in being able to know about the news around the world, it also narrows the focus of the reader to the certain issues that they are only interested in. They have ‘blinders’ on, avoiding the news they do not want to read and only paying attention to the news they care about. Newspaper and other older mediums allowed people to stumble on issues they would have never have known about, but with the Internet being the main source of information these days, this may never happen quite as often.

**Question:** In the recent election, pop culture promoted political participation through voting and supporting a certain candidate. If reading the news and being aware of issues were to be promoted as heavily through pop culture as the election was, do you think this would curb the current generation's apathetic attitude towards news? And what other mechanisms could be used to promote being aware of the news?

In Sara Barbour's article, "Takin' It to the Web," she highlights the difference between the political activism of today’s youth compared to the youth of the '60s. On page 5 of her article, she explains that, "In the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey, 72 percent of students said they've never attended any form of public demonstration." Barbour feels that this is due to the recent advancements of technology, and the rising population of the internet. There are now numerous political groups, blogs, and resources online, meaning that people do not have to put in the extra effort to attend a public event. She also goes on to state that University of California, Santa Barbara sociology professor Dick Flacks "suggests that the reason students today aren't protesting may in fact be because of the liberal trend." This makes sense, because if a majority of people are liberal, then there is no need for rebellion and acts of violence to gain attention, since most people are on the same page. What do you think is the more likely reason for the decrease in student protest among recent years; the increase of liberalism as a trend, or the rise of the internet and other technological resources? **With liberalism being the general trend among students today, is it likely that the conservative students will soon feel the need to speak out and protest to make their voices heard, too? Can you predict any significant trends or patterns for the future based on what you have already studied?**

To start I found this article interesting and extremely pertinent to today's society and in particular its' youth. The reason why I believe this is so pertinent to today's youth is because we are
living in an extremely volatile world where with globalization occurring in nearly all aspects of life from politics to economy affect us all. However with all this going on in my opinion the youth have taken an apathetic approach to all of this. I find this to be some what of a paradox with the emergence of internet and explosion of news outlets.

Instead of raising a question about the content of this article, I have a possible explanation for this lack of interest in world events by the youth. UCSB has historically been considered a liberal college, and as of lately in my opinion liberal has changed from a political ideology to a fashion trend. In the past few years the lifestyle of the 60's and 70's with the hippy movement have been glorified thus creating a resurgence. This would be terrific however since it has drifted away from a political ideology and towards a fashion trend youth cling on to the idea that being anti-government is cool. They go even further as to remove themselves entirely from the political process claiming it is flawed and corrupt as the hippies once did. The difference between the two generations however is the fact that the youth of the 60's and 70's took it upon themselves to try to fix the imperfections that were in our political system while today’s youth acknowledge it is flawed and withdraw entirely from it.

In your essay "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy," you claim that today's youth are far less politically aware than their counterparts of 60's and 70's. However, you mention briefly that, "Conservative kids have never been more organized," (pg. 7). Can you describe the mechanisms that conservative youth at UCSB are using to organize? Do you see these youth as having an appreciable political effect in relation to their size? Are a greater percentage of youth with conservative views politically active then those with opposing viewpoints? If so why?

In your article, 'INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY: SOME CONTRADICTIONS', you discuss how technology affects the way UC students get information in different ways. You said you were surprised to find that out many of the students that you surveyed did not use the newspaper to get information and in fact a good percentage of students didn't check the news daily. If a majority of the students did indeed read the newspaper daily to get information, how would you think that would affect the lives of the students?

Dick flacks discusses the relevance of the internet in terms of
college students using it as a news outlet. It is reasonably popular, he says, but at the same time he talks about how it gives a narrow view of the news. Because internet users have control over what they view on the internet, they are more likely to see articles that they are already interested in. He says that this is less likely to occur with conventional media like television or newspaper. **However, I pose this question: Couldn’t you say the same thing about a newspaper? There are several sections in the newspaper, so wouldn’t you be subject to the same critique of being selective of what you read in the news?** He also mentions how the internet allows people to have instant access to a much wider and diverse variety of views articles and news than ever before. He suggests that both internet news and communication via the internet can be a very effective way to spur political action amongst people, and that this behavior should be encouraged, especially with college students in his conclusion.

In your article, you raise the question of collectivity of perception, “The cultural choice and autonomy made possible by new technology means that those using it need not experience themselves as members of a collectivity that is hearing the same news, or seeing the same shows, or sharing the same objects of attention … the new liberties I’m referring to are jeopardizing much of social fabric that enables collective action, and destroying the bases for whatever is left of publics.” How exactly do you think this loss of collectivity could manifest itself? **When someone has an ipod playing in our ears instead of listening to the sounds of a busy city street, that person is not sharing an experience with the rest of the people on that city street. Do you think this will have a more macrosociological effect on our perceptions of each other? Do you think there will be political repercussions to our increasingly individualized perceptions of reality?** As an example, people’s perceptions of the Iraq war are completely varied because of different levels and types of media consumption on the subject (some read BBC News, some Fox News, some online blogs, and some none at all). **How might a political protest be affected by this variance in people's breadth, depth, and types of understandings? Or could a truly united protest even exist?**

At the end of your piece, you assert that the advancement of technology results in a lessening of institutional influence and a heightened individuation, which varies with economic stratification. More affluence equates to more accessible technology and thus more opportunity for individuation. While you provide several examples of the positive benefits of individuation, **there seems to be a condemnation of the**
consequences of technology that have enabled today’s youth to construct and remain in a sheltered bubble. How do you suggest sociologists help the youth break out of the bubble and foster interconnectedness in a highly individualized society (especially pertaining to media sources)?

This week’s reading is "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions" by Dick Flacks. In this piece, Flacks tells us about his experience with a survey that covered the question of whether (and how) students followed the news. It was concluded that students have been increasingly unlikely to read a daily newspaper; in fact no more than 7% of students at the University of California said they read a newspaper daily. It was also pointed out that the internet has increasingly become a substitute for the newspaper. The findings from the survey illustrated the primary point Flacks wanted to make; that "the internet’s effects on democratic participation are fundamentally ambiguous and contradictory" (p. 2). This is because on one hand, there has been a large abandonment of established journalistic institutions by the American student body (students don’t read an actual newspaper) but in the other hand, there is a much smaller group for whom the web provides ready access to information that could be more diverse and richer (in comparison to what might be read in the New York Times). Among some of the reasons for the preference in the internet are its appeal to individuation, how easy it, and mistrust in the media….this week I wanted to get some clarification/further expansion on two things Flacks mentioned. The first is when it is said that when you walk around a campus, every third person is interacting with a cell phone or wearing headsets as they stroll, bike, skateboard. Can you expand on why it is that this gives you a "feeling of certain resentment that these folks are somewhere other than here" (p.4). What do you mean when you say that a great deal of what we have assumed to be social connectedness is dissolving? And do you think things like the internet and IPods and cell phones are "bad things" or "good things" because there seems to be a contradiction here (but then again that is the title of this piece: Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions). Finally, you say that "students’ cluelessness today is not easy to explain" and that "we need to foster a conversation about how to create pedagogy that can help students break out of their bubbles and become serious social actors" (p.7). This seems like a good idea but like always, I have to ask how? How might we be able to do this seeing how popular the internet is and how unpopular newspapers are especially how stubborn ones habits could be.
In his article Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions, Professor Flacks discusses the “bubble” that envelops individuals throughout this campus. One cannot deny the existence of a bubble nor can one deny that the very nature of the campus environment fosters the growth of a bubble given the availability of intellectual resources, including information technology. **Even though information technology does foster this bubble, I would like to know how the participatory levels have changed in the last three to four years since the publication of the original article.** The influence of social networking sites, such as Facebook and Myspace, has spread further into society to demographics once thought unreceptive to these sites (we all know someone over the age of 25 with a Facebook these days). IT technology as a whole has allowed the general population to interact and react in a completely new way within this relatively broad realm of the American political scene. **If we take this IT bubble into the context of the last election, could we not say that social networking sites, among the myriad of other information technologies, have actually encouraged participation in the democratic system?**

In Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions, author Dick Flacks strives to inspire today’s youth to be social actors in our world but argues that the individuation of media has become a major roadblock in today's participation in the political realm. He demonstrates that because students are so immensely absorbed and connected to the internet and technology that our perspective of current events and world news has become skewed and selective. Even worse, Flacks makes it clear that besides having individuation of mass media, most students have lost touch to the news altogether. On the bright side however, Flacks demonstrates that although the internet has made way for a selective and sometimes shorthanded outlook on the news, it can also provide a new social fabric to foster collective action. He ends this piece by placing the responsibility of social participation mostly on the 'rich' kids of society which is logical since they are indeed the most ‘plugged’ in these days. **My question for Dick Flacks is: since online ‘news’ sources are starting to seriously lack credentials, should the government intervene on these sites (maybe in a decade or so) so we can have a uniform understanding of the real facts?** My only concern is that these blogs and selective internet ‘news’ sources become so full of crap that the true facts will be obsolete.

In Dick Flacks's *Information Technology and Participatory Democracy*
Democracy: Some Contradictions, Flack states, "the individuation offered by the internet is one of the many things that makes being online so attractive. We feel freer online because we can make our own way through the information ocean. We feel informed, more autonomous in our understanding, because we can instead compare divergent news sources and find ones that are marginalized in the mainstream." (p.3) To my understanding Flacks is saying that we as a society tend to go to the internet as our source for news and pressing political issues of today, because we feel more free and more as an individual to search particular issues and stories online that already interest us. I think that we feel more comfortable with the internet because we can find other people’s opinions and thoughts on issues that you can't necessarily find through the newspapers or the media. However, what is quite unclear to me is, by relying on the internet as a primary source for news does this put us at a disadvantage? Meaning, are we at a disadvantage due to the fact that we are only searching for the issues which interests us? Knowing that not everything on the internet is true or legit, how do we distinguish which stories or true and which are false? Is it wrong to want to be an individual (internet) instead of being part of a mass society(newspapers)? Flacks also mentions in his article that, "the internet became a remarkable tool for collective action, for social capitalization, for new social formation. I suggested earlier that the new technology endangers collective action, but at the same time technology makes for new possibilites..."(p. 6). It appears that the internet is a good thing in the sense that it allows new possibilities and for people to communicate easier in a sense and it allows individualization but bad in terms of collective action. At what point is the internet so bad that it it is affecting society? How can we change this? What is more important, helping people socialize more over the internet (e.g grassroots, spreading the word) or the endangerment of collective action?

In Dick Flacks’ Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions he addresses the issue of the contemporary American consumer culture actually limiting the scope of political awareness in today’s college students than benefiting it. According to Flacks, the vast amount of information available, and the personalized way to pick and choose what type of information you see constricts the spectrum of awareness and reliability. My question to Flacks would be what would he change about the internet and other widely used sources of information to enlarge the personal bubbles created by today’s college students? Should a student who is
looking to be informed look at non-biased information sources, or the various radical ones? Since student voting is recently on the rise, what effect and correlation does this have with the students who have limited themselves by not reading a paper or watching a news program?

The article, "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions", by Dick Flacks, reveals startling information about University of California college student’s heavy reliance on technology, mainly the internet, as their news source, as opposed to the traditional method of reading the newspaper. Flacks goes on to argue that college students are going down the path of "willed cluelessness" by choosing to be selective of the forms of news that they expose themselves to and can be considered the "most politically oblivious we've seen in several decades". Thus, there is a stark contrast between the radical, politically active college students of the Vietnam era and the "politically oblivious" college students of this generation. My question for Dick Flacks is: Do you think that due to the popularity of the internet in allowing college students to pick and choose their news, that this will lead to a decline in political activism and lack off agency in students? If we choose to continue to shut ourselves off from the rest of the world by reading only about what interests us, how will this adversely affect the next generation of college students, since the internet is growing increasingly popular as a source of information?

Upper middle class students these days would rather be comfortable than challenged. The new technology fosters such a stance, even if it offers access to alternatives. (page 7) It is evident that most of the youth in my generation- especially the privileged do only participate in becoming active members of our society unless it is in their inbox or facebook news feed. Do you think that this has stemmed from the over-availability of information? Perhaps previous generations were more informed and physically active because the information did not so readily come to them, but by a sense of being young and wanting to know about the big and mysterious world they lived in. Would it be a valid theory to ask if the reason we are so passive is because we can browse through our world in a matter of seconds without the shock of discovery?

There is no way to reverse the effects of technology and I believe that in a way we are the internet generation. With every new technological advance, there is an affect on the way that people communicate. If language is the fundamental institution, as stated by Berger and Berger, what is the effect of technology
that makes communication instant such as instant messaging and text messaging? Dick Flacks suggests in his paper that, “These feelings, I think, stem from fear that a great deal of what we have assumed to be social connectedness is dissolving.” Does an increase in technology have to mean that our society is no longer connected? With the technology that is now at most of societies’ fingertips, could it not be argued that we are more connected now than we have ever been? There are definitely issues that arise with the widespread use of technology, but just as in past generations, all change does not bring all positive implications. Dick Flacks also states that he believes, “political disaffiliation and willed cluelessness seem to me to characterize the dominant campus mood. That mood is fostered, I think, by the way that new technologies enable the relatively affluent to construct and maintain their cultural bubbles.” I understand this belief and that with the internet allowing people to specifically search what news they would like to hear they may miss out on the broad range of news topics available in the newspaper, however, how many people read the entire newspaper from front to back? Just because someone says that they read the newspaper everyday that does not mean that they read every section of the paper.

**Could the argument be made that the amount of information that is very easy to access makes today’s youth more knowledgeable than past generations?** Does the increased number in students who voted in this past presidential election say anything for our interest in politics and the future of our country? "The consensus of students now is more liberal, more anti-war, than at the height of the Vietnam War," Flacks says. **Could our generation be more anti-war because we know the historical impact of the Vietnam War and see that the War in Iraq has many similarities and we fear history repeating itself?**

Students use the means of internet to brush up their knowledge of the news and current politics. Students don’t necessarily trust the media and thus choose not to partake in political communication. For students, the media is more flexible and gives the internet-goer a sense of control because the student has a sense of autonomy and they are able to control what information they can see. Technological advances have made it easier to have central power for any one person to control the use of music, information on the computer, cultural frameworks and things of that nature. Professor Flacks, how can students break out of their bubbles and become serious social actors?

In the article *Information of Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions*, you express a concern for a decreased awareness of news among students on college
campuses which, as explained in the article, can be associated to the growing dependence on technology. You stress that news coverage has become individualized with in technology which weakens the power of media to define what news is. Why is it important for central authority to control the definition of public reality? How would students benefit if they mainly relied on traditional sources of news such as a newspaper?

In Mr. Flacks paper, he went on to talk about how he conducts surveys of students and the UC's and how his primary goal is to see students' "degree of engagement" in the areas of their undergraduate experience. He went on to talk about how startling the results of his questions on how students follow the news were. He went on to say that almost no students read the newspaper as well as receiving news from other outlets. After seeing the results of the internet use and news gained from internet, Flacks came up with his point that "the internet's effects on democratic participation are fundamentally ambiguous and contradictory." He gave the example of ambiguity as when one searches for a select topic on the internet redefines exactly what news is. Furthermore, Flacks went on with an interesting point that many students do not trust the media therefore, they turn to outlets of "fake news" such as John Stewart and the Daily Show. Flacks also went on to say that because of all the technological inventions people are able to experience the world to their own personal preferences. Flacks then ended his paper by saying that we should learn how to use this technology in a way that doesn't leave out news, but instead sparks interest and makes new social actors for a young generation.

Have you found that by people having the selectivity to choose just what they want to hear, that they are less likely to become politically active and vote? Do you feel that by listening to "fake news" like John Stewart that there are no positive ways of gaining worldly knowledge and making strong choices based off that information.

You argue that IT has allowed the mass population to choose what and when it hears its news. Creating a customized experience for each user of say an iPod, cell phone or computer. And by having this much customization, we are liberated from the dominant media organizations and elite. But do you not think that media organizations such as Apple with it's iTunes software controls what content is actually available to its iPod users? Or that the companies that make the cell phone applications that allow streaming of news stories don't also control their content? My point is that even though we have a
great many more choices when it comes to choosing our audio, visual and print news we are still enslaved by the companies that distribute them or the mobile devices we use. On another point, I do agree that students today live in a comfortable "bubble" and would rather not be challenged, physically or politically. But do you feel that students have any need to be confrontational, or are actions like joining Facebook political groups, choosing politicians more wisely and voting in elections more important?

You explain that more and more students are resorting to the internet for acquiring the latest news stories. You also go on to say that this may become problematic because students pick and choose what is important instead of seeing all news as important. Can you explain how this is a problem? I mean, when students read the newspaper or a magazine, can't they pick and choose what is important as well? Another thing you state is that the rich students are the ones who worry you because they are the ones who fueled the left and counterculture of the sixties. Can you elaborate on this being that you state that one-third of UC students come from low income, or working class families and one-half have parents that emigrated or the student themselves are an immigrant. Is it not true that these students in fact could organize the same kind of activism? Thanks.

You mention that student’s "justify their disengagement [with the news/media] as a type of resistance." Do you think it is wrong to reject the media's biased information? Or, do you think it is better to watch biased news channels to get the basics? Or, do you recommend that students watch or read alternative news sources as opposed to "main stream" news? Do you think that it is possible to be politically active while not keeping up with news, but read alternative sources? Do you think that the clueless "mood" on campuses is similar to the mood of students of the hippie era? Or, is it more of a self centered mood? Do you think that online interactions gaining too much power can eventually have a negative effect on societies and even politics?

What is your primary news source? Newspaper, Internet, Tv? What do you encourage us as students to be more involved in?

In introducing his article about the news media, Flak argues how different media outlets impact our perception of the news. For instance, Flak infers that when the majority of people got their news from newspapers and network news shows, they had less choice in what information they were receiving. Now that the internet seems to dominate all other news media outlets, people
are more autonomous in how they receive information, therefore they mostly pay attention to just the stories that they are interested in, ignoring the rest of the news. But, I strongly disagree with this statement. In my junior and senior years of high school I became more interested in the news, and I started reading the newspaper and watching news shows. But, I never read the whole newspaper or watched network news shows all the way through. Instead, I only paid attention to the stories that I was interested in, and tuned out the rest of the news. I know that the same goes for my parents, as well as most people I know who read the newspaper or watch news shows. Would Mr. Flak agree that the internet is actually a continuation (and not the creation) of passive news viewing?

In "Takin' it to the Web", Flacks argues "Today, 'being very well off financially' tops the college objectives charts, surveys show, and though they are often more politicized than their forbears, current students tend to forgo public protest, opting instead to join political Facebook groups or shop online for T-shirts with slogans like "Barack 'n' Roll." With a widespread drive to achieve and a fundamentally different outlook on life, they lend new energy to the fusion of pop culture and politics." Now from experience, in your point of view what method used by previous generation or present generations seems effective in getting their point across? Also, do the present generations have to protest or do some kind of "attention-grabbing activity" once in a while to show the world that they don't lack of political interest?

According to Dick Flacks 'Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions', then number of college students who stay current with current news has severely decreased since the rowdy 60's and 70's. Flacks reports, however, that '60% of students say they do use the internet at least several times a week to get the news? (1). One observation that Flacks points out is that although college students hardly ever resort to an actual hardcopy of a newspaper, internet news sources are booming, allowing users to access a plethora of information at the click of the mouse. Flacks goes on to provide various viewpoints as to which source of information is the best way of staying informed and educated. My question is which means is better? Does it really matter or affect an individual depending on which way he/she obtains his/her news? Does the continual growth and spread of technology actually overwhelm the individual, causing an even greater lack of interest or knowledge?

Dick Flacks writes about a startling contradiction between the increasing use of web-based media outlets and democratic participation in the current
generations. In this piece he argues that the increasing number of news sources provided by the internet is creating a generation of more individualized thinkers, and that these people choose what media outlets and information to read, redifining and narrowing their personal bubbles of information. This information contradicts the rise of youth participation in the democratic process, which has increased over the past few decades. He counters this statistic by arguing that the internet, though creating this very individualistic view, has also helped create new communities dedicated to political activism. Websites like MoveOn.org and so on. It is because of these online communities that this generation of technologically minded young people can be more active in the democratic process, as opposed to the different methods used in the 60s and 70s.

Flacks' argument is compelling, yet I remained unconvinced that the internet is responsible for these effects entirely. Many young aquire their news not from the internet or paper, but by word of mouth. It is not necessarily that young people are not aware of the issues, but that their "security bubbles" feed them the information they want to hear. Social networking sites such as Myspace and Facebook dedicated to keeping in touch with friends seem to be the more mode of aquiring information. They are afterall, the most visited websites by this generation. Are these websites taken into account in your study on the contradiction of democratic participation and internet use? If not, I believe that networking sites that reinforce the social bubble of younger people would be less contradictive, since youths seem to surround themselves with secure social bubbles already, and think similarly to many of their closest friends.

First off we learned about the terrible public displays of torture, and how that evolved to a more mental torture of discipline through actions and secrecy. Then we were exposed to the idiotic ideas of Lombroso claiming that criminals were predisposed by their "lesser race" or features. Gould takes the time in the article to reiterate the inane racism of the theory, and goes on further to disprove it.

Dick Flacks' article was interesting, as well as Sara Barbour's.
Flacks argues that students are becoming more self-centralized with the advents of technology, not getting a full spectrum of ideas they would otherwise get if not left to their own searching. Barbour brings to point that students are in fact very politically galvanized, but do so peacefully online, rather than through riots as in the past. I would argue that although students may be more individually separated than their immediate neighbors, they are able to connect with millions of others with the same interests through the internet. And those people can get together to make things happen. Also, rather than being force fed news, we are free to read and check the credibility of what we want. In turn, we should pay mind to other topics and challenge ourselves with new ideas through discourse. Many debates of this nature in fact to occur online. I greatly enjoy being able to pursue what I like. I hate watching television or listening to the radio, because none of it interests me. In fact, I find it distasteful in most instances. Finally people are free to deviate from the norm and create new boundaries of society, those of similar interests, yet still tolerant of other groups. This makes for a richer, more accepting society.

My question to Professor Flacks would be: rather than segregating society into separate indifferent spheres, would not the freedom of allowing persons to pursue their own interests lead to greater diversity and cultural richness? By creating so many different galvanized groups, would they not be forced to confront each other and learn from one another? Does this not account for the increasing trend towards more liberal openness and acceptance for those unlike ourselves? Because of one group's own freedoms, are they not willing to grant others their rights?

Last week we read from Lareau that children from upper and middle class families are treated more like adults, as their parents converse with them more, they are more confident and articulate, and display a sense of entitlement, while children from working and lower class families are more clearly separated from adults and seem less comfortable with authority figures. With the UC as a whole having as varied a student body as it does, did Flacks take into account the different backgrounds of students who took his surveys? Were students from working and lower class families more likely to be up to date on currents events than those from middle or upper? Flacks concluded by saying that he is most worried by students from wealthy families, who he says are the most clueless. Would he attribute this willful cluelessness to their
entitlement issues, that they are somehow entitled to remain in their comfortable, idiosyncratic bubble? What about the political mobilization that took place here on campus (which happens to have highest median family income of the UC’s) this past year, with protests against military research being done through UCSB, advocacy for underpaid UC workers, and the massive voter-registration drives? Are college students less clueless before big elections, and then forget about politics and current events? Does Flacks have any information as to which students are most active in politics and current events?

In his article, "Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions," Dick Flacks presents the pros and cons of the internet and how the IT generation receives (or do not) their news. Flacks’ survey shows that only a startling 7% of current undergraduates read the newspaper. The rest either get their news from the internet or not at all. Flacks states that although the internet is better for providing in-depth news on one particular matter, users become selective of what they want to read, and consequently, they do not get the news that they otherwise would have gotten from the newspaper.

I completely disagree with Flacks on this matter. I believe that most of the news presented daily in the newspaper and the daily TV shows are not news at all. How many times do we read about a local murder or drug deal or a five-car pile up on a freeway? Come to think of it, probably in every issue. How many of these do we remember? None, because they are not newsworthy and do not affect your immediate lives. Of course, there are newsworthy news in every issue of a newspaper. However, these important ones are the ones that actually make it to the internet. Flacks also forgets that every page on the internet is fueled by advertisements. The minute I log onto my hotmail account (which I do at least five times a day), MSN delivers me the most important news from around the world. Every search done on Google will have three related news story presented at the very top of the page. Or what about Facebook? The most important issues that occur always, and I mean always, get made into a Facebook group or survey to petition or show support for various parties involved.

I believe Flacks’s article have many interesting points to it, but overall, Flacks needs to learn more about the information highway that is the internet before he can criticize it. To call today’s undergrads "sheeps ready for slaughter" is offensive.

My question for Flacks is, how many hours does he spend on the internet a day?
I am as equally shocked as you are concerning the lack of University of California students' involvement/interest in the news and current events in the world. Upon reading your article, however, I have come to determine that I myself have fallen into this "bubble" and need to become more informed of the ongoings of the outside world. You mention at the conclusion of your writing that, "We need to foster a conversation about how to create pedagogy that can help students break out of their bubbles and become serious social actors." Do you have any further ideas on how to do this? Or what strategies we may use to help break free of these bubbles?

I am very interested on your point about individuation and how technology, especially the internet, excludes people from the outside world. In other words, someone that is using his cellphone or ipod is secluded in his or her own world and is not part of reality. You mentioned that students attending college back in the 60s and 70s were more physically involved in politics (protests, rebellions) and in society overall. I believe that we as students are definitely less involved compared to years past due to the dramatic changes that society and our culture have been through. Technology has led us to spend less time with society and our environment while providing more time to spend with ourselves as growing individuals. I am curious on what you believe is more beneficial to society as a whole: a person who is primarily involved in his or her community/society or a person who is hardly involved but spends time with him or herself and grows as an individual thinker? Or is it ideal do have a balance between both aspects?

I found Flacks' reading to be of much interest. As a college student, I agreed with many of the things he had to say. However, to me, it seems like Flacks is discontent about the way we use sources other than the newspaper to be informed about the news. It is obvious that we live in a time period where technology advances as each day goes by. And of what importance is that to us as consumers? Well, whatever makes our lives easier is going to be the best option and, in this case, that's exactly what the internet provides. When an individual is in college, it is difficult to have access to the "outside world" because we are so caught up with school and every single minute is of great value to us, which is why I agree that college students live in a "bubble." I believe that the internet is just as good of a source for news as is a newspaper. In fact, I kind of think that a newspaper has less to offer. To my understanding, it seems like Flacks thinks that the internet can be a biased source, and I would like to ask him why? It is true that we only target the stories that we want when we're
Both Barbour and Flacks’ articles discuss the varying levels of political activism in current college students and the effects of students increase use of internet as a political tool. Barbour argues that students today are not less politically active as they were in the 60s, but the fact that we are a networked generations leads us to spreading political messages and attempting to gain support through the internet. Singing petitions and sending organizations money via the internet is no less effective then doing it on the streets, and as over 90% of college students access the web daily it is a highly effective way of reaching students. I agree with Flack’s belief that college students live in a bubble, especially at a campus such as UCSB, one can go weeks without having contact with the outside world. Living in a community that is so disconnected from issues across the globe makes the internet much more necessary in a college student’s life. Though accessing world news through the web may change the way we read the news, it actually makes it much easier for us to follow specific issues that we are interested in, after all even when one picks up a newspaper they are only going to read the articles whose headlines interest them. I believe that the internet, though it can be a very scary and controversial thing, can also, when used correctly spread lots of awareness and gain widespread supports for politicians, propositions, organizations etc. Preceding the 2008 presidential elections I was sent many e-mails and invited to join multiple groups supporting Obama via Facebook, many of the messages and groups were actually highly informational, especially for people that didn’t know why they were on one side or another. Is it possible that the increased use of internet groups and member websites correlates with the increase of youth voter participation in the last election?

My question to Dr. Flack’s would be: You argue that students today are much more misinformed because they aren’t actively pursuing the news because they don’t read the newspaper or watch the news on a regular basis. What about the student protesters during the 1960s? Although some of them were very informed on the issues they were arguing, weren’t a lot of the student subculture simply following along with the crowd because it was the "cool" thing to do?

In Dick Flacks piece, he expresses his concern over the decline of newspapers as a news source on college campus’s. Based on his research, he had found that most students do not read the paper at all, but now rely on the internet as their number one source of news. Because of this, students can filter what they see and learn online, but don’t you think that that's exactly what happens when we read a newspaper?
about current events. Could this, in a way, cause one to form a bias based on how one chooses to find information, or even what information one tries to find? This, to me, comes as no surprise, as technology has practically become synthesized with our lives. With the quick and easy access we have to the internet, it is almost obvious that one would simply get on their computer to check out the news, rather than go to a news stand and pick up a paper (and waste those trees that many activist college students are trying to save). Whether or not they check the news is another issue. He also expresses how it is the mindset of the youth that determines how much they pay attention to the news. He says how some students felt they couldn’t trust the media, which is one reason why they had stopped paying attention to it. Is this caused by a change in how the media operates, or is it because of how the media has operated in the past? Flacks later states how "the cultural choice and autonomy made possible by new technology means that those using it need not experience themselves as members of a collectivity..." Is this view suggesting that new technology is creating a more individual centered approach in our society? Do people become detached from those around them to the point where they could have a somewhat different view on reality?

I really enjoyed Dick Flack's analysis of where individuals gain their information from, and how they educate themselves about society. I found it very interesting when he looked at the differences of reading the morning paper daily from searching information online. I agree with him on the fact that the online reader/viewer, "pursues the topics one already is interested in." I believe that Flack is stating that the online reader is closing their awareness of other's issues and perspectives. By seeking sources online, the reader is limiting themselves to the information that he/she is only interested in. Oppose to the daily newspaper reader who may also become aware of issues that he/she did not volunteer to pay attention to. This limitation lead me to question, does the selective information that the online reader receives affect them to become conservative in society oppose to the traditional reader who receives a broad and widely shared information?

In his article 'Information Technology and Participatory Democracy: Some Contradictions’ Dick Flacks describes his sentiment that today’s generation is one that focuses on individual pursuits as people rely on technology that negates a collective social understanding. He goes on to describe how Internet Technology as the main medium for this new age leads to less political and social awareness and ultimately undermines
participatory democracy as people are apathetic toward these institutions. While I see some truth to this argument that is made relevant by the statistics that show that very few students follow the news, I believe Dick does not accurately describe the root cause of this apathy present in today’s youth. I would argue that the movements in the 60’s that he claims epitomize the notion of participatory democracy actually laid the foundation for the increasing individuation that preceded in decades to follow. In my opinion the movements that took place in the 60’s expressed a great deal of distrust in government and social institutions and thus were the impetus for an increased focus on an individual pursuit of freedoms and political activism. While this movement was rooted in collective activism, the ideals it fostered are the ideals of individuation that are present in today’s youth. While these movements created a new political perspective I am still left wondering what actually led to the political apathy that slowly increased over generations following the radical social movements of the 60’s? While I believe IT represents the individuation of this generation I do not believe it is an accurate representation for the reason people feel less inclined to be politically responsible.

It has become noticeably evident that people in today’s society have distanced themselves from each other and isolated themselves. As Flacks noticed "Every third person is interacting with a cell phone; those who aren't are typically wearing headsets as they stroll, bike, skateboard." (Pg. 4). Flacks states there is a problem that today's society has isolated itself away from physical and personal contact, while still acknowledging the connectiveness of the internet and cell phones. Although people no longer protest and march as in the 1970s, the effect is now taken on the internet, and possibly more widespread. Knowing all of this, why do you feel it is important for people to connect in the ways that they used to? People still communicate and protest together, just instead of doing so in person, they are communicating through technology. If the results are the same, why should there be an emphasis on communication on a more personal basis as in the 1970s?

Flacks must answer why a collective identity is better than a more democratic identity where similar individuals from more places can work together more efficiently and effectively. Also, I’m curious to know if Flacks himself really believes that the new technology is being more hurtful to the population or better, weighing out the collective action opportunities to the slightly less informed population.

All of this week’s readings speak on sociological change in
the realms of crime, punishment, and politics. The Barbour and Flacks articles, however, focus on the change in political expression between the youth of the 1960s and 1970s compared with today. College students are linked through technology: conducting rallies, signing petitions and fighting for any cause without leaving their dorm rooms. This provides for a more effective way of voicing opinion, but takes away the person aspect of the fight. Most radical students from the 1960s remained friends, reminiscing on their hard work for change. Today’s teens are more isolated then ever, though more involved. Do you think that losing the personal aspect of the fight is worth trading in for more progress in what ever the cause? Since personal communication is the basis for all other institutions, will the lack of face to face contact eventually hurt the causes of these many organizations? What is the difference from a sociological point of view between face to face communication and online/cell phone communication?

This week’s articles, titled "INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY: SOME CONTRADICTIONS" by Dick Flacks and "Takin’ It to the Web" by Sara Barbour seemed biased to me. Who is to say which kind of news is important for UC students, and which kind is not? Yes, it is a different type of news these days as most students use this thing called the internet to obtain news. But why is that such a bad thing? It kind of demeaned Flack’s credibility when he allowed typo’s to slip into his final draft for this article. He contradicts himself about the internet then the changing technological advances which seem to make people take each other for granted, especially rich UC kids. But then he goes on and says just how much technology can help things like activism. The sense I got from Sara Barbour’s article was an overall sense of how students act toward politics today. We need stability and structure in our lives, and by supporting a candidate for what he is doing instead of protesting against something that he(or she) is not provides that structure. In the 60's and 70's during the Vietnam War at UCSB the students were into the free will and peace sort of hippie-esque attitude. Nowadays, this air of happiness has remained yet it is because of a different reason. We support what we like. This is what makes us happy, not going against something that doesn't. Question: Why is Flack so subdued about his opinions nowadays when he was such a leader in the 60's and 70's? What caused this change? Was it the changing society around him or was it himself that just
I believe that the idea that people use the web to individualize information is important. They are able to do this because of the enormous amounts of facts and archives that remain on the web for anybody to see, which enables people to question what the media is saying. This is a huge step forward because it means that people can now open their minds and do not necessarily have to believe everything the media says. This change from one-way communication to two-way, because now the media is forced to report the truth in virtually all occasions, because they know that people can challenge their facts by going on the internet. At the same time, people will always use the internet to read information that is familiar to them, and they will not be able to explore unfamiliar things that they might have learned from reading a newspaper.

How is this avoidance of unfamiliarity link to what is going on in society? Are people really becoming more and more separated from reality because of all of this technology? Is our current society evolving, dissolving, or simply just changing from past societies? A more personal question for Mr. Dick Flacks: Does your opinion of the internet and its effects on current sociological trends change now that you know that every single person in this class read your essay on the INTERNET?

Do you think that this "Fusion of pop culture and politics" is due to the fact that many UC students are getting their news from the internet? Do you think that these internet news seekers are primarily interested in pop-culture related news?

The survey, therefore, allowed Flacks to infer that students prefer to read about current events on the internet rather than reading a classic newspaper. He knows that online websites can often be illegitimate and provide false information from poor sources and notices that only 15% of students, ‘go to web places that provide more sophisticated in depth possibilities.’ The second half of Flacks’ article took an opposite approach and responded to the, ‘concentration of control media by corporate monopoly or state agencies would produce political uniformity and enhance the manipulability of atomized masses…. Then he admits that email has worked miracles for the democratic party over the more recent years. He knows that without political online groups, like Moveon, communication between Democratic party members would be nearly lost without the technology of email. Organizations like Moveon allow members to use email to form meetings and places where groups of people from all over the nation can support the democratic party and its candidates. Flacks claims that, ‘new technology endangers
collective action, but the same technology makes for new possibilities for grassroots democracy.' How would Flacks argue that technology is considered 'dangerous' if he also claims that it creates a world of possibilities for democracy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there something out there that can help students &quot;break out of their bubbles&quot;? If so, what are those factors and what will make the students aware of what they need to change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My Question to Professor Flacks is how does it make you feel, having been teaching in an era of political activism, to see college kids today act so politically unaware?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since language and communication are a basic institution of society, wouldn’t it make sense to argue that the Internet will heighten progress and participation in already existing systems of our world, such as politics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It states at the end of the reading that it is the &quot;rich kids&quot; that they have to worry about. Personally to me it doesn’t seem that wealth has anything to do with being involved in the news of the world. Why would you make that assumption that just because people have money they don’t get involved? Where did that stem from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#1: What would you consider to be a fairly reliable source of news and furthermore what news do you read, watch or listen to? Q#2: What hopes in terms of news, maybe an unbiased news source or a news station that actually reports 'the news' do you have for this generation and what have you seen or not seen that does or does not give you this hope?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the economy is getting worse and jobs becoming less and less available students have a reason to get involved with these matters. It is their future in trouble and by joining groups such as Facebook it allows them to have a voice, without sacrificing time that most students don’t have in this generation. It allows mass communication and the chance to show your support without having to show it physically. Therefore, what does Dick Flacks think of the new way students are showing their support for this year presidential candidates- was it a positive or negative thing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is Flacks able to argue that technology (internet) is weakening our social ability when the example he talks about with anti war marches totally 10,000 people was organized by the email?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an age where information is literally at your fingertips how come college students are so disconnected? My theory is that college students balance a lot, and the traditional means of news has fallen by the wayside for more efficient news outlets. As students, we are new to the world of independence. We stay up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Late and sleep in even later, bypassing the leisure time on spends mulling over the morning newspaper or relaxing with it after a hard day at school. Priorities are different than they once were. Being so connected, friends and events are only a click or phone call away, calling us away from educating ourselves about the outside world – we are generation "me", the generation that only cares about the self, and the betterment of the bubble we live in. Only when we become generation "us", can we can about news and time and management, because right now, we are children, living in a dollhouse, having fun. Questions: With web access to the world from media allow citizens access 24/7, and why are students ignoring the calls to become involved? What is your theory on why the current generation is so un-politicized?

Barbour addresses social actions of today versus that of earlier decades. She shows that students today are no less interested in politics than those of yesteryear, but express it in a different way. Less often will students march to protest, but rather do it through the internet. Are the methods of today’s students any more or less affective than those in the 60s? Is the lack of dramatic expression such as riots made up for by the sheer amount of people that can be reached through the internet?

I'm not so sure I agree with Dick Flacks. He is saying that it is a bad thing for individuals to actually seek the news in which they are legitimately interested, as opposed to sorting through the stories we may not care about that are in the newspaper. This according to him is what is making the American student body more politically oblivious; maybe this just means that we have found more intelligent and direct ways to go about figuring out what we believe in. I have never been a strong believer in protesting. I'm really not sure what the point of a protest is. What effect does a student anti-war protest in Santa Barbara have on a war that is occurring on the other side of the world? Maybe these media outlets are allowing us, politically oblivious students, to see that matters such as war and international conflict are not as black and white as the media usually portrays these matters to be. This leads me to my question for the speaker: So you believe it is better for students my age to read news items and fight for causes in which we have no interest as opposed to becoming more educated about things that actually interest us?

In your article you claim that technology is a way "for individuals to experience the world according to their own personal preferences, and therefore to be relatively free from many of the controls historically available to dominant organizations and elites." How does this affect the idea of an Institution? If everyday people are less likely to be swayed by the media and political
forces, will they be able to continue to regulate our society, or will we switch to a more fully individual-center approach to life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you think the change in the media and the way we receive news will affect our generation in the long run? Do you think that it is just a phase since we don’t have access to actual newspapers on campus that we will eventually grow out of it and become just like our parents who read the newspaper daily? Or do you think we will continue to receive our news off the internet as we grow older which in the end will help to save forests around the globe in pursuit of creating a better environment and not pillaging our world, which could become a huge factor in our decision to move from actual newspapers to articles online.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally, I refrain from listening, watching, or googling the news because of the repeatedly terrible and tragic stories that are so often news worthy. I'm not saying it's the right approach to be so passive and in a way ignorant, but media today feeds off of people's need for tragic drama. Therefore stories are more often about death than politics. I was wondering what Mr. Flacks had to say about students like me. I voted and was interested in the election, but only ever turned on the news for the results. I'm not choosing to be disconnected from society, but I am taking my individual stance by choosing not to observe the media. This does not necessarily mean I live in a ‘bubble,’ does it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we don’t have access to a daily newspaper where should we go on-line to look? How do you get your news?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your opinion on the coexistence of nature and technology? Because of our generation’s dependency on technology, will the future of the environment become more at risk of degradation? Will focusing too much on technology and material objects be a problem in environmental appreciation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Though in today’s generation the use of technology is extremely useful in the world of student protest, do you believe if the students of the Vietnam age had the same opportunities, as far as technology goes, would they have used them? And because the students of today are not physically out marching, or sitting and shouting, are their voices still effective and are they still heard?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flacks’ article seems to criticize people choosing their own news. By going onto websites such as Google or Yahoo, the viewer can choose what to read and what to discard. It seems as though people would generally like to choose their news anyways, and would do the same with a newspaper. Why is it so different electronically? What are really the bad effects of choosing what you read? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the best way to be politically active?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this article, Flacks seems to hold the view that the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuating effect that has accompanied the advent of internet media sources isn’t necessarily a good thing, that ‘those using it need not experience themselves as members of a collectivity that is hearing the same news, or seeing the same shows, or sharing the same objects of attention,’ essentially that we are losing a cohesive group identity because our opinions are no longer formed by the same sources. It’s hard for me to see this individuation as a bad thing. I think of the town in Kansas that used to have only one newspaper and one local television station, that town is now inhabited by people who have access to an unimaginable number of different opinions and perspectives, an amount of opinions which is truly limited only by their imaginations. Is this really such a bad thing? Doesn’t having such an array of information at our fingertips make us more informed voters? I feel that such a wealth of readily available information promises to create more widespread political discourse in our society, and considering that the percentage of people who actually vote in the US is depressingly lower than our industrialized European counterparts, how could this be bad?