

emancipation as an on-going affair, which changes the context only to be put forward anew. An amount of illusions, concerning the scope of impacts, generated by new technologies, is invested in the changing of complex social relationships, but what is not usually taken into account is that the change in the context, or a change in the means of communication within a (social) relationship, cannot do away with the relationship as such. A suggestion that the means of interactive communication may cause a profound change of democratic decision-making so that an electorate would perpetually take part in electronically mediated “referendums” misses the point entirely. An immediate “reproducibility” of political events cannot do away with the representational – therefore potentially always ideological – factor of any conceivable democracy and the decision-making process that it implies. On the other hand, the scope of media representations such as opposed pluralistic comments, differently biased information with a verbal and visual argumentation – also in its “disreputable forms” – may or may not help civil society to participate and influence the decision-making process. After all, ever more precise and accurate surveys of public opinion are quite interactive.

However, there are many recent cases proving that the media and its effects, function always within a particular culture, and the elements of universal global culture (if it actually exists at all) become transformed through a “translation” within a given “local” culture. This, for example, happened in the Balkan countries, which were according to any criteria in 1990s media societies, gives enough material to study the ambiguity of mass culture of today in view of the slightly changed Benjamin’s terms of opposition between the “aesthetisation of politics and politicising the aesthetics”.