

The Society of Constant (Continuous) Opinion

Aristeidis Orfanidis

Publication Date: 2026/04/15

Abstract: This study introduces and develops the concept of the “society of constant(continuous) opinion” as a theoretical framework for understanding a significant transformation in the contemporary public sphere. In modern democratic societies, the spread of digital communication media and the increased access to information have substantially expanded citizens’ ability to participate in public discourse. The expression of opinion has become an almost universal social practice, resulting in the growing visibility and influence of opinion within the public sphere. The study examines this phenomenon through a philosophical, sociological, and political perspective. It begins with an analysis of the classical distinction between knowledge and opinion in the history of philosophy. It then proposes a definition of the society of constant opinion and presents a theoretical model that includes epistemological, communicative, and political dimensions. The research highlights the main mechanisms that reinforce the continuous production of opinion, as well as the paradox of the hyper-democratization of opinion, according to which the expansion of participation in public discourse may lead to a weakening of the distinction between knowledge and opinion, that is, between objectivity and subjectivity. Finally, the concept of the society of constant opinion is proposed as an interdisciplinary interpretive framework for analyzing the relationship between knowledge, public communication, and democratic participation in contemporary societies.

Keywords: *Society of Constant Opinion, Public Sphere, Knowledge and Opinion, Democratic Dialogue, Sociology of Communication.*

How to Cite: Aristeidis Orfanidis (2026) The Society of Constant (Continuous) Opinion. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(3), 3937-3944.
<https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1417>

I. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary societies are characterized by an unprecedented expansion of public expression. The proliferation of digital communication media and the near-universal access to information have radically transformed the way individuals participate in public discourse. The expression of opinion is no longer an activity confined to experts, intellectuals, or political actors; rather, it has become an almost universal social practice. Citizens are constantly called upon to take positions on political and social events, scientific developments, ethical or aesthetic issues, and cultural phenomena, often in an immediate and public manner.¹

This development is closely linked to fundamental democratic principles. Freedom of speech and equality among citizens presuppose that all individuals have the right to express opinions on matters concerning the community.² However, the continuous and uninterrupted production of opinion creates a new social condition that has not yet been sufficiently analyzed in theories of the public sphere.³

This study introduces the concept of the “society of continuous opinion” in order to describe this transformation. The term refers to a social condition in which the constant formulation and circulation of opinions becomes the dominant form of public participation, often regardless of the level of knowledge supporting them. Within this framework,

opinion acquires increased social visibility and influence, while the distinction between knowledge, information, and opinion tends to weaken.⁴

This concept does not aim to challenge the right to free expression. On the contrary, it seeks to understand the consequences of a historical transformation in the functioning of public discourse. The continuous production of opinion not only reshapes forms of communication but also affects the relationship between knowledge, information, and public discussion.⁵

The aim of this study is to formulate a theoretical framework for understanding this phenomenon. It begins by examining the philosophical distinction between knowledge and opinion as it appears in the classical philosophical tradition. It then defines the concept of the society of continuous opinion and develops a theoretical model that includes three levels of analysis—epistemological, communicative, and political—as well as three types of opinion. This is followed by an exploration of the mechanisms that reinforce the continuous production of opinion, and an analysis of the paradox of hyper-democracy of opinion that characterizes contemporary democratic societies.

In this way, the study seeks to contribute to contemporary discussions on the nature of the public sphere by proposing the concept of the society of continuous opinion

as an analytical category for examining the evolving relationship between knowledge, information, and opinion in modern societies. The concept is introduced here as a theoretical tool that aspires to contribute to the systematic understanding of contemporary public communication and the transformations affecting the relationship between knowledge, public discourse, and democratic participation.

II. THE PHILOSOPHICAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE AND OPINION

The distinction between knowledge and opinion is one of the oldest and most significant issues in philosophy. From antiquity to modern epistemology, philosophers have sought to differentiate mere belief from justified understanding of reality. This distinction concerns not only epistemology but also the way societies organize public discourse and decision-making processes.⁶

The first systematic formulation of this distinction appears in the philosophy of Plato. In the Platonic dialogues, a clear differentiation is made between knowledge (*epistēmē*) and opinion (*doxa*). Knowledge is characterized by stability, justification, and the ability to grasp the causes of a phenomenon. By contrast, opinion is a belief that may be true or false but is not necessarily accompanied by sufficient justification.⁷

This distinction is closely linked to the Socratic philosophical stance. Socrates emphasized that the recognition of ignorance is a prerequisite for knowledge. His famous statement, “I know that I know nothing,” does not express skepticism but rather the realization that true knowledge requires continuous inquiry and critical examination of beliefs.⁸

The distinction between knowledge and opinion persisted in modern philosophy. In contemporary epistemology, knowledge is often defined as “justified true belief.” According to this classical model, for a belief to qualify as knowledge it must be true, believed by the subject, and adequately justified.⁹ Opinion, by contrast, may consist of belief without the necessary justification.

This philosophical distinction has significant implications for the organization of public discourse. In a society where knowledge retains particular authority, positions supported by well-founded arguments acquire greater credibility. Conversely, when the distinction between knowledge and opinion weakens, public discourse tends to be dominated by beliefs that have not undergone sufficient critical examination.¹⁰

The concept of the society of continuous opinion presupposes precisely this transformation. It does not claim that opinion is a new phenomenon—opinion has always been part of human thought. It argues, however, that in contemporary societies opinion gains increased social presence and influence, often without the corresponding process of knowledge production traditionally considered necessary for forming valid judgments.¹¹

In this sense, the philosophical distinction between knowledge and opinion constitutes the theoretical starting point for understanding the phenomenon of the society of continuous opinion. The following sections examine how this distinction is transformed within the modern context of public communication and democratic participation.

III. DEFINING THE CONCEPT OF THE SOCIETY OF CONTINUOUS OPINION

Based on the philosophical distinction between knowledge and opinion, the concept of the society of continuous opinion can be formulated as an interpretive framework for understanding a contemporary transformation in the public sphere. The term refers to a social condition in which the constant production and expression of opinion becomes the dominant form of participation in public discourse.¹²

More specifically, a society of continuous opinion may be defined as a society in which individuals are encouraged—or pressured—to express views on a wide range of issues—political, scientific, ethical, or cultural—regardless of their level of knowledge. The expression of opinion thus becomes a nearly constant social activity and a primary mode of participation in the public sphere.¹³

This concept does not imply that opinion is a new phenomenon. On the contrary, the articulation of views has always been a fundamental element of human communication and democratic life. What distinguishes the society of continuous opinion is the intensity, frequency, and centrality of opinion expression. Opinion no longer appears merely as one element of public dialogue but as its dominant form.¹⁴

Within this framework, a significant shift occurs in the relationship between knowledge, information, and opinion. Knowledge, which requires systematic inquiry and justification, now coexists with a vast number of immediate opinions expressed rapidly and often without extensive justification. Information functions as an intermediate level that feeds the formation of opinion without necessarily leading to deeper understanding.¹⁵

The society of continuous opinion can therefore be understood as a social condition in which the balance among these three forms—knowledge, information, and opinion—is altered. Opinion acquires particular visibility and influence in public discourse, while the production of knowledge requires more time, effort, and institutional support.¹⁶

The term is proposed here as a theoretical tool for analyzing this transformation. It does not constitute a normative critique of opinion expression but an attempt to understand a new form of public communication characteristic of contemporary societies. The following sections present a theoretical model that analyzes the functioning of the society of continuous opinion across three levels: epistemological, communicative, and political.

IV. THE THREE LEVELS OF THE PHENOMENON

The concept of the society of continuous opinion does not merely describe a change in the way people express their views, but a broader transformation in the structure of the public sphere. To fully understand the phenomenon, it is useful to analyze it on three interrelated levels: the epistemic, the communicative, and the political. These levels do not operate independently but interact with and reinforce one another.¹⁷

➤ *Epistemic Level*

At the epistemic level, the society of continuous opinion is associated with a shift in the relationship between knowledge and opinion. As noted in the previous section, the philosophical tradition—particularly in Plato's thought—clearly distinguished between justified knowledge and mere opinion. Knowledge presupposes justification, systematic examination, and the possibility of verifying claims.¹⁸

In modern societies, however, this distinction tends to weaken in public discourse. The rapid circulation of information and the ease of expressing opinions create an environment in which opinion gains increased social visibility, even when it is not supported by systematic knowledge. The result is a shift in the cognitive balance: opinion often becomes the most immediately accessible form of participation in discussion.¹⁹

The continuous production of opinion in the public sphere is often associated with immediate and unprocessed expression. The speed of expression tends to precede the processes of reflection and justification, resulting in opinions often appearing in an unfiltered form.

➤ *Communicative Level*

The second level concerns the way communication functions in the public sphere. In the society of continuous opinion, public communication is characterized by a high rate of production of comments, judgments, and evaluations. Social media, online platforms, and digital forms of public discussion enhance the speed with which opinions are formulated and disseminated.²⁰

In this context, opinion expression acquires the features of an almost immediate reaction. The need for speed often precedes processes of deepening or verification. Communication thus becomes a continuous flow of opinions, within which analytical thinking and systematic argumentation struggle to find the necessary time and space.²¹

➤ *Political Level*

The third level concerns the consequences of the phenomenon for democratic political life. Democracy is based on the principle that citizens participate in public dialogue and make collective decisions through discussion and exchange of arguments. Expressing opinions is therefore a fundamental element of democratic participation.²²

However, when public discourse is dominated by rapid and often superficial opinions, the quality of political discussion may be affected. Political debate then tends to shift from evaluating arguments toward contesting identities or slogans. Opinions often function as indicators of political belonging rather than as results of investigation into reality.²³

These three levels—epistemic, communicative, and political—constitute the basic theoretical framework of the society of continuous opinion. Together, they show that the phenomenon is not limited to a mere increase in opinion expression but is connected to deeper changes in how knowledge is produced, disseminated, and evaluated in the public sphere.

V. THE MECHANISMS OF CONTINUOUS OPINION

The emergence of the society of continuous opinion is not a random phenomenon but the result of specific social and communicative mechanisms. These mechanisms explain why the expression of opinion has become so widespread and why opinion often gains greater visibility than systematic knowledge in the public sphere. Within the framework of the present theory, two key mechanisms can be identified that contribute to the formation of this phenomenon: social participation pressure and the identity function of opinion.²⁴

➤ *Social Participation Pressure*

The first mechanism concerns the increasing social expectation that individuals should express their views on public issues. In the contemporary public sphere, expressing an opinion is often regarded as a sign of active engagement in social and political life. Conversely, the absence of opinion may be interpreted as indifference or lack of interest.²⁵

This condition creates a form of informal social pressure: individuals feel compelled to take a position on events or issues even when they lack sufficient knowledge. Opinion thus functions as a means of inclusion in public discourse. Participation in the public sphere no longer necessarily requires systematic knowledge but primarily the ability to express an immediate position.²⁶

This pressure is further reinforced by the modern structure of public communication, where discussions evolve rapidly, and immediate reactions are often preferred over thoughtful analysis.²⁷

➤ *The Identity Function of Opinion*

The second mechanism involves the transformation of opinion into an element of social and political identity. In the society of continuous opinion, views do not operate solely as cognitive positions but also as declarations of belonging to specific groups or value frameworks.²⁸

People often express opinions to signal:

- Political alignment
- Ideological stance
- Cultural or social identity

In this case, opinion acquires a symbolic character. Its value depends not only on its justification but also on its ability to convey collective identities. Changing one's opinion thus becomes more difficult, as it may be perceived as a departure from the group or the value system with which the individual identifies.²⁹

The identity function of opinion thereby contributes to the reinforcement of continuous opinion production, as expressing opinions becomes a form of social self-presentation.³⁰

➤ *The Interaction of Mechanisms*

These two mechanisms—social participation pressure and the identity function of opinion—interact and reinforce one another. The social expectation of participation encourages individuals to express opinions, while the identity significance of opinion makes such expression important for social self-perception.³¹

The result is the creation of a public sphere in which opinion production becomes a continuous process. Opinion is no longer merely an occasional form of positioning but a fundamental element of everyday social communication. The next section will examine how this condition leads to the paradox of the hyper-democracy of opinion, which constitutes a central aspect of the theory of the society of continuous opinion.

VI. THE PARADOX OF CONTINUOUS OPINION

The society of continuous opinion gives rise to a distinctive epistemological and political paradox. Despite the fact that contemporary societies enjoy unprecedented access to knowledge, the public sphere is increasingly dominated by opinion. The dissemination of information, the development of scientific knowledge, and the ease of access to learning resources are not necessarily accompanied by a corresponding enhancement of well-founded understanding in public discourse.³²

This paradox can be formulated as follows: the more citizens' opportunities to participate in public dialogue expand, the greater the presence of opinion as a dominant form of discourse. The democratic principle of equality in public expression thus leads to a situation in which the distinction between knowledge and opinion becomes blurred.³³

Philosophical thought had already recognized this difficulty. Plato expressed concern that the dominance of opinion in public life could undermine rational judgment. Although modern democracies reject Plato's idea of governance by a knowledge elite, the problem of the relationship between opinion and knowledge remains fundamental.³⁴

In the society of continuous opinion, this paradox is intensified. The ability of all citizens to express their views constitutes a fundamental democratic right. However, when the continuous production of opinion becomes the dominant

form of public communication, knowledge often struggles to maintain its distinct position in public discourse.³⁵

The paradox of continuous opinion, therefore, does not consist in the mere existence of many opinions, but in the shifting balance between knowledge and opinion. The increase in information and access to knowledge coexists with a public discussion in which the speed of expression and the social visibility of opinions often outweigh the process of systematic understanding.³⁶

This concept helps to illuminate a key tension in the contemporary public sphere: the democratic expansion of participation in public discourse can lead to a situation in which opinion wields greater influence than knowledge. In the following section, a typology of opinion forms will be presented, aiming to clarify the different functions that opinion may perform within the framework of the society of continuous opinion.

VII. TYPOLOGY OF OPINION IN THE SOCIETY OF CONTINUOUS OPINION

Analyzing the society of continuous opinion requires a further distinction between the forms in which opinion appears in public discourse. Opinion is not a uniform phenomenon; it varies according to the level of knowledge that underpins it, the way it is formed, and the function it serves in social communication. Within the framework of this theory, three primary types of opinion can be distinguished: informed opinion, informational opinion, and identity-based opinion.³⁷

➤ *Informed Opinion*

Informed opinion is based on knowledge, study, and systematic understanding of the subject to which it refers. The individual expressing such an opinion possesses sufficient information and is able to justify their position with arguments. This form of opinion is closest to what the philosophical tradition considered rational judgment.³⁸

Since the time of Plato, knowledge has been distinguished from mere opinion precisely because it is accompanied by justification and understanding of causes. Informed opinion therefore represents a form of opinion that approaches knowledge without fully equating to it.³⁹

➤ *Informational Opinion*

Informational opinion is primarily based on fragmentary information. The individual has access to certain data or has encountered specific information, but has not engaged in deeper analysis or systematic study of the issue.

In contemporary societies, where information is abundant but often fragmented, informational opinion is a particularly widespread form of public expression. People form views based on limited elements or brief exposure to information, which can lead to a superficial understanding of complex issues.⁴⁰

➤ *Identity-Based Opinion*

The third form is identity-based opinion. In this case, the opinion is not expressed primarily for cognitive reasons but for purposes of social or political identity. The viewpoint functions as a declaration of belonging to a group, an ideological stance, or a value system.⁴¹

Opinion thus acquires a symbolic character. Its value is less related to its justification and more to its capacity to express the individual's position within the social or political field. For this reason, changing an identity-based opinion can be experienced as a threat to the person's social identity.⁴²

➤ *The Dominance of Identity-Based Opinion*

In the society of continuous opinion, there is often a reinforcement of the identity-based form of opinion. Expressing viewpoints functions not only as a means of understanding reality but also as a form of social self-presentation. Opinions become indicators of political and cultural identity.⁴³

This typology does not aim to fully categorize all forms of opinion but to provide an understanding of the main ways in which opinion operates in the contemporary public sphere. Through this distinction, it becomes possible to analyze more systematically the role of opinion in the society of continuous opinion and to better understand the shifting relationship between knowledge and public discourse.

VIII. THE PARADOX OF THE HYPER-DEMOCRACY OF OPINION

The society of continuous opinion leads to a particular paradox that can be called the paradox of the hyper-democracy of opinion. In modern democracies, freedom of expression and the equality of citizens entail that everyone has the right to express their views on public issues. This principle constitutes a fundamental prerequisite for democratic life.⁴⁴

However, when the ability to express opinion expands without limit and without distinction between knowledge and mere viewpoint, a new condition arises: opinion becomes the dominant form of public discourse. The democratic principle of equality among citizens then transforms into the equality of all opinions, regardless of the level of knowledge underpinning them.⁴⁵

Here the paradox emerges. Democracy, in seeking to broaden citizen participation in public discourse, can inadvertently create conditions in which knowledge loses its distinct position. The equality of political voice tends to be conflated with the equality of cognitive validity.⁴⁶

The philosophical tradition had already recognized this difficulty. Plato expressed concern that the dominance of opinion could undermine rational governance. Although modern democracies reject the Platonic solution of governance by "experts," the problem he highlighted remains pertinent.⁴⁷

The paradox of the hyper-democracy of opinion does not advocate restricting freedom of expression. Rather, it highlights a structural tension within democracy: the very expansion of participation in public discourse can create conditions in which the distinction between knowledge and opinion becomes blurred.⁴⁸

The society of continuous opinion can be seen as the historical context in which this paradox manifests with the greatest intensity. The more a society encourages the continuous expression of views, the more opinion tends to replace knowledge in the public sphere.⁴⁹

IX. KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOCIETY OF CONTINUOUS OPINION

The concept of the society of continuous opinion can be further clarified through the analysis of certain key characteristics that shape its functioning in the contemporary public sphere. These characteristics do not constitute independent phenomena but interrelated aspects of a broader transformation in the relationship between knowledge, communication, and democratic participation. Through them, it becomes possible to understand more precisely the structure of the modern public sphere.⁵⁰

➤ *Universal Production of Opinion*

One of the primary characteristics of the society of continuous opinion is the universal production of viewpoints. Unlike earlier historical periods, when public discourse was primarily expressed by politicians, intellectuals, or institutional actors, in modern societies almost every individual is considered a potential participant in public discussion.

This possibility is linked to the expansion of the public sphere and the development of forms of communication that allow for the immediate expression of views by a large portion of the population. Opinion production thus becomes a universal practice, and participation in public discourse transforms into an everyday social activity.⁵¹

➤ *Temporal Immediacy*

A second characteristic is the temporal immediacy of opinion expression. In the society of continuous opinion, views are often expressed immediately following an event or the appearance of information. The speed of reaction acquires particular significance in the public sphere.

This condition creates a communicative environment in which the speed of expression often precedes the process of understanding. Opinions are articulated before the collection or evaluation of available information is complete. As a result, public discussion may be characterized by intense activity but limited depth of analysis.⁵²

➤ *Flattening of Cognitive Authority*

Another characteristic of the society of continuous opinion is the weakening of cognitive authority in the public sphere. The distinction between experts and non-experts does

not disappear but becomes less visible within the structure of public communication.

Opinions expressed by scientific experts, researchers, or institutional actors often appear in the public sphere in a similar manner to views articulated without scientific justification. This flattening does not imply that knowledge ceases to exist, but rather that in public discourse, the visibility of opinion can be equated with that of knowledge.⁵³

➤ *Identity Function of Opinion*

In the society of continuous opinion, viewpoints do not function solely as cognitive positions but also as statements of social identity. Opinion expression can serve as a way of declaring political stance, ideological position, or cultural affiliation.

Opinion thus acquires a strong symbolic function. Publicly expressing a view does not only reflect a judgment about reality but also a position within the social or political field. For this reason, a change of opinion may be experienced not merely as a change of view but as a shift in identity.⁵⁴

➤ *Proliferation of Public Discourse*

Finally, a characteristic of the society of continuous opinion is the proliferation of public discourse. The continuous production of comments, evaluations, and judgments creates a state of communicative oversaturation.

In such an environment, well-grounded knowledge may struggle to stand out amid the multitude of expressed opinions. The abundance of discourse does not necessarily lead to greater understanding; on the contrary, it may result in a situation where knowledge and opinion coexist within a dense communicative field without clear distinction.⁵⁵

These characteristics indicate that the society of continuous opinion is not merely the outcome of technological change but a deeper transformation in the relationship between knowledge, communication, and democratic participation. By analyzing these characteristics, it becomes possible to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon and its implications for the modern public sphere.

X. INTERPRETIVE FUNCTION OF THE CONCEPT

The concept of the society of continuous opinion is not merely a descriptive category but also an interpretive tool for understanding significant phenomena that characterize the contemporary public sphere. Through this concept, it becomes possible to analyze changes in the ways public discourse is produced, disseminated, and evaluated in modern democratic societies.⁵⁶

One phenomenon that can be interpreted within this framework is the rapid dissemination of unsubstantiated positions in public discourse. In an environment where the expression of opinion constitutes the dominant form of participation in public communication, views can spread very

quickly, even when they are not supported by sufficient evidence. This dynamic is not necessarily linked to an intention to disseminate inaccurate information but rather to the structure of public communication, which favors immediate expression and rapid circulation of viewpoints.⁵⁷

A second phenomenon that can be interpreted through the concept of the society of continuous opinion is the growing confusion between information and commentary. In modern forms of public communication, the transmission of information is often accompanied by immediate evaluation and interpretation. The distinction between fact and opinion becomes less clear, resulting in a blurring between information and the expression of personal judgments.⁵⁸

Related to this is the difficulty in distinguishing between knowledge, information, and opinion. As previously analyzed, knowledge requires systematic investigation and substantiation, whereas information involves the simple transmission of data. In the society of continuous opinion, however, these levels are often conflated within public discourse, causing opinions to appear with similar visibility to well-founded knowledge.⁵⁹

Another phenomenon that can be interpreted through this concept is the increasing polarization of public discussions. When opinions function as markers of identity and affiliation with specific social or political groups, public discourse tends to transform into a confrontation between competing identities. Under such conditions, the evaluation of arguments may be overshadowed by the logic of group identification.⁶⁰

In this way, the concept of the society of continuous opinion functions as an interpretive framework for understanding changes in the public sphere in the contemporary era. It is not limited to describing the increased expression of opinions but enables an understanding of deeper transformations that affect the relationship between knowledge, information, and public discussion in modern democracies.

XI. METHODOLOGICAL USEFULNESS OF THE CONCEPT

The concept of the society of continuous opinion functions not only as a descriptive or interpretive framework for the contemporary public sphere but can also be employed as a methodological tool across various scientific disciplines. Its theoretical usefulness lies in its ability to facilitate a systematic investigation of the relationship between knowledge, opinion, and public communication in the modern social context.⁶¹

First, the concept can be applied in the philosophy of knowledge. Epistemology has traditionally focused on the distinction between knowledge, belief, and opinion, as well as on the conditions that render a belief epistemically valid. The concept of the society of continuous opinion provides a new framework in which these categories can be examined

not only at a theoretical level but also within the real social space of public communication.⁶²

Second, the concept is particularly useful for political philosophy. Democratic theory has repeatedly emphasized the importance of public deliberation for the functioning of democracy. The society of continuous opinion allows for the analysis of the quality of contemporary democratic dialogue, focusing on how the continuous production of opinions affects the relationship between political participation and rational discussion.⁶³

Third, the concept can be applied in the sociology of communication. Modern public communication is characterized by the mass production and circulation of opinions, comments, and evaluations. The society of continuous opinion provides a theoretical framework for understanding the mechanisms through which public discourse is produced and disseminated, as well as the social conditions that promote the growing presence of opinion in the public sphere.⁶⁴

This methodological utility demonstrates that the concept of the society of continuous opinion can serve as an interdisciplinary analytical tool. Through this concept, questions from philosophy, political theory, and the sociology of communication can be connected within a unified theoretical framework aimed at interpreting the transformations of the contemporary public sphere.

XII. CONCLUSIONS

This study has aimed to articulate and develop the concept of the society of continuous opinion as a theoretical framework for understanding the contemporary public sphere. Through the preceding philosophical, sociological, and political analysis, it has become evident that the continuous production and circulation of opinions constitutes a defining characteristic of modern democratic societies. The introduction of this concept does not seek to challenge freedom of expression, but rather to illuminate the changes observed in the relationship between knowledge, information, and public discourse.⁶⁵

The analysis began with the philosophical distinction between knowledge and opinion, a distinction deeply rooted in the history of philosophy. From Plato's differentiation between *epistēmē* and *doxa* to contemporary epistemological discussions on justified true belief, the philosophical tradition has highlighted the importance of evidence, justification, and critical examination of beliefs. This distinction provided the theoretical starting point for developing the concept of the society of continuous opinion.⁶⁶

Subsequently, the core definition of the concept was formulated, according to which the society of continuous opinion is characterized by the transformation of opinion expression into a dominant form of participation in public discourse. In such an environment, individuals are encouraged—or even pressured—to express opinions on a wide range of issues, often regardless of their level of

knowledge. Opinion thus becomes a central mechanism of public communication.⁶⁷

The analysis of the three levels of the phenomenon—cognitive, communicative, and political—demonstrated that the society of continuous opinion is not merely the result of technological changes but is linked to deeper transformations in the structure of the public sphere. At the cognitive level, there is a relative weakening of the distinction between knowledge and opinion in the public space. At the communicative level, the speed of communication enhances the immediate production of opinions. At the political level, the continuous expression of opinion affects the form of democratic deliberation.⁶⁸

The study also highlighted the main mechanisms contributing to the shaping of this phenomenon. Social pressure to participate encourages individuals to express opinions on public issues, while the identity function of opinion transforms expressed views into markers of social and political belonging. These mechanisms create a public space where the production of opinion becomes a continuous and almost inevitable process.⁶⁹

Particular attention is given to the paradox of the hyper-democracy of opinion discussed in the previous sections. Democracy relies on the principle of equality of citizens in public expression. However, when this equality is interpreted as equality of all opinions regardless of their epistemic grounding, a situation may arise in which knowledge loses its privileged position in public discourse. This paradox does not serve as an argument for restricting freedom of expression, but rather as a reflection of a structural tension characteristic of modern democracies.⁷⁰

The typology of forms of opinion—informed, informational, and identity-based—allowed further clarification of how opinion functions in the contemporary public sphere. This distinction showed that not all opinions serve the same cognitive function: some approach knowledge through evidence and argumentation, while others primarily function as mechanisms of social integration and identity.⁷¹

The analysis of the key characteristics of the society of continuous opinion also highlighted certain structural transformations in contemporary public discourse. Universal opinion production, temporal immediacy of expression, the weakening of cognitive authority, the identity function of opinions, and the proliferation of public discourse constitute fundamental elements of this new communicative environment.⁷²

Finally, the methodological usefulness of the concept of the society of continuous opinion was examined. The concept can be employed in the philosophy of knowledge to study the relationship between knowledge and opinion, in political philosophy to analyze the quality of democratic dialogue, and in the sociology of communication to understand the production of public discourse in modern societies.⁷³

Overall, the concept of the society of continuous opinion is proposed as a theoretical tool that allows for the understanding of a significant transformation in the functioning of the contemporary public sphere. The continuous production of opinions is not merely a quantitative increase in public discourse but a deeper transformation in the way public judgments are formed, expressed, and evaluated in modern democratic societies. Through this concept, it becomes possible to analyze more clearly the dynamic relationship between knowledge, opinion, and democratic communication in the contemporary world.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Arendt, Hannah. *Between Past and Future*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- [2]. ---. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- [3]. Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- [4]. ---. *On Television*. New York: The New Press, 1998.
- [5]. Brennan, Jason. *Against Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- [6]. Dewey, John. *The Public and Its Problems*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press, 1927.
- [7]. Gettier, Edmund L. "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" *Analysis* 23, no. 6 (1963): 121–23.
- [8]. Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.
- [9]. Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [10]. Kahneman, Daniel. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
- [11]. Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. New York: Free Press, 1922.
- [12]. Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- [13]. Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. London: Penguin Classics, 2006.
- [14]. Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. London: Routledge, 1945.
- [15]. Plato. *Apology*. In *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1997.
- [16]. ---. *Republic*. In *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1997.
- [17]. ---. *Theaetetus*. In *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1997.
- [18]. Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Penguin Books, 1985.
- [19]. Sartori, Giovanni. *Homo Videns: Television and Post-Thinking*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- [20]. Sunstein, Cass R. *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.