Journal of
Applied Sciences

ansinet
Asian Network for Scientific Information

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

Society and the Authorities: New Mechanisms of Communication in the Conditions of the Network World

[1]Leonid Baltovskij, [2]Vladimir Belous and [2]Alexander Kurochkin
[1]St. Petersburg State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Vtoraja Krasnoarmejskaja ul., 4, St. Petersburg, 190005, Russia
[2]Department of Russian Policy, Faculty of Political Sciences, St. Petersburg State University, Universitetskaja emb., 7/9, St. Petersburg, 198001, Russia

ARTICLE INFO

Corresponding Author:
Leonid Baltovskij,
St. Petersburg State University of
Architecture and Civil Engineering,
Vtoraja Krasnoarmejskaja ul.,
4, St. Petersburg, 190005, Russia
Tel: +79214388931

ABSTRACT

Early XXI century is the time when the world was rearranged and new relationships between the society and the political authorities were formed. The present study analyzes network mechanisms of political communication and their influence on the transformation of political systems of modern states. The applied relevance of this study is conditioned by the wide use of network forms of communication between the structures of the civil society and the state. Boundaries between them are largely diluted now. On the one hand, this extends the possibilities for citizens to participate in the political activity; on the other hand, this makes such participation spontaneous and uncontrollable. Both tendencies greatly influence the political process not only in the conditions of stable democratic regimes but also in various types of authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes. The authors make the following conclusions with respect to the fact whether proliferation of internet-technologies and growth of social networks introduce fundamental changes into political process, into a sphere of state and non-state actors or not: (1) The present-day political reality is largely defined by establishing network communities, (2) Network technologies and structures introduce completely new features into the process of transformation of the national state and its sovereignty, (3) Establishing network structures of management influences the expanding participation of bureaucracy in the processes of making political decisions and (4) Political science reacts to new demands from the society by updating its methodological postulates as well as introducing new notions.

Key words: Network society, political networks, crowd sourcing, communication

INTRODUCTION

The main task of this study is to give consideration to a phenomenon of a "network city" as the political reality emerging now which description will require generating a specific scientific language (Baltovskij and Belous, 2013). What were the prerequisites of studying Netocracy? The development of new scientific methodology at the end of the XX-th century brought about the creation of an original sociological concept representing the contemporary society as the network association. The first use of "social network" term is attributed to anthropologist (Barnes, 2006). The concepts "network communication", "network communities", "network society" came into use for the first time as far back as early 1970s. Further on the network problems were developed by White (1992) and Freeman (2004). Canadian sociologist Wellman B. became one of the pioneers in this field, who wrote his work "The Network City" (Craven and Wellman, 1973). His key idea consisted in the actualization of apprehension of the society as socially and dimensionally diversified network or the "network of networks" and retreat from the traditional perceptions of society as the system of

hierarchically-organized and interrelated social groups. The ideas of Wellman were elaborated by Hiltz and Turoff (1993). The main credit of these authors consists in anticipation of (long before internet creation) a revolutionary role of computer technologies in the course of transformation of social communications. Actually the term proper was used for the first time by Martin (1978), for real, not yet in the "network society" version which is more customary today but in the form of "wired society" to define a society, where the mass media makes a basis of social and cultural links.

The next wave of interest to the network communications and network communities falls at late 1980s-early 2000s and is linked directly to a revolutionary breakthrough in the sphere of information technologies development and to a cardinal renovation of media-resources. The works of sociologist; Van Dijk (2005) from Holland, specialists in urban and regional planning; Albrechts and Mandelbaum (2006), studies of Cardoso (2005), quite ambitious and ambiguous work of Bard and Soderqvist (2002) and a number of works of other authors can also be mentioned here.

In general terms a previous study has defined the social network as a set of socially-relevant units connected through one or several links. The people, organizations, websites, publications, countries and many other objects can operate as these units. The cooperation, friendship, exchange or power relations, web references, quotations, flows of information and different types of resources, etc., can come under review as the links. In every particular case the concise network definitions will differ from each other to a significant extent due to an empirical character. A network coordination model oriented to involvement in the process of discussion and formulation of the policy of uttermost wide circle of actors as well as actualization of coordinative function of state come out under conditions of network society and knowledge-driven economy as the most effective model of development and implementation of innovative policy. A theory of a network society in its final form has been developed by M. Castells, one of the leading sociologists of the present time. A basic content has been laid down in the trilogy "The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture" (Castells, 2000, 2003, 2010).

The authors develop a point of view of Castells in this study to the effect that the proliferation of internet-technologies and the growth of social networks make qualitative changes in our understanding of a political process and its actors. The internet transforms communities by building new forms of collectivity (e.g., social networks of Facebook type); enhances communities by adding new means of communication to already available ones. In this connection the authors are being guided by the following assumption: The network society defines new determinants of economical and social and political development influencing the dominating model of state policy development and implementation as well as parameters determining its efficiency. The main purpose of the study is to define the content and specific features of

influence of the network forms of cooperation and coordination of political activity on the traditional democratic institutions.

It is supposed to solve the following tasks in order to reach this goal:

- Determine and analyze the transformation of nature of the relations of power under conditions of network society
- Investigate a process of autonomation of public institutions and growth of the importance of horizontal relations in the system of state administration
- Analyze a change of conditions and principles of efficient bureaucracy functioning in the network community

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the present study, we research the status of the new political reality that is being currently formed; in order to describe it, a specialized scientific language needs to be developed (Baltovskij and Belous, 2013). The objects of research are new network forms of political communication as well as of political system where they are implemented. A particular case of such analysis regards the modern political system and the political process in Russia that are influenced by network forms of communication. As the basis of the analysis of cross-sectoral interaction between the society and the state, we used the basic notions of the network approach and in particular, the theory of political networks. The methodological basis of the research are the theory and the applied analysis of network society as presented in the works by Bogason and Toonen (1998), Castells (2005), Cardoso (2005), Van Dijk (2005), Hassan and Thomas (2006), Rhodes (1997) and Kickert *et al.* (1997) as well as provisions and conclusions put forward in the study of Knoke (2012), Borzel and Panke (2007), Scharpf (2013) and Davies and Imbroscio (2012), regarding the theory and organization principles of political networks.

Main part: Early XXI century is characterized by establishing a new type of society-a network one. Under the influence of wide spreading of self-regulating networks, transformations of political systems and their separate elements take place. This effect has been highlighted by many political analysts and management theorists (Judge *et al.*, 1995; Kickert *et al.*, 1997; Rhodes, 1997; Bogason and Toonen, 1998; Scharpf, 1998; Sorensen, 2002; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003; Koliba *et al.*, 2011; Davies and Imbroscio, 2012; Alderman *et al.*, 2014). They investigated a growing significance of international political institutions that often are of a network character; they analyze creation and spreading of new administrative technologies that promote development of institutions of self-regulation inside the political system and intensification of various forms of interaction between private and official state actors.

Most of the above-mentioned authors agree that establishing the network character of the modern society

promote forming mixed or transitory forms of management defined as the "network management overshadowed by hierarchies" (Sorensen and Torfing, 2007; Scharpf, 2013). At the same time, only a few of them speak of the cardinal character of changes, of the transition to the essentially new network system of political management. We place high importance on researching modern forms of political subjectiveness. In this regard, the following question is topical: Do network forms of coordination and co-operation in the political management influence the traditional democratic institutions? Do they influence the principles of the so-called "liberal democracy" as well as their use for developing and implementation of innovative politics?

In the conditions when a new network society is formed, studies of new forms of political management are of particular interest as well as research of the influence of the corresponding models of political decisions on the traditional principles of functioning of democratic political systems. A significant role is played by such notions as the principle of functional division between the political and the social spheres, the principle of minimizing the influence from the bureaucracy on the process of political decision-making, regarding the institute of representation as the basic mechanism ensuring connection between the "people" and the political decision-makers and finally, the change of the notion "people" ("demos") itself (Scharpf, 2013).

In the past, the tight connection between the processes of establishing the classical concept of liberal democracy and developing sovereign national states as key actors on the global political stage, caused to erase the difference between the meanings of "people" and "citizens". Boundaries of national states became basic demarcation lines defining a particular "people" (i.e., nation). The main formal-legal attribute of a particular nation was whether an individual had its citizenship or not. Whatever the political meaning of "people" (nation) could be, this term, in the classical concept of liberal democracy, had a pre-determined character. It was considered as not the result of the political process but as some "pre-political" entity. The focus is on how democracy is institutionally structured and how it should function within that political entity. A too tight connection with the phenomenon of the national state and its static, pre-determined character were the main reasons of criticism of the traditional interpretation of the notion "people" (nation) in the conditions of transition to the network model of social management (Castells, 2013). The notion of "demos" is becoming more and more trans-border, highly non-uniform and it is, to a large extent, formed in the course of the political process.

Criticism of the traditional idea of the national state and the state sovereignty is widely presented in the political analytical literature (Davies and Imbroscio, 2012; Scharpf, 2013; Strom and Mollenkopf, 2007). Firstly, it is related to the phenomenon of localization, when global international structures (International Monetary Fund, World Bank, European Community etc.) increasingly limit sovereignty of national states in the global arena, whereas, at the same time, local and regional authorities that rely on the principles of territorial de-centralization and subsidiary, weaken sovereignty from the inside. The conditions of globalization itself set limits to the economic nationalism and induce co-operation in solving global problems of the present time, which, in its turn, conditions the limitations of the sovereignty in technology and structures of nations.

Network technologies introduced completely new features due to the process of transformation of national states and their sovereignty. Castells (2013) highlights that, instead of the traditional national state, a new type of state is to come forward; it will be based on "networks of political institutions and decision-making organs on the national, regional and local levels; their inevitable interaction will transform decision-making into endless negotiations between them" (Castells, 2013). Developing these ideas, well-known experts in the sphere of state management and urban issues (Judge *et al.*, 1995) draw the conclusion that a network structure supports a specialized language and coordinates system, within which the modern administrative reality can be analyzed from a new viewpoint (Judge *et al.*, 1995). In this coordinates system, the state no longer has an exclusive position as an administrative and political decision-maker and the management process itself becomes much more complex that includes a lot of actors who usually have diverging interests (Strom and Mollenkopf, 2007). On the global level of management, the adepts of the network approach define the possibility and the usefulness of forming a uniform system of trans-national networks aimed at fulfilling a number of functions delegated to it from national states and uniting international organizations, national states and civil structures (Slaughter, 1997).

At the same time, the practical politics implemented in the network realm nowadays gives rise to completely new effects which also requires revision of the traditional view of the state sovereignty and the future transformation of national states. In this regard, one of the most illustrative phenomenon is WikiLeaks that showed one of the important demarcation lines between the "old" state (based on hierarchy and strict legal order) and the "new" one (already diluted in global networks) as well as controversial and conflicting character of these two modalities. Despite its ambiguous character, the phenomenon of WikiLeaks is not to be regarded a political game or a highly provoking attempt. It developed an ideology of its own and turned into a geographically wide movement with lots of followers. During 2010-2011, replicas of WikiLeaks were created in different regions. For publishing the information that was supposed to be classified, the web-site BrussellsLeaks in the EU. In the Balkan region, a local site BalkanLeaks was started as well as the site PirateLeaks in Czech Republic; even in Indonesia which seems so different from Western social-political trends, the site IndoLeaks was created.

On the global level, a new and more developed platform OpenLeaks is created; it is aimed at accepting, processing and publishing any type of information. In the internet, a wide WikiLeaks followers' movement is developing

cyber-dissidents named the "anonymous". It is the "anonymous" formulated (be it not quite perfectly and completely shaped yet) the ideological manifest of the new social movement inspired by the WikiLeaks: "We are living in the digital age. The technology of the XXI century makes it possible for the authorities to intervene the private life and these capabilities are used to their maximum. Our campaign in support of WikiLeaks is not petty vandalism. Our only purpose consists in promoting democratic virtues for the sake of everybody's benefit".

The main conclusion that can be drawn from the "WikiLeaks case" is significant increase in the social-political influence from small social groups and individuals in the conditions of establishing the network society and the public sphere with changing forms and tools. They are now becoming significant actors both in the national sphere and on the global stage. It is important that this process is taking place simultaneously with a decrease in the power of traditional authorities in the sphere of international relationships and partly, the sovereignty of national states and their alliances. International relationships are turning into a multi-level and multi-sided process of interaction implemented in various forms that are often not related to the official realm (Gill, 2008).

Social networks and other forms of internet communication form a new culture of publicity that, in the near future, will most likely dominate the political realm and define the agenda of the social and political activity. In this sense they definitely transform traditional view of the state sovereignty. The hierarchic structure of political authority is now being transformed into a pretty complex network structure where no single decision-maker having absolute sovereignty can be identified (Acevedo, 2009).

The formation of a new political reality is contingent upon the fact that the interaction of society and management environment changes with respect to a relatively stable linearly developing state towards more complex and indefinite state. This factor stimulates significantly the demands for various innovations, compels the state structures and business respond in the way of more sophisticated strategies corresponding to the network forms of coordination and interaction (Kettl, 1996). The proliferation of new forms of coordination of social relations keeps up to date a fundamentally new type of social conflicts as well, predetermines a trend towards individualized forms of social existence. All these create conditions for the crisis of a national state in its traditional administrative and bureaucratic form and demonstrate its capability to efficiently confront the swift-flowing changes and challenges of the external environment (Fabbrini, 1995). As a result, it can not control the social medium through the classical scheme of subject-object management coordinated from one center any more. The hierarchic structure of political power rearranges itself in the course of adaptation to these challenges into a complex network structure but in this case a status of the sole and absolutely sovereign subject capable of taking decisions becomes doubtful since it contradicts a bureaucratic management principle.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The next challenge to traditional concepts of the structure and basic actors of democratic procedures is associated with the changed role of administrative structures in the process of policy formulation and implementation. The following issue still remains disputable and problematic now: Does the set of the most significant requirements to efficient administration change radically under conditions of the network society and accordingly, does the very image of bureaucracy change? Or the bureaucracy is a priori neutral in taking these or the other political decisions and its image shall as before, remain conservative (Kettl, 2002).

According to Wilson (1987) and Weber (2013), the founders of classical theory of administrative policy, the bureaucracy and administrative institutions are presented as a priori neutral and laid-back actors in the process of taking political decisions. The indicated difference of bureaucracy is an important principle determining substantive difference of the theory of administrative policy and political science. Such an approach is frequently doubted in the modern political science on the state policy and administration. Ironically but particularly the establishment of network administration structures is used as a crucial factor of expanding bureaucracy participation in the processes of policy shaping and adopting. The same point of view is adhered to by Latham (2002).

First of all, the network process leads to the growth of autonomy of public institutions which, in turn, determines political administration as meta-administration effected through self-regulatory mechanisms and accordingly, erodes a boundary between politics and administration (Sorensen, 2002). On the other side, a growing importance of horizontal relations essentially strengthens the functions of administrative structures in the sphere of organizing and coordinating interaction of different networks. They become the key actors of the network politics and administration replacing at the same time a traditional administration by coordinative methods and administration practices (Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004; Latham, 2002).

The capability of effective coordination, mediatorship and non-standard solutions instead of dominating principles of political neutrality and adherence to the language of law become the key requirements here. The creativity and initiatives in a search for solution of political problems become the most demanded qualities of the present-day bureaucrats (Rhodes, 1997). A managerial approach became one of the first to shape an updated model of sharing functions between politicians and policy-makers by providing politicians with the functions of determining political agenda and general principles of administration and securing the direct politics implementation by the method which is the most acceptable in this particular case to the policy-makers (Bogason, 2004; Ronfeldt and Arquilla, 2009).

An important problem that can not be just overpassed in the course of analyzing changes of political institutions under conditions of network society concerns transformation of the

nature of power relations. Do the network structures feature a special form of coordinating interactions or a traditional hierarchic, when the nature and character of power relations implementation is the same as in the political systems of etatistical or egalitarian type?

The most fully developed methodological approach to the analysis of political power in the network society can be found in a number of the latest studies of Castells (2007, 2011). According to his opinion the network structures correspond to a special form of coordination of interactions which are fundamentally different from the traditional political hierarchies. The key factors influencing the specific features of power relations are nowadays, first of all, the emergence and proliferation of new forms of communication which become the fundamental principle for shaping the public opinion (instead of traditional institutions of etatistical or egalitarian type); secondly, a proliferation of media or show politics (a political message is always a message communicated by the mass media; the politics uses patterns, images, etc.) (Castells *et al.*, 2009; Schneider, 2001).

The attempts are made in the modern political theory to revise the idea of politics and political process in view of the reviewed above changes generating new challenges by means of introducing the new concepts: "Cyber politics" (or less frequently, "network politics") and "noopolitics" (politics of knowledge). The cyber politics became a frequent practice thanks largely to an assumption that internet and different network technologies not just influence the political process but transform it changing the composition of participants, methods and character of political participation as well as its institutional basis. In this case the overwhelming majority of cyber politics definitions feature either extremely wide (like any political communication functioning on internet) or technological character (use of internet communications as the tool for increasing efficiency of the state politics and administration) (Scheule, 2003).

The other term noopolitics from Greek word Noos (knowledge) and German word Politik (politics) has been suggested by the American researchers (Arquilla *et al.*, 1999) to designate a political strategy of manipulations in the sphere of international relations effected predominantly through network mass media and aimed at shaping either positive or negative image of the foreign-policy strategies proposed by a state or a group of states (Arquilla *et al.*, 1999). The noopolitics actualizes influence of the non-state actors and especially their networks in the international political relations. At the time when the real politics strives to strengthen the state in the international arena, the noopolitics puts forward a wide proliferation and strengthening the networks of state and non-state actors as the main task. The idea of this term introduction is confined to actualization of the role of knowledge and network forms of communication (key tools of the so called soft force) under conditions of a new system of international relations determined by the conditions of network society. Nevertheless, it remains not clear, what are the limits of expanding and using the real politics and noopolitics, since

the political strategies of manipulations (as an expression of will to power) turn, first of all, to and regularly penetrate into a sphere of state and non-state actors.

It is apparent that the prospects of using network terms and accordingly, heuristical potential of revising the political theory attempted in this respect will depend on more clear definition of the distinctive characteristics thereof as well as general positive answer to a question, whether the proliferation of Internet technologies and exponential growth of social networks bring about essential changes into our concepts of political process and its actors or not (e.g., whether the network society became a space for total planning, etc., or not) (Quan-Haase, 2012; Hampton and Wellman, 2003; Innes, 2006; Van Dijk, 2006).

CONCLUSION

It may be noted to summarize the foregoing that the networks become, no doubt, a source of power in the new society; however, this power appears not as a result of exclusiveness of the network phenomenon proper. There exists an effect of synergy which helps take the omnidirectional interests into account and produce optimal decisions to a maximum extent. A basis of network politics is the provision of ultimately wide involvement in the process of discussing, taking and implementing decisions. In the final reckoning we can say that the network society is being shaped in the deliberate environment, environment of the public discourse and gets filled with new political contents radically changing not only the structure but the essence of political relations. The "network" society grants a chance to a new political type of communication and interaction of everybody with everyone to open. A network is a new Leviathan taking over the supra-national functions: Control over individual and social medium. It cannot go unnoticed that a contemporary individual lets himself into the networks of his own free will; escaping from the politics it gets trapped by the other "nets" spread for him. It is quite possible that at certain following community development evolution the network will begin to be perceived as a grave digger of that form of statesmanship which is funded with hostility and old social master-slave contract. It is also a possibility that particularly the network will formulate and shape a new social contract with a unity of ethnos, state, community and individual spelled out in it.

The following findings are suggested as the basic study results:

- The modern political reality is characterized by transformation of political systems and their separate elements. Establishing the network society promotes special forms of state management. Classical forms of democracy as the power of the people are radically changed. The meaning of the notion "demos" is more and more diluted and is often arbitrarily construed in the course of the political process

- Network technologies and structures introduce new features into the process of transformation of the national state and the idea of sovereignty. Social networks and other forms of communication form a new culture of publicity. In the new system of coordinates, the state no longer has the role of the exclusive center of decision-making for administrative and political issues. The management process itself becomes much more complex that includes many actors which often have diverging interests

- Establishing network structures of management, paradoxically, causes extended participation of the bureaucracy in the processes of political decision-making. A growing significance of horizontal connections greatly increases the function of administrative structures in the sphere of organizing and coordinating the interaction between different networks. At the same time, network structures are a specialized form of coordinating the interaction that is essentially different from the authorities' hierarchy

- The modern political science reacts to the new reality by revising the overviews of politics and the political process through introducing new notions and improving the methodological tools. Obviously, the perspectives of using these terms will depend on the heuristic potential of the revised political theory

REFERENCES

Acevedo, M., 2009. Network cooperation: Development cooperation in the network society. Int. J. Inform. Commun. Technol. Hum. Dev., 1: 1-21.

Albrechts, L. and S.J. Mandelbaum, 2006. A New Context for Planning? In: The Network Society: A New Context for Planning? Albrechts, L. and S.J. Mandelbaum (Eds.). Routledge, London, ISBN: 9780415701501, pp: 1-6.

Alderman, N., C. Ivory, I. Mcloughlin and R. Vaughan, 2014. Managing Complex Projects: Networks, Knowledge and Integration. Routledge, New York, ISBN: 9781134423613, Pages: 173.

Arquilla, J., D. Ronfeldt, D. Barnes-Proby, E. Williams and J. Christian, 1999. The Emergence of Noopolitik: Toward an American Information Strategy. RAND Corporation, Santa-Monika, California, ISBN: 9780833048271, Pages: 102.

Baltovskij, L. and V. Belous, 2013. Communicative element in the activities of Russian political parties: Past and present. World Applied Sci. J., 23: 936-940.

Bard, A. and J. Soderqvist, 2002. Netocracy: The New Power Elite and Life after Capitalism. Pearson Education, Harlow, USA., ISBN: 9781903684290, Pages: 269.

Barnes, J.A., 2006. Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish. In: Models and Interpretations: Selected Essays, Barnes, J.A. (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, ISBN: 9780521024938, pp: 67-87.

Bogason, P. and T.A.J. Toonen, 1998. Introduction: Networks in public administration. Public Admin., 76: 205-227.

Bogason, P., 2004. Local Democratic Governance: Allocative, Integrative or Deliberative? In: Tampering with Tradition: The Unrealized Authority of Democratic Agency, Bogason, P., S. Kensen and H. Miller (Eds.). Lexington Books, Lanham, MD., USA., ISBN: 9780739107485, pp: 23-38.

Borzel, T. and D. Panke, 2007. Network Governance: Effective and Legitimate? In: Theories of Democratic Network Governance, Sorenson, E. and J. Torfing (Eds.). Routledge, London, ISBN: 9780230220362, pp: 153-166.

Cardoso, G., 2005. Societies in Transition to the Network Society. In: The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy, Castells, M. and G. Cardoso (Eds.). Center for Transatlantic Relations, Washington, DC., ISBN-13: 9780976643456, pp: 23-67.

Castells, M., 2000. End of Millennium, Volume III: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. 2nd Edn., Wiley, Malden, MA., ISBN: 9780631221395, Pages: 464.

Castells, M., 2003. The Power of Identity: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume 2. 2nd Edn., Wiley, Malden, MA., ISBN: 9781405107136, Pages: 560.

Castells, M., 2005. The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy. In: The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy, Castells, M. and G. Cardoso (Eds.). Center for Transatlantic Relations, Washington, DC, ISBN-13: 9780976643456, pp: 3-22.

Castells, M., 2007. Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. Int. J. Commun., 1: 238-266.

Castells, M., M. Fernandez-Ardevol, J.L. Qiu and A. Sey, 2009. Mobile Communication and Society: A Global Perspective. MIT Press, London, ISBN: 9780262262309, Pages: 352.

Castells, M., 2010. The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume 1. 2nd Edn., Wiley, Malden, MA., ISBN: 9781405196864, Pages: 597.

Castells, M., 2011. A network theory of power. Int. J. Commun., 5: 737-787.

Castells, M., 2013. Communication Power. 2nd Edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK., ISBN: 9780191510441, Pages: 624.

Craven, P. and B. Wellman, 1973. The network city. Sociol. Inquiry, 43: 57-88.

Davies, J.S. and D.L. Imbroscio, 2012. Introduction: Urban Politics in the Twenty-first Century. In: Theories of Urban Politics, Davies, J.S. and D.L. Imbroscio (Eds.). 2nd Edn., SAGE Publication, London, ISBN: 9781412921619, pp: 1-14.

Fabbrini, S., 1995. Italy: The Crisis of an Oligarchical States. In: Disintegration or Transformation? The Crisis of the State in Advanced Industrial Societies, McCarthy P. and E. Jones (Eds.). Palgrave Macmillan, New York, ISBN: 9780312121990, pp: 65-84.

Freeman, L.C., 2004. The Development of Social Network Analysis: A Study in the Sociology of Science. Empirical Press, Vancouver, Canada, ISBN: 9781594577147, Pages: 205.

Gill, S., 2008. Power and Resistance in the New World Order. 2nd Edn., Palgrave Macmillan, New York, ISBN: 9780230203693, Pages: 288.

Goldsmith, S. and W.D. Eggers, 2004. Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector. The Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC., ISBN: 9780815731283, Pages: 224.

Hajer, M.A. and H. Wagenaar, 2003. Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK., ISBN: 9780521530705, Pages: 307.

Hampton, K. and B. Wellman, 2003. Neighboring in Netville: How the internet supports community and social capital in a wired suburb City Community, 2: 277-311.

Hassan, R. and J. Thomas, 2006. The New Media Theory Reader. McGraw-Hill, New York, ISBN: 9780335217106, Pages: 326.

Hiltz, S.R. and M. Turoff, 1993. The Network Nation: Human Communication via Computer. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA., ISBN: 9780262082198, Pages: 557.

Innes, J.E., 2006. Networks and Planning Thought. In: The Network Society: A New Context for Planning? Albrechts, L. and S.J. Mandelbaum (Eds.). Routledge, London, pp: 57-62.

Judge, G., G. Stoker and H. Wolman, 1995. Urban Politics and Theory. In: Theories of Urban Politics, Judge, D., G. Stoker and H. Wolman (Eds.). SAGE Publication, London, ISBN: 9780803988644, pp: 1-12.

Kettl, D.F., 1996. Civil Service Reform: Building a Government That Works. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, ISBN: 9780815749035, Pages: 110.

Kettl, D.F., 2002. The Transformation of Governance: Public Administration for Twenty-First Century America. Johns Hopkins University Press, Washington, DC., USA., ISBN-13: 9780801870491, Pages: 204.

Kickert, W.J.M., E.H. Klijn and J.F.M. Koppenjan, 1997. Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector. SAGE Publication, London, ISBN: 9780761955481, Pages: 206.

Knoke, D., 2012. Economic Networks. 1st Edn., Polity Press, Cambridge, ISBN-13: 9780745649979, Pages: 180.

Koliba, C., J. Meek and A. Zia, 2011. Governance Networks in Public Administration and Public Policy. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Latham, R., 2002. Information technology and social transformation. Int. Stud. Rev., 4: 101-115.

Martin, J., 1978. The Wired Society. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ., ISBN: 9780139614415, Pages: 300.

Quan-Haase, A., 2012. Technology and Society: Social Networks, Work and Inequality. Oxford University Press, Oxford, ISBN: 9780195437836, Pages: 304.

Rhodes, R.A.W., 1997. Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability. Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia, ISBN: 9780335197286, Pages: 235.

Ronfeldt, D. and J. Arquilla, 2009. Noopolitik: A New Paradigm for Public Diplomacy. In: Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy, Snow, N. and P. Taylor (Eds.). Routledge, New York, pp: 352-365.

Scharpf, F., 1998. Interdependence and democratic legitimating. MPIfG Working Paper 98/2, September 1998, Max-Planck-Institute for the Study of Societies, Koln, Germany. http://www.mpifg.de/pu/workpap/wp98-2/wp98-2.html.

Scharpf, F., 2013. Political legitimacy in a non-optimal currency area. MPIfG Discussion Paper 13/15, October 2013, Max-Planck-Institute for the Study of Societies, Koln, Germany. http://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp13-15.pdf.

Scheule, R.M., 2003. [Noopolitik in Empire. Political Action and Political Legitimacy in the Information Age]. In: Handeln im Netz: Bereichsethiken und Jugendschutz im Internet [Action on the Net Area of Ethics and Youth Protection on the Internet], Hausmanninger, T. (Ed.). Wilhelm Fink Verlag, Munich, Germany, ISBN-13: 9783770538140, pp: 59-82, (In German).

Schneider, V., 2001. Institutional Reform in Telecommunications: The European Union in Transnational Policy Diffusion. In: Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change, Cowles, M.G., J.A. Caporaso and T. Risse-Kappen (Eds.). Cornell University Press, USA., ISBN: 9780801486715, pp:60-79.

Slaughter, A.M., 1997. The real new world order. Foreign Affairs, 76: 183-197.

Sorensen, E., 2002. Democratic theory and network governance. Admin. Theor. Praxis, 24: 693-720.

Sorensen, E. and J. Torfing, 2007. Theoretical Approaches to Governance Network Dynamics. In: Theories of Democratic Network Governance, Sorensen, E. and J. Torfing (Eds.). Palgrave Macmillan, London, ISBN: 9781403995285, pp: 25-42.

Strom, E.A. and J.H. Mollenkopf, 2007. The Urban Politics Reader. Routledge, London, ISBN: 9780415319966, Pages: 354.

Van Dijk, J., 2005. The Deepening Divide: Inequality in the Information Society. 1st Edn., SAGE Publications, London, ISBN-13: 978-1412904032, Pages: 248.

Van Dijk, J., 2006. The Network Society: Social Aspects of New Media. Sage Publications, London, ISBN: 9781412908672, Pages: 292.

Weber, M., 2013. Economy and Society. University of California Press, Berkeley, ISBN: 9780520280021, Pages: 1469.

White, H.C., 1992. Identity and Control: A Structural Theory of Social Action. Princeton University Press, Princeton, ISBN: 9780691003986, Pages: 423.

Wilson, W., 1987. The study of administration. Political Sci. Q., 2: 197-222.