# International Journal of Applied Research

**Dr. Sanjeev Kumar**
Assistant Professor in History
Amity University Haryana,
Gurugram, Haryana, India

# Rise of Netpolitik and internet changing international politics and diplomacy

**Dr. Sanjeev Kumar**

**Abstract**
It is most important pattern of the current use of technology to affect global interaction is just the tip of the iceberg. As described in the sides that follow, Diasporic societies around the global affect the internal politics and outer policy positions of their motherlands through e-mails and websites. The fast communication of information straight from the source allows global players to bypass formal diplomatic channels, have need off aster and maybe less considered responses by administrative officials and enables NGOs to communicate and make an impression their positions more broadly. Cyber campaigns influence political and economic decisions throughout the world. The last 500 years by historical personalities such as Richelieu, Metternich, Bismarck and Kissinger. Diplomats play political chess with nation-states, balancing and manipulation one against the other to gain political advantage. It is a international of fault lines: the global alliances leading to the world wars, the subsequent Cold War or the Clash of Civilizations suggested by Samuel Huntington. This article focused on rise of Netpolitik: how the internet is changing international politics and diplomacy.

**Keywords:** international politics, international liberalism, Netpolitik, realpolitik, noopolitik, media politics, cyberpolitik, network power

## 1. Introduction
In this new 21st century environment the network has emerged as the dominant organizing principle. This is the culmination of the societal evolution from tribes to institutions to markets to networks. In the current century, the digital revolution has changed the music, publishing, banking and retail industries, as well as corporate and civic governance. Passive listeners or viewers have become active creators. The world today is more social, mobile, interconnected and active. This is fostering more informed transactions, greater connections with peers and more opportunities in every aspect of life.

With the advent of movement in the general public, bright chances are that with not need the world of diplomacy. No doubt the latest technology especially in the Information Technology sector has transformed the entire attitude thinking of the world society and common man. Even it has also conventional and traditional vocabulary to exchange the ideas, wisdom and opinions, has now became an old cliché. Now prefer to use Netpolitik instead of Realpolitik to face the diplomacy. So in these circumstances, Netpolitik has become so instrumental that even the diplomat has taken initiative to access to politics, to execute certain policies and to queries of the public. Moreover, diplomats have become accessible for the common through the Netpolitik. In turn, the players in this new world of complex interactions will need to understand network principles and how to increase, in David Grewal's words, "network power". As diplomacy moves to the masses, with public and citizen diplomacy-seen as so important in the Arab Spring and other hot spots that diplomats will need to involve themselves in the tools, principles, culture and mindset of Netpolitik.

## 2. Significance of the theme
The International politics and diplomacy were the preserve of government leaders and certain elite actors in Law, Finance, Business and Academia. Now, not only is the velocity of information posing new challenges for the diplomatic crops, so is the proliferation of new participant. Perhaps the most important imperative in Netpolitik is to recognize that it exists.

**Correspondence**
**Dr. Sanjeev Kumar**
Assistant Professor in History
Amity University Haryana,
Gurugram, Haryana, India

The Internet and other information technologies are no longer a peripheral force in the conduct of world politics but a powerful engine for change. Global electronic networking is not only remaking economies, but transforming people's values, identities, and social practices. Moreover, these changes are not just occurring within the boundaries of nation-states but all sorts of unpredictable transnational communication. The significance of the theme are explore how the faster velocity of information and the diversification sources are complicating international diplomacy.

## 3. Objectives of the study
### 3.1 This study is intended to get associated on the following
- To discuss the rise of Netpolitik in international relations.
- To talk about the key features of international politics and diplomacy.
- To analysis the major theories of Netpolitik related to Politics and cyber diplomacy.
- To highlight the principal of Netpolitik in cyber diplomacy and international relation.
- To draw attention to internet play key role in digital diplomacy and new opportunity in world politics.

## 4. Research methodology
The study based on primary and secondary sources of information. Here we study the various steps that are generally adopted by a researcher in working on his research problem along with the logic behind them. It is necessary for the researcher to know not only the research method/techniques but also the methodology. The data collected from the secondary sources of information, it is classified and presented in the form of simple tables for easy understanding. In addition to the literature collected through journals, books, articles, seminar reports.

## 5. Review of literature
In order to answer the posed questions I have collected and analysed a large amount of material. To create a theoretical framework section, I have used a number of articles and books written by prominent scholars in the field of social media, communication studies and international relations.

### 5.1 Theoretical development of Netpolitik
To frame the global strategic questions, political leaders and leading thinkers have tended to gravitate to at least two different "worldview" approaches:
A. Realpolitik has been practiced over the past 500 years by historical luminaries such as Richelieu, Metternich, Bismarck and Kissinger. Diplomats play political chess with nation-states, balancing and maneuvering one against the other to gain political advantage or equilibrium. This is a world of fault lines: the global alliances leading to the world wars, the subsequent Cold War or the Clash of Civilizations suggested by Samuel Huntington.
B. Liberal Internationalism regards the world as moving to an intertwined world organism composed of international players governmental and non-governmental for whom reality is inter-reliance among nations and cultures, economies and environments, and lack of control over many of the actions that affect one's

own locale. It recognizes that people belong to several communities at the same time, have multiple self-images and identities, and need to see themselves as world citizens as well. Here, informal diplomats use soft power, the attractive power of ideas, to survive or prevail. Thomas Friedman's (1999) [33] highlights this world approach, which is best explained, I believe, in Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye's (1977) [29]. Princeton Lyman, is aimed at helping citizens understand their relationship to world affairs and people throughout the globe.

### 5.2 Interrelationship between media and politics
A. **Media politics:** Lee Edwards (2001: 7) describes the interrelationship between the mass media and world politics in liberal democratic, authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. He suggests, as many observers have before, that "there is a strong but always shifting correlation among government, journalism, and public opinion in foreign policy making". In essence, Edwards places the role of media as a central player in the conduct of world politics.
B. **Cyberpolitik:** David Rothkopf, (1998) [30] in his article "Cyberpolitik: The Changing Nature of Power in the Information Age" suggests that "the realpolitik of the new era is cyberpolitik, in which the actors are no longer just states, and raw power can be countered or fortified by information power".
C. **Noopolitik:** John Arquilla and David Ronfeld (1999: 29) [1] coined this term from Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's concept of noo sphere, the sphere of ideas. "Noopolitik is an approach to state craft, to be undertaken as much by non-state as by state actors, that emphasizes the role of soft power in expressing ideas, values, norms and ethics through all manner of media". It incorporates not only mass and cyber media but also the concept of soft power and thought leadership in developing strategy on the world stage.

All of these approaches, with some overlapping, help to explain the circumstances we face in the current age-dilemmas that the terrorist attacks of 2001 have so cruelly sharpened. However, none of them may be sufficient for understanding and dealing with the 21st century of high technology, biological encroachment, network structures, blurring borders, rapid communication, ambiguous actions and endemic insecurity. In short, the international diplomacy and politics rules changed probably not completely, hut significantly in this era of complexity there are new battles fought every day for the citizen's attention, affinity and loyalty. Identity, meaning, grand narratives, legitimacy, participation, rights and access are implicated and are carried out over a series of networks and through a variety of media (Bollier, 2002) [3]. Therefore the word 'Netpolitik' is adopted to describe the importance of the network from as an organizing principle in the management of world affairs.

## 6. Netpolitik
These new phenomena deserve a name the word *Netpolitik* has been suggested to describe a new type of diplomacy that succeeds *Realpolitik*. *Realpolitik*, the German term for "Power Politics", is an approach to international diplomacy that is "based on strength rather than appeals to morality and

world opinion". Netpolitik is a new style of diplomacy that seeks to exploit the powerful capabilities of the Internet to shape politics, culture, values, and personal identity. But unlike *Realpolitik* which seeks to advance a nation's political interests through amoral coercion Netpolitik traffics in "softer" issues such as moral legitimacy, cultural identity, societal values and public perception (Kumar, *et al*., 2017) [21].



## 7. Rise of Netpolitik

Netpolitik is the system of the network from to interact in international affairs particularly international communications. From the greater effectiveness, it is overlays a network mentality to the more traditional attempt of realpolitik and international liberalism. That is, as world players think about how to get others to act in consist manner with their interests and values; they need to be aware of the network from as a means or medium to achieve their goals. In the process of doing so, they need to adapt and apply network principles.

The world of diplomacy moved to a multidisciplinary business of influencing publics within countries. It is done in a public diplomacy. The actor is government, or a host of other categories like citizen diplomacy, cultural diplomacy or fringe diplomacy. When performed by non-state actors. Netpolitik will be performed by all these actors, in one or another from using a new set of tools in a significantly manner on a different canvas (Kumar, *et al*., 2017) [21]. Ultimately the official or unofficial diplomats who succeed will be the ones who became part of the Net: active, transparent, respected members of the international society coordinating, encouraging and empowering other to act, in a Net.

A network is a set of interconnected nodes, as Manuel Castells defines it. The nodes are connected by links. On the global stage, nodes are players, organizations and hubs. Links are both the physical and relational connections among nodes. To gain usage they need to be trusted. And to be trusted the links need to be reliable, transparent and credible. Increasingly, non-state actors are becoming nodes

in global diplomatic networks. Jessica Tuchman Mathews long ago chronicled the emergence of non-governmental organizations as significant players on the global stage in "Power Shift" (*Foreign Affairs*, 1997). Later, in A New World Order, Anne-Marie Slaughter showed how the world's nations are disaggregating and reforming into global governance networks to address cross-border issues.

The ones who succeed in this new world of complexity figure out how to become a connected hub, a super node, a node that others want to link to, a node that can understand, foster, manage, influence and even manipulate networks. That means, *Barabási would explain,* as new nodes join a network, the fastest and most efficient way for them to connect to others is to start by linking to the most connected or attractive hubs. Nodes in the world of public diplomacy, then, need size or other attractors such as narratives or resource value. This, we contend, is what Joseph Nye presaged in *Soft Power* (Nye, 2004) [27].

In recent times David Grewal in *Network Power* showed the significance of developing relational links through "mediating or membership standards" in creating "network power". That is, there are networks that require certain capabilities to be a member, e.g., speaking English, which he called "mediating standards" and networks where gaining membership is the gating factor, e.g., the World Trade Organization. Controlling or manipulating those standards brings network power. These can also be analogized to network protocols and organizing principles such as commonalities of mission, culture or values. Taking Facebook and Weibo two easily seen examples, Business, too had developed major platforms that have to be understood and used. Business is taking networks and platforms to new dimensions of usability with the use of predictive analytics and other new techniques (Kumar, *et al*., 2017) [21]. The basis of Netpolitik understands various relationships among nodes and links, hubs, platforms and networks.

## 8. A new soft power politics

Some of the most politically significant uses of the internet are occurring among national of ethnic populations who have isolated around the world in various Diasporas. Historically, of course, "the Diaspora" has referred to the scattering of the Jews to countries outside of Palestine following their Babylonian captivity. But in recent decades, as Universal conflicts and migration have increased, so have the number of ethnic and national Diasporas. The internet has been a godsend to such populations because it enables large numbers of geographically isolated people with a shared history to organize themselves into large virtual communities. For them the Internet is a tool for maintaining identity and community. It also is a powerful tool for such communities to express their politics and cultural beliefs and agitate for reforms, both in their native countries and in international forums. Shanthi Kalathil discussed in her article that 'the information revolution has helped creates a multicentre, fragmented world, in which the concept of sovereignty has retreated in favor of a territorial, neo-medieval system of overlapping, jurisdictions and loyalties'.

## 9. Principles of Netpolitik

The question then arises, how do governments, NGOs, communities, and others use network principles to gain advantages in the global diplomatic and communications worlds?

First, they need to immerse themselves in the world of networks. A majority of world will soon have access to cheap smart phones, thus they will be informed. They will communicate among themselves, meaning they will shape content and receive it, thus they will be engaged. And they will form groups of friends, supporters, ideological fellows, expert communities and social classes, thus be networked. With the informed, engaged, and networked population in the world, nations, diplomats and others (citizen diplomats) will need new tools and much better skills to influence the market for reliabilities. He or She needs to become immersed in the network culture (just as a diplomat needs to become in another country's culture). The same principles that allow for great impact emanating from the node, however, will also create vulnerability within that node, as, for example, Jacob Shapiro found in the Terrorist's Dilemma (Shapiro, Jacob, 2013). To play in the world of Netpolitik, the actor must become immersed in it and take action consistent with network forms. This also includes precautions, defenses and reactions against bad actors.

Second, actors on the world stage will need to create or use major platforms and become a major hub. To become a major hub, one needs to have attractive characteristics to gain followers, members, connecters. These can be power, genuineness, economic motivation and narratives. Being a large hub allows your message to reach more instantaneously and to gain feedback quicker. The bigger a hub becomes, the more it is to grow bigger. Thus, at least in the public diplomacy realm, the narratives need to be authentic, compelling and attractive. Here the narratives are responsible for providing a story that gives sense or a meaning to a person, country or idea. In the literal sense of the word: Narratives are those who attract others to your node and the one cannot always control them. During the Iraq War, the 'Arab Street' did not like United States. The United States sent messages, or spent money to convey messages. They did not understand why the 'Arab Street' did not like them or respond them. The Iraq War's underlying narrative was the reason behind them; that of a country invading another to impose its will and the United States failed to control the narrative. In the world of network, if people are allowed to be creators, to be members of a general society, to be able to contribute to the reputation of others and to be remembered for what they contribute than these point together became a strong parts of a Netpolitik strategy.

Third, actors (diplomats, organizations, countries) need to become part of the underlying operational aspects of the network they are trying to change. They need to accept the capabilities of modern networks and expansibility to create movement in their interest. For instance, to use only Facebook and Twitter to promote ideas is not enough. He or She needs to become an authentic member of the network community, get involved in it or do whatever the significant element needs to impact the network (Kumar, 2016) [20].

## 10. Changing international politics and diplomacy

Diplomacy is the engagement between nations to solve international problems in a peaceful way. Over time two broad approaches to diplomacy have emerged: realpolitik and international liberalism. Realpolitik is the approach taken by masters such as Prince Metternich in 19th century Austria or Henry Kissinger more recently. These practitioners sought to serve their country's interests by maintaining a balance of power among nations, often playing one country against another to their own strategic advantage, all on an ad hoc and pragmatic basis. International liberalism takes a more communal approach to world politics and often looks to international organizations to find solutions to the world's problems. Under this approach, countries would, in effect, give up some of their sovereignty for a regional (European Union) or global (United Nations) good (Kumar, et al., 2017) [21].

## 11. Internet and international relations

The Islamic extremist group Al-Qaeda mirrors the way many global movements are developing, whether focused on some nontraditional security issues like poverty, global warming etc. What the Internet brings here is the ability to link such groups (terrorist) mire effectively and making their voice here globally more powerful. This has created a multiplication of actors in the previously world of diplomacy. Previous studies of the Internet and diplomacy have identified that the Internet enables more and different actors to get involved in political and diplomatic processes (Bollier, 2002; Christodoulides, 2005; Soloman, 2007) [3, 5, 31]. Richard Grant, a New Zealand diplomat, describes the process as the "democratization of diplomacy": "Diplomacy has become democratized. The technology allows more people to play, increases the size of the playing field by an almost exponential amount, and it changes the rules every day" (Grant, 2004) [13].

The changes in these, is the impact of the internet that reinforced the capacity of non-state actors to take part in the debate and outcome. With the help of Internet, The Make Poverty History Campaign in 2005 bring together diverse groups into a union that helped Tony Blair push up the Africa agenda and to secure commitments to increase aid for the poorest countries in the 2005 G8 Summit at Gleneagles. The outcome was broadcasted in government channels and also across the internet by different Non-Governmental Organizations websites (Christodoulides, 2005; Soloman, 2007) [5, 31].

Alongside the Armenian government, the Armenian Diaspora has become an actor. In the United States, the significant influence of AIPAC (the American Israel Public Affairs Committee) has been amplified by its ability to mobilize the Jewish lobby through the internet; so there is no need to take a soapbox to speakers corner in Hyde Park. Now any individual can find a platform for their views.

With the collaboration of these new actors, it creates a new dynamic. Working together to a collective end has been one of the basic principles of the Internet with one of the very reasons for its creation as an academic network (Tapscott, 2007) [32].

It applies similarly in public affairs. One of the biggest changes has been the ability with which hybrid alliances can now be put together on specific issues. As the make poverty history campaign in 2005 Brought together development NGOs, church groups, rock fans, and school and education networks in a formidable; focused alliance (Kumar, *et al*., 2017) [21]. The Internet makes publishing one's views free and easy. And once connected to those who share similar ideas, it becomes easier to act on them. It has led to what one commentator has called the "globalization of grievance" (Gideon, 2007). Anyone with an extreme view, be it libertarian, terrorist, racist or whatever, will find on the Internet ample "facts" and opinion to reinforce their view, whatever steps are taken to try to limit access to such material. Such people can live within an "echo chamber" where all the views they hear reinforce their own (Sunstein, 2007).

## 12. New diplomacy

These developments will inexorably lead to new approaches to diplomacy, pulling from the lessons of realpolitik and international liberalism, yet needing more. The world of diplomacy saw the inklings of this when the United States invaded Iraq and George W. Bush called for a "coalition of the willing". This was the right idea of diplomacy of the future countries swarming in ad hoc networks or clusters to accomplish a particular purpose if perhaps clumsily executed. We see it again in the coalitions fighting the Islamic State.

Yes, there are and will remain alliances, the kind that pushed the world into World War I. But, as birds flock in different formations, countries will increasingly be in a group of 8, 20, 22 or 80 to tackle one issue, and then take itself out of the group confronting another challenge. They will increasingly look for ways of networking, building quick alliances around issues, using new tools in the process. They can be in the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia (CICA). As Tom Friedman presciently concluded, "America's ability to build coalitions is as vital today as the exercise of its own power (Kumar, 2016) [20]".

Networks have often been the bases for intra-national conflicts, regional disputes, and global movements. But if networks are the architecture of complex world affairs, diplomats and other players on the world stage would be well advised to understand network principles. Indeed, we propose that henceforth nations will need to approach diplomacy whether work by traditional diplomats, governments seeking to reach foreign publics (public diplomacy) or other forms (cultural, relational, virtual, business, fringe or citizen diplomacy)-by adopting network principles and immersing themselves in sound network practices (Kumar, *et al*., 2017) [21]. We call the new approach, "Netpolitik".

## 13. Digital diplomacy

Internet is entirely a new means of communication that reinforces the existed trends. Non-state actors and Non-Governmental Organizations were major representative in international relations before the internet and though people can easily take part in foreign policy debate, still 80% have little or no interest in doing so. Diplomacy is still conducted primarily between the government of nation states and the most crucial discussions will still conducted face to face, because that is essential to establish the level of trust that allows decisions to be taken (Kumar, 2016) [20]. So it is completely valid to ask whether the internet really makes much different at all. Those who believe that Diplomacy can be carried on in the same old way will lose ground to those who understand the new dynamics and put in place policies to exploit them. This is Digital Diplomacy. It has implications for foreign policy-making in four areas: ideas, information, networks and service delivery.



## 14. New prospect

The greatest challenge of Netpolitik is also its most promising opportunity. The immediate emergence of a netizen culture on one side can turn a global movement for the welfare of the state, nation or a world, can also on the other side would appear anarchic, chaotic and threats to not only governments but also for the world. Citizen protests on the net against local officials in China have resulted in positive actions by their government, and in the United States the anti-SOPA campaign stopped legislation in its tracks (Wortham, 2012) [36]. James Moore called the Internet "the world's second superpower", (Moore, 2003) [26]. Whether one agrees or not, the Netizens can form a significant force for transparency, accountability and personal engagement. And for the one's countries welfare, it will be up to the government of the world to react, harness and leverage those forces.

## 15. Concluding remarks

It does not matter we support it or not, the usage of network in our life is increasing day by day. With the evolution of network, a type of revolution spread all over the world rapidly taking almost all sectors under the network. Players are networks, enemies are networks, governments are becoming networks, and everything appears to be in the network. It is the high time that we need to understand the basis and principles of networks for effective usage in the welfare of world. The network creates a new world where there is a faster communication, comfortable and faster access to do work, security of one's data, convenience for everyone. Precautions are also taken in the network as if the is advantage there is also a disadvantage behind them.

Netpolitik seems to be an unpredictable force because of its great reach: affecting the whole thing from the exercise of

state power and military might to issues of deep own identity and social values. We hardly understand how the internet is being used across the world; understanding how it is remarking the conduct to international politics will have need of much more research, study and debate. Since time immemorial, stories have conveyed rich bodies of complex information in deeply human ways. This is significant development in human history.

## 16. References

1. Arquilla, Ronfeldt. The Emergence of Noopolitik for the National Defense Research Institute (Santa Monica: RAND) 1999.
2. Arquilla J, Ronfeldt D. Networks and Netwars: Terror, Crime and Militancy, Research and National Defense, (Rand), USA 2002.
3. Bollier D. The rise of Netpolitik: How the Internet is changing international politics and Diplomacy, 2002. (Aspen, http://www.aspeninstitute.org/).
4. Bull H. The Anarchical Society (London) 1977.
5. Christodoulides N. The Internet and Diplomacy American Diplomacy 2005.
6. Cooper R. The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the 21st Century, (London) 2003.
7. Cronin A. Cyber-Mobilization: The New Levee en Masse, Parameters, Summer 2006.
8. Dutton W, Helsper E. The Internet and the UK, (Oxford Internet Institute) 2007. Available at: http://www.oii.ox.ac.uk/microsites/oxis/publications.cfm
9. Firestone, Charlie, Leshuo Dong. Netpolitik: What the Emergence of Networks Means for Diplomacy and Statecraft, Global Affairs, The ASPEN Journal of Ideas 2015.
10. Friedman T. The Lexus and the Olive Tree, (New York) 1999.
11. Friedman T. The World is Flat, (New York) 2005.
12. Fukuyama F. After the Neocons: America at the Crossroads, (Yale) 2006.
13. Grant R. The Democratization of Diplomacy: Negotiating with the Internet (Oxford Internet Institute) 2004. Available at: http://www.oii.ox.ac.uk/
14. Grewal DS. Network power: the social dynamics of globalization, Yale University Press 2008.
15. He B, Murphy H. Global social justice at the WTO? The role of NGOs in constructing global social contracts, International Affairs 2007;83(4):707-727.
16. Hobsbawm E. Globalization, Democracy and Terrorism, (Little Brown: London) 2007.
17. Hughes R. Bits, Bytes and Bullets, the World Today, 20-22 (Chatham House: London) 2007.
18. Hundt R. You Say You Want a Revolution, (Yale) 2000.
19. Keohane Robert O, Joseph S Nye Jr. Power and Interdependence in the Information Age, Foreign Affairs, 1998, 77(5).
20. Kumar Sanjeev. New Media and its Impact on International Relations in the 21st Century, International Journal of New Media Studies, A Refereed Bi-annual Journal devoted to Media, New Delhi, India, 2016, 3(4).
21. Kumar Sanjeev *et al*. Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship-An Elucidation for the Problems of Modern Society, International Journal of Management (IJM), 2017, 8(1).
22. Kumar, Sanjeev *et al*., Leadership of the Future, International Journal of Management (IJM) 2017, 8(2).
23. Kumar, Sanjeev *et al*., "E-Innovation", International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology (IJARET) 2017, 8(1).
24. Lia B. Architect of Global Jihad: the Life of Al-Qaeda Strategist Abu Mus'ab al-Suri, (Columbia: New York) 2007.
25. Media politics: How the Mass Media Have Transformed World Politics (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press) 2001.
26. Moore James, The Second Superpower Rears its Beautiful Head, a paper of the Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University (paper not available by Internet search) 2003.
27. Nye JS. Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics, (New York) 2004.
28. Price ME. Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication, Cambridge University Press 2014.
29. Robert Keohane, Joseph Nye's. Power and Interdependence (Boston: Little Brown. http://www.makepovertyhistory.org/ (acc. 19.6.07), supplemented by conversations with those involved in Gleneagles 1977.
30. Rothkopf David. Cyberpolitik: The Changing Nature of Power in the Information Age, Journal of International Affairs 1988;51(2):325-59.
31. Soloman RH. The Internet and the Diffusion of Diplomacy, 2007. Available at: http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/ (acc. July 2007).
32. Tapscott D. Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything, (New York) 2007.
33. Thomas Friedman's. The Lexus and the Olive Tree, (New York: Farrar Strauss Giroux) 1999.
34. Westcott, Nicholas. Digital Diplomacy: The Impact of the Internet on International Relations, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Oxford Internet Institute, Research Report 16, London 2008.
35. Wilson, Godfrey, Monica. The Analysis of Social Change, (Cambridge University Press) 1945.
36. Wortham Jenna. A Political Coming of Age for the Tech Industry. The New York Times 2012. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protests_against_SOPA_and_PIPA;.