

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iasi

**Doctoral School Of The Faculty of Philosophy and Social- Political
Sciences**

Specialty: Social- Political Sciences

Abstract of

DOCTORAL Thesis

Scientific Coordinator:

Ph.d Professor George POEDE

Ph.d candidate:

Oana OLARIU

Iași, 2015

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iasi

Doctoral School of The Faculty of Philosophy and Social- Political Sciences

Specialty: Social- Political Sciences

The Role of Media on the Changing Societies

The Contemporary Life-Style as a Political Statement

Abstract of

DOCTORAL Thesis

Scientific Coordinator:

Ph.d Professor George POEDE

Ph.d. candidate:

Oana OLARIU

Iasi, 2015

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Hypothesis and the Objectives of the Present Research.....	16
The Methodology	18
General Background: Literature Review	20
Socio-political Fragility and Changing Societies	20
From the Mass-Media Paradigm to the Digital One	34
Perspectives over Democracy	41
Conclusions: Paradigm Shift: New Ways of Interacting with Reality ..	49
Ist Part: The Normalization of the Extraordinary and the Socio-Political Role of the Layman	53
1. Mass-Media Evolution and the Change of Mentalities: From Objectivity to Consciousness.....	54
1.1. The Classic Journalism: Objective Equals Conflicted	55
1.2. The Abandonment of Objectivity and the Embrace of Interventionist Responsibility: Citizen Journalism and the	

Absorption of the Editorial Exercise in the Daily Praxis	61
1.3. Liberating Technologies67
Conclusions : From the Silent Flock, to the Smart Mobs	75
2. The Social Change : From Mass to Community	78
2.1. From Tarzan`s Rebellion to the Yo-Yo People`s Protest	79
2.2. The Rationality and The Extraordinary Politics	85
2.3. The Narrative Identity of Change	91
2.4. The Banality of The Extraordinary Politics : The Birth of Prefigurative Politics	98
Conclusions: The Layman and his Life-style as a Socio-political Interventionalist Tool	107
3. From the Imposed Order to Self-Organization	111
3.1 A Clash of Values: the Horizontal Ascension	113
3.2 The Failure: Escaping the Institutions - the Socio-Political Fragility	118

3.3 The Inefficiency: the Social Inability of Those Who Aren't Members.....	132
Conclusions: The Private Life Practices and the Cultural Change	144
The 2nd Part: The Efficiency of the Layman in Handling the Socio- Political Extraordinary	150
4. Eluding Power by Practicing Freedom. Post-anarchism as Social Process	151
4.1. The Metaphor of the Starfish: the Model of the Decentralized Organization	152
4.2. Idiosyncrasy to Power and the Rejection of Domination	155
4.3. How Personal Life-styles Got into the Political Space: The Self- transcendent Thought and the Politics of Love	164
4.4. The Efficiency of Idealism and the Silent Social Change	180
Conclusions: Self-organization as Active Retreat from the Conventional Society.....	192
5. The Post-anarchic Every-day Life	193
5.1. <i>The Millennials</i> . A Neurotic Generation Living Outside Conventional Social Order	194

5.2. From the Banality of Violence, to the Banality of Heroism	199
5.3. Egotism, Communitarianism and Don Quixote. Capitalizing on the Action Drivers for Social Change	209

**Conclusions: The Revolutions of Don Quixote: The Values Behind the
Efficiency of Decentralized and Collaborative Structures 212**

**6. In the Beginning There Was Hedonism: A Longitudinal Assessment
of Action Drives, as They Are Reflected in the Ideological and Social
Discourse of Three Post-anarchic Decentralized Networks 214**

6.1. Methodology and Research Design	216
Defining Variables	218
The Research Hypotheses of the Exploratory Study	219
6.2. Results and Assessment	220
6.2.A. Establishing the Annual Tendency for the Action Drives	225
6.2.B. The Relations between the Study Variables	226
6.2.C. Predictive Models for Quixotism	228
6.2.D. Moderating Effects in Quixotism Prediction	234
6.2.E. Mediators in Quixotism Prediction	237

6.2.F. Preliminary Conclusions for Quixotism	241
6.2.G. Predictive Models for Communitarianism	242
6.2.H. Moderating Effects in Communitarianism Prediction	246
6.2.I. Mediators in Communitarianism Prediction	248
6.2.J. Preliminary Conclusions for Communitarianism	250
6.2.K. Predictive Models for Egotism	250
6.2.L. Moderating Effects in Egotism Prediction	254
4.2.M. Mediators in Egotism Prediction.....	256
8.2.N. Preliminary Conclusions for Egotism	258
6.3. Conclusions: Addition to Exaltation	259
Final Conclusions: from the Animal Farm, to the Networked People	265
Bibliography	272
Annexes	292

Abstract

This study aims at establishing a reference framework for the social assimilation of self-organization and direct action principles. It strives to prove that both self-organization, as well as direct action are conceptual nodes synthesizing behaviours, attitudes and cultural values reflecting the media paradigm shift. The pivotal argument of this thesis is that the digital paradigm is closely related to the social normalization of the prefigurative politics. Prefigurative politics mean to practice personal principles and values through the daily life-style. It will be shown that the new-new social movements, as they reflect the values of the digital paradigm, are the expression of a conflicted state between the individual and the traditional state design. In other words, the political actions that are manifested by the new social movements are not triggered, it's argued, by the political allegiance of the individuals, but rather by their tendency to self-manage their private life.

Perspectives on Democracy

Touraine (1994) associates democracy with modernity, as a political order regulating a laic world, wherein the Laws, Principles and Universal Rights are manmade and conceived to protect the liberty and the equality of the individual, while the human himself is the rational subject. The liberal democratic system assumes the development of an aware civil society, based on knowledge and reason, which is fully able to comprehend and sanction the behaviour of political actors. The press is given, therefore, a crucial role in the

democratic edifice. The digitalization, at its turn, is conducting to the envision of new democracy models. The model of emergent democracy or decentralized democracy (Johnson, 2002) is based on the observation that interconnectivity enables individuals to act independent of each other and, at the same time, to intuitively synchronize with each other, without the need for hierarchic structures to regulate their behaviours. Johnson (2002) is describing the model of emergent democracy in analogy with the mound-building termites which are communicating through pheromones and are self-regulating in the absence of directives provided by hierarchical structures.

The interconnectivity – as Johnson (2002) explains – converges to natural order, pluri-disciplinary oriented and without hierarchy, not unlike a termites colony where each insect acts on the mutual space complying to a non-hierarchic society (Johnson, 2002).

The extreme democracy – as a political philosophy specific to info-societies – is articulated once Web 2.0 is developed. The model assumes the interconnected individuals are placed in so-called *relative centres* of the political landscape, thus enabling them to be in complete control and unmitigated involvement in the political life, without being assimilated to traditional political structures. The concept of *relative centre* is borrowed from the Theory of Relativity, postulating that in an open system the centre is everywhere, while the periphery is nowhere (Lebkowsky, 2005). The abovementioned philosophy is related with extreme development theories, according to which an extremely small number of individuals may significantly alter an interconnected macro-space. The empirical roots of this perspective may be found in the experiments conducted by small teams of

researchers who created digital applications that radically transformed the social behaviour patterns. The Ushahidi platform is an eloquent example concerning this aspect. The application was used to enable the citizens to monitor alleged election fraud in Kenya, in 2008, and it is presently used by Human Rights international organizations. The application was developed by three men with limited financial resources.

The Extraordinary Politics and the Layman

It is widely believed that by amplifying digitization, the non-political individuals are enabled to influence the political landscape (Joyce, 2010). The result will be the banalization and the wide diffusion of the *extraordinary politics* (Euchner, 1996). *The extraordinary politics* are political action repertoires aside the conventional, recurrent civic participation mechanisms. The protests, petition signing, and, generally speaking, the challenging behaviours disrupting the every-day political environment, are all assets of *extraordinary politics* (Euchner, 1996).

The interactive information technology development is usually linked to the enhancement of both the social reflexivity and the uncertainty (Tornero & Varis, 2010; Bauman, 2007; Giddens, 1994). The exposure to social issues and direct interaction should enable one to assume a personal responsibility conscience regarding problems transcending the domain of the domestic life. This context generates the premises of a debate aimed at re-evaluating the very nature of conventional politics, and as such the birth of *generative politics*. „Generative politics exists in the space that links the state to

reflexive mobilization in the society at large. (...) Generative politics is a politics which seeks to allow individuals and groups to make things happen, rather than have things happen to them, in the context of overall social concerns and goals.

Generative politics is a defence of the politics of the public domain, but does not situate itself in the old opposition between state and market. It works through providing material conditions, and organizational frameworks, for the life political decisions taken by individuals and groups in the wider social order” (Giddens, 1994, p. 15).

The generative politics belong to the broader field of the contemporary radical politics. These aim at empowering the individual, enabling one to become self-determined in the wide context of the global society. The *radical politics* terms are describing the politics addressing the roots of the problems and thus are redefining the social functions’ patterns (Pugh, 2009). The alter-globalisation movements, anti-capitalism or ecologist movement, alongside multiculturalism, anti-militarism or the Islamic State phenomenon are usually mentioned in discussions concerning contemporary radical politics (Steven, 2014; Pugh, 2009).

Strongly influenced by the post-anarchic principles blending the post-modernism and anarchism (Žižec, 2012), the contemporary radical politics are built around the suspicion toward the power structures. As such, they are contemptuous when faced with traditional power edifices. This kind of politics are oriented mainly towards communization (Clark, 2013) and are rejuvenating the principles of *prefigurative politics* (Yates, 2014). *The*

prefigurative politics are revived through digitalization that enables collaborative economies, such as those based on *sharing* (Davis, 2011; Einstein, 2011). In collaborative digital environments, the class segregations are fading, while the social and economic status is becoming meaningless. The collaborative networks are enabling the unhindered enactment of autonomy and egalitarianism. Giddens (1994) observes that currently more people are members of mutual aid groups, than members of political parties. The importance of these groups resides in their ability to bring forward in the public environment, issues or situations which are often ignored by the traditional actors of power.

Patterns of Decentralized Behaviours

The development of various networks further led to the dissemination of cultural values which are different from those endorsed within the dominant social order. There are certain fundamental distinctions between the decentralized network or organisations, and the centralized ones. First of all, there is no control and command unit in a decentralized community. As such, each one becomes fully responsible for one's actions, without delegation.

While a centralized organisation will usually attract its members through promises derived from the economic and social status bestowed to them, the affiliation with a decentralized organization is conducted solely on ideological compatibility premises. Furthermore, while the members of a centralized organisation are pecuniary dependent of it, and the organization itself owns a capital to be distributed according to various meritocracy patterns, the decentralized organization holds no capital apart from the direct

contribution of its members. There is no control or impediment in accessing a collaborative capital (Amant & Still, 2007; Brafman & Beckstrom, 2006).

The horizontal and collaborative nature of these decentralized networks generates a different dynamic when compared to a centralized organization. The positions in a decentralized organization are self-assigned by each individual, without any formal investiture rituals. The knowledge and the power are also evenly distributed across the network. In other words, the members are free to express themselves using the entire repertoire of roles made possible within a network. They are encouraged at the same time to diversify the types of actions (Brafman & Beckstrom, 2006). These kind of networks are favouring the inspiring leader, rather than the magnetic leader. While the magnetic leader attracts *toward himself* (Ayalew, 2010; Lipman-Blueman, 2004), the inspiring leader attracts *from himself*, encouraging authenticity and autonomy in others.

The rejuvenation of mutual help

The development of digital networks rejuvenated the cybernetic anarchism, in general, and enhanced the post-anarchism, in particular. This current pleads for pacifism, autonomy, liberty and egalitarianism, based on free collaboration and mutual help. The mutual help behaviours are constructed around three action principles: the egotist drive, the communitarian drive, and the quixotic drive (Salgado & Ocejja, 2011). The individuals involved in humanitarian activities, following a quixotic drive are investing more time and effort when compared with egotistic or communitarian types. The

quixotic drive is describing a social action based on the belief that by doing so, the world itself will become better (Salgado & Ocejja, 2011).

The quixotic drive does not necessarily implies grand actions. It may be the spark behind every gesture or action, if one is doing it in the hope of creating a better world. The decentralized communities oriented towards challenging the traditional power paradigm may, thus, be especially effective if they foster the quixotic behaviour.

A longitudinal analysis on the three action drives as emerging from the members' discourse of three decentralized networks

In order to investigate the quixotic, communitarian and egotistic drive, a discourse analysis was conducted at first. In employing this particular approach, the monthly level of each drive could be assessed, as it is apparent in the discourse of three decentralized networks: Impossible, Couchsurfing and Occupy. As the three action drives are based on Schwartz's (1992) cultural values taxonomy, 10 categories were established, one for each cultural value. A list with the assigned lexical thesaurus was created for each category. Based on these lists, a frequency occurrence assessment was conducted, on the basis of the collected discourse from those tree networks. Ratios were subsequently calculated, because the discourses varied in size on monthly basis. The results were then exported in Spss, for statistical analysis.

The investigated hypotheses were such as listed below:

1. The quixotic drive was more present than the communitarian and the egotist drives;

2. The quixotic and the egotist drives were more present than the communitarian drive;
3. There is connection between the quixotic drive and benevolence and passion;
4. There is connection between the egotist drive and self-fulfilment;
5. There is connection between the communitarian drive and self-determination;
6. The hate speech is seldom present in the case of all three communities;
7. The quixotic drive is more present in the Impossible and Couchsurfing communities than it is in the Occupy community.

Results

The analysis showed that empowering self-determination may lead to all three action drives. Although the egotism is the most frequent motivation, there is a quixotic drive more powerful than the communitarianism drive. The first hypothesis was, thus, invalidated.

Quixotism prediction model

	b	SE b	β	p
Constant	3.03	0.32		.00
Benevolence	0.13	0.05	.30	.01

Passion	0.30	0.14	.25	.03
----------------	------	------	-----	-----

$R^2 = .46, p = .00$)

The regression equation: $Quixotism_i = 3.03 + (0.13benevolence_i + 0.30passion_i)$

Communitarianism prediction model

	b	SE b	β	p
Model 1				
Constant	1.77	0.50		.00
Self-determination	0.09	0.07	.26	.22
Hedonism	-0.88	0.06	-.24	.15
Passion	-0.20	0.1	-.21	.12
Self-fulfilment	0.55	0.07	.15	.46
Model 2				
Constant	1.60	.45		.00
Self-determination	0.13	0.03	.39	.00
Hedonism	-0.05	0.04	-.16	.20
Passion	-0.23	0.12	-.23	.07
Model 3				

Constant	1.33	0.40		.00
Self-determination	0.14	0.03	.43	.00
Passion	-.32	0.10	-.33	.00

$R^2 = .26$ for the first model and $\Delta R^2 = -.00$ for the second model and $\Delta R^2 = -.01$ for the third model ($p < .00$)

The regression equation: $\text{Communitarianism}_i = 1.33 + (0.14\text{self-determination}_i - 0.32\text{passion}_i)$.

Egotism prediction model

	b	SE b	β	p
Model 1				
Constant	6.70	1.10		.00
Self-determination	0.41	0.15	.45	.01
Hedonism	-0.38	0.16	-.39	.02
Passion	-0.13	0.28	-.05	.62
Self-fulfilment	-0.52	0.16	-.55	.00
Benevolence	-0.02	0.14	-.02	.89
Model 2				
Constant	6.68	1.08		.00
Self-	0.41	0.15	.44	.01

determination

Hedonism	-0.39	0.12	-.41	.00
Passion	-0.13	0.28	-.05	.63
Self-fulfilment	-0.52	0.16	-.56	.00
Model 3				
Constant	6.82	1.03		.00
Self-determination	0.38	0.14	.41	.00
Hedonism	-0.43	0.10	-.45	.00
Self-fulfilment	-0.50	0.15	-.54	.00

$R^2 = .53$ for the first model and $\Delta R^2 = .00$ for the second model and $\Delta R^2 = -.00$ for the third model ($p < .00$)

The regression equation: $Egotism_i = 6.82 + (0.38 \text{self-determination}_i - 0.43 \text{hedonism}_i - 0.50 \text{self-fulfilment}_i)$.

The third hypothesis postulating the connection between the quixotic drive, on one hand, and benevolence and passion, on the other, was validated. The more present the benevolence and the passion, the more apparent the quixotic drive. However, as it is shown, the relationship is established when the hedonism level is over the average. The mean values for the quixotic drive are lower for the Occupy community than the other two. The seventh hypothesis was, as such, validated.

There is a negative connection between egotism and self-fulfilment. The higher the self-fulfilment level, the less present the egotist drive. There is a positive connection between communitarianism and self-determination. The higher the self-determination is present, the more apparent the communitarianism. The fourth and the fifth premises were, thus, validated. Furthermore, the hate-speech was seldom apparent in the discourse of the three communities, as expected.

The impossible community project, based on mutual help (Clark, 2013; Kropotkin, 1907), becomes the more efficient the more is implemented. In other words, as individuals are practicing benevolence, they become more susceptible to act on quixotic drives and to experiment social relationships different than those provided by the dominant social order. Their dependence on the traditional power structures will, thus, lessen.

However, the analysis shows that cultural and generational particularities may generate numerous blocks. Detail analysis shows that the quixotic and the egotist are vastly influenced by hedonism. If the hedonism level is diminishing, the egotist drive is most likely to emerge. A high hedonism level equals amplifying benevolence and passion. As a consequence, the quixotic drive becomes more probable. The hedonism level is influencing also the relationship between self-fulfilment and quixotism. When the hedonism level is low, the connection between self-fulfilment and quixotism is negative. In other words, for individuals experiencing low levels of hedonism, the higher the self-fulfilment, the lower the quixotism. On contraire, when the hedonism level is elevated, the higher the self-fulfilment, the higher the quixotism. The results are supporting the observations

regarding the novel creative class (Florida, 2012), emphasising the ludic spirit and mixing free time, personal development and professional activities. At the same time, it becomes apparent that the scepticism of the researchers in the pessimist trend concerning the technology social role is well founded, as hedonism strongly influences their dynamic and drive.

Final conclusions

The collaborative economy principles (Eisenstein, 2011) are fostering benevolence and personal conscience, while enabling self-management. The collaborative structures are not directly threatening the state. But they are creating a parallel social order. The dominant values of the traditional social order and the values cherished in these networks are antagonist. While the conventional social order implies hierarchical structures, power and control, the network experience leads to egalitarianism, autonomy and self-determination, based on collaboration and mutual help.

Paradigm Shift, Davis, 2011, p.11

The Old Paradigm	The New Paradigm
The individual is self-centred.	The individual is part of the ecosystem.
Industrialisation and consumerism	Sustainability
The organizations are focused solely on financial profit	The organizations are TBL oriented („triple bottom line”), meaning they are aware of social, ecological and financial consequences of their activities

The employees are “workers”	The employees are people
The progress is quantified depending on the investment return	The progress is quantified depending on the social return of the investment
Isolation	Collaboration
Technology is employed in increasing productivity	Technology is employed in creating community.
Closed world	Open world
Insular vision on the world	Holistic vision of the world

The values conflict is generating a unique context for the citizens who don't cherish a political identity to develop a political conscience, since they find themselves in dissonance with the very concept of the state. As the digitalization empowered self-expression, the decentralized communities' members are spontaneously reacting when the political decision-making is ignoring the social values cherished by them. The more the members of a society are living by their own principles, the more they become sensible to the political decisions which are ignorant of their values. In a culture regarding self-expression as a public communication action, it is only to be expected that breaking these values to be sanctioned by public manifestations.

Acknowledgements

I thank Professor George Poede - the scientific coordinator of this thesis – for his open mindedness regarding this project. His approach as a coordinator proved to be crucial in the development of the research. The Professor is supporting the autonomy of his students, offering help without hindering the coalescence of their own thought system. He shows respect for their intellectual personality. I furthermore thank him for the bibliographical references and volumes I would not had access to otherwise, should he would not offered them from his own library. I could not but admire his intellectual and moral attire.

I would also like to thank the tutoring board for the patience showed in perusing this study in its various development stages, as well as for their bibliographical guidance and suggestions. I owe gratitude to the entire Doctoral School staff: the professors, the colleagues, and not in the least to the secretaries guiding me through the bureaucratic labyrinth. I am also grateful to my colleague, Ph.D. Dora Cana, for all the nights spent talking about human nature, decentralization and post-anarchism.

I am thankful to my family, who undertook numerous efforts to adapt in the period spent working to this study. My parents and my sister have proved an empathic capacity to psychologically address the many changes in my life, for which I could never be grateful enough.

Selected references:

Amant, K., & Still, B. (2007). *Handbook of Research on Open Source Software. Technological, Economic, and Social Perspectives*, New York: Information Science Reference

Ayalew, H. (2010). *Political Leadership in the Transformation of Societies: F. W. De Klerk and Pim Fortuyn in the Multicultural Project*, Macalester International, 25, 1-18.

Bakunin, M. (1873). *Statism and Anarchy*, descărcat în octombrie 2014 de la adresa: <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/michail-bakunin-statism-and-anarchy.pdf>

Bakunin, M. (1916). *God and the State*, descărcat în martie .2015, de la adresa: http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bakunin/godandstate/godandstate_ch1.html

Baudrillard, J. (1996/ 1968). *Sistemul Obiectelor*, H. Lazăr (Trad.), Cluj: Echinox

Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid Times. Living in an Age of Uncertainty*, Polity Press

Bennett, L., Lawrence, R., & Livingstone, S. (2007). *When the Press Fails: Political Power and The New Media from Iraq and Katrina*, University of Chicago Press

Berlin, I. (1958/ 1996). *Patru eseuri despre libertate*, Humanitas

Brafman, O. & Beckstrom, R. (2006). *The Starfish and the Spider. The Unstoppable Power of Leaderless Organizations*, Penguin Group.

Cammaerts, B. & Carpentier, N. (Eds.) (2007). *Reclaiming The Media. Communication Rights and Democratic Media Roles*. Bristol, Uk, Chicago, USA: Intellect Books.

Chomsky, N.(2006). *Failed States. The Abuse of Power and the Assault of Democracy*, Metropolitan Books

Chomsky, N.A. (1959). A review of B.F. Skinner's Verbel Behavior, *Language*, 35, 26-58, retras în iunie 2014 de la adresa: <http://cogprints.org/1148/1/chomsky.htm>

Clark, J. P. (2013). *The Impossible Community. Realizing Communitarian Anarchism*, Bloomsbury Academy

Davis, M. P. (2011). *Crowdfunding Nation: The Rise and Evolution of Collaborative Funding*, Shareable Magazine

Durkheim, E. (199/ 19375). *Formele Elementare ale Vieții Religioase* (Magda Jeanrenaud & Silviu Lupescu, Trad.). Iași: Polirom

Effler, E.S. (2010). *Laughing Saints and Righteous Heroes. Emotional Rhythms in Social Movement Groups*. Chicago și Londra: The University of Chicago Press.

Eisenstein, Ch. (2011). *Sacred Economics: Money, Gift and Society in the Age of Transition*, Evolver Edition, retrasă în mai 2014, de la adresa: <http://sacred-economics.com/about-the-book/>

Emerson, W. (1907). *Essays*, retras în februarie 2014 de la adresa: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2944>

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and Society*, New York: Norton

Euchner, Ch. (1996). *Extraordinary politics: How Protests and Dissent Are Changing American Democracy (Transforming American Politics)*, Westview Press.

Euchner, Ch. (1996). *Extraordinary politics: How Protests and Dissent Are Changing American Democracy (Transforming American Politics)*, Westview Press.

Florida, R. (2012). *The Rise of The Creative Class. Revised*, New York: Basic Books.

Freire, P. (2005/ 1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Continuum.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond Left and Right. The Future of Radical Politics*, Stanford University Press.

Giles, D. (2003). *Media Psychology*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers

Godwin, W. (1793/ 2014). *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, University of Adelaide, consultat online în septembrie 2014 la adresa:

<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/g/godwin/william/enquiry/index.html>

Goffman, E. (1974/1986). *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Boston: Northeastern University Press

Goldman, E. (1931). *Living My Life*, The Anarchist Library, descărcat în septembrie 2014 de la adresa: <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life.pdf>

Hayek, F. A. (1948). *Individualism and Economic Order*, The University of Chicago Press.

Hayek, F. A. (1992). The Fatal Conceit. The Errors of Socialism, în *The Collected Works of Friedrich August Hayek*, W. W. Bartley (Ed.), Londra: Routledge.

Howard, P. (2010). *The Digital Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Informaion Technology and Political Islam*, Oxford University Press.

Johnson, S. (2002). *Emergence: The Connected Live of Ants, Brains, Cities and Software*, New York: Scribner

Joyce, M. (2010). (Ed.) *Digital Activism Decoded*, NY: International Debate Education Association

Kropotkin, P. (1902). *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, descărcat în decembrie 2013 de la adresa: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/4341>

Lebkowsky, J. (2005). *Extreme Democracy*. retras în mai 2011 de la adresa www.lulu.com.

Lebkowsky, J. (2005). *Extreme Democracy*. retras în mai 2011 de la adresa www.lulu.com.

Lee, T. (2011). Collective Movements, Activated Opinion, and the Politics of the Extraordinary. în Sina. O. Odugbemi & Taeku Lee (Eds.), *Accountability Through Public Opinion. From Inertia to Public Action* (pp. 257 - 272), Washington DC: The World Bank.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005, January-February). The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why Followers Rarely Escape Their Clutches. *Ivey Business Journal*, 1-8.

Lippmann, W. (1922/2010). *The Public Opinion*, Greenbook Publications LLC

McAdam, D. (1982). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*, University of Chicago Press

McLuhan, M. (1964/ 2001). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Routledge.

McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass communication theory – An introduction*. London: Sage.

Meier, P. (2008). *iRevolutions*, Consultat în iunie 2014, la adresa: www.irevolutions.net

Meier, P. (2011). *Do “Liberation Technologies” change the balance of power between repressive states and civil society?* (teză de doctorat nepublicată) The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

Morozov, E. (2011). *The Net Delusion. The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York: Public Affairs

Popper, K. R. (1945/ 2005). *Societatea deschisă și dușmanii ei*, București: Humanitas.

Pugh, J. (Ed.) (2009). *What is Radical Politics Today?*, Palgrave Macmillan

Roşca, I., & Todoroi, D. (2011). Creativity in conscience society, *Economic Interferences*, 13, 599-619.

Salgado, S. & Oceja, I. (2011). Towards a Characterization of a Motive Whose Ultimate Goal Is To Increase The Welfare Of The World: Quixotism, *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14, 145-155

Salter, C. (2011). Activism as Terrorism: The Green Scare, Radical Environmentalism and Governmentality, *Anarchism Developments in Cultural Studies*, 1, 211 – 238.

Scharmer, O. (2000). Presencing: Learning From the Future As It Emerges. On the Tacit Dimension of Leading Revolutionary Change, *Conference On Knowledge and Innovation*, 25-26 Mai, 2000, Helsinki School of Economics, Finland, and the MIT Sloan School of Management, OSG, 20 Octombrie, 2000

Scharmer, O. (2001). Self-transcending knowledge: sensing and organizing around emerging opportunities, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(2), 137 – 151.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.

Sharp, G. (2010). *From Dictatorship to Democracy. A conceptual Framework for Liberation (Fourth Edition)*, The Albert Einstein Institute

Shirky, C. (2008). *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*, The Penguin Press HC.

Springer, S. (2014). Why a radical geography must be anarchist, *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 4 (3), 243-270.

Stekelenburg, J., Klanderman, B., & Dijk, W. (2009). Context Matters: Explaining How and Why Mobilizing Contexts Influences Motivational Dynamics, *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(4). 815-838.

Stekelenburg, J., Walgrave, S., Klandermans, B. & Verhulst, J.(2012). *Contextualizing Contestation. Framework, Design and Data. Protest Survey*, 17,

retras în februarie 2014 de la adresa:

<http://www.protestsurvey.eu/publications/1344583801.pdf>

Stepan, A., & Linz, J. J. (2013). Democratization Theory and The Arab Spring, *Journal of Democracy*, 24, 15- 30.

Storck, M. (2011). *The role of Social Media in Political Mobilization: a Case Study of the January 2011 Egyptian Uprising* (teză de doctorat nepublicată). University of St Andrews, Scotland

Sundin, O. (2011). Janitors of Knowledge: Constructing Knowledge in the Everyday Life of Wikipedia Editors, *Journal of Documentation*, 67, 840-862.

Taylor, B. (2013). From alterglobalization to Occupy Wall Street: Neanarchism and the new spirit of the left, *City. Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 17, 729-747.

Thoreau, H. (1849). *On The Duty of Civil Disobedience*, retras în martie 2014 de la adresa: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/71>

Thoreau, H. (1854). *Walden*, retras în octombrie 2014 de la adresa: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/205>

Tilly, Ch. (1977). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Michigan: University of Michigan

Tilly, Ch. (1990). *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990-1992*, Cambridge MA and Oxford UK: Blackwell

Todoroi, D. (2012). Creativity's Kernel Development for Conscience Society, *Informatica Economică*, 16, 70-87.

Toffler, A. (1973) *Socul Viitorului*, Politica.

Tornero, P.&, Varis, T. (2010). *Media Literacy and New Humanism*, Moscova: UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education

Touraine, A. (1971). *The Post-Industrial Society*, New York: Random House

Touraine, A. (1994). *Qu'Est-Ce Que La Démocratie?*, Fayard

Valenzuela, S. (2013). Unpacking the Use of Social Media for Protest Behavior: the Role of Information, Opinion Expression, and Activism, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 20(10). 1-23.

Woodcock, G. (1962). *Anarchism. A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*, consultat online în noiembrie 2014 la adresa:
<http://www.ditext.com/woodcock/anarch.html>

Yates, L. (2014). Rethinking Prefiguration: Alternatives, Micropolitics and Goals in Social Movements, *Social Movement Studies*, 14 (1), 1-21.

Ziccardi, G. (2013). *Resistance, Liberation, Technology and Human Rights in the Digital Age*, Springer.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect. Understanding how good people turn evil*. Random House, New York.

Žižek, S. (2012). *The Year of Dreaming Dangerously*, Londra, New York: Verso.