Olga Zernetska
D.Sc. (Politics), Professor, Chief Research Fellow,
Institute of the World Economy and International Relations of
The National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine
5 Leontovych St., Kyiv, 01030, Ukraine
olga_zernetska.49@mail.ru

THE NATURE OF POWER IN THE GLOBAL NETWORK SOCIETY
(Notes on the Margins of the Work of Manuel Castells)

Abstract. *The newest concepts of Manuel Castells' theory of power in the global network society have been detected; four forms of this power under different social and technological conditions have been observed (networking power, network power, networked power, network-making power). Such meaningful concepts as power and counter power that constitute one of the central binary oppositions in his theory have been regarded. Special attention to such central concepts of his theory as programming and switching has been paid. The primary problem of programmers and switchers in exerting real power in the global network society has been provided. The new concept of mass self-communication as the communication organized around the Internet and other horizontal digital communication networks which Castells introduces in this work has been appreciated. His views on the complex interrelations between power, networks and communication have been analyzed and his insightful hypotheses in this sphere have been discussed. The present article sets out to evaluate the newest theory of the outstanding scholar of our times and has a genre which may be called «notes on the margins» of Manuel Castells' «A Network Theory of Power».*
Keywords: *theory of power; global network society; communication; «programming»; «switching».*

О. В. Зернецька
доктор політичних наук, професор, головний науковий співробітник,
Інститут світової економіки і міжнародних відносин НАН України, Київ, Україна
ПРИРОДА ВЛАДИ У ГЛОБАЛЬНОМУ МЕРЕЖЕВОМУ СУСПІЛЬСТВІ
(нотатки на берегах праці Мануеля Кастельса)
Анотація. Досліджено новітні концепції теорії влади Мануеля Кастельса, проаналізовано його погляди на складні взаємодії між владою, мережами та комунікацією, розглянуто далекоглядні гіпотези видатного вченого у цій сфері.
Ключові слова: теорія влади, глобальне мережеве суспільство, комунікація, «програмування», «перемикання».

О. В. Зернецкая
доктор политических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник,
Институт мировой экономики и международных отношений НАН Украины, Киев, Украина
ПРИРОДА ВЛАСТИ В ГЛОБАЛЬНОМ СЕТЕВОМ ОБЩЕСТВЕ
(заметки на полях работы Мануэля Кастелльса)
Аннотация. Исследованы новейшие концепции теории власти Мануэля Кастелльса, проанализированы его взгляды на сложные взаимоотношения между властью, сетями и коммуникацией, рассмотрены прозорливые гипотезы выдающегося ученого в этой сфере.
Ключевые слова: теория власти, глобальное сетевое общество, коммуникация, «программирование», «переключение».

Introduction. According to «Relative Ranking of a Selected Pool of Leading Communication Scholars by Number of Citations in the Social Science Citation Index, 2000-2012», which refers only to living scholars, Manuel Castells takes the first place. The data for this rating was obtained from the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) between January 1 and December 31, 2012 as well as the data which was obtained for «Relative Ranking of a Selected Pool of Leading Scholars in the Social Sciences by Number of Citations in the Social Science Citation Index, 2000-2012», where Manuel Castells takes the third place after such outstanding scholars of our times as Anthony Giddens and Robert Putnam.

These rankings only once more prove that Castells is among the world's leading sociologists and communications scholars. He is an author of 26 books, an advisor to foreign governments and the 2012 winner of Norway's prestigious Holberg Prize. Up till now he is very active in his research and lecturing. One of the recent proofs we find in «Library of Congress Blog» dated December 19, 2012: «He resided at The John W. Kluge Centre as the Kluge Chair in Technology and Society, continuing his research on social movements in the Internet Age» [1].

Manuel Castells firstly became widely known as a sociologist whose work in urban studies has been extremely influential in all areas of the social sciences. But virtually Herculean labor has been undertaken by him in 1998, when he finished a three-volume opus, The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, that he describes as «an empirically grounded, cross-cultural theory of the Information Age» [2, p. xii]. This *magnum opus* brought him fame all over the world. Based on research in the USA, Asia, Latin America, and Europe, it aims to formulate a systematic theory of the information society which takes account of the fundamental effects of information technology on the contemporary world. As one of the most influential newspaper The Wall Street Journal stated on its pages, «Adam Smith explained how capitalism worked, and Karl Marx explained why it didn't. Now the social and economic relations of the Information Age have been captured by Manuel Castells».

During the first decade of the XXI century Castells pays more and more attention not only to social and economic relations in global network society but to the issues of power in it and especially to the pole of communication power. He writes «A Network Theory of Power» (2011) after which he rightly deserves to be named an outstanding scholar in political sciences too.

The Aim of this article is to interpret the main concepts of power in global network society that Castells introduces in his theory of power, to analyze his views on the complex interrela-

tions between power, networks and communication and to observe some of his breakthrough hypotheses.

Brief Review of Literature. In the case of Castells it is almost impossible to dwell on this subject. As it is mentioned at the beginning of this article he is the most cited author in the field of social sciences and the first one in communication studies. Still we can mention the book of Frank Webster «Theories of the information society» [3], as one of the comprehensive works that thoroughly analyzes the main works and ideas of Castells among other theoreticians of the information society as well as academic edition «Visions and Realities» edited by William H. Dutton (1996) [4], the work of Krishan Kumar (1992) published in «New Theories of Industrial Society» [5] and many others.

Results. Castells seeks to build a network theory of power on his previous theories pertaining to the Network Society. According to this theory of Castells, «power in the network society is exercised through networks. There are four different forms of power under these social and technological conditions:

1. *Networking Power:* the power of the actors and organizations included in the networks that constitute the core of the global network society over human collectives and individuals who are not included in these global networks.

2. *Networking Power:* the power resulting from the standards required to coordinate social interaction in the networks. In this case, power is exercised not by exclusion from the networks but by the imposition of the rules of inclusion.

3. *Networked Power:* the power of social actors over other social actors in the network. The forms and processes of networked power are specific to each network.

4. *Network-making Power:* the power to program specific networks, according to the interests and values of the programmers, and the power to switch different networks following the strategic alliances between the dominant actors of various networks» [6, p. 773]. It should be mentioned that each one of these forms of power defines specific processes of exercising power. More than that: all of them constitute the core of the global network society.

Castells gives examples of the most specific dominant networks. First of all he stresses that in global capitalism, the global financial market has the last word (including the IMF, rating financial agencies (e.g., Moody's or Standard & Poor's), the U.S. Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board, Wall Street etc. Then he named the military power of the United States (meaning the functioning of any structure that can use technological innovation and knowledge to exert military power and that has the material resources for large-scale investment in war-making capacity. Of course there are numerous other networks (of scientific research, of organized crime, of professional sports etc.).

He mentioned also the power of political decision which is largely dependent on media (we pay special attention to this alliance of political and media networks at the age of globalization later on).

Besides the concepts of various forms of power in the network society Castells introduces the concept of counter power. Power and counter power constitute one of the central binary oppositions in his theory of power because they «aim fundamentally at influencing the neural networks in the human mind by using mass communication networks and mass self-communication networks» [6, p.773]. Asserting that power relationships are the foundation of society, as institutions and norms are constructed to fulfil the interests and values of those in power, Castells notes that «wherever there is power, there is counter power, enacting the interests and values of those in subordinate positions in the social organization» [6, p. 774]. He underlines that specific interaction between power and counter power makes power multidimensional as it is constructed around multidimensional networks programmed in each domain of human activity according to the interests and values of empowered actors. He justly mentions that each type of society has a specific form of exercising power and counter power and that in the network society, social power is primarily exercised by and through networks.

Thoroughly analyzing each one of the forms of power mentioned above and defining specific processes of exercising power Castells comes to the conclusion that *«The most crucial forms of power follow the logic of network-making power* (Underlining is mine. – **O. Z.**). In a world of networks, the ability to exercise control over others depends on two basic mechanisms: (a) the ability to constitute network(s) and to program/reprogram the network(s) in terms of the goals assigned to the network; and (b) the ability to connect and ensure the cooperation of different networks by sharing common goals and combining resources while fending off competition from other networks by setting up strategic cooperation» [6, p. 776].

Castells offers to call «holders of the first power position programmers. Holders of the second power position are switchers. It is important to note that these programmers and switchers are certainly social actors, but not necessarily identified with one particular group or individual» [6, p. 777]. Castells summarizes that more often than not, these mechanisms operate at the interface between various social actors, defined in terms of their position in the social structure and in the organizational framework of society: «Thus, I suggest that in many instances the power holders are networks themselves, in fact, subnetworks of the networks that organize society. Not abstract, unconscious networks, nor automata, but humans organized around their projects and interests. Note that they are not single actors (individuals, groups, classes, religious leaders, or political leaders), as the exercise of power in the network society requires a complex set of joint action that goes beyond alliances to become a new form of subject – a networked subject» [6, p. 777] .

Castells expectedly plunges into sophisticated examination of these two mechanisms of power making in the networks: *programming* and *switching.* He points out that «the programming capacity of the goals of the network, as well as the capacity to reprogram it, is, of course, decisive, because once programmed, the network has greater capability to perform efficiently and reconfigure itself in terms of structure and nodes to achieve its goals [...] However, all networks do share a common trait: ideas, visions, projects, and frames generate the programs. These are cultural materials. In the network society, culture is mostly embedded in the processes of communication, particularly in the electronic hypertext, with the global multimedia business networks and the Internet at its core» [6, p. 776].

So the scholar comes to the conclusion that the process of communication in society, as well as the organizations and networks that enact this process of communication, «are the key fields where programming projects are formed and where constituencies are built for these projects. *They are the fields of power in the network society»* (Underlining is mine. – **O. Z.**).

Castells convincingly substantiates that there is a second source of power: the control of the connecting points between various strategic networks. Holders of these positions are switchers to assert a geopolitical strategy. [6, p. 777]. His article abounds in examples that the connections between different networks (such as networks of the political leadership, the media networks, the scientific and technology networks, and the military and security networks) can produce and diffuse specific political-ideological discourses. The combination of *programming* and *switching* helps to communicate with each other, inducing synergy and limiting contradiction.

Then Castells focuses on such closely interrelated subjects as power, networks, and communication. This part of his theoretical observations is of paramount scientific interest to us. He contends that «social power throughout history, but even more so in the network society, operates primarily by the construction of meaning in the human mind through processes of communication. In the network society, this is enacted in global/local multimedia networks of mass communication, including mass self-communication» [6, p. 779]. He gives his own definition to the new concept of *mass self-communication* as the communication organized around the Internet and other horizontal digital communication networks.

Castells analyzes the role of emotion and cognition in politics, the ways in which emotional states effect and condition our

responses to information. The scholar shows how belief and emotional framing are key to comprehending the ways in which people make political decisions. He stares that one of the key ways in which media operate is through the creation of frames or images which produce emotional resonances with viewers, which are achieved in several ways.

In the last part of his work he presents several hypotheses concerning the nature of power in the global network society, the role of media and communication power in it and discusses the roots of meta-program that have been designed by someone else from outside the network. This enigmatic «someone else» is the subject of the most determining form of power – network-making power. Castells writes about such important function of media as framing of individual and collective minds stressing that although there is a great deal of diversity in a cultural context that is simultaneously both global and local: «There is, however, one feature common to all processes of symbolic construction: They are largely dependent on the messages and frames created, formatted, and diffused in multimedia communication networks» [6, p. 780].

Mobilizing this theoretical framework, Castells draws attention to the typology of network power presented above. He puts forward a hypothesis, which is built on the basis of empirical observation in his article written with Amelia Arsenault (2008) [7]. Castells assumes that «multimedia communication networks jointly exercise network power over the messages they convey because messages must adapt to the common protocols of communication embodied in the structure and management of the networks. However, while standardized forms of mass communication may shape minds by their formatting of the messages (for instance, news as infotainment), in the world of mass self-communication (built on the Internet and horizontal digital communication networks), the diversity of formats is the rule. Thus, apparently, standards are diminished as a source of network power. However, digitization operates as a protocol of communication. In principle, everything can be digitized, so it does not appear that this standard inhibits the message» [6, p. 780]. Yet, Castells argues that this phenomenon has an opposite, significant effect: «It amplifies the diffusion of the message beyond anyone's control. Digitization is tantamount to potential viral diffusion throughout global networks of communication. This is highly positive if you do want to diffuse the message, but devastating if you do not want to diffuse the message (if, say, the message is a video recording of your wrongdoing). In this case, the network power exercised by digital networks assumes a new form: the removal of control over message distribution. This is in contrast with the traditional network power of mass media, which reformats the message to be suitable for the audience in accordance with their corporate strategy» [6, p. 780].

Referring to his conceptual framework, Castells argues that networking power consists of the capacity to let a medium or a message enter the network through gatekeeping procedures. Castells writes: «Those in charge of the operations of each communication network are the gatekeepers, and so they exercise networking power by blocking or allowing access to media outlets and/or to messages that are conveyed to the network. I call it gatekeeping the nodes and gatekeeping the messages. The rise of mass self-communication has deeply modified the gatekeeping capacity of the programmers of mass communication» [6, p.780]. In this case his thought echoes with the ideas of Karine Barzilai-Nahon (2008, 2010) about a theory of network gatekeeping as framework for exploring information control [8; 9].

Castells warns: «Anything that reaches the Internet may reach the world at large. However, gatekeeping still yields considerable networking power, as most socialized communication is still processed through the mass media, and the most popular information Web sites are those of mainstream media, given the importance of branding in the source of the message. Furthermore, government's control over the Internet and corporate business' attempt to enclose telecommunication networks in their privately owned »walled gardens» show the persistence of networking power in the hands of the gatekeepers» [6, p. 781].

Castells goes on explaining already known terms from mass media research such as *agenda-setting* but now he interprets its meaning according to communication networks. He writes: «Networked power [...] is the form of power exercised by certain nodes over other nodes within the network. In communication networks, this translates as the agenda-setting, managerial and editorial decision-making power in the organizations that own and operate multimedia communication networks» [6, p. 871]. Castells explains that decision making in the corporate media has the multilayered structure. There are different decisions makers on each level of this multilayered structure and between them exists a complex interaction. There are decision makers of news production, that is, the social actors that set up the communication agenda. For example, they include governments, social elites, owners of communication networks and their corporate sponsors [through the intermediation of advertising agencies], managers, editors, journalists, and an increasingly interactive audience). Castells stresses that it is at each one of these levels that programmers exercise power.

There are multiple programmers in each network. While there is a hierarchy in the capacity to program the network, it is the whole set of programmers who jointly decide on the network's operations. Because they interact among themselves, as well as with the programmers of other communication networks, it can be said that programmers constitute a network themselves – a decision-making network to set up and manage the programs on the network. Castells defines their power as specific: «It is geared to ensure the fulfilment of the goals of the network, with the primary objective being to attract an audience regardless of whether it is to maximize profits, or influence, or something else. The overarching goal of network management by the networked power of programmers is to constitute the programmed» [6, p. 871].

Network-making power is the capacity to set up and program a network, in this case a multimedia, mass communication network. Castells mainly refers here «to the owners and controllers of media corporations, be they businesses or the state. They are the ones who have the financial, legal, institutional, and technological means to organize and operate mass communication networks. And they are those who, in the last resort, decide the content and format of communication according to the formula that will best accomplish the goals they assign to the network: profit making, power making, culture making, or all of the above» [6, p. 781].

Castells puts the central question: «But who are they?» He names the most powerful media tycoons, such as Rupert Murdoch, Silvio Berlusconi, Michael R. Bloomberg, or those who run the most powerful Internet business corporations, Sergey Brin, Larry Paige, Jerry Yang, David Filo, Mark Zuckerberg, and others.

In this case Castells mentioned his empirical research «The structure and Dynamics of Global Mutli-media Business Networks» done together with Amelia Arsenault [7] which demonstrates a highly complex picture of the reality of global multimedia business networks – the core of the entire communication system, global, national or local. Network-making power is in the hands of a small number of conglomerates and their surrogates and partners. But these conglomerates are formed by networks of multiple media properties operating in multiple modes and in multiple cultural and institutional environments. And what is the mostly important: «multimedia conglomerates are intertwined with financial investors of various origins, including financial institutions, sovereign funds, private equity investment firms, hedge funds, and others» [6, p. 781].

Castells comes to the very profound conclusion: the *meta-programmers* empowered with network-making capacity are themselves corporate networks. He explain it in a paradoxical way: «They are networks creating networks and programming them to fulfil the goals that these originating networks embody: maximizing profits in the global financial market; increasing political power for government-owned corporations; and attracting, creating, and maintaining an audience as the means to accumulate financial capital and cultural capital. Moreover, the range of investment of these global multimedia business net-

works increases with new possibilities of interactive, multimodal communication, particularly the Internet and wireless communication networks» [6, p. 782].

Furthermore, Castells goes on to argue that in this case, the programming of the networks is less about content than it is about format. He comes to the most interesting conclusions: The Internet only becomes profitable if people use it, and people would use it less if it lost its fundamental features of inter-activity and unfettered communication regardless of how surveyed it is. This observation of Castells speaks of him as of great sociologist that understands the psychology of Internet-addicted generations: even realizing that they get into surveillance of those who accumulates power of Internet networks, people chose their right to communicate.

Castells finds out, names and introduces a new strategy – *commodification of freedom.* According to him it means «enclosing the commons of free communication and selling people access to global communication networks in exchange for surrendering their privacy and becoming advertising targets» [6, p. 782]. It sounds rather sad, but the truth very often has a salty taste.

However, there is a note of optimism in his research, because Castells constitutes that once in cyberspace, people may have all kinds of ideas, including challenging corporate power, dismantling government authority, and changing the cultural foundations of our aging, aching civilization.

Conclusions. Having detected his theory of network power, we may see that Manuel Castells is a great scholar of our days. He gives clear and deep analyses of interrelations between communication power, media power, financial power and political power in a global network society. He formulates a theory of power relevant to the information age. He constructs his network theory of power on the foundation of paramount empirical detection of the processes that are taking place in the global network society and exploits his hypotheses and visions as a kind of proselyte thinker of our epoch.

References

1. Allen, E. *Inquiring Minds: Scholar Manuel Castells on Social Movements* (2012, December 19). Retrieved from http://blogs.loc.gov/loc/2012/12/inquiring-minds-scholar-manuel-castells-on-social-movements/
2. Castells, M. (1996–1998, revised 2010). *The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1–3, xii.
3. Webster, F. (2002). *Theories of the Information Society* (second edition). London: Routlegde.
4. *Visions and Realities: Information and Communication Technologies* (1996). In William H. Dutton (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Kumar, K. (1992). *New Theories of Industrial Society. New Theories of Industrial Society* (pp. 45-75). In Phillip Brown & Hugh Lauder (Eds.). Oxford: Blackwell.
6. Castells, M. (2011). A Network Theory of Power. *International Journal of Communication, 5,* 773-787.
7. Arsenault, A., & Castells, M. (2008). The Structure and Dynamics of Global Multi-media Business Networks. *International Journal of Communication, 2,* 707-748.
8. Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). Toward a Theory of Network Gatekeeping: A Frame Work for Exploring Information Control. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 59*(9), 1493-1512.
9. Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2010). *Talks Networks, Gatekeeping.* Retrieved from http://ischool.uw.edu/news/2010/03/dr-barzilai-nahon-talks-networks-gatekeeping

УДК 044.738.5(477)

Н. О. Піпченко
кандидат політичних наук, доцент кафедри міжнародної інформації,
Інститут міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, Україна
nataliyapo@gmail.com

ІМІДЖ УКРАЇНИ У БЛОГОСФЕРІ

Анотація. Проаналізовано імідж України в іноземній блогосфері та визначено основні тенденції використання соціальних медіа для ефективної зовнішньополітичної комунікації держави. З'ясовано, що в зарубіжній блогосфері переважає інформація про поточні політичні й економічні події в Україні, які привертають увагу світової громадськості, тоді як повідомлення про інші аспекти життєдіяльності держави майже відсутні. На основі авторського дослідження доведено, що розміщення в соціальних медіа різнобічної інформації про Україну сприятиме формуванню її позитивного іміджу в міжнародному інформаційному просторі. Запропоновано розробку єдиного вузлового веб-сайту зовнішньополітичного відомства для інформування в соціальних медіа з актуальних питань зовнішньої і внутрішньої політики, проведення інтерактивних семінарів та використання прикладних додатків у сфері міжнародних відносин.
Ключові слова: імідж України, зовнішньополітична комунікація, соціальні медіа, зарубіжна блогосфера.

Н. А. Пипченко
кандидат политических наук, доцент кафедры международной информации,
Институт международных отношений Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко, Украина

ИМИДЖ УКРАИНЫ В БЛОГОСФЕРЕ
Аннотация. Проанализирован имидж Украины в иностранной блогосфере и установлены основные тенденции использования социальных медиа для эффективной внешнеполитической коммуникации государства. Установлено, что в зарубежной блогосфере преобладает информация о текущих политических и экономических событиях в Украине, которые привлекают внимание мировой общественности, тогда как сообщения о других аспектах жизни практически отсутствуют. На основе авторского исследования сделан вывод о необходимости размещения в социальных медиа разносторонней информации об Украине для формирования ее позитивного имиджа в международном информационном пространстве. Предложено разработать единый узловой веб-сайт внешнеполитического ведомства для информирования в социальных медиа по актуальным вопросам внешней и внутренней политики, проведения интерактивных семинаров и поддержки прикладных приложений в сфере международных отношений.
Ключевые слова: имидж Украины, внешнеполитическая коммуникация, социальные медиа, зарубежная блогосфера.

Nataliya Pipchenko
PhD (Politics), Institute of International Relations of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
36/1 Melnykov St., Kyiv, 04119, Ukraine

IMAGE OF UKRAINE IN BLOGOSPHERE
Abstract. *Introduction:* Study of Ukraine's image in the foreign blogosphere helps to realize the state's position in the global information space, as well as identify opportunities for information and political influence on the external audience. *Purpose.* To analyze the image of Ukraine in foreign blogosphere and to establish trends of social media usage for effective foreign communi-