

Tapio Häyhtiö, tapio.hayhtio@uta.fi
Researcher, M.Soc. Sc.

Jarmo Rinne, jarmo.rinne@uta.fi
Researcher, M.Soc. Sc.

Department of Political Science and International Relations
University of Tampere
<http://www.edemokratia.uta.fi/eng/>

Paper to be presented in *Politics: Web 2.0: An International Conference*
New Political Communication Unit,
Department of Politics and International Relations, Royal Holloway,
University of London, April 17-18, 2008.

BI-DIRECTIONAL CIVIC ACTIVITIES: Reflexivity in administrational and actionist approaches

Abstract: The use of ICTs and Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) is restructuring the politics and political activities, as well as our understanding concerning them. Enhanced communication exploiting digital technology, accessible public spheres, and asynchronous temporality of action on the web platforms transfigure the political culture and notion of the political itself. This reflexive politics, as we call that emerging phenomenon, is challenging the older prevailing version of politics allowing the bi-directional interactive involvement and embarking on the political matters. Governments are using the ICT-applications to involve citizens in the name of legitimating good governance (and because of falls in voter turnout), and people are exercising their newly discovered potentiality to pursue their own personal political goals.

We illustrate this ongoing transformation, both from the perspective of the formal institutional politics and from the standpoint of citizen-initiated reflexive politics with the help of empirical cases. In the current situation, two opposite discourses on citizenship and participation are salient. They can be labelled administrational and actionist discourses. The paper is outlining theoretical perspectives both regarding the use of computer-mediated communication in involving the citizens to joint decision making, and equally, citizens engagement in personal political projects to transcend the normal limits and constraints of the formal politics. The problematic nature of political participation and the ambiguities of political governance in civic involvement are to be analysed in the light of Finnish examples. Secondly, changes in the action and participation, particularly reflexive activity by the people instead of activity for the people facilitated by ICT are reviewed. In this respect, we argue, that “big politics” becomes more kaleidoscopic smaller personal politics emerging on diverse, complex and multi-spatial networks. Thirdly, the paper discusses the importance of public spheres in doing and transfiguration of politics.

Introduction: The Changing Scope of Political Participation

What do we understand by the politics? As a defined concept it refers to a number of phenomena or things that could be labelled as politics or at the minimum, have some politically understood content in them. A common way to grasp the notion of politics is to reduce it to mean the structures or institutions in which politics and political matters take place. This view is traditionally considered a narrow perspective concerning politics. However, the notion does mean something else, too. One important aspect of it is a motion or an action that tries to achieve some valued goals or things, and at the same time has reflexive relations between an actor and his/her community (see for instance Jung xiv-xv, 1979).

In brief, politics is both necessary and unavoidable. Human societies need politics, because by its implementation societies can be governed. It is an instrument of distributing good (and bad) in communities, finding out resolutions and resolving the conflicting views within communities, allocating values with legitimate authority, organising the changes and directions of communal life etc. Politics is, in a word, an organised attempt to bring order in a pluralistic chaos. (See for instance Arendt 1958; Beetham 1991; Keane 1998.)

In many textbooks about the politics and political participation, references are, for granted, pointing to the democratic political system. This is no wonder. In present day world, the notion of *democracy* has bestowed an aura of legitimacy on political governing (see Held 1997, 78). In addition, democratic ideal is, by definition, based on the popular participation in government. In respect of participation, and political activity *per se* orientation is to find out and clarify those conditions in which the governing is legitimate and acceptable. (Heywood 2004, 220.) The underlying tendency in these textbooks' discourses is to define justifiable conditions or criteria of

democratic governing in whatsoever given society or association. One of the most well known very influential principle is that in just political governing individuals' ought to have an access in the decisions that affect one's life (Dye and Zeigler 1975, 6).

In recent years, the idea or impression of politics is somehow blurred. This trend has a close connection to the social changes and processes that social scientists from different fields have observed in recent decades (such as modernisation, globalisation, the fragmentation of societies, individualisation and so forth.). The changing nature of a society changes the scope of social sciences as well. In the study of politics that change has been visible. Among political scientists, the focus of research is shifting increasingly towards the civil society and its activity.

There is a new orientation in political science research; activity by the people instead of activity for the people. This change has also had a profound effect on the notion of citizenship, which in modern democracies seems to parallel to the right to vote. However, electoral participation has decreased in recent decades and political culture is taking steps in the path to more reciprocal direction. Emerging rival articulations in regard of citizenship contain more '*having a voice during electoral periods*'-aspects. That means a greater involvement and say in decisions concerning the future shape of community/society. Citizens' activism and forming groups in order to express opinions and attitudes is part of the process linked to societal change. More and more often political claims are channeled through organizations of civil society. And, as the number of such expressions increased, the more serious civil society organisations are recognised by traditional political institutions. To study the politics is to study the spontaneous/voluntary civic activity within the political system emerging in the frames of civil society and in its' multiple organisations. This altering of scope is contrary to the earlier top-down model of politics. The transformation has controversial implications – actionist and administrative consequences. Nevertheless, the public

or political issues are not losing their significance in people's minds; in fact, politics still matters. Only the forms and forums along with the concept of political activity and participation are changing.

In the current turmoil, two opposite discourses on political citizenship in respect of civil involvement and participation are somehow salient, and we label them as *administrational* and *actionist* discourses. The first one aims to create and rationalise the practices of participation from above (e.g. the planning of land use and urban construction, good governance practices). The latter discourse strives for bringing alternative meanings and practices from below (e.g. the criticism of 'official' influence opportunities, the inhabitants' own initiatives and plans, citizens' public action). Due to the actionist '*do-it-yourself*' -tendency political environment has fractured into a diverse, complex and multi-spatial network. The significance and sensibility of political participation springs not only from the impact and consequences of the action but also from the participative action itself.

One ongoing, and in many various ways launched attempt to increase citizens' political participation is linked to the use of computer-mediated communication (CMC) especially the Internet. Using the Internet seems to be very promising tool to deploy in overcoming the apathetic traditional political involvement, and empowering the commitment to political issues. Both institutional and civil societal actors, and even single individuals have noticed that Internet and other CMC – related technical applications have inherently politically facilitating features.

The purpose of this paper is to outline a theoretical perspective on the use of computer-mediated communication, as a political tool, channel, and forum enabling the people to transcend the normal limits and constraints of politics. In setting the context, the paper first considers the problematic

nature of political participation. References are especially made to ambiguities of political governance in respect to the case of political civic involvement in a Finnish context. Secondly, changes in the modes of action and participation are in focus. In particular, Finnish actionist civic politics facilitated by CMC is reviewed. Thirdly, the paper sets research cases in the context of *reflexive politics* that illustrates conflicts arising from clashes of different subjective values, lifestyles and attitudes. As we understand reflexive politics, it refers both to the politicisation of private worries and issue-specific questions and to political judgement, and to outcomes resulting in action. Therefore the term reflexive politics provides an explanation of intuitively and instinctually emerging modes of politics that unfold in more an organised form of action in the subjective process of political judgement. (Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008ab.) Finally, the summary of theoretical points of view is to be found in the concluding remarks.

The Case of the City of Tampere: Forming Administrative Public Involvement

The discussions and practices of new public involvement have its roots in two different approaches, which in very peculiar manner have converged to influence in the transformation of political participation culture. These are New Public Management reforms and forms of political participation theory that have converted into innovations of public involvement.

During last decades various modernisation reforms have been conducted in different levels and fields of public administration in OECD countries. The reforms have followed a philosophy of *New Public Management* (NPM) that is a broad and complex doctrine. Most fundamentally it aims to improve the cost-efficiency of public sector by privatising, marketising and utilising the management practices of economic life. The effects of NPM reforms can be both vertical and horizontal. For instance, vertical reforms have created the methods of management by results, large centralized profit centres, harmonizing systems of quality and payroll and management practices supporting

representative political system. On the other hand, NPM reforms have been justified demanding the break up of hierarchical government, desentralising, deregulation, administrative transparency and flexible horizontal governance (see Hood 1999; Pollitt & Bouckaert 2004.) Public administration reforms have also strived to connect citizens better to decision-making processes. Citizens are considered as subjects with needs and wishes that have to be met in order to produce good efficient governance. This is the reason why representative government is supplemented with range of devices for public hearing and consultation to ensure the direct representation of citizen's views. (see Pollitt & Bouckaert 2004.)

The implementation of NPM strategies has led to the emergence of new practices and theories of political governance (Pierre 2000a, pp. 1-3; Hirst 2000, p. 18, Bingham et al. 2005, p. 549). It is defined that political steering has transformed from hierarchical decision-making to horizontal networked governance of many actors (public, private and civil society sectors). In political governance power, responsibility and accountability have fractured and politics has changed to a complex arena of plural actors (Pierre 2000b; Bang 2003a). One mode of political governance is public involvement culture, which aims to construct and rationalise the practices of civic participation from above (see Häyhtiö & Keskinen 2005; Bingham et al. 2005; Bang 2003b). The culture of public involving is a model of new steering imperative, inclusive political communication, which invites lay people to exercise civic influence in new access points and to partake in a systemic decision-making process (Bang 2003a).

In addition to NPM reforms, the culture of public involving has been influenced by the fact that the distance between political parties and citizens is widening. The ongoing discussion of political alienation is an expression of concern about the unpopularity of political participation. The reigning political elite has recognised the need for the formation of new medias for deliberation and forums

of participation to bring about a more justified and legitimate form of governance. The aim and the promise of various local, regional, national, EU and global participatory projects and initiatives consist of closer bonds between public officials, politicians and citizens. The purpose is to create and introduce such procedures within the political governing system that strengthen the legitimacy and accountability of political decision-making. (Coleman & Gøtze 2001; Macintosh et al. 2002; Malina 2003; Tsagarousianou 1999; Schulman et al. 2003; Schlosberg et al. 2007.)

The practices of public involvement are based on the ideas given by the participatory democracy theory, deliberative democracy theory and e-democracy, which all stress the importance of citizen participation in public political deliberation and decision-making (Bingham et al. 2005; Häyhtiö & Keskinen 2005; Dahlberg 2001). These models of participation aspire to political deliberation, in which people are motivated to deliberate in a civil and reasonable manner. Theories emphasise the distribution of information and knowledge as a material used by public in order to form arguments or to support their political opinions so that confidence among citizens increases. A democratic community is therefore to be founded on solidarity and intellectual deliberation and effective cooperation. The admission of legitimacy emerges from reasonable, logical and knowledgeable arguments that are approved by a majority (Häyhtiö & Keskinen 2005, p. 430)

The characteristic feature of this new *public involvement culture* is that it is voicing the citizens in such matters that fit into the context of representative political governance. The representative bodies, or civil servants, set the agenda. The citizens themselves do not set the agenda (see Macintosh et al. 2002; Malina 2003; Tsagarousianou 1999; Schulman et al. 2003; Schlosberg et al. 2007; Wiklund 2005; Albrecht 2006). Thus, active civil discussion is about matters, which are considered suitable (and usually they are rather harmless or insignificant) (Blaug 2002; Lappalainen 2006; Häyhtiö & Rinne 2006). Nevertheless, despite the fact that the topics of desired civil

discussion are fixed, the very tendency to seek more legitimacy by allowing the citizens to participate in governing, tells of the transformation of the political culture. Those in power recognise the need to find out the attitudes and opinions of people at intermediate times between elections. (see Bang & Dyrberg 2003).

The significant feature of the political governance, articulated in the 1990's, is the emergence of the idea of having a more inclusive political decision-making model by offering the citizens a media to participate in decision-making (see Bevir 2003; Bang 2003). In Finland such projects involving public response are salient both within the context of local and national policymaking. Amongst these new channels to empower people are digital networks, especially the Internet. They offer new methods of utilising democratic participation. Most of the experimental public involvement e-projects utilise fairly similar infrastructures of computer-mediated communication, notably various Internet applications. In general, the electronic democracy discourse is marked by two grand promises: the citizen's free access to public information and open discursive deliberation on the electronic Net (Tsagarousianou 1999).

In Finland, local projects offering digital media to participate in decision-making give an interesting insight into the new public involvement culture. In many reports, the website of the city of Tampere¹ is referred to as a best practice for local citizen-oriented e-governance (see Anttiroiko et al. 2005). The website² of the City of Tampere can be analysed as a comprehensive case of administrationally organised public involvement. The site's applications on the *Participation Portal* (*Osallistuminen* in Finnish)³ are connected to a dominant representative system, in other words,

¹ "Tampere is the third largest city in Finland and the largest inland centre in the Nordic countries. Currently there are over 200,000 inhabitants in Tampere and almost 300,000 inhabitants in Tampere Sub-Region, which comprises Tampere and its neighbouring municipalities." (the City of Tampere – Tampere in Brief [www-document].)

² <http://www.tampere.fi/>

³ <http://www.tampere.fi/osallistuminen/index.html>

people are encouraged to influence political decision-making. The website offers a range of e-services, and even allows and encourages civic debate concerning the governing of the city (see the website of the City of Tampere [www-document]). The city has put a lot of effort into the enhancement of civic net-participation by constructing *Participation Portal* (in Finnish: Osallistuminen [www-document]), which consists of the following parts:

1. information about municipal government and participation opportunities as well as the contact information
 2. permanent channels of e-participation: feedback facilities, discussion sites and a Questions & Answers service
 3. topical consultations: Internet-user surveys since 1997, budget polls since 1999 and various consultations on issues such as traffic, zoning and services
 4. opportunity to initiate official motions and monitor their progress, links to other discussion and participation arenas, such as children's and young people's forums.
 5. links to other discussion and participation arenas, such as children's and young people's forums
- (Seppälä 2003, 1.)

The governance model presented in the City of Tampere *Participation Portal* -website, as well as various other fairly similar administrative public involvement projects, attempts to answer globalised modernisation pressures by engaging the citizens in the communicative processes of political regime. The public organisations strive towards dialogic relationships with various stakeholders because political environments have become highly complex and fragmented. Political government cannot be anymore carried out by non-communicative hierarchical steering (Bang 2003c, 243–244). The *Participation Portal* of the city of Tampere is an excellent example of how a representation system tries to connect to the political community's stakeholders and citizens. The political managers and administrators have to demonstrate nowadays that they want to be in

cooperative relationships with civil society and citizens so that they can generate the legitimacy of political steering (Bang 2003c, 252):

In the planning, decision-making and realisation of the future of the city all of us are needed. The inhabitant has a right to participate in taking care of common matters.

The city of Tampere develops the possibilities of the inhabitants' participation. Our purpose is to hear and to listen to more inhabitants than before in all matters concerning the city. (An introduction to the *Participation Portal* <<http://www.tampere.fi/osallistuminen/index.html>>, translation: Häyhtiö.)

The public involvement culture adopted by public organisations addresses several rhetorical promises relating to citizens' empowerment, customer orientation, opening up participation channels and the creation of multiple partnership relations etc. (Bang 2003b, 243). The report of the city of Tampere, *Working Group for Improving Citizens' Opportunities for Participation*, states that the residents, civil servants and the elected representatives have to be in closer interaction than before so that representative democracy can be strengthened by direct participation (The City of Tampere, 2003). Furthermore, it is proposed that the whole organisational culture of the city need to be changed so that civic participation can become *an inherent aspect of political and administrative culture* (Anttiroiko 2004b, 380). The City wants to organise a responsive participation culture so that the citizens would be activated in participating in the preparation and taking care of matters related to their own living environment. The report also underlines that active participation in the city affairs would have integrative effects for the local community and public policy activities (the City of Tampere, 2003).

According to Henrik Bang, public involvement culture strives to construct feasible citizen empowerment, which means inviting people to exercise civic influence at new access points and to participate in systemic decision-making. In networked society the public authorities want to create

an administration related participative culture, which is effective for the legitimacy, coherence and the decision-making of the organisation. Thus, communicative governance refers to the social practices of a modernised political community, in which *the rulers attempt to socialise and regulate people's conduct in an indirect manner by working on their identities and thereby their values, feelings, attitudes and beliefs via a variety of new interactive modes of dialogue and co-operation* (Bang 2003b, 246–247).

In practice, governance in political systems has to be based on complex communicative and interactive practices. The e-governance model of the city of Tampere gives an outlook on the features of electronic civic participation organised by public authorities. It seems to share a general belief that the citizens' awareness of societal affairs is a precondition for meaningful citizen participation and making them interested in systemic governance issues. The website of the city has made available a wide variety of information about the city's plans, reports, policy alternatives and proposals. For instance, all the agendas and the minutes of the municipal bodies are published on the website at the same time as they are sent to the decision-makers. The *Participation Portal*, especially, extensively disseminates extensively information on opportunities of participation, procedures, local current affairs, formal instructions and regulations. Accordingly, the city of Tampere wants to provide residents with background information in order to help them produce and express reasonable comments to the authorities and political representatives on local issues (Seppälä 2002; Seppälä 2003; the City of Tampere 2003, 13, 21–23.).

The *Preparation Forum* of the City (in Finnish: *Tampereen kaupungin valmistelufoorumi VALMA* [www-document]) is the most innovative two-way application of the *Participation Portal*. The Forum was launched in spring 2003 with the support of the *City Working Group for Improving Citizens' Opportunities for Participation* (The City of Tampere 2003 [www-document]). During

2003-2005, 75 administratively launched discussion topics were published on the *Preparation Forum* discussion site and 630 citizen floors took place on the public forum. In addition, 239 unpublished⁴ individual opinions were e-mailed to preparing officials. The city officials describe the functioning of the Preparation Forum in the following manner:

Residents of the municipality will be secured a means of delivering feedback and participating in case preparation from beginning to end. As soon as the decision is made to open a case for preparation (when the case is, for instance, entered into working plans), the secretary or spokesperson of the committee places a notice about this on the website of the municipality. The notice will be accompanied by a feedback form returnable to the preparing official, committee secretary or elected officials. The network debate concerning the case is recorded on a discussion forum. When the preparation proper begins, preparation documents in digital form will be available to the residents via the Internet. (Uurtamo 2003.)

It must be acknowledged that several aspects of participatory, deliberative e-democracy theory materialise in the City's Internet forums. People participate in the deliberations as equal citizens: the participants could be considered equal speakers and performers in relation to one another. Electronic deliberations – with the background information provided – could be considered as processes of political reasoning and argumentation, and the deliberations are free and public. Presentations are not generally hindered or restricted by any authority and they are all public. (cf. Dahlberg 2001a & 2001b.) Although, it has to be acknowledged that the city's discussion services are premoderated (Seppälä 2002; 2003). Participation is voluntary and its aim is to influence local politics – although people do not actually have a direct opportunity to contribute to policymaking. However, the explicit aim of the City's website forums is to promote democracy and the citizens' opportunities to participate in politics. The forums therefore seem to seek a kind of consensual politics by means of argumentative deliberation. The aim of public deliberation is to legitimate

⁴ The citizens may choose whether they want to give their opinions in public or in private on the *Preparation Forum*.

future policies. In the forums, participation is reciprocal. Also, background information on the issues under deliberation is provided. This gives the participants an opportunity to justify their arguments and to assess the arguments delivered by others.

At first sight, the *Preparation Forum* may seem a very tempting channel to partake in municipal decision-making, because it provides easy access for residents “to bring forward their opinions concerning issues on the agendas of the committees and to participate in discussion”. It is also declared that citizen “opinions are e-mailed directly to the elected officials and municipal employees concerned and collected into a summary enclosed in the minutes of the committee” (Anttiroiko et al. 2005, 398). Evidently, a number of city dwellers very much appreciate the new medium and utilise the services that Tampere’s websites offer. However, *Preparation Forum’s* participation figures illustrate that the vast majority of the city dwellers do not take a part in e-facilitated discussions, nor have any idea, whatsoever, what subjects are current topics in the city’s discussion forums. (Häyhtiö & Keskinen 2005; Anttiroiko et al. 2005.) The obvious obstacle to increasing participation in decision-making is the fact that too many citizens feel that the activation of the political dialogue is a fake attempt on the side of the political elite (Häyhtiö & Rinne 2006).

The City of Tampere website and its *Participation Portal* are modern, virtual spaces for political action facilitated by new ICT. Theoretically, they are ideal examples of deliberative, participative e-democracy. The key preconditions of this theoretical viewpoint materialise quite extensively in the online forums. Information resources are distributed, the participants are considered equal and everybody has a say. Moreover, the deliberators are mostly well educated and they have at least to some degree a chance to influence decision-making. Thus, it is quite obvious how the tradition of participatory democracy thinking has given organic civic participation ideas to the public involvement practices, which aims to construct and rationalise the practices of participation from above. Both approaches are in favour of construction of a political discussion environment, which

adheres to an assumption of civil sociability. The concept of *civil* signifies, in this context, a kind of erudition and a level of competency in deliberation, on the basis of which people feel capable of co-operation and of trusting each other. Co-operation and trust engender predictability and certainty about the action and its effects. Politics therefore becomes sociable politics, in which conflicts emerge on the political agenda but in which they are resolved in the harmony created by civic deliberation. (rf. Mouffe 2000.)

The paradox in many projects that are invented to increase political participation is that they do not actually empower the citizens. Quite the contrary, people do not believe that they might have an opportunity to make a difference in local/national governing because the agenda is already set, and what is the single most important factor is that the voice of the citizens is heard, but it doesn't necessarily have any influence. That is, that the decision-makers do not have to take that voice in to account, there is no imperative in that voice. This is a very vital point, according to the classics of participation theory (Arnstein 1974) people feel more empowered, if they are given real tools to influence. Strong participation means collaboration, and actual influential participation in decision-making. The crucial question to be answered is: *Can the political dialogue flourish on websites, especially if the representatives of the political system set the agenda in advance, and it is not responding to the initiatives of citizens?* If citizens themselves could bring out the topics of discussion in *electronic agora*, and if their opponents (politicians and leading office holders) would step in to focus, representing their lines of argumentation, would that activate civil participation? Or is it simply, that in intensive and often conflicting issues, the dialogue between rulers and ruled is basically impossible, because citizens are perceived as non-professional, but yet somehow the legitimate voice of political needs?

The case of Tehotuotanto.net (Intensive farming) as horizontal-vertical style of participation

The other side of political participation and involvement concerns with citizen initiated activities, which is more horizontal in nature when compared with the administrative involvement. Of course, to be effective the citizen initiated activity should include vertical elements, too. That is to have an impact and at least get public attention, the political actionist campaigns ought to breakthrough into wider consciousness in order to have a say to the official political agenda. It does not necessarily have no role in the actual decision-making processes, but the topics may arise from “private public spheres” in which people are pointing out social or political evils. In some cases civic activism brings the plurality of opinions ostensive and starts a kind of snow-ball effect that in the end leads to the changes in the legislative level.

Nowadays the forms and forums to promote whatsoever political agenda or ends, even for single individual, are numerous. The development of light portable digital technology has had its’ effects in empowering the citizens, too. Easily accessed publication channels and applications together with the development of technology have empowered people and enable them to distribute what ever material to the public spheres on the Internet. Among this self broadcasted content there are also stuff that has political relevancy and significance. On the open sphere within the Internet, the creativity of civic agents flourishes and takes many forms in pursuit of aimed political goals. Such forms found on the Internet are, for instance, emailing, blogging, disseminating information through the means of citizen journalism, building up groups and communities on the social networking sites (cf. Chadwick 2007, 290). In this we find a sharp contrast between the “big politics” from above and small “do-it-yourself” politics.

By sharing self-made content on the web 2.0 environment, people are involving themselves in peer-to-peer politics. By introducing their political visions, aims and means they may put forth

interactivity between individuals and create a kind collectivistic network of a new type. People may choose to join the discussion, take required actions (like signing the petitions, taking part to virtual sit-ins and so). Such networks based on everyday activism and swarming (see Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008b) are results of individual's personal responsible taking, and thus they resemble the Micheletti's notion of individualized collective action (see more Micheletti 2003, 28) in which public and private concerns are coupled together.

One of the most interesting characteristic in regard to that individual responsible taking is, that it could analytically be distinguished into three categories in terms of the degree of its' intensiveness. At the first level individual shows interest towards some particular issue and is, in principle ready to take some action to pursue that issue and help on campaigning. This level is engagement. The second level is involvement, in which individual actually does something concrete. In other words She/he gives her/his time and efforts to make a difference and participate in action for sake of the wanted goal. The third and final level of individual responsible taking is commitment. In this level individual is ready to make sacrifices and share her/his private resources more intensively than at the earlier phases. At this point, it is sufficient to state that this final level comes in terms with a full-time activist. In addition, some characteristics describing the *everyday maker* (Bang & Sörensen 1998) are also useful in defining or conceptualising the principle guiding the commitment through activity. Bang and Sörensen has several features (1998, 23-25) defining the "identity of the everyday maker", but in this text three most essential features to catch the idea of reflexive individual responsible taker are:

- DO IT YOURSELF;
- DO IT BECAUSE YOU FIND IT NECESSARY
- DO IT CONCRETELY

Finnish animal rights activists applied above mentioned principles while committing themselves into direct covert action during 2006-2007. According to Oikeutta eläimille- association (Justice for Animals) the animal rights activists performed an investigation: *“During the investigation we visited 101 Finnish factory farms and filmed with digital cameras. The filming was conducted mostly inside the sheds, and sometimes through the vents. The buildings were never broken into, since the doors were unlocked. We paid particular attention to disease risks by changing clothes and shoes before entering and using respirator masks.”* Tehotuotanto.net [www-document]).

The adopted model for action could be called a individualised civic watch (see Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008b) even though, that the website containing the material of that “investigation” is maintained and administrated by Justice for Animals association. Digital broadcasting technology enables the reflexive politics in the form of civic watch, and this option was realised by animal rights activists. The Justice for Animals association claims they have only received the sent material and put it on their website. The actual action has been taken by unknown active individuals, who have acted, according to the statement found on animal rights association’s website, *“independently and as individuals”*. So, the activists are not representing any organisation. In their own words:

“Our identities are not important - what counts are the results of this investigation which are shown on this website”

“Sometimes one just can't sit back and wait for somebody to do something. We simply just got up and took action for the defenceless”.

“The results from the investigation show that suffering animals are not an exception but a rule in Finnish animal production. This material shows that animal suffering is an inseparable part of the production: animals are seen as products and commodities instead of sentient beings.”

“What happens behind the closed doors of the Finnish factory farms is a wrong that exceeds the act of opening those unlocked doors and documenting the horrors. We haven't destroyed any property, instead we are just revealing existing facts.” (Tehotuotanto.net [www-document])

So, the motive to taking actions in defending the animal rights reflects on personal or individual responsible taking. The reason why then these videos were uploaded on the site of the existing

animal right organisation was that the purpose of those footages meets the goals of the association itself. Both videos and association aim to reveal the “truth of Finnish animal production”.

The campaign was launched by the help of Finnish national broadcasting company Yleisradio (YLE). In one of the most popular programme handling the current topics A-Studio reportaasi (Reportage of A-studio) in November 28 clips from the footages were shown. That was the departure point of the campaign against intensive farming. After the starting video collage there were a TV-talk, in which the head of Finnish Food Safety Authority Jaana Husu-Kallio and philosopher Elisa Aaltola discussed about the standards and ethics of Finnish animal farming. During the following days, the topic of the treatment of animals in food production blossomed. It was a hot stuff in news and current affairs programme. Most Finnish TV-channels made reportages of the issue and interviewed both animal rights activists and farmers. A short and incomplete list of the TV-programmes is below:

- [29.11.2007 [YLEn aamu-tv](#), [MTV3 klo 22 uutiset](#) (YLE’s morning news, MTV3 ten o’clock news)
- [3.12.2007 [Nelosen uutiset](#) (Channel four News)
- [4.12.2007 [Ajankohtainen kakkonen](#) (Channel 2 current affair’s programme)
- [5.12.2007 [MTV3 klo 19 uutiset](#), [Nelosen uutiset](#) (MTV 3 seven o’clock news, Channel four news)

In all these programmes the case of Tehotuotanto.net was treated in a journalistically profound and sound manner. After gaining public awareness through media attention, the campaign moved to Internet. Oikeutta eläimille (Justice for Animals) association offered to tender the efficient server for the Tehotuotanto.net Internet-campaign. The original server proved to be powerless to handle the massive flow of requests, thus it was jammed and was out of order for couple of days in the beginning of campaign.

By publishing the shocking material that has delivered to them anonymously the Justice for Animals managed to launch campaign of a new type and at the same token update their political style in their information disseminating, which has always been one of the cornerstones of Finnish animal rights activities. Earlier these actions took their places on the streets by collecting the names for petitions, handing out flyers, sticking posters and banners all over the walls and fences, publishing the radical magazine, and participating in different panels and popular events. Despite the fact, that animal rights association has been active on the net environment more than ten years, the Tehotuotanto.net rallying brought something new regarding association's styles and forms of activities. In fact, it was vital injection of a sort for animal rights activism, because it aroused and invoked public interest and caused a vivid fussing in the public discussion and within social media in web 2.0 environment.

In many newspaper articles and letters to the editor the treatment of animals in the Finnish farming industry was considered a social evil that should be solved. On the other side, investigatory journalism tried to find out whether the accusations of Justice for Animals association were true. In public, many farmers take a defensive stance and explained that the animals are treated according to the accepted standards and the demands of the customers have lead to the conditions under which animals are living in the farms. Farmers were eager to emphasise that they did not have treat animals in illegal manner. A bit ironically, that has been the point of animal activist more than ten years. They have stated that the living conditions of production animals is: “ *not an exception but a rule in Finnish animal production. ...[a]nimals are seen as products and commodities instead of sentient beings.*” (Tehotuotanto.net [www-document]). The whole point of their campaign was to make it publically known. Thanks to modern technology, the delivering the message is more effective and convincing than in the early phase of activism.

One interesting feature in Finnish campaign was the reaction of public and consequences on the Internet. Quickly after publishing the videos of Tehotuotanto.net the formation of supporting groups were founded on social networking site like Facebook (having 2,582 members) and collection of links to mass media sources that have dealt with the issue and MySpace. In addition, some boycotting attempts not to buy traditional ham for Christmas were launched, too. The effect of such boycotts, whether they decrease the selling of intensively farmed meat, is not known yet.

Reflexive politics on the Internet

Internet research has shown, how cost efficiently resource poor political actors can utilise digital technologies in reducing the cost of their actions and forming actionist networks. Most commonly the Net is studied from the perspectives of enabling participation, creating the structural composition of action networks and their continuations, or shaping the organizational form of political activity. (Garrett, 2006, pp. 203-204.)

The accessibility of www browsers in the 1990's created a setting for the notion of *Web 1.0* that refers to easy-to-use computer-mediated communication. The expanding growth in the capacity of computing devices, software and data transfer led to the final breakthrough of the Internet and multiplied the number of users. The Internet became a graphic environment in which people can consume, publish content freely, create sites and communities, seek linked information, “surf” from one place to another, and entertain themselves, conduct politics and meet people. (Walch 1999, pp. 39-49; Chadwick 2006, pp. 45-47.) In computer-mediated communication the most significant political feature is *de-medialization*, which refers to the fracturing mediator role of mass media and the emergence of horizontal communication. As the Internet expanded, new styles of communication activism arose, because it was impossible to control them and anybody could try to bring matters to public discussion. (Walch 1999, pp. 67-75.)

Studies considering citizen-oriented politics have shown a growing interest in the paradigm shift in the political use of the Internet – labelled as a politics of *Web 2.0*. The notion of Web 2.0 encompasses sites based on user-generated content, networking and sharing. (Wyld 2007.) Today, the services and applications offered by the Internet are largely commercial but this has not hindered political spontaneous civic activity in emerging onto the platforms of social media. In fact, it is understood that Web 2.0 sites in general are transforming the Internet into a mode of space where users do not simply discuss but do things together (O’Reilly 2005). It presents an Internet where contents are created and shaped by networking individuals. (Wyld 2007, pp. 43-44; Chadwick 2006, pp. 8.) In user-generated content production individuals themselves control creation processes by developing, classifying, architecting or evaluating Web content. Indeed, Web 2.0 sites can be defined as peer-to-peer media, in which collectivities consist of the choices of individuals to connect to platforms and to act voluntarily in them. (O’Reilly 2005.) Web communities can also materialise sources of collective political activity when swarming and meshworking individuals visit interesting websites and hubs to solve problems or attain shared aims or orientations. The multitude of individuals may grow into a politically effective force, if they unite. By meshworking the swarming effect turns the plural into unity (cf. Osterweil 2004, p. 504.)

Through the Internet actors may disseminate their aims and agenda horizontally, from peer to peer, by opening new public places within the complex structure of overlapping public spheres *micro-, meso- and macro-public* spheres, which form according to John Keane (2000, pp. 77-78): “...a]complex mosaic of differently sized, overlapping and interconnected public spheres.” In addition, the employment of CMC offers multiple layers of spatial *asynchronous* contexts and opportunities to mobilize and advocate political pursuits. Publishing and sharing self-made media content horizontally through the Net is a process in which media outputs are received and conceived by

their audiences in discursive and interactive manners. In this context any issue may take on political relevance. The meanings of these outputs are formed through communicative practises of sharing and delivering self-created material and information. Meaning-making is open-ended, even loose talk in which politics can materialise in the context of discursive interaction, when the new ways of framing social/political issues, new ways of perceiving, and new formulations of strategies are formed (cf. Dahlgren 2006, 279). The processes can be reciprocal, mutual attempts or launched even by a single active individual. It is possible to define issues as political, in other words politicise chosen topics, by denaturalising the conventional perceptions or through ironic and sardonic approaches. (Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008a)

The CMC enable digital *micro*-politics that fosters the new ideas and modes of action along with the “snowball-effect” that can, during a timely course of action, permeate into *meso*-, or even *macro*-political publicness. The asynchronous temporal dimension is then fortified when people decide to join the original online campaign after noticing it from some other media. Hence, the Internet is to be considered as a *locus*, channel, and to some extent even a temporal space for political and communicative action, participation, and mobilization. (Meikle 2002; Donk et al. 2004; della Porta & Mosca 2005; Garrett 2006; Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008ab.) The empowering potentiality of the Internet is so impressive, that hardly any serious political actor (or “wanna-be” actor) could overlook its’ facilitating features (Chadwick 2006). The technical development of the Internet and the plural forms of communication empower activity by opening a radically individualised environment, where personal concerns may be politicised.

The effects of the Internet on political civic empowerment can be analysed as follows. First, computer-mediated communication is a resource for the activity. The Internet has modified movements and organisations making them more networked, flexible, and polycentric, making

collective mobilisation easier and increasing the opportunities for direct action. The Net also facilitates the construction and strengthening of collective identities and the distribution of alternative information. (della Porta & Mosca 2005, p. 185.) Second, micro-public spheres of the Net are potential places for the usage of actionist power; the Net is an open space both for political judgements and opinions and for choosing political styles. On the Net, basically anybody can try to influence matters that are considered important. (Lappalainen 2006.) Third, the communication platforms on the Internet construct personalised connections, such as user identifications, bookmarks, link listings, archives, email lists, blogs etc., which may be latent connections of social networks for a long time, but in the unpredictable situations of Net politics they may become politically significant *nodes* (cf. della Porta & Mosca 2005, p. 186). Fourth, the Internet as an experience-based space enables different learning processes through which individuals can improve their self-governance related for instance to technical skills, information retrieval and self-generated content and knowledge (Chadwick 2007; Dahlgren 2006), which are also crucial arts for practising spontaneous Net politics.

Individualised Civic Watch as a Form of Reflexive Politics

One recently emerged form of politics is the individualised civic watch, which stems from the idea of reflexive political action being intertwined in all aspects of the empowering effects of the Internet. Civic watching improves the self-governance of the individual's own life in pursuing his/her political objectives. Hence, the individualised civic watch complements the traditional "watchdogs" of power, such as broadcast media and civil society organisations. The political motive for an individual is to enter into public discussions via horizontal communication in order to have an effect on people's opinions. It seeks to influence other individuals' behaviour and action at the level of their everyday lives. The persuasive arguments could be addressed either to universal or particular audiences (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969, pp. 28-30). As such, it reflects the

fragmentation of the traditional institutional political environment into more diverse, complex and multi-spatial networks, in which personal responsibility-taking is replacing centralised political governing and shifting the focus onto the acting individual subject (Micheletti 2003, p. 20; McDonald 2006, p. 14). Formal politics is scaled down by the multiplication of individually generated public spheres (Bentivegna 2006, p. 339), in which political activity, participation and mobilisation emerge from the issue-specific questions through personal political judgement based on intuitive and subjective values.

In this vein, the individual civic watch is one increasingly strengthening form of *reflexive politics* referring to the transformation of political activity and participation in which political issues are springing from the basis of subjectively felt wrongs reflecting personal political judgement (Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008). An approach of this kind emphasises the activity of the people (*Do-it-yourself*-attitude), and extends the dimension of politics in a more personalised direction. The individual civic watch emerges from bi-directional interactive applications found on the Internet, and it may even occur on the commercially governed sites, such as YouTube.com. DIY-activists' creativity in utilising commercial, though costless, platforms is noteworthy, because so far most commentators have believed that spontaneous civic activity is unthinkable in commercialised environments (e.g. Atton 2004, p. 3). The commercial nature of the platforms seems not to bother active citizens, because publishing is free. In fact, swarming increases the advertising potential of sites that become popular.

When an individually politicised issue is made publicly accessible, anyone can participate in it or share in it (Heller, 2006, p. 318). Through publicness the reflexive individualised activity reaches its audiences. That turns the particular issue into a universal, publicly known one (ibid. p. 321). If and when other people are agreeing with the sent message and sharing the same sort of sentiment,

individuals' initiative forms a *collectivity*, consisting of a variety of personal political judgements and eventually evolves into an actionist network. The development of CMC has enhanced the possibilities of citizens pursuing their political aims through self-made publicity. To be persuasive in this requires some technical skills to be applied, such as photo shopping and editing information and pieces of news (Dahlgren 2006, p. 279). The success of alternatively produced communication lays also in timing and the capability of exploiting chances in opening political contexts. The *raison d'être* of politically intended interventions are the most effective when the general feelings of the public are resonated, or at least are taken as being politically relevant for some segments of diversified audiences (cf. Dahlgren 2006, p. 276).

People's individual choices concerning the course of their reactions and actions may impact on a larger social problem or thematic entity. Such an *individualized collective action* (see Micheletti 2003) is not directed from above, neither is it organised or centralised. It is not coordinated action, and the course of collective activity utilises the self-made public sphere (publicness), and the styles and forms of the action are taking their shape intuitively in anonymous and fluid network flows, where unpredictable events occur (McDonald 2006, p. 9). Individual collective activity arises on the basis of individually made judgements of a prevailing situation, deploying the existing possibilities and infrastructural facilities. An individualised civic watch creates the new types of relations between political agents. The uses of interactive platforms generate new *loci* for meaningful action (see Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969, p. 83), and in these *meet-up-places* people can share their fluctuating concerns and form constantly altering alliances around changing issues.

The Internet is a space to conduct and to enhance the art of political judgement. Due to *de-medialized* public spheres users turn out to be active actors judging content for themselves and making choices (Walch 1999, pp. 70 –71; Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008). Thus, the Internet provides an

opportunity for anybody to intervene in different levels of publicness, addressing self-generated agenda, if the issue gets intensified accumulation, acceleration and support by other like-minded individuals. As an interactive media the Internet can challenge and on some occasions even replace the centralised (and sometimes controlled or else censored) mass media by offering independent alternative information about the world's events. (Bentivegna 2006, p. 339.) User-friendly and easy accessible applications, such as YouTube, Flickr, Facebook, Myspace, enable the creation of cross- and interlinked horizontal public places on the Internet. The chance to exercise surveillance is practically within reach of anyone who is capable of making good use of the CMC. Utilising the complex, overlapping structures of interconnected public spheres, it is possible to influence public opinion by disseminating information concerning politicians' blunders or the misconduct of officials.

Concluding remarks

This paper has outlined a theoretical perspective on the use of computer-mediated communication, as a political tool, channel, and forum enabling people to transcend the normal limits and constraints of politics in late modern liberal democracies. Looking back to recent years' political, economic and technological developments (such as the breakage of ideological divides, the strengthened globalisation of economies and cultures, the effects of ICT innovations, the problems of welfare-state politics, the fragmentation of institutionalised politics etc.) and the ways that citizens have reacted to them (e.g. the emergence of new social movements, the resistance of economic globalisation, the challenges to the norms and practices of representative democracy and the rise of 'urban political' action demanding improvements in local democracy) it is easy to perceive that the perspective of 'old school' participation theory is too narrow.

In the current situation, *administrational* and *actionist* discourses on citizenship and participation are dominating the discussion. Public authorities have learnt to apply new laws and governance principles, and have involved citizens in decision-making, but the citizens have conducted their activity greatly somewhere other than in the institutionally organised participation process. The political environment has fractured into a diverse, complex and multi-spatial network. The significance and sensibility of the political participation springs not only from the impacts and consequences of the action but also the participative action itself.

It has been stated, that different communication media may impact in an activating manner on political participation (e.g. Bennett & Entman 2001). In the field of new media, the development of the Finnish model of the information society has been supported by the national and local government (Castells & Himanen 2002). Several on-line forums and interactive web sites have been built up in order to empower citizens and to raise interest in public/communal matters. The idea of an *active citizen* in addition to the neologism of net-democracy is widely in use

By creating legislatively, a range of interactive channels and forums for the actors within the civil society in order to lower the threshold of participation in political planning, decision-making and so on, the government is trying to promote and strengthen the participation culture to avoid political alienation. All these efforts are, of course, worth supporting and most laudable, but as a criticism it must be stated, that in western liberal-democracies increasing and strengthening political participation has frequently been debated since the 1940's. In this discussion, only the instruments tend to be replaceable. Substituting the radio (1940's) with the Internet (1990's and 2000's) using a new "saviour" machine is just old wine in new bottles. No technical solution succeeds in making the change, unless the opinion of the reigning elite remains the same in terms of sharing political power with citizens. In addition, regarding institutional politics as the only mode and form of

politics hinders the renaissance of political participation. In this process the Internet may prove it's usefulness because:

... [digital] technologies make possible a more interactive relationship between people and media. Citizens adopt a more active relationship with information – not just passively accepting what is fed through the broadcast medium, but rather engaging with it and recreating it in intriguing, creative ways. The result might be a more energized citizenry and "semiotic democracy" – the "recoding" and "reworking" of cultural meaning. (Palfrey 2004 [www-document]).

Only by adopting the broader understanding of political participation, is it possible to avert the alienation and ruination of the concept. The most important effect of net-empowerment is that it can create citizen-oriented autonomous and authentic political participation, which are well in harmony with the ideals of *becoming who one really is* and of being *one's own person*. In the best possible scenario, political power is communicative by nature in on-line politics. In political encounters on the Net, both action and discourse are evolved in relation to political participation. Well-functioning boundary-crossing public arenas in local, national and global planes, might lead to a kind of situation, in which “public spheres ensure that nobody ‘owns’ power and which increase the likelihood that its exercise everywhere is rendered more accountable to those whom it directly or indirectly affects” (Keane 2000, 88).

In current political arenas the role of the Internet is crucial. Various uses of the Internet facilitate different civic and individually organised networks and help to introduce their aims and strategies, and to reach target groups and members of the public. Also, it is more efficient to run the core tasks of campaigning projects, such as communicating with supporters, coordinating events in the field,

organising crowds in fast-breaking situations, reacting quickly to breaking news, and gaining publicity for their issue. (Häyhtiö & Rinne 2008a.) Various forms of individualised civic watching demonstrate that the new phenomenon of political Web communication is becoming more common. Googling, blogging, clicking, downloading, uploading, generating net contents and so forth, have proved to be increasingly influential forms of political activity. The Net-based environment opens variety of possibilities for different styles and methods of political action, reflecting individuals' intentions and aims to emerge (Lappalainen 2006). On social media platforms, even individuals may try to gain support with their messages and become politically empowered actors without organisational resources. It is up to message providers to decide what, how and to whom they communicate. The power of the Internet is based on its ability to provide horizontal communication with no gatekeepers between citizens and civic networks, bypassing the traditional mass media. The use of CMC have reduced the costs of stepping out in public, but also technologies have transformed political communication so that the art of creating and mastering the content of the message, ability to persuade, and gain support are elementary in political activities. (Dahlgren 2005, p. 215; Garrett 2006, p. 214.)

In principal, the accessible, unconstrained communication and the horizontal nature of the Net, radically shapes the understanding of political communication. It seems to be an ideal space, *per se*, for DIY-communication, because the Net offers space for personal political judgments, activities and debates detaching structural formal politics. The Internet public spheres create self-made publicness of a new kind in which individuals may promote their political projects. In addition, the open publicness facilitates the making of comments and remarks by other Net users.

As a channel, the Internet is tolerant and produces repertoires of contention and challenging information. It connects a many voiced crowd to discuss certain issues bringing participants from

various backgrounds together to share and contest their views. The multitude of people may unite into a meshworked collectivity or the opinions may polarise or diversify. Yet, as a political facilitator and meet-up place, the Internet has shown its' potentiality. The horizontal participation and action culture, characteristic of the Net, is far more radically democratic than traditional vertical democratic governing. Open and free Web communication based on the premise that all participants are equal changes the nature of political communication and deliberation. The persuasiveness of arguments is dependent on the quality of argumentation, not on the position or status of the participant. The lack of personal face-to-face communication underlines the significance of appealing argumentation. This feature is important when we think of its outcomes in regard to political action. The transformative change is crystallised particularly in Net-politics, because it is used to mobilise supporters and gather coalitions. Communicative reflexivity could be considered as a vitalisation of personal political empowerment, where collectivities and communities might be constituted just by clicking the mouse:

References

Literature

- Albrecht, S. (2006): Whose Voice is Heard in Online Deliberation? A study of participation and representation in political debates on the Internet. *Information, Communication & Society* Vol. 9, No 1, February, 62-82.
- Atton, C. (2004) *An Alternative Internet. Radical Media, Politics and Creativity*. Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press.
- Arendt, H. (1958), *The Human Condition*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Arnstein, S.R. (1971), A ladder of participation in the USA. *Journal of the Royal Town Planning Institute*, pp. 176-182.
- Bang, H. & Sørensen, E. (1998), "The Everyday Maker: a New Challenge to Democratic Governance". *COS-rapport*, No. 3.
- Bang H. (2003a) (ed.). *Governance as Social and Political Communication*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Bang H. (2003b). Governance as political communication (pp. 7-23). In H. Bang (ed.), *Governance as Social and Political Communication*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Bang H. (2003c). A new ruler meeting a new citizen: culture governance and everyday making. In H. Bang (ed.) *Governance as Social and Political Communication*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 241–266.

- Bang, H. & Dyrberg, T. B. (2003) Governing at Close Range: Demo-elites and Lay People. In H. Bang (ed.) *Governance as Social and Political Communication*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 222–240.
- Bennett, L. W. & Entman, R. M. (2001) Mediated Politics: An Introduction. In Bennett & Entman (eds.), *Mediated Politics. Communication in the Future of Democracy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. pp. 1-29.
- Bentivegna, S. (2006) 'Rethinking Politics in the World of ICTs, *European Journal of Communication*, vol. 21 no 3 pp.331-343.
- Bingham, L. B.; Nabatchi, T. & O'Leary, R. et (2005). The New Governance: Practices and Processes for stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government. *Public Administration Review*, 65, 547-558.
- Chadwick, A. (2006) *Internet Politics. States, Citizens, and New Communication Technologies*. New York & London. Oxford University Press.
- Chadwick, A. (2007) Digital Network Repertoires and Organisational Hybridity. *Political Communication* 24:283-301.
- Coleman, S. & Gøtze, J. (2001) Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation. London: Hansard Society. <http://bowlingtogether.net/> (accessed June 2005)
- Dahlberg, L. (2001a). Extending the Public Sphere through Cyberspace: The case of Minnesota E-Democracy. *First Monday* Issue 6 (3).
http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue6_3/dahlberg/index.html (accessed October 2002)
- Dahlberg, L. (2001b). Computer-Mediated Communication and the Public Sphere: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 7 (1). (accessed January 2006)
<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol7/issue1/dahlberg.html>
- Dahlgren, P. (2005) 'The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation', *Political Communication* 22(2), pp.147-162.
- Dahlgren, P. (2006) 'Doing citizenship: The cultural origins of civic agency in the public sphere'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 2006; 9 (3), pp. 267 – 286.
- della Porta, D. & Mosca, L. (2005) 'Global-net for Global Movements? A Network of Networks for a Movement of Movements', *Journal of Public Politics* 25/165-190.
- Donk, W. van de & Loader, B.D. & Nixon, P.G. & Dieter Rucht (eds.) (2004), *Cyberprotest. New media, citizens and social movements*. Routledge, London & New York.
- Dye, T. R. & Zeigler, H. (1975), *The Irony of Democracy. An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press.
- Garrett, K. R. (2006) 'Protest in an Information Society. A review of literature on social movements and new ICTs', *Information, Communication & Society* 9(2):202-224.
- Heller, M. (2006) 'New ICTs and the Problem of 'Publicness'', *European Journal of Communication*. Vol 21(3), pp. 311-329.
- Held, D.(1997), "Democracy: From City-states to an Cosmopolitan Order?", in "*Contemporary Political Philosophy. An Anthology*", in Goodin. Robert., E. & Pettit, Philip (eds.). Oxford, Malden: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Heywood, A. (2004), *Political Theory: An Introduction*. Third edition. Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hirst, P. (2000). Democracy and Governance. In J. Pierre (ed.), *Debating Governance. Authority, Steering and Democracy* (pp. 13-35). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hood, C. (1991). A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration* 69 (1), 3-19.
- Häyhtiö T. & Keskinen A. (2005), Preconditions of Democratic e-Governance: A Critical Approach. In A-V. Anttiroiko & A. Kasvio (eds.). *e-City. Analysing Efforts to Generate Local Dynamism in the City of Tampere* (409-448). Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Häyhtiö, T. & Rinne, J. (2008a) Hard Rock Hallelujah! Empowering reflexive action on the Internet. *Journal for cultural Research* 11:4, pp. 355 – 376 (forthcoming)

- Häyhtiö, T. & Rinne, J. (2008b) Little Brothers and Sisters Are Watching – Reflexive Civic Watch through Computer-Mediated Communication. *Information, Communication and Society* (revised and resubmitted article, forthcoming)
- Jung, Hwa Yol (1979), *The Crisis of Political Understanding*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Keane, John (2000), Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere. Teoksessa Hacker, Kenneth L. & Dijk, Jan van (eds.), *Digital Democracy. Issues of theory and practice*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage Publications. pp. 70-89.
- Keane, John (1998), *Civil Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Lappalainen, P. (2006) The Internet as a Forum of Multiple Styles of Political Activities. Paper presented to the open international research and post-graduate seminar “Politics on the Internet: New Forms and Media for Political Action”, Tampere, 24.-25.11.2006.
- Malina, A. (2003). E-Transforming democracy in the UK. Consideration of Developments and suggestions for empirical research. *Communications* 28, 135-155.
- Machintosh, A.; Malina A. & Whyte A. (2002). Designing E-Democracy in Scotland. *Communications* 27, 261-278.
- McDonald, K. (2006) *Global Movements: action and culture*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.
- Meikle, G. (2002) *Future Active: Media Activism and the Internet*. Routledge, London.
- Micheletti, M 2003, *Political virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mouffe, C. (2000) *Democratic Paradox*
- Palfrey, J 2004, ‘Internet Politics 2004: The Good, The Bad and the Unknown’, in *Personal Democracy Forum*, 12.7.2004. Retrieved October 10, 2005, from <http://www.personaldemocracy.com/node/184>
- Perelman, CH. & Olbrechts-Tyteca L. (1969) *The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame/London.
- Pierre, J. (2000). Introduction: Understanding Governance. In J. Pierre (ed.), *Debating Governance. Authority, Steering and Democracy* (pp. 1-10). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis. Second Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schlosberg D.; Zavestoski S. & Schulman, S. W. (2007). Democracy and E-Rulemaking: Web-Based Technologies, Participation and the Potential for Deliberation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*. Vol. 4(1). 37-55.
- Schulman, S. W.; Schlosberg D.; Zavestoski S. & Courard-Hauri D. (2003). Electronic Rulemaking. A Public Participation Research Agenda for the Social Sciences. *Social Science Computer Review*, Vol. 21 No. 2., 162-178.
- Tsagarousianou, R. (1999). Electronic Democracy: Rhetoric and Reality. *Communications* 24, 189–208.
- Walch, J. (1999) *In the Net. An Internet guide for Activists*. Zed Books, London & New York.
- Wiklund, H. (2005). A Habermasian analysis of the deliberative potential of ICT-enabled services in Swedish municipalities. *New Media & Society* vol 7(2), 247-270.

WWW-documents:

- The City of Tampere*. Accessed 27.1.2008. <http://www.tampere.fi/> *The City of Tampere – Tampere in Brief*. Accessed 27.1.2006. <http://www.tampere.fi/english/tampereinbrief/index.html>
- The City of Tampere (2003) *Tampere toimeenpanee strategiaa. Kuntalaisten osallistumismahdollisuuksien parantaminen-työryhmä. Loppuraportti, in Finnish*, (Tampere implements its strategy. The working group for improving citizens’ opportunities for participation. Final Report). 19.2.2003.

<http://www.tampere.fi/hallinto/toimintamallinuudistus/osallistumismahdollisuudet/loppuraportti.html>

Participation Portal, (in Finnish: Osallistuminen), The City of Tampere. Retrieved 11.10.2005.

<http://www.tampere.fi/osallistuminen/>

Preparation Forum of the City of Tampere (Tampereen kaupungin valmistelufoorumi VALMA).

Retrieved 5.1.2006 <http://www.tampere.fi/valma/>

Julma totuus (Tehotuotanto in English The cruel Truth)(Link to site in English). Retrieved 14.4.2008

http://www.oikeuttaelaimille.net/ttnet/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=154&Itemid=174

Facebook group (Facts on animal h/farming in Finland, in English available

<http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=6642442438> (retrieved 3.3.2008)

In Finnish available <http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=6090086682> (retrieved 3.3.2008)

Facebook links:

<http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=6642442438>

Tuomio: Eläinten vankileirit 14.4. YLE TV2 20:55

Ohjelman jälkeen pääset antamaan tuomiosi ylen sivuilla:

<http://ohjelmat.yle.fi/tuomio/>

Kuka on vastuussa tuotantoeläinten oloista? Syytettynä maatalousministeri Sirkka-Liisa Anttila. Ajankohtainen oikeussalidraama. Syyttäjä: Nina Stenros, puolustaja: J-P Raeste, tuomari: Matti Pitko. Tuotanto: Yle Ajankohtaisjournalismi.

Vihreiden puoluehallitus: Kotieläintuotannon sääntöjä tiukennettava 15.12.07

<http://www.vihreat.fi/fi/node/2543>

Journalistiliiton lehdessä: 21.12.-07:

<http://www.journalistilehti.fi/tuotteet.html?id=53/189>

A-Studio 12.12.2007:

<http://areena.yle.fi/toista?id=964312>

Uudessa Voima-lehdessä (10/2007):

<http://www.voima.fi/content/view/full/2390>

<http://www.voima.fi/content/view/full/2356>

Kansanedustaja Annika Lapintie blogissa 3.12:

<http://lapintie.vuodatus.net/blog/973074>

Nelosen Uutisista 3.12.

<http://www.nelonen.fi/uutisvideot/default.asp?video=1353>

Uudet videot nelosella:

<http://www.nelonen.fi/uutisvideot/default.asp?video=1351>

Sunnuntai HS - Sanojen takana:

<http://www.oikeuttaelaimille.net/foorumi/index.php?showtopic=13308&view=findpost&p=274761>

MTV3 - Eläintilojen tarkastukset laajenemassa uusien tietojen myötä:

<http://www.mtv3.fi/uutiset/kotimaa.shtml/arkistot/kotimaa/2007/12/587662>

Uutisissa nähty video oli kuvattu Jokioisilla:

http://www.oikeuttaelaimille.net/ttnet/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=49&Itemid=61

Maa- ja metsätalousministeri Sirkka-Liisa Anttilan tyttären tilalta:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s4O2Ce03N1g>

Uutisissa sanottiin että Anttilan tyttären tila sai "puhtaat paperit" eläinlääkäriltä. Nyt pitäisi saada lupa käydä kuvaamassa Anttilan tila ja näyttää koko kansalle että mitä puhdas tehotuotantosikala näyttää.

Facebook links:

Oikeutta Eläimille luovutti Eviralle tiedot kaikista epäilemistään tuotantoeläiniloista

<http://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/artikkeli/1135232258442>

luomusikala:

http://www.tehotuotanto.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=152&Itemid=171

"vapaa kanala":

http://www.tehotuotanto.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=124&Itemid=139

A-Studio lähetykset nähtävissä osoitteesta:

<http://areena.yle.fi/toista?id=959409>

A-Studio in YouTube:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XBgjfz8t7o>

YLE:n aamu-tv:n kooste nyt nähtävissä osoitteessa:

<http://areena.yle.fi/toista?id=939031>

Hesarissa videoiden kera:

<http://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/artikkeli/1135232208303>

MTV3 10-uutiset 29.11.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PX8tBX9W3Ak>

Kansanedustaja Paavo Arhinmäen kysely eduskunnalle:

http://muukkonen.blog-city.com/kirjallinen_kysymys_tuotantoelinten_kohtelusta.htm

Kansanedustaja Oras Tynkkysen toimenpideohjelma:

<http://www.orastynkkynen.fi/?p=506>

IRC-galleria yhteisö:

http://irc-galleria.net/channel.php?channel_id=2549337

Oikeutta Eläimille foorumi:

<http://www.oikeuttaelaimille.net/foorumi/>

MySpace:

<http://myspace.com/julmatotuus>