

Cyber-Activism and Social Network Media: Appropriating the Emerging Platform to Promote Nation-Building and Peace

Adefolarin A. Olamilekan

University of Abuja
Gwagwalada, Abuja FCT
lekkans@yahoo.com; adefolarinolamileka@hotmail.com

Tel: +2348073814436; +2348134232272

Abstract

The article demonstrated the values and roles of cyber-activism and social network media in promoting nation-building and peace. It addressed the conceptual definitions of cyber activism, social networking media, nation building, peace and their manifold meanings. This led to a discussion of the relevance of discourse theory to a study of nation-building, the relevance of discourse theory to a study of nation-building and peace, especially to the understanding of nationalist ideology. The paper concluded that cyber activism and social networking media platform is a viable tool, hence can enhance the promotion of nation-building and peace, although the study identifies some criticism against the uses of internet being the platform cyber activism and social networking media are both created and users generated content.

Keywords: Cyber activism, social network media, Internet activism, national-building, nationalism, ideology

Introduction

Information technology has brought about fundamental paradigm shifts in human society and created profound change in the way we live, work or play. It has become all so pervasive that the whole world environment of the 21st century has experienced a quantum, not only in the size of information to be applied but in the magnitude of far-reaching transformation in our collective

society. One thing that has been tied to this success is the emergence of personal computers and improvement in telephone technology that pushed computer into the world of mass communication media and opened up the frontiers of online communication services on what is today metaphorically called “Information super highway”. The emergence of information channels of this means has revolutionised today's knowledge and awareness thereby re-awakening society. Understandably, it is critical that cutting edge information and communication revolution channels such as the internet provides solution and products content in other areas of human endeavours. Strategic application needs to be adopted in our desire for nation-building and peace attainment. Human history, collectively with humanity has so much surrendered to finding solution to numerous issues and problems bequeathed our noble existence. Nation- building and peace is being force - fed with trivialities, with ill- perceived effect on co-habitation, tolerance and aspirations.

It is pleasing to every researcher having the opportunity to work on a subject of this magnitude, most especially the need for nation-building and peace. Sharing thought, ideas and possible solution to mankind difficulties are reasonable service. The argument in this paper tends to show-case nation building and peace as obtainable through the “Information superhighway” of cyber activism and the platform of social network media. Within the period 2011 - 2012, the platform of internet has played significant high profile political participation the world over. The Arab spring, the January 2012 fuel subsidy protest in Nigeria, election campaign in America and other manifold social, economic and political development did have significant showpiece as a result of cyber-activism and social network media impact and influence. However, the present interest is to see a situation whereby the platform of cyber-activism and social networking media are taking advantage off in our journey to foster sustainable peace and nations building.

Conceptual Definition

Cyber-activism can be seen as digital campaign, digital activism, online organising, electronic advocacy, e-campaigning or e-activism. Cyber activism is the use of electronic communication technologies such as social media, especially face book and Twitter, You-tube, Yahoo mail, my space,

Pod casts and others for various forms of activism to enable faster communications by citizen movements and the delivery of local information to a large audience. Internet technologies are used for cause - related fundraising, community building, lobbying, organising, political campaign, marketing, buying and selling e.t.c.

Sander (2011) divides cyber- activism into three main categories: Awareness/advocacy, organisation/mobilisation and action/reaction. The concepts of organisation/mobilisation, for example, can refer to activities taking place solely online, solely offline but organised online or a combination of online and offline; the concept of awareness/advocacy entails, distribute news, e-mail message, reporting atrocity to the outside world, emailing petition and asking people to pass them on e.g. the concept of action/reaction encompasses active participatory, communication between groups and gathering protest.

Cyber- activism has considerable potential to reach and engage opinion leaders who influence the thinking and behaviour of others. The internet is a key resource for independent activist or cyber activist, particularly those whose message may run counter to the mainstream. When a serious violation of human rights occurs, cyber- activism is essential in reporting the atrocity to the outside world. Cyber- activism in the words of Kleinfeld (2011) connects all sides of issues, not just an ideologically broad anti - war constituency, from the left of an answer to the pressed - for -time soccer moms who might prefer move on and conservative activism as well. According to the Institute for Politics. Democracy and the Internet, cyber activism, what they call Online Political Citizens (OPC) are seven times more likely than average citizens to serve as opinion leaders among their friends, relatives and colleagues. Normally, 10% of Americans qualify as influentials. Our study found that 69% of online political citizens are influentials (IPDI.Org).

Cyber- activism is a major opportunity to improve exchange of information and ideas throughout the world. The profound opportunities of participation in spheres of issues, programmes and events are there to recruit and communicate with more users. Cyber-activism provides techniques to increase support for belief causes, positively influence their desire /public

image, influence opinion within groups and to push for policy change.

Social Networking Media

The term networking refers to a set of communication links for connecting a collection of terminal, computers, telephones, printers and several other types of data - communication and data handling devices. The internet is a collection of global computer networking linkage together with the same computer languages accessible through direct links and online information services such as the Social Network Media Platforms.

According to Kaplan (2010), social networking media is a group of internet - based application that builds on the ideological and technological foundation of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content. In other word, social network media are social software which play a role in human communication, exchange of information and respectively create one on one interaction. In the year 2012, social network media became one of the most powerful sources for news updates through platforms like face book and Twitter. It is evidently opened that when the techniques are in place, social network media is ubiquitously accessible, and enabled by scalable communication techniques.

Social networking media can also be defined as interactive platform via which individuals and communities create and share user-generated content. The software application of social network media served to mediate human communication. A common thread running through all definitions of social network media is a “blending of technology and social interaction for the cocreation of value (Matthew, 2012).

Kietzman *et al.* (2012) present a social network media honeycomb framework definition of how social networks differ according to the extent to which they focus on some or all of seven functional building blocks: identity, conversation sharing, presence, relationship, reputation and groups. On the other hand, Kaplan and Heinlein (2010) created a classification scheme in their business horizon article, with six different types of social media: Collaborative projects (for example, Wikipedia), blogs and micro blogs (for example, Twitter), content communities (for example You-tube), social

networking sites (for example, face book), virtue game worlds (e.g. world of war craft) and virtual social worlds (e.g. Second life). These building blocks and the classification help understand the engagement needs of the social network media audience and users alike.

Social networking media provide an open arena where people are free to exchange ideas; people obtain information, education, news and data. The increasing trend towards social networking media suggests that the engagement in it use is a factor where conversation, support campaign and promotion of nation-building and peace. Social networking media has become more popular among older and younger generations, sites like face book, twitter and You-tube gradually undermine the traditional authoritative voices of news media. Social network media trend allows for greater participation and shaping our future.

Nation-Building

Originally, nation-building referred to the efforts of newly-independent nations, notably the nations of Africa, both also in the Balkans, to reshape territories that had been carved out by Colonial powers or empires without regard to ethnic, religious or other boundaries. Nation-building includes the creation of national paraphernalia such as flag, anthems, national days, national stadiums, national airlines, national languages and national myths. At a deeper level, national identity needed to be deliberately constructed by ~ aiding different ethnic groups into a nation, especially since in many established states colonial practices of divide and rule had resulted in ethnically heterogeneous populations. However, many new states were plagued by tribalism and rivalry between ethnic groups within the nations. This sometimes resulted in their near-disintegration, such as the attempt by Biafra to secede from Nigeria in the late 1960s to early 1970s, or the continuity demand of the Somali people in the Ogadan region of Southeast Africa—ca. Eritrea breakaway from Ethiopia. In Asia, the disintegration of India into Pakistan and Bangladesh is another example where ethnic differences exacerbated by geographic distance, tore apart a post-colonial state. The Rwandan genocide as well as the dividing of Sudan into two (Sudan and South Sudan) were results of ethnic, religious or racial cohesion within the nation.

Nation-building is a normative concept that means different things to

different people. The latest conceptualisation according to Stephenson (2005) is essential that nation-building programmes are those in which dysfunctional or unstable or failed states or economies are given assistance in the development of governmental infrastructure, civil society, dispute resolution mechanism, as well as economic assistance, in order to increase stability. A 2003 study by James Dobbins and others for the RAND Corporation defines nation-building as the use of armed force in the aftermath of a conflict to underpin an enduring transition to democracy. This definition came from the review study and comparing seven historical cases: Germany, Japan, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan, in which American military power has been used in the aftermath of a conflict to underpin democratisation elsewhere around the World War II, they examine the lessons learned. This definition of nation-building is substantially different than those which see nation-building as the Province of people within a nation. The definition centers on the building of democratic process but many argue that the use of military to bring about democracy may be inherently contradictory. As Stephenson (2005) notes, whether nation building can be imposed from outside is one of the central questions in this field, and whether that can be done by the military is further part of the question.

To understand the concept of nation-building, one needs to have some definitions of what a nation is. Early conceptions of nation defined it as a group or race of people who shared history, traditions, and culture, sometimes religion, and usually language (Stephenson, 2005). The people of a nation generally share a common national identity, and part of a nation generally shares a common national identity, and part of nation-building is the building of that common identity. Some distinguish between an ethnic set of political ideas and institutions, and linkage of citizenship to nationality. The term nation-building is often used simultaneously with state-building, democratisation, modernisation, political development, post-conflict reconstruction, and peace- building. But each concept is different, though their evolution is intertwined. The concept of nation-building came to be used especially among American political scientists a decade or so after World War II, as means to describe the greater integration of state, and society, as citizenship brought loyalty to the modern nation with it. For example, Reinhardt (1950s) focused on the expansion of citizenship and

right to political participation, Karl (1940s) focused on the role of social communication and national integration in nation-building in Western societies, and others began to apply it to non-Western societies as well.

To fully understand what this paper is proposing, along the aspect of genuine participation and collaboration in nation-building through the uses of cyber activism and the social network media platform, from definition given above. That nation-building connotes the province of people within a nation; democratic procedure is the key which permits people's consent; creating effective governing institution; cultural match; building identities as people in order to challenge their disintegration; resource allocation; development strategy; dispute orientation. The definition of nation-building which this paper intends to align as focus on the above highlight that, cyber- activism and social network media platform could provide the necessary ingredient for peaceful co-existence. If nation-building in this 21st century is to be successful, it may need to evolve the cyber- activism and social network media populations.

Peace

“If you want peace, prepare for war.” This statement is credited to the Roman Empire adventure, undertaking tragic ruins of failed empires. Not forgetting the destruction that characterised the two World Wars (1914-1918; 1939- 1945) and other various wars over-time, and the resulting set back of denying mankind the peace we so much desire for our development. In the process, the global perception of peace in action as the focus of bilateral and multilateral relations and a veritable goal of both regional, international organisation, non-states actors, IGO's and NGO's pursuing of true peace.

Peace, he said, is essentially a state of order in society in harmony with man's reasonable nature. (This harmony, he adds, may occur from the spontaneous reasonable actions of members of a society, but if it does not occur, then the law will attempt to preserve a reasonable pattern of conduct or to make reparation for the violation of that pattern). Thus, breaches of the peace are directly linked to law and order in society. The concept of peace discussed above naturally excludes the kind of order promoted through going anarchist whose primary object is to live without order, they, however, only conceive of

an order arising out of the law of association preferably through self-governing groups.

Peace, as not the negative conception of anesthesia, or, indeed, does it contemplate the popular expression of peace of the grave yard. It is the foundation of everything else that assures good and healthy living for mankind world-wide. If we are to grasp the state of order in society, it is in harmony with man's reasonable nature. These posit that assurance of good and healthy living for mankind worldwide is subject to state of order that the law attempts to preserve as against violent behaviour. A closer look at this concept expects enormous contribution from human, constitutes the coexistence that may lead to break down in peace or stability as the case maybe.

Peace can only be achieved by understanding. There is peace in a man when his senses are subject to reason, when his reason is subject to faith, when his body is subject to his soul and when his entire personality is subject to God. Peace in this context signifies the acknowledgement of God as peace. Religions are portrayed to teach and promote peace. Peace in this context also means a situation where every man in society gives to neighbour, when government gives to its citizens that which is their due. Furthermore, true peace results from true order, that is to say, an order not imposed by force, oppression, fear, threats, blackmail and other similar negative tendencies, but an order in society in harmony with man's reasonable nature. Peace can be referred to as that order that provides what is needed to sustain life and self-respect; it is that order that produces a society that is free, harmonious, honoured by all, cultured and religious. We can attest to it that peace comes from order steaming from reasonable nature of mankind tolerance and self-control.

Moreover, in a special way, peace must be won; for it is the prize for those who win the war against self, against selfishness and against-self-centeredness, the war against hate, the war against passion, against envy. In this form the ideal peace is that peace which reflects transparency in the polity and eschews bribery and corruption.

In matters of peace and war, there really should be no spectators or bystanders. One outstanding actor to world peace is the cyber activist,

generating content on the social network media platforms. The population enjoying these impacts must be re-inventing to secure world peace and nation-building through their numerous activities.

Discourse Theory to the Study of Nation-Building and Peace

Discourse theory is valuable in describing how the ideological construction of the nation aims to achieve a hegemonic re-articulating of the national 'nodal point'. In turn, nation-building and peace attainment can be placed within the epistemological context of discourse theory and approached methodologically through the rhetorical analysis of texts (Sutherland, 2005).

The theory of discourse propounded by Laclan *et al.* (1985) is a post-Marxist orientation incorporating that of Foucault's (1974) theory of discourse formations. In a swift opposition to Foucault's definition of discourse, however, Laclan (1985) conceptualisation of Discourse Theory incorporates that of ideology. Their attribute of a central role to words and meaning as indicators of power relations informs the approach to nationalist ideology adopted here, which can be summed up as a 'syntax of hegemony' (Billig, 1995).

The philosophical and methodological difficulties of linking macro and micro level of discourse are exemplified by Foucault's juxtaposition of archaeology of all-pervasive power with localised 'genealogies of power' (Barret, 1991). One categorisation of varieties of discourse uses a capital letter to distinguish forms of discourse which analyse localised contexts from the concept of discourse used in long-range theory-building. Localised Discourse and Long-range Discourse respectively correspond to 'the study of the social text (talk and written text in its social actions contexts) and the study of social reality as discursively constructed and maintained (Alvesson *etal.*, 2000).

Textual discourse is further sub-divided into Micro-discourse or the detailed study of linguistic analysis in an attempt to find broader general patterns (Sutherland, 2005). On the other hand Theory-building Discourse is broken down into Grand Discourse, defined as an assembly of discourses, ordered and presented as an integrated frame, and the second one known as Mega

discourse defined also as a long-range interest in the Macro-system context (Karreman, 2000). The subject of Foucault's work, for instance, is classified as an example or Mega Discourse, since 'Overall categories and standards tend to be privilege in the treatment of empirical material' (Alvesson, 2000).

It is important to emphasise that Alvesson and Karreman's hierarchy of 'Discourse and discourse does not entail an incompatibility between the linguistic concern of, say, conversation or discourse analysis and the study of discourse as a wide-ranging body of ideas, concepts and institutions (Sutherland, 2005). On the clear, the empirical analysis of texts may well be employed as a research method within a theory of discourse. According to Laclau (1985) discourse does not mean a combination of speech and writing but that speech and writing are themselves internal components of discursive totalities. For instance, nation-building can be approached theoretically as Grand Discourse and analysed empirically by deconstructing the integrated frame of specific province of people, to reprise Alvesson and Karreman's definition of Grand Discourse. As Sutherland (2005) alludes 'textual analysis thus feeds into the larger theoretical framework, to which the concept of ideology adds a further, crucial dimension, that ideology's successful incorporation into Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory contrasts with Foucault's neglect of the concept.' An ideology is an adaptable but internally coherent belief system that offers an interpretative explanation of society coupled with practical measures for maintaining or changing the political status quo (Plamenatz, 1979). Discourse for Foucault (1974), is an open and doubtless indefinitely describable field of relationship as opposed to a general development stage of reason or even a slice of history. Clearly, he is arguing that all - pervasive discursive formation such as that of modernity can only be grasped by being broken down into smaller units. Discourse theory explores political conflict and its linguistic expression in terms of hegemony and resistance.

Ideology has been described as the key mechanism of rule by consent (FairClough, 1989). As such, it has great potentials for interpreting how nationalists articulate their ideologies vis-a-vis 'other'. An articulation is defined as 'any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result' (Laclau, 1985). Nationalist ideology, for instance is organised around the core principle and practices of prioritizing

the nation (Sutherland, 2005).

Naturally, the concept of ideology itself does not go uncontested, and its definition can broadly divide into neutral and negative categories. The neutral views tend to stick closely to the semantic definition of ideology as the logic of an idea (Plamenatz, 1979). Negative definitions of ideology range from erroneous beliefs serving to perpetuate the dominance of a social class (Engels, cited in Cranston *et al.*, 1980) to the opposite of rationale and objective science (Dahl, 1961). Other views consider just such scientific rationality and technocracy to be a manifestation of ideology (Habermas, 1992). As Laclau and Mouffe (1985) argued, the Discourse Theory, in turn, doubts the possibility of verifiable truth and claims that the world-view of all, without exception, is useful in analyzing nationalism because it combines principles and practices.

Discourse as the means used to organise a society into a structured totality, in order to give it stability and meaning. Discourse here includes all social institutions, customs and practices as well as language, since meaning is fully relative to context (Laclau, 1995). Ideology can thus be characterised as one aspect of discourse. Conversely, concept can only be understood in terms of the complete social contexts of which they form a part. What emerges is a discursive ordering of elements within an ideological interpretation of reality. "A discursive structure is an articulatory practice which constitutes and organises social relation" (Laclau *et al.*, 1985).

Laclau and Mouffe's definition of discourse flows directly from Saussure's proposition that language finds its meaning in its structure and not in its substances. They strongly emphasise that discourse is "a system of differences, thereby highlighting its vulnerability, contingency, historicity and openness to multiple identities." Although they follow Saussure's proposition that the relationship between a word or signifier and the concept it signifies is arbitrary, they do not believe that this relationship is fixed (Sutherland, 2005). In Laclau's view (1995), to uphold the Saussurean's claim as to the isomorphism of signifier and signified would render the two indistinguishable and thus deny the duality of the linguistic sign.

Structuralist Theorist favoured a wider definition of discourse to that of

Saussure (1967), who defined it as the expression of the autonomous subject and thus unpredictable from one utterance to the next.” Central to the structuralist critique of Saussurean linguistics was its proclamation of the 'death of the subject'. Discourse was redefined in the words of Laclau (1995) as a 'view point from which it was possible to re-describe the totality of social life” and uncover the basic regularities which govern the production of meaning in social life.”

One of the most radical critical of structuralism has been Jacques Derrida in 1984, whose questioning of “essentialist truth claims allowed for infinite 'deconstruction' of authorless texts. Although not derived from linguistic, Foucault's thought can also be termed post-structuralist, in that it aims to denounce the power relations shaping structures (Scruton, 1996). On the other hand, Laclau *et al* (1985) is post- structuralist in so far as they see discourse not as a closed totality but as a concentration of floating signifiers, which actors compete to mould into meaningful configurations. They share Derrida's (1984) view of the “infinite possible construction of subject position.”

Laclau and Mouffe make a substantial contribution to our understanding of nationalist ideology as Grand Discourse. In the context of nationalism theory, characterising the nation as a form of discourse flows from an understanding of reality as constructed, malleable and therefore contingent, consequently, the vocabulary of discourse theory applies to nationalist ideologies contesting the alternative national construct embodied in the hegemonic discourse of nation-state. The external manifestation of this thought practice is a unique conceptual configuration (Freedom, 2000). Discourse theory characterised this conflict as antagonistic, a useful starting point for empirical studies of nationalism. Michael Billig's (1995) study of Bana nationalism has demonstrated that well established national construct is not thereby unproblematic or somehow exempts from study as nationalist is. Bana nationalism is expressed in the symbolic makers of belonging to a 'nation-state'; the limp flag, 'home' news singing the national anthem and repeated use of the adjective 'national to describe affairs of state (Sutherland, 2005). The term is shorthand for expressing the idea of nationalism as Grand Discourse; our everyday 'social reality is always discursively constructed around a concept arena.

As Calhoun (1997) argued “as a discursive formation, nationalism shapes the form of representation, not its precise content or level of inclusion.” The linkage of nation to state embodies successful nationalist mobilisation. Freeden (1998) opined that “nation may be defined and appealed to in different ways, but remains the immutable focus of national mobilisation. Freeden's definition of core ideological principles overlaps with that of a nodal point of partial fixation (Laclau *et al.*, 1985). These conceding concepts lend themselves well to theorising nationalism's versatility and diversity; nationalism is determined not by the character of its elements, but by certain organising principal significance (Greenfield, 1993). According to Discourse Theory, a democratic system is fueled by competing attempting to hegemonies the principles organising a given society. All political parties use ideology in an attempt to legitimate and consolidate their bids for power (Laclau *et al.*, 1985). On the whole, nationalist ideology aims to re-articulate the meaning of a given political arena.

Discourse theorists consider ideas and their linguistic expression to be one aspect of the complex web of institutions, customs and practices, which together constitute a society; building on an understanding of language as a structure of interrelated signifiers (Saussure, 1967). And according to Laclau *et al.* (1985) political struggle involves asserting one form of discourse over another by the construction of a new “Common sense” which changes the identity of the different groups. A Discourse Theory, as portrayed both in meaning and expression by notable scholars of the theory, it is particularly useful to the study of nation-building and peace attainment. What is obtainable as hegemonic and resistance could be identified through the Discourse Theory, even as the form of ideology also shapes the following system. Cyber-activist on the platform of social network media is significant to the desire of nation-building and nodal peace, for the discussion and textual content will predominantly correspond to nationalist articulation and aspiration and discursive moment.

Appropriating the Platform to Promote Nation-Building and Peace

Very significantly, appropriating the platform of both cyber- activism and social network media are nodal advantage to the desire of nation-building

and peace. The impact or role this platform makes available is an instrument that in no small way has influenced our collective and novel agenda. It is often remarked that the political, economic and social challenges of the 21st century demand coordinated, even global, responses. In the world over, issues such as poverty alleviation, good governance, civil unrest, migration, corruption and peace require just such appropriating platform of cyber activism and social network media if these besetting problems are to be adequately addressed.

Nation-building and peace matter to intractable conflict because of the theory that a strong state is necessary in order to provide security welfare, employment and economic dividends. Over the years, conflicting interests and ideologies have to a greater extent destroyed our noble world. The understanding so required is appropriating this platform to promote nation building and peace as a factor of underpinning importance toward sustainability. In perspective, the appropriation of this platform (Cyber activism and Social Network Media) allows greater participation in mobilising and gathering support to overcome the problems of the past and present, and certainly, shaping its future. Although the platform trend can serve as a long run opportunity for effectively helping collective discussion, education on contemporary progression of civil rights, political participation and equality, political and socio-economic issues as while as other cogent issues of mutual importance.

The platform that is likely to contribute to stable international peace and nation-building needs to emphasise the democratic participation of people. That is one great opportunity cyber- activism and social network media as made available to user like (Kietzman *et al.*, 2012) argue that corporate communication has been democratised. The power has been taken from those in marketing and public relations by the individuals and communities that create, share, and consume blogs, tweets, face book entries, movies, pictures and so forth. Increasingly, the term cyber- activism on the social network media platform is being used to try and suggest that engagement on this platform is important and should affect and shape our desire for nation building and peace sustainability.

People participate and obtain information, education, news and other data

from engaging as cyber activist on the social network media that is inexpensive and accessible to enable anyone publish or access information. One significant characteristic of these platforms is the capability to reach millions of people. The platforms are by their very nature more decentralised, less hierarchical and distinguished by multiple points of production and utility. The social media networks are generally available to the public at little or no cost. Production in the social media requires only modest re-interpretation of existing skills; in theory, anyone with access can operate the means of social media production.

The process of engaging in cyber-activism that the platform of social media network provides is an effective foundation concept that you initiate, participate in, and influence your conversation. The Social Media Honeycomb Framework defines how social media service focuses on some or all of seven functional building blocks (Identity, conversations, sharing, presence, relationships, reputation and groups). These building blocks help understand the engagement needs of the social media audience. For instance, Linked in users are mostly identity, reputation and relationships; whereas You-tube's primary building blocks are sharing, conversation, groups and reputation. The extent to which Social Media Network Platform and Cyber activism facilitate the discourse of nation-building and peace garnered a great amount of attention, interaction, influence and engagement. Nation building and peace attainment must engage people around a distinctive call and theme, as in around a particular topical participation. As discourse theory emphasized, the discourse obtainable must fall in line with the ideology of nationalism. In all, the focal point, either identity or groups appropriating the platform is a leeway to sustainable peace and nation - building.

Criticisms against Internet Activism

Critics argue that internet activism and social network media faces the same challenges as other aspects of the digital divide, particularly the global digital divide. One of such criticisms is that it gives disproportionate representation to those with greater access or technological ability and platforms (Nielsen, 2011). This argument is bartered by Schulman (2011), who stated that groups that may be disadvantaged by the move to activist activity online are those that have limited access to technologies, or lack the technological literacy to

engage meaningfully online; these include ethnic and racial minorities, those of lower socio- economic status, those with lower level of education, and the elderly.

Sustein (2012) expressed concern that online political discussions lead to cyber balkanisation discussion that leads to fragmentation and polarisation rather than consensus, because the same medium that lets people access a large number of news sources also enables them to pinpoint the ones they agree with and ignore the rest. Sunstein (2012) added that the discussion will be about strategy, or horse-race issues or how bad the other candidates are, and it will seem like debate. It is not like this should be censored, but it can increase acrimony, increase extremism and make mutual understanding more difficult.

On the other hand, Andrew (2010) noted that out of this anarchy, it suddenly became clear that what was governing the infinite Monkeys now inputting away on the internet was the law of digital Darwinism the survival of the loudest and most opinionated. Under these rules, the only way to intellectually prevail is by infinite filibustering. Another concern according to Epstein (2011) is that the internet allows people who agree with each other to talk to each other and gives them the impression of being part of a much larger network than is necessarily the case.” She warns that the impersonal nature of communication by computer may actually undermine the human contact that has always been crucial to social movements.

A further critic comes from Mathew Auer (2012), when he casts doubts on the participatory. He also speculates on the emergence of anti-social media used as instrument of pure control. While the critics of internet by Berners-Lee (2011), Contending that the danger of social networking sites is that most are silos and do not allow users to port data from one site to another. He expresses cautions against social networks that grow too big and become a monopoly as this tends to limit innovation. Most of the criticisms labelled against the social network media and cyber- activism are of the argument that the platform occupies free time that can no longer be spent getting involved in activist group, or that the platform, will replace more substantial, effortful forms of in-person activism.

While some critics point out that the internet does not do a very good job of motivating action, others allude that the United State Congress, corporations and Pentagon do not necessarily fear the civil use of the internet. Other critics claim that the platform has devalued certain currencies of activism. A situation whereby citizens may like an activist group on face book, visit a website, or comment on a blog, but fail to engage in political activism beyond the internet, such as volunteering or canvassing (Nadal, 2004).

Hermann (2011) in his own criticism, contends that social media in the form of public diplomacy creates a patina of inclusiveness that converse traditional economic interest that are structured to ensure that wealth is pumped up to the top of the economic pyramid, perpetuating the digital divide and post Marxian class conflict. He also voices concern over the trend that finds social utilities operating a quasi- libertarian global environment of Oligopoly that requires users in economically challenged nations to spend high percentages of annual income to pay for devices and services to participate in the social media lifestyle.

However, the critique above has been seen as Western - centric, because it discounts the impact this can have in authoritarian or repressive contexts. A case in point is the Arab spring, 2010-2012, the fuel subsidies protest in Nigeria 2011 and many others in future.

Conclusion

The paper marshalled its argument in favour of appropriating the platform of social network media with the genuine activity of cyber-activism toward promoting nation-building and peace. Nation-building and peace attainment is generally a must in this 21st century. The population undertaking and making available advanced technology to the world in such a quantum can only be appreciated when nation-building dividends are feasible and peace that guarantees sustainability is ensured.. The appropriating of this platform is a must for the world, the impact so generated in the other uses of the platform is obvious; while the discourse theory as exposed in this paper opens up the quality of ideology to nationalism, as the fundamental leading the way. However, discussion of nation-building and peace as the paper opined is to gamer peoples' consent, democratic process, good governance,

accountability and strategic orientation for quality life and tolerance. All the various platforms available on the social network media are suitable and accessible. As a focal leeway, cyber- activism and social network media criticisms against internet are quite inconclusive as the benefit so gained from the technology so far is what the global village of the 21st century still fathom to be the grace of progression development.

References

- Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2000). 'Varieties of Discourse: on the Study of Organisations through Discourse Analysis.' *Human Relations*, 53 (9): 1125-49.
- Andrew, K. (2010). *The Cult of the Amateur*. Random House .p.15. ISBN 978-0-385-52081-2.
- Auer, M. R. (2012). "The Policy Sciences of Social Media." *Policy Studies Journal*, 39 (4): 709-736.
- Bilgic, M. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Barrett, M. (1991). *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burchell, G. Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (Eds). (1991). *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*. London: Wheat sheaf.
- Calhoun, C. (1997). *Nationalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cranston, M. & Mair, P. (Eds), (1980). *Ideology and Politics*: Alphen aan den Rijn: Sijthoff.
- Dahl, R. (1961). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Derrida, J. (1984). *Signepong/signsponge*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Epstein, M. (1974). *The Order of Things: Archaeology of Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Freeden, M. (1998). 'Is Nationalism a Distinct Ideology?' *Political Studies*, 46 (4): 748-65.
- Freeden, M. (2000). 'Practicing Ideology and Ideological Practices.' *Political Studies*, 48 (2):302-22.
- Greedenfield, L. (1993). *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1992). *The Structural Transformation of the Bourgeoisie Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- James, D. (2003). "Nation-building: The Inescapable Responsibility of the World's only Superpower." *RAND Review*. Summer, 2003.
- Karl, D. (1963). 'Nation-building and National Development: Some Issues for Political Research.' In: Karl Deutsch and William Fottez (Eds). *Nation-building* (New York: Atherton, 17-8).
- Klein field, N. (2011). "Wall street occupiers, protesting till whenever" www.nytimes.com.
- Kaplan, R. (2003). "Supremacy by Stealth, "The Atlantic Monthly": p.65.
- Kaplan, A. & Heanlein, M. (2010). "Users of the World Unite! The Challenges and Opportunities of Social Media." *Business Horizons*, 53(1): 59-68.

- Keitzman, J.H., Herkens, K., McCarthy, I.P., & Silvestre, B.S. (2012). "Social Media: "Get Serious! Understanding the Functional Building Blocks of Social Media." *Business Horizon*, 54 (3).241- 251.
- Laclan, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso. E. Laclan & C. Mouffe (1987). Post Marxism without Apologies. *New'Left Review*, 166:79-106.
- Laclau, E. (1995). "Discourse. In: R. Goodin & P. Pettit (Eds). *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Cambridge, M.A Blackwell. Mathew.
- Naval, A. (2000). "The Things We Do with Words: Contemporary Approaches to Analysis of Ideology." *British Journal of Political Science*, 30 (2):313-46.
- Nielsen, J. (2011). "Connecting and Engaging with Digital Indian Consumers." Blog. Nielsen.com.
- Plamenatz, J. (1979). *Ideology*. London: Key Concepts in Political Science.
- Raph, N. (2009) "Internet not so hot at motivating actions" arstechnica.com/web/news.
- Saussure, F. de (1967). *Course de linguistique Generale*. Wiesbaden: Harwassowitz, Macmillan.
- Scruton, R. (1996). *A Dictionary of Political Thought*. London: Macmillan.
- Sutherland, C. (2001). *Neo-Nationalist Ideology: a Discourse Theoretical Approach to the CSU and SNP*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Edinburgh University.

- Sutherland, C. (2005). Nation-building through Discourse Theory 11 (2) 185-202 ASEN. Scot Dick Harris, www cause builder. Info.
- Stephenson, C. (2005). Beyond Intractability: Nation-building, www. Beyond intractability .org/bi-essay.
- Shulmen (2010). (<http://Shulman.Ucsur.ptt.edu/doc/pepers/gendiff>)
- Sunstein, C. (2012). The whole world is talking (<http://cyber.eserver.org/talking.t&t>)

