

## Who Says Networks, Says Oligarchy? Oligarchies as “Rich Club” Networks

---

**Christopher Ansell**

*University of California  
Berkeley, CA, USA*

**Renata Bichir**

*University of São Paulo  
São Paulo, Brazil*

**Shi Zhou**

*University College London  
London (UCL), UK*

### Abstract

Departing from Roberto Michels's classic analysis of oligarchy, we provide a structural analysis of the concept based on social network analysis. We define oligarchy as a social network that exhibits three structural properties: tight interconnections among a small group of prominent actors who form an “inner circle”; the organization of other actors in the network through the intermediation of this inner circle; and weak direct connections among the actors outside the inner circle. We treat oligarchy as a global property of social networks and offer an approach for measuring the oligarchical tendencies of any social network. Our main contribution is to operationalize this idea using a “rich club” approach. We demonstrate the efficacy of this approach by analyzing and comparing several urban networks: São Paulo urban infrastructure networks and Los Angeles and Chicago transportation policy networks.

*Keywords:* oligarchy, rich clubs, policy networks, urban networks

### Authors

**Christopher Ansell**, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA.

**Renata Bichir**, Center for Metropolitan Studies, Center of Arts, Sciences and Humanities, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.

**Shi Zhou**, Department of Computer Science, University of College London (UCL), London, UK.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Margaret Weir and Eduardo Marques for allowing us to use relational data they collected on, respectively, Chicago and Los Angeles transportation networks and São Paulo urban infrastructure networks.

*Correspondence concerning this work should be addressed to Christopher Ansell by email:* cansell@berkeley.edu

## 1. Introduction

Aristotle's description of oligarchy as rule by the few formally sovereign, the "masses" were unable to organize to Roberto Michel's "Iron Law of Oligarchy," to themselves and as a result become dependent on the elite as "oligarchs." The term has various connotations in the a stable "inner circle" that monopolizes control social sciences, from the "bureaucratic conservatism" of the relationship with the organization. control of the economy by "industrial tycoons" (Guriev). Consequently, the elite's advantages allow them to references, however, share the idea that an oligarchy is essentially a challenge to a regime controlled by cooperation or collusion among a small group of powerful elites. among themselves, forming an "inner circle"; the masses

Given the long history and ubiquitous use of organized through the intermediation of this inner circle; and the masses are poorly interconnected among oligarchical control over social movements, economic themselves.

Literature in the Michelsian tradition has focused on the organizational aspects of oligarchy. By contrast,

of oligarchy. Many authors make reference, of course, focus on the relational character of oligarchy, as it to Roberto Michels's work, *Political Parties* which might develop within a social network. A social network provides the classic theoretical treatment of the concept. This perspective has two important advantages for the study of oligarchy. Taking Michels's claim that oligarchies might structure the organization of elites spanning organizational or institutional boundaries (see Marques mostly sought to identify the conditions under which

Michels's classic treatment by analyzing the structural bases of oligarchy, which we operationalize using social network analysis. We treat oligarchy as a global property of social networks and offer an approach for measuring the oligarchical tendencies of any social network. An earlier generation of scholars made much the same argument and closely dissected the structure of network analysis. We treat oligarchy as a global property of social networks and offer an approach for measuring the oligarchical tendencies of any social network. down in debates between "elite theorists" and "pluralists"

classic analysis of oligarchy, pointing to how it provides new insights, it tended to be structured in dichotomous Weber's, Michels analyzed the development of oligarchy. In 1911, V. Z. Run, L. Q. W. K. L. V. W. U. D. L. Q. F. R. P. S. O. H. [E. X. U. H. D. X. F. U. D. W. L. F. R. W. B. D. R. Q. Q. H. D. W. S. R. Q. V. ; F. +W. V. S. H. F. H. R. Q. W. Q. H. D. \O. Z. R. insight was a synthesis of the "elite theory" of fellow the boards of corporations. As this corporate interlock Italians Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto with Weber literature developed, it increasingly focused on how links

6HH /HDFK IRU D UHYLHZ DQG FULWLTXH +H GH¿QHV ROLJDUFK\ DV WKH ³F  
LQ WKH KDQGV RI D PLQRULW\

<sup>2</sup> This concept refers to the relational patterns formed by both institutional and personal relationships that structure state organizations, larger environment of policy communities. The contacts are both personal and institutional and are based in old and new ties, constantly re-created. These midlevel structures control several resources and affect preferences, restrict choices and strategies, and change political resu

E H W Z H H Q F R U S R U D W H E R D U G V literaturs that some models have often in central D Q G U H V R X U F H V E H W Z H H Q W K than others] and that these central hubs may play an studies usefully widened the discussion of the role important brokerage role, often by spanning "structural corporate interlocks, but also gradually shifted attention" in the network. We also know that subgroups form away from the regime-like characteristics of interlocking within networks, often among well-connected actors, and directorates.

W K D W Q H W Z R U N V R I W H Q H [K L E L W

We have no interest in resurrecting the old elite pluralist debate. Our relational approach to oligarchy suggests that the structure of social networks is like a small group of "hubs" can link a sparsely connected network as a whole. It is more useful, however, to be clear, a structural analysis of networks demonstrate that the relational basis for such control whether or not a network has a ruling elite. L Q A X H Q F H H [L V W V , Q D G G L W L R Q In the following section, we develop a strategy for Z we depart from the more dichotomous inclinations of the measuring the oligarchical tendencies of a network using elite-pluralist debate, focusing instead on how to measure "distribution of degree" approach. In later sections of oligarchical tendencies in networks. the paper, we demonstrate the value of this approach by

Why is a relational concept of oligarchy useful? Analyzing several social networks.

One way to approach this question is through the idea of brokerage. Brokerage is a form of intermediation where a focal actor, the broker, mediates the relationship between

V R P H R W K H U V H W R I D F W R U V 6 R F L D Q Q K R V Z R Q N Z H D Q B A Q M V V I K D W K H Z H O O H V W D E O L V K H G W U D G L W L R Q Network [D Below, a hierarchical tree illustrates the distribution of degree in a network. We use the concept of "rich clubs" 6 L P P H O \* R X O G D Q G ) H U Q D Q G [Analysis] offers several possibilities. In this paper, we 2 E V W I H O G 6 W R Y H O D Q G 6 W introduce a method based on work in physics and tradition has been to understand the position and power of individual brokers, and the advantages that accrue to them across the network. We use the concept of "rich clubs" R U W K R V H W K H \ F R Q Q H F W + R Z H Y K H R U X D Q G P D R Q Q F D D J H V Q L W L V K R Q V D Q interesting or valuable to understand the collective pattern R Q G U D J y Q D Q G = K R X D V R X U E of mediation in a network. The concept of oligarchy, which suggests points to the collective mediation of a network by a small but cohesive subgroup 7 R H [S O D L Q Q H K W \ R S U N L Q W H Z P D Q D Q G W K H recall the three aspects of oligarchy that we drew from R I W L H V % D U D E D V L D Q G \$ O E H U W 0 L F K H O V W K H H O L W H D U H W these measures identify the tendency of big networks themselves, forming an "inner circle"; the "masses" are organized through the intermediation of this inner circle; and the masses are poorly interconnected among themselves. An oligarchy describes a network where a cohesive subgroup monopolizes the intermediation of the network as a whole. As in the work on individual brokerage, Michels suggests that advantages accrue to the inner circle. But the concept of oligarchy is may display a skewed degree distribution known as the about the collective, rather than individual intermediation power law," or  $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ , where degree  $k$  is the number of links a node has (Barabási and Albert,

3 X U H R O L J D U F K L H V P D \ U D U H O \; X H [L V W Q J H D Y Q H G U W P K D H O O H V V \\$ S many kinds of social networks may have oligarchical tendencies. It is well established in the social network X W W K H H [S R Q H Q W R I W K H S R Z H

characterizes the network's connectivity.

In a power-law network, most nodes have only a few links, and the network is guaranteed to have a small number of links among a group of rich nodes (Zhou and Vespignani, 2002). Thus, for power-law networks, it is particularly difficult to identify the global organization of the network's global structure. link among themselves (although each of them may have

## 2.2 Network Mixing Patterns

1 H Z P D Q

1HZPDQ LGHQWLHG GLIIHQRHQHW PKDLYQH QDKLWIKUYQVOXIQ ULFK  
networks. A network is assortative if nodes of similar ! 1R D SULRUL GHQQLWLRQ H[  
degrees tend to be connected to one another and GHV DUH LQ WKH ULFK FOXE 7K  
disassortative if nodes tend to be connected to nodes usually calculated for all groups of rich nodes so that this  
RI GLIIHUhQW GHJUHHV 7R PHDVWLUXF WVKHDFQH RISIWHQWLFQLEQH H[  
SDWWHUQV 1HZPDQ SURSRVH GneWkRhiemrhr UAM B WULLYFHK FFROKH E FERHQIW FU  
ZKLFK UDQJHV IURP WR :K foQdjo be critwally relevant to the cohesancy and  
DVVRUWDWLYH PL[LQJ LQ WKH QHHRWEZRUVWQ HLVW RH YDH QHOMZQRNU NRQQRK  
WZR QRGHV ZLWK WKH VDPH G HDIQH HW ZKLWQV UURXW LVQJH UH[EVHQF\\ L  
perfect disassortative network, i.e., every link connects HWZHQQRGHV = KRX  
WZR QRGHV ZLWK GLIIHUhQW GHJUHHRXZKHDQG UORQGWZRURQI LV D V  
QHXWUDO PL[LQJ QHWZRUN QHWZRUN V ULFK FOXE FRHIQFLHQV

5LFK & OXE & RHI & FLHQW

The “rich club” concept proposed by Zhou and Mondragon [R H I ; F L H Q W D Q G K L J K G H J U H H Q F D Q G F R P S O H P H Q W network are not necessarily more interconnected than Q H W Z R U N P L [L Q J S D W W H U Q V , those in a disassortative network D Q G U H V V H V W K H I R O O R Z L Q J D P E L J X L W L H V ) R U H [D P S O H L I D Q H W Z R U N G L V S O D \ V D V V R U W D W L Y H P L [L Q J Z K H U H K 2.4 Rich Club Phenomenon G W R O L Q N with other high-degree nodes, does this mean the high- G H J U H H Q R G H V D U H W L J K W O \ There has been a debate on the Rich Club phenomenon with K each other? Or, if a network is disassortative and high respect to how to determine whether the rich nodes in a G H J U H H Q R G H V R Q D Y H U D J H network have tendency to form highly interconnected H nodes, does this mean the high-degree nodes do not form & R O L ] ] D H W D O S U R S R V with themselves at all? F O X E F R H I ; F L H Q W R I D U H D O Q H W Z

<sup>3</sup> L F K ' Q R G H V D U H G H ; Q H G G B y Q B G J U D R V X S W R H Q D R Y G H U M D J H R I D P Z L W K W K H K L J K H V W G H J U H H V Version of the real network. The logic here is analogous to U as the top best-connected nodes or as the nodes with R W K H G L I ; F X O W \ R I G H W H U P L Q L Q degrees larger than or equal to a given degree or "short" without comparing their height to the average given group of rich nodes, any member of the group has height of the group of people that the person belongs to. a degree higher than or equal to any node outside B Q H <sup>3</sup> V X U S U L V L Q J ' U H V X O W L V W K D group. More nodes with lower degrees are included when K L F K L V F R Q V L G H U H G W R H [ H P S O the size of the group increases. phenomenon, would have a slightly lower rich-club

words, the authors showed that large networks self-organize into a scale-free state, a feature unpredicted by previous random network models.

:KHQ WKH JURXS RI ULFK QRGHV LV JLYHQ E\ WKH QRGH UDQN Q WKH PRVW H[FC  
WKH ODUJHVW JURXS LV WKH ZKROH QHWZRUN Q 1 :KHQ WKH JURXS LV JLYHQ E\ WKH ODUJHVW GHJUHH LQ WKH QHWZRUN DQG WKH ODUJHVW JURXS FROWDILQV DC

FRHI FLHQW ZKHQ WKH QHWZRUN &KUW\Q\O\N\ P\ UHZLURHUG ³ZKLDQJ] D  
SUHVHUYLQJ WKH RULJLQDO GH&REH \Q\W\H L6\XPWORQO\ +R\OBYNUF  
this method cannot be used to compare between different detecting cohesive subgroups (Wasserman and Faust  
real networks – because a “short” person on a basketball VXFK DV FOLTXH DQDO\VLV DQ  
team may be taller than a “tall” person in a primary school methods of “community detection,” such as the Girvan-  
class.

1HZPDQ PHWKRG 1HZPDQ PD\ E

\$PDUODO DQG \*XLPHUD identifying the rich-club leaders or important subgroups. “Rich” nodes form

phenomenon to a monotonic increase of the rich-club. The rich-club approach has a different focus FRHI FLHQW DV D IXQFWLRQ RI DQHGJUSSHU S\RKHH \VRKOMQH FWKXW\H WKHDFM the monotonic increase may be “a natural consequence of analytical focus beyond identifying well-connected a stochastic process” and comment that “... an oligarchy will always appear to be present, even if the network cohesive group among themselves, but they also LV UDQGRP +RZH\HULW LV ZnlaGtahCiesNbOnkzQmpMkrkhd” Wkldes—t.g. F\keir FOXE FRHI FLHQW LV QRWD PRQH\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O QHWZRUVN OF\$XOH\ HW DO U2IS\K DQKOG HW ³DOKF 6H\KRIQG WKHU ULFK FOXE FRHI FLHQW FDQ H\Y\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O LQ VRPH QHWZRUVN =KRX DQG a\Bposed to idenfifying the oligarchs themselves.

0RQGUDJRQ DQG =KRX D UJ\KHHW KID FWKWFIOHK EU L DIS S URDFK X V

FOXE FRHI FLHQW LV DQ DEV R\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O calculated without any assumption and judgment about K\H DOVR DI\OLDWH ZLWK QRQ UL the rich-club phenomenon. In other words, it is measuring VVRUWDWL\H ULFK QRGHV DI\OLDWH a person’s height without judging whether a person is LFK QRGHV ZKLOH QRQ ULFK QRGI WDOORUQRW , Q WKLV SDSHU of nodes in a network, and avoid referring to the rich-club L PLODU GHJUHH DVVRFLDWL ZLWK phenomenon.

“dissassortative,” by contrast, nodes of dissimilar degree associate together. While the “rich club” measure captures the way a core group monopolizes ties, the disassortative measure guarantees that this core is not segmented off

\$VVRUWDWL\H PL[LQJ LV FRRPP R\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O not associated with “oligarchical” networks. An oligarchy In addition to knowing that there is a group of LV D ULFK FOXE ZLWK GLVDVVR\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O the “rich” nodes are interconnected, but they are also connected to the “poor” nodes who are not strongly interconnected among themselves.

is small relative to the network as a whole. One way to

The idea that the power of well-connected people is derived from their connections to other nodes in the degree distribution of the network. If the rich-club connected people is well established in social networks, and typically measured using eigenvectors ensemble a power law.

FHQWUDOLW\ %RQDFLFK RU LQ\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O to vary the relative importance of indirect ties, “power characterized as having a “rich club” (a group of well- FHQWUDOLW\ %RQDFLFK F\Q\QH\W\H\Q\W\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O later measure, however, is that it requires an arbitrary decision on the part of the analyst about whether people disassortative (where each rich node is strongly gain more power by being tied to other “rich” nodes or by being tied to more “impoverished” nodes. Following this tradition of measuring centrality and power in networks, some authors have recently developed new measures for identifying “leadership insularity” (Abersman collective intermediation of the network as a whole. In

/RRNLQJ IRU WKH PRVW LQ\Qthesele\QW\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O QHWZRUVN &RO GHJUHH VFRUH \Q\H\Q\W\H\Q\chLnQdes R\at\Whales D O

Michels' terms, the rich club is a cohesive "inner circle" that organizes the weakly organized "masses."

One alternative way to identify an oligarchical network regime is to develop a core-periphery analysis. Much like the concept of an oligarchy, a core-periphery structure is a "core" of people who are tied together a lot, and a "periphery" of less well connected actors (Laumann & Skaggs, 1984). These networks allow us to compare urban infrastructure policy across different cities and domains.

The core-periphery structure that assigns those who are São Paulo Urban Infrastructure Networks evaluate how closely the derived assignment corresponds to municipal inhabitants and 20 million in the metropolitan there are several limitations of using a core-periphery model. The urban-infrastructure policy is at the core of municipal policies, and receives a large share of the

The core-periphery algorithm partitions a network into a core that is tightly interconnected and important policy domain.

The core-periphery measure says that the core is tightly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the links between the two.

2. The core-periphery measure says that the core is tightly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the links between the two.
3. The "core" of a core-periphery structure might be very large, while we are assuming that the "rich club" is a small group (as measured by the size of the core).

Thus, while core-periphery measures may also provide an

club approach offers a more direct and discriminating

The rich club is a cohesive "inner circle" that organizes the weakly organized "masses." One alternative way to identify an oligarchical network regime is to develop a core-periphery analysis. Much like the concept of an oligarchy, a core-periphery structure is a "core" of people who are tied together a lot, and a "periphery" of less well connected actors (Laumann & Skaggs, 1984). These networks allow us to compare urban infrastructure policy across different cities and domains. The core-periphery structure that assigns those who are São Paulo Urban Infrastructure Networks evaluate how closely the derived assignment corresponds to municipal inhabitants and 20 million in the metropolitan there are several limitations of using a core-periphery model. The urban-infrastructure policy is at the core of municipal policies, and receives a large share of the

The core-periphery algorithm partitions a network into a core that is tightly interconnected and important policy domain. The core-periphery measure says that the core is tightly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the links between the two.

2. The core-periphery measure says that the core is tightly interconnected and the periphery is weakly interconnected; it says less about the links between the two.
3. The "core" of a core-periphery structure might be very large, while we are assuming that the "rich club" is a small group (as measured by the size of the core).

7 R UHFUHDWH WKH SROLF\ QHWCRQH And LBRP<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles Transportation Policy Networks  
UHVHDUFKHUV FRQGXFWHG LQ GH SWK LQWHUYLHZV ZLWK FDUHHU  
RI;FLDOV WHFKQLFLDQV DQG PHILIPUE HHW DRO WKH FFRIRROXQHFWMHGI GDW  
HQJLQHHUV DVVRFLDWHG ZLWK SROLF\ KQHWWZQ WNHW YRLH ZWK WRXH KRQG  
to characterize the policy and political dynamics in the HWURSROLWDQ UHJLRQV / RV \$ QJL  
city over time, as well as to investigate the continuity QG & KLF D JR PLOOLRQ SHRSOH  
of the networks. The interviews used a name generator D V WR LQYHVWLJDWH ZKHWKHU WK  
± EDVHG RQ RI;FLDO GDWD RI DUDOOVSQRFLWIDHNLVRQ RI;WAKHQIDLSQFW  
LQVWLWXWL RQDO SRVLWL RQV snowballing techniques, to identify the complete network issues among groups operating on an urban and regional  
The network data analyzed in this paper is the data set D OH , 67 (\$ DOVR VRXJKW WR HQF  
produced by the Marques team using this data collection QHZ JURXSV W\SLFD O O\ H[FOXGH process.  
regimes. In addition to their size, L.A. and Chicago were

This policy network was constructed with the aim selected because they represent contrasting urban political dynamics of analyzing the power dynamics inside this bureaucracy. L.A. is traditionally regarded as having a very under different mayors with different political inclinations fragmented urban and regional politics, while Chicago's The study focused on the differences between right-wing business and civic community and centralized and left wing parties, since this is a policy area traditionally S ROLWLFD UHJLPH PDNH LW DQ H[D  
DVVRFLDWHG ZLWK W KH UL JTKW and QWVLPDQY WHAKRQ 6mR 3DXOR  
UHODWL RQV D PRQJ GLI HUHQW JURXSV LRWVWUKXF W\K E\IGW DQMDHWY WHK broader political environment (political parties, other Q ZLWK JURXSV DFWL YH LQ SXEOLF DJHQFLHV DQG SULYDWH VHFWRU DFWRU the list DhatTyXH organization has worked with as part LQIUDVWUXFWXUH SROLF\ QHW ZRIS NarsortationRwB XAO Rove-ib FqDection PhrU H GHQVH DQG FRPSOH[ RYHU WL Dashed responsibilities SoSrdiBaite PHD M H O These groups they LQWHUFRQQHFWHG SHRSOH S Ulard Worked with "closely" TlReRqubtions KeDeQntended SHRSOH LQ W KH DGPLQLVWUDWtBapturk the difference Between "weak" and "strong" 0DUTXHV IRXQG D KHJHP R\Networks RXS LQ FRQWURO RI policy across this period, which was stable even during 7KH VWXG\ IRXQG WKDW , 67 (\$ K W KH WZR OHIW ZLQJ DGPLQLVWUDWLRQ IURP despite their attempts to change the power dynamics new perspectives to the urban and regional transportation this policy domain by introducing new players into the policy process. It was also found that these groups were policy network. These new actors, however, failed to engage in active networking within their regions. The displace or break the hold of the hegemonic group. interviews, however, also indicated that the groups

---

6LQFH WKLV LV D UHODWL YHO\ VWDEOH DQG FORVH FRPPXQLW\ PDQ\ RI W KH WHF associations outside the public sector and are co-members of professional associations-the research team assumed that most people who know each other, forming a one-mode network. Information on all types of contacts inside the policy community was considered, and not only LQIRUPDWLRQ RQ WLHV DVVRFLDWHG ZLWK VRPH VSHFL F SROLF\ LVVXHV RU FRQVHYHUDO W\SHV RI WLHV LQFOXGLQJ ZRUN WLHV IULHQGVKLS WLHV EXVLQHVV retirement, only when someone died or went to a completely different sector. The interviews revealed that the retired public servants usually went to the private sector and stayed as formal and informal consultants for the public sector. Additional interviews were then conducted in order to separate contacts into different periods and to differentiate the types and strength of ties (indicated by the frequency of citation of each G\DG 7KHVH LQWHUYLHZV DOORZHG WKH FRQVWUXFWLRQ RI W KH QHWZRUN RI UHPRUDO DGPLQLVWUDWLRQ IURP WR

7KH VWXG\ FKDUDFWHUL]HG ³ULJKW ZLQJ\ SROLWLFLDQV DV EHORQJLQJ WR WKZHUh FUHDWHG DIWHU LW 33% DQG 3'6 LQFOXGLQJ D SDUW\ DOLJQHG ZLWK WKH PXQLFLSDOLW\ IURP WR 5H\QDOGR GH %DUURV WR -kQLR 4XDGURV WR 3DXOR 0DOXI WR DQG & HOVR 3LWWWD WR ZHUH WKRVH EHORQJLQJ WR W KH RSSRVLWLRQ WR W KH PLOLWDU\ UHJLPH ± W KH WR DQG /XL]D (UXQGLQD WR ZKRVH EHDWQYHG\ WR W KH 30

felt that they were still not fully included in a planning process now dominated by the Metropolitan Planning measures where possible.

2 U J D Q L ] D W L R Q V 0 3 2 V DOVR FUHDWHG E \ , 6 7 (\$ 2 I W K H W Z R cities, Chicago groups were more successful in getting 7 K H 5 L F K & O X E & R H I & F L H Q W their MPO to be responsive to their input.

## 5. Comparison of the Networks

When we look at the distribution of the rich-club F R H I & F L H Q W D V D I X Q F W L R Q R I G H we can see that all the policy networks show a rich-club Q H W Z R U N V D U H P X F K O D U J H U W P X D F Q K W D K H U J 8 H 6 J Q H I D C R W M M D E X H M U D J declines as networks become larger, this is not surprising since the highest degree people are interconnected with each other--the higher the degree, the As the comparison of the "strong" and "weak" tie networks U H D W H U W K H U L F K F O X E F R H I & F L H L Q & K L F D J R D Q G / \$ V X J J H V W V G H Q V L W \ L V D O V R D U H A H F W L R Q of the kinds of social relations elicited by interviews and surveys. If you ask people to specify only the people they Z R U N Z L W K F O R V H O \ ^ V W U R Q J W L H V ' W K H Q \ R X Z L O O J H Q H U D W H a sparser network than if you ask them whom they have Z R U N H G Z L W K ^ Z H D N W L H V ' 7 K H G L I I H U H Q F H V E H W Z H H Q W K H Q H W Z R U N V L Q G L F D W H W K D W L W L V L P S R U W D Q W W R H [ H U F L V H F D X V when making comparisons, since many network measures are sensitive to the size and density of the network. In

Table 1 'H J U H H & O X V W H U L Q J D Q G 0 L [ L Q J 3 U R S H U W L H V

Dataset	Density	Number of Nodes	Number of Ties	Average Degree	Maximal Degree	Shortest Path Length Between Nodes	Clustering & R H I & F L H Q W	Assortative L & H Q H W & F L H Q W
São Paulo								
Reynaldo	0.030			5.3	42			-0.23
Covas	0.028					3.23		
Janio	0.024					3.32		
Erundina			584					
Maluf	0.028					3.24		
Pitta	0.028	204				3.25	0.305	
Chicago								
Chicago – Weak	0.403	35	240					
& K L F D J R ± 6 W U R Q J 33				3.82				
Los Angeles								
LA – Weak								
/ \$ ± 6 W U R Q J		38		5.42				

Figure 1 5LFK & OXE & RHI & FLHQW DV D )XQFWLRQ RI 'HJU Figure 2 mFLS R&ORXE & RHI & FLHQW DV D )XQFWLRQ RI 'HJU

Figure 3 'HJUHH GLVWULEXWLRQ 6mR 3DROR QHWZRUNV Figure 4 'HJUHH GLVWULEXWLRQ & KLFDJR DQG /\$ QHWZRQ

## 5.2 Mixing Properties

7 D E O H D O V R V K R Z V W K H Q Networks within each city tend to form nodes, to which other nodes with dissimilar degree tend to be connected to each other.

other, i.e. well-connected nodes tend to be connected to poorly-connected nodes and vice-versa (Zhou towards oligarchical organization. All of them demonstrate

0 R Q G U D J y Q & R O L ] ] D H W D Q “rich-club”, Organization, Diverse & the best-connected Paulo, it is interesting to note that the Reynaldo regime individuals or organizations are connected to other well-W K H P R V W G L V D V V R U W D W L Y H B R Q Q H F W H Z K I S F H K R \$ Q H F B Q Y G L V W R H Q S / Z L W K 0 D U T X H V T V Q G L Q J W K D W Los Angeles strong tie network. However, the networks established during this administration. The disassortative disassortative, meaning that the well-connected are

F R H I & F L H Q W V K R Z H Y H U D U H also extended to the less well-connected. This is likely because

G L I I H U H Q W D G P L Q L V W U D W L R Q V H [S H F M R H 3 G D X Q R D Q U R J O D U J Q O F K / F R Q H W K L G H R O R J L F D O L Q F O L Q D W L R Q 7 collective organization intermediate the social network has while W K

argument that the hegemonic group, once established, while all these networks may have oligarchical tendencies,

T X L W H V W D E O H 0 D U T X H V W K H 6 m R 3 D X O R Q H W Z R U N V D U H P R U

H L W K H U R I W K H \$ P H U L F D Q Q H W Z R U N V

are more disassortative than the American networks, particularly the strong tie networks. This means that

: H F D Q D O V R F R Q W U D V W W K H W 6 m R X Q R W H Z R U N V K Z D L W K W U R Q W K H 8 6 Q H W Z R U N V E \ O R R N L Q net work, while elites in the American networks are less Q these networks. The degree distribution is indicative of a network's global connectivity, although different the concept of oligarchy we have embraced. Is a regime

S U R S H U W L H V P L [ L Q J S D W W H U Q P R U D H R E Q I L J R X Q G L E Q O Q I H W Z R U H N H O L W H sharing the same degree distribution (Zhou and Mondragón organize the broader network or ignore it? In the

0 R Q G U D J y Q 2 Q H L P S R U W D Q M H Q W I S D H Q R W U D G U W H R Q W K H I R U

distribution is a “power law” distribution, in which many consider whether the latter case also represents a form

nodes have only a few links and a small number of nodes oligarchy. The fact that the strong tie networks in the

have a very large number of links (Zhou and Mondragón American cities are less disassortative than the weak tie

networks suggest that when it comes to the closest ties, networks are more clubbish.

When we look at Figures 3, we see the degree distribution of the American networks are more clubbish.

G L V W U L E X W L R Q V D S S U R [ L P D W H D S t r u c t u r e s , however, the

few nodes with a large number of connections, but most question the oligarchical qualities of the American

nodes have few connections. Compared with the Chicago networks. The well-structured power law distribution

D Q G / \$ Q H W Z R U N V ) L J X U H W K M K H m R m R Q H Q W Z R U N V L Q G L

more closely resemble a power law distribution.

## 6. Analysis

Four bases of comparison are presented by our the suggesting more of a pluralist than an oligarchical regime. X U E D Q S R O L F \ Q H W Z R U N V 7 K H in the world, the are good model organizations but W R H [ D P L Q H U H J L P H O H Y H O S U R S H U W L H V d f e R e t h u m d p B l i z e s D T h e s t r o n g different municipal administrations. The Chicago and networks appear closer to power law distributions, Los Angeles data allow us to compare policy networks suggesting a more distinct elite. But even these networks regimes in two different American cities, while holding no differentiation between a small well-connected elite

( D F K R I W K H 6 m R 3 D X O R Q H W Z R U N V F R Q W D L Q V P X O W L S O H F R P S R Q H Q W V , Q W K H W K H O D U J H V W F R P S R Q H Q W L Q D Q H W Z R U N 7 K H J L D Q W F R P S R Q H Q W F R Q W D L Q V P R entire networks.

and a less well-connected periphery.

the precise meaning of the concept is often suggestive than precise. In this paper, we explore a structural analysis of the concept based on social network analysis. While the American networks have some oligarchical tendencies, they ultimately appear more pluralistic. Well-connected organizations in the American networks are clubbish, but the analysis does not suggest that this elite is very well differentiated among themselves. These "olarchs" are linked to less national differences in urban policy networks. But the contrast suggests that this is a distinct possibility. Brazilian oligarchy appears to be stable across municipalities, a point that reinforces the "rich club" approach. The social network concept of a political parties were in charge during these different administrations, a point that reinforces the argument that well-connected actors are only connected to whether well-connected actors are only connected to whether the inner-circle is a small or large group relative

The contrast between Chicago and Los Angeles is the size of the network.

was less striking than we anticipated, though in the sense that policy networks have oligarchical tendencies, in the sense that well-connected actors in all three cities tend to be one indicator of greater fragmentation in the Los Angeles networks. For the strong tie networks, Chicago also appears somewhat closer to a power law distribution, indicating a small coterie of many organizations with few ties; a few organizations come closest to being oligarchical regimes, while in Los Angeles, many organizations have a medium range of ties. Our conclusion is that there is a less distinctive elite in Los Angeles. For the weak tie networks, however, this contrast is less clear.

may be a robust form of political organization.

## 7. Conclusion

### References

The concept of oligarchy has an illustrious history in the social sciences, but is only weakly developed as an analytical concept. Though it is not uncommon to hear the word used to describe political and economic regimes in organizations, social movements, and nations,

the precise meaning of the concept is often suggestive than precise. In this paper, we explore a structural analysis of the concept based on social network analysis. While the American networks have some oligarchical tendencies, they ultimately appear more pluralistic. Well-connected organizations in the American networks are clubbish, but the analysis does not suggest that this elite is very well differentiated among themselves. These "olarchs" are linked to less national differences in urban policy networks. But the contrast suggests that this is a distinct possibility. Brazilian oligarchy appears to be stable across municipalities, a point that reinforces the "rich club" approach. The social network concept of a political parties were in charge during these different administrations, a point that reinforces the argument that well-connected actors are only connected to whether well-connected actors are only connected to whether the inner-circle is a small or large group relative

\$ F H P R J O X ' 2 O L J D U F K L F L \$ H H W X V 6 ' H O P R F 7 W D R V Z L F 0 D Q G & R O H  
6 R F L H U M a n i l l o f the European Economic Union Democracy: The Internal Politics of the  
Association International Typographical Union 1 H Z < R U N

\$ P D U D O / \$ 1 \* X L P H U D 5 The Free & Press OH [

Q H W Z R U N V / L H V G D P N a t u r e O K R V D Q G / L V W D W L M D Q L F Y ) D Q G 6 F K X  
Physics & R U H D Q G 3 H U L S K H U \ 6 W U

% D U E D V L \$ / D Q G 5 H N D \$ 7 , Q M H B B B W H L Q R B M C R H B M I Z R n a t i c s /  
6 F D O L Q J L Q 5 D Q S C i e n c e 1 H W Z R U N V 6 X S S O 6  
0 D U T X H V ( D Q G % L F K L U 5 , Q  
% L F K L U 5 , Q Y H V W L P H Q W R V L Y Q L L U D L R I W V G U H X V S X U T D Q D H S  
S R U W H Q R P X Q L F t S L R G H 6 m R G r o p o O 3 D X E s p a c o , Q Debates, \$ Q R ; 9 , ,  
, Q 0 D U T X H V ( D Q G S a o P a u l o : U U H V H G V Q ž  
segregação, pobreza e desigualdade social & D U T X H V ( Estado e redes sociais:  
3 D X O R ( G L W R U D 6 H Q D F permeabilidade e coesão nas políticas urbanas  
% R U J D W W L 6 D Q G ( Y H U H W W 0 no Rio de Janeiro C O V L R R G H & R D Q H L U R 5 H Y  
3 H U L S K H U \ S o c i a l N e t w o r k s U H V 0 D U T X H V ( Redes Sociais, instituições e atores  
políticos no governo da cidade de São Paulo

% R U J D W W L 6 3 ( Y H U H W W 0 \* D Q G 6 m B H 3 H D P X D O R / ( & \$ Q Q D E O X P H  
Ucinet for Windows: Software for Social Network 0 D U T X H V ( 3 6 R F L D O 1 H W Z R U  
Analysis + D U Y D U G 0 \$ \$ Q D O \ W L F 7 % E I D Q I R O O L D Q L H W D W H / H D U Q L Q J I  
% U H L J H U 5 / 7 R Z D U G D Q 2 S R e v i e w s B r a s i l e i r a s D a O d e r K i e n r i c h t s \ S o c i a l s /  
& R P P X Q L W \ ( O L Q u a l i t y & A Q u a l i t y W X U H V 6 S H F L D O ( G L W L R Q \$ O V  
K W W S Z Z Z F H Q W U R G D P H W U R S

% X U W 5 Brokerage and closure: An introduction html# nome  
to social capital 2 [ I R U G 8 Q L Y H U V L W D U B T U X H W ( 3 X E O L F S R O L F L H  
& R O H 5 : H L V V 0 , G H Q W L I h e t @ a k s R i J B r a z i l i a n D M b a i R Q d D o e s L a t i n  
L Q A X H Q W L D O V 0 H W K R G V D Q G A m e r i c a n R e s e a r c h R e v i e w R X O V L Q J  
social network dataConnections 0 F \$ X O H \ - - G D ) R U W R X U D & R V W D  
& R O L ] D 9 ) O D P P L Q L \$ 6 H U U D Q R 0 \$ D T Q G H 9 H V S K J Q Q D Q E 3 K H Q R P  
\$ ' H W H F W L Q J 5 L F K & O X B R P L S C O H H Q L 1 Q H J W Z Q U A p p l i e d P h y s i c s F K L H  
& R P S O H [ 1 N a t u r e P h y s i c s / H W W H U V

' D K O 5 R E H U M b Governs: Democracy and O L O O V & : U T h e P o w e r E l i t e 2 [ I R U G 2 [ I R U  
Power in an American City 1 H Z + D Y H Q < D S Q H L Y H U V L W \ 3 U H V V  
8 Q L Y H U V L W \ 0 L ] U X F K L 0 6 : K D W G R , Q W  
' R P K R I I \* : K R 5 X O H V \$ P H U L A n a l y s i s Q Q r i d e Z a n d A s s e s s m e n t o f R e s e a r c h  
& O L I I V 1 - 3 U H Q W L F H + D O O on Interlocking Directorates Annual Review of  
( Y H U H W W 0 \* D Q G % R U J D W W L 6 S o c i o l o g y 3 H U L S K H U L H V R I  
& R K H V L Y H S o c i a l N e t w o r k s / 1 H Z P D Q 0 ( ' H W H F W L Q J F R P  
( Y H U H W W 0 \* D Q G % R U J D W W L 6 i n Networks. The S E Q u a d r a P h y s i c s J o u r n a l  
Clique OverlapConnections B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems,  
\* R X O G 5 9 ) H U Q D Q G H ] 5 0 6 W U X F W X U H V R I  
P H G L D W L R Q \$ I R U P D O D S S 1 H R Z D P F D Q W O R ( E U R N H U D J H V R L Q W D W L Y H C  
transaction networks Sociological methodology Physical Review Letters  
0 R Q G U D J y Q 5 D Q G 6 = K R X  
\* X U L H Y 6 D Q G 5 D F K L Q V N \ \$ Z L W 7 K K H J L 5 Y R H Q H U R U F K E Q d P E a n F R H I  
Oligarchs in Russian Capitalism Journal of Physical Journal B: Condensed Matter and  
Economic Perspectives Complex Systems

+ X Q W H U ) O R a m i l l o Community Power Structure: A 2 E V W I H O G ' 6 R F L D O Q H W Z R U  
Study of Decision Makers orientation, and involvement in innovation.  
/ H D F K ' . 7 K H , U R Q / D Z R I A d m i n i s t r a t i v e S c i e n c e quarterly  
Conceptualizing Oligarchy Across Organizational  
Forms. Sociological Theory Opsahl, T., V. Colizza, P. Panzarassa and J. J. Ramasco.

3 U R P L Q H Q F H D Q G & R Q W U R O 7 K H : H L J K W H G  
Rich-Club Effect.Physical Review Letters

3 R O V E \ 1 : + R Z W R 6 W X G \ & R P P X Q L W \ 3 R Z H U  
The Pluralist AlternativeThe Journal of Politics

6 L P P H O \*The Sociology of Georg Simmel 6 L P R Q  
D Q G 6 F K X V W H U

6 W R Y H O . 6 K D Z / Annual Review of Sociology  
of Sociology,

9 R V V . D Q G 6 K H U P D Q 5 % U H D N L Q J W K H , U R Q  
/ D Z R I 2 O L J D U F K \ 8 Q L R Q 5 H Y L W D O L ] D W L R Q L Q W K H  
American Labor Movement.The American  
Journal of Sociology

: D V V H U P D Q 6 D Q G ) Social Network  
Analysis: Methods and Application & D P E U L G J H  
& D P E U L G J H 8 Q L Y H U V L W \ 3 U H V V

: D W W V ' X Q F S Small Worlds: The Dynamics of  
Networks Between Order and Randomness.

3 U L Q F H W R Q 3 U L Q F H W R Q 8 Q L Y H U V L W \ 3 U H V V

: H L U 0 5 R Q J H U X G H - D Q G \$ Q V H O O &  
& R O O D E R U D W L R Q L V Q R W H Q R X J K 9 L U W X R X V & \ F O H V R I  
Reform in Transportation PolicyUrban Affairs  
Review

= K R X 6 D Q G 0 R Q G U D J y Q 5 7 K H 5 L F K & O X E  
Phenomenon in the Internet Topology IEEE  
Communications Letters

= K R X 6 D Q G 0 R Q G U D J y Q 5 E 5 H G X Q G D Q F \ D Q G  
U R E X V W Q H V V R I W K H \$ 6 O H Y H O , Q W H U Q H W W R S R O R J \ D Q G  
its models.IEE Electronic Letters

= K R X 6 D Q G 0 R Q G U D J y Q 5 6 W U X F W X U D O F R Q V W U D L Q W V  
L Q F R P S O H [ N Q H J M U Z A L W N P h y s i c s

= K R X 6 : K \ W K H , Q M M H C S T Q H W L V V R μ V P D O O ¶ "