

# Philosophy of Digitalization

Instructor: Aleksandra Samonek

Philosophy of Digitalization module is a 3-course module planned for semester 1 & 2 on year 2 or 3 of the Bachelor "Philosophy, Politics and Society" Program.

# SOCIETY AND NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Radboud University, SEM 1 & 2, 2022/23, syllabus v. 0.1

---

<b>Instructor:</b>	Aleksandra Samonek	<b>Time:</b>	TBD
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:asamonek@protonmail.com">asamonek@protonmail.com</a>	<b>Place:</b>	Zoom & TBD

---

**Course Page:** TBD

**Office Hours:** TBD

**Description:** The main goal of this course is to encourage philosophical reflection over on the relationship between individual and the society in the context of technology. It will consist in two components. (1) Topics and discussion points which we will take on during our meetings, for which students will need to read the literature and materials provided in advance (up to 20 pages of text). (2) Practical component, where each student plans and executes a mini-experiment or a practical task related to the course.

## Tentative Course Outline:

I — Introduction. History of social impact of technology: from first pocket camera to face recognition technology.

Format: Lecture

## BLOCK I — Technology and Social Relations

II — Cultural determinants of privacy expectation. Privacy and housing. Privacy and spatial design.

Readings:

Ozaki, R. (2002). Housing as a reflection of culture: Privatised living and privacy in England and Japan. *Housing studies*, 17(2), 209-227.

Mizutani, M., Dorsey, J., & Moor, J. H. (2004). The internet and Japanese conception of privacy. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 6(2), 121-128.

III — Technology of oversight in protection of minors and vulnerable individuals

Readings:

Hamilton-Giachritsis, C., Hanson, E., Whittle, H., Alves-Costa, F., Pintos, A., Metcalf, T., & Beech, A. (2021). Technology assisted child sexual abuse: professionals' perceptions of risk and impact on children and young people. *Child abuse & neglect*, 119, 104651.

Hennum, N., & Aamodt, H. (2021). The place of children in the imaginary of welfare states. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 9(2), 205-217.

IV — Collective choice, "cancel culture", modern ostracism & public shaming

Readings:

Boykina, E. E. (2022). Modern faces of social ostracism: ghosting, orbiting, phubbing, cancel culture. *Journal of Modern Foreign Psychology*, 11(2), 131-140.

Mueller, T. S. (2021). Blame, then shame? Psychological predictors in cancel culture behavior. *The Social Science Journal*, 1-14.

- V — Physical & digital violence: hate speech, crowd-sourced violence, "body search" (人肉搜索, or *Rénròu Sōusuō*), doxing.

Readings:

Matamoros-Fernández, A., & Farkas, J. (2021). Racism, hate speech, and social media: A systematic review and critique. *Television & New Media*, 22(2), 205-224.

Venkatagiri, S., Gautam, A., & Luther, K. (2021). Crowdsolve: Managing tensions in an expert-led crowdsourced investigation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW1), 1-30.

Li, Y. T., & Whitworth, K. (2022). Data as a weapon: The evolution of Hong Kong protesters' doxing strategies. *Social Science Computer Review*, Vol. 0(0), 1-21.

Barry, P. B. (2022). # MeToo and the Ethics of Doxing Sexual Transgressors. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Sexual Ethics* (pp. 507-523). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

## BLOCK II — Mapping Societies Through Data

- VI — The ethics of voluntary *vs* mandatory information sharing and psychological elements of information sharing

Readings:

Liberti, J., Sturges, J., & Sutherland, A. (2018). Economics of voluntary information sharing (No. 869). Working paper.

Stuart, A., Bandara, A. K., & Levine, M. (2019). The psychology of privacy in the digital age. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(11), e12507.

- VII — Data-informed worldview *vs* traditional and social media

Readings:

Kümpel, A. S., Karnowski, V., & Keyling, T. (2015). News sharing in social media: A review of current research on news sharing users, content, and networks. *Social media+ society*, 1(2), 2056305115610141.

Hermida, A. (2016). Social media and the news. *The SAGE handbook of digital journalism*, 81-94.

Dollar Street Project by Gap Minder:

<https://www.gapminder.org/dollar-street>

- VIII — Data sharing in health and healthcare: benefits and risks

Readings:

Sharon, T. (2018). When digital health meets digital capitalism, how many common goods are at stake?. *Big Data & Society*, 5(2), 2053951718819032.

Shekelle, P. G., Morton, S. C., & Keeler, E. B. (2006). Costs and benefits of health information technology. *Evidence report/technology assessment*, (132), 1-71.

## IX — Understanding political agendas through networks

## Readings:

Paulis, E. (2020). Using social network analysis (sna) to study members and activists of political parties. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 147(1-2), 13-48.

Faustino, J., Barbosa, H., Ribeiro, E., & Menezes, R. (2019). A data-driven network approach for characterization of political parties' ideology dynamics. *Applied Network Science*, 4(1), 1-15.

## X — Visualizing migration through data

## Readings:

Blasi Casagran, C. (2021). Fundamental rights implications of interconnecting migration and policing databases in the EU. *Human Rights Law Review*, 21(2), 433-457.

Suari-Andreu, E., & van Vliet, O. (2022). Intra-EU Migration, Public Transfers, and Assimilation: Evidence for the Netherlands. Department of Economics Research Memorandum.

UN Global Migration Database:

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/data/global-migration-database>

## BLOCK III — Group Interest, Group Conflict and Information Wars

## XI — The impact of social media filtering and fake news on group conflict

## Readings:

Kubin, E., & von Sikorski, C. (2021). The role of (social) media in political polarization: a systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 45(3), 188-206.

Törnberg, P., Andersson, C., Lindgren, K., & Banisch, S. (2021). Modeling the emergence of affective polarization in the social media society. *Plos One*, 16(10), e0258259.

(fragments) Clack, T., & Johnson, R. (Eds.). (2021). *The World Information War: Western Resilience, Campaigning, and Cognitive Effects*. Routledge.

## XII — Collective organization, marketing and the electoral process

## Readings:

Bright, L. F., Sussman, K. L., & Wilcox, G. B. (2021). Facebook, trust and privacy in an election year: Balancing politics and advertising. *Journal of Digital & Social Media Marketing*, 8(4), 332-346.

Fujiwara, T., Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2021). The effect of social media on elections: Evidence from the United States (No. w28849). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Himelein-Wachowiak, M., Giorgi, S., Devoto, A., Rahman, M., Ungar, L., Schwartz, H. A., & Curtis, B., and others (2021). Bots and misinformation spread on social media: Implications for COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(5), e26933.

## XIII — Race and race equality in digital spaces

## Readings:

Matamoros-Fernández, A., & Farkas, J. (2021). Racism, hate speech, and social media: A systematic review and critique. *Television & New Media*, 22(2), 205-224.

Olayinka, J. T., Gohara, M. A., & Ruffin, Q. K. (2021). #BlackGirlMagic: Impact of the social media movement on Black women's self esteem. *International Journal of Women's Dermatology*, 7(2), 171.

#### XIV — Digital censorship and Internet censorship

Readings:

Are, C. (2021). The Shadowban Cycle: an autoethnography of pole dancing, nudity and censorship on Instagram. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1-18.

Sciberras, R., & Tanner, C. (2022). Feminist sex-positive art on Instagram: reorienting the sexualizing gaze. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1-16.

Volokh, E. (2021). Treating Social Media Platforms Like Common Carriers?. Online draft from UCLA Previously Published Works. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0bz3d1fx>.

#### XV — "Walled gardens" and information freedom

Readings:

Rozenshtein, Alan Z., Moderating the Fediverse: Content Moderation on Distributed Social Media (September 8, 2022). 2 *Journal of Free Speech Law* (forthcoming 2023), Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4213674>

(fragments) Napoli, P. M. (2019). Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age. Columbia University Press.

Schiltz, M. (2018). Science without publication paywalls: cOAlition S for the realisation of full and immediate open access. *PLoS Medicine*, 15(9), e1002663.

### Course Credit and Workload:

- Practical component:

Students can pick one practical assignment from a list provided before the course or propose their own assignment after consulting the instructor. The assignment should have to do with one of the topics which we discuss during the course.

The topic proposal should be accepted by the instructor by the time we finish block 1, that is, before class VI. It should be submitted before class X, unless a special timeline is needed to perform the activity. In the latter case, the timeline should also be accepted by the end of block 1.

- Attendance:

The seminar will be held in person. Hybrid attendance is possible (and recommended if you are not feeling well!).

- Preparation for the class:

Read the texts a few days in advance and more than once, giving yourself time to think about issues they raise and topics you want to discuss. On that basis, prepare 2-3 discussion points, which may include:

- (i) an elaboration and extension of a point in text you think could be pushed further that the text's author(s) did,
- (ii) a flaw in one of the arguments or a counterexample to one of the statements made in the text,
- (iii) a point in the text you do not understand, reason why you do not understand it, and possible ways to interpret the passage.

A short paragraph (approximately the length the description on page 1 of this document) for each talking point is a good length; longer than that is OK, but try not to go above one page total. Please send your talking points to me over email by Thursday evening in the week preceeding a given session. You might be asked to present your talking points during the seminar.

# PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES IN DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP

Radboud University, SEM 1 & 2, 2022/23, syllabus v. 0.1

---

<b>Instructor:</b>	Aleksandra Samonek	<b>Time:</b>	TBD
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:asamonek@protonmail.com">asamonek@protonmail.com</a>	<b>Place:</b>	Zoom & TBD

---

**Course Page:** TBD

**Office Hours:** TBD

**Description:** The main goal of this course is to examine problems which arise in the context of collective action, public governance, and technology. It will consist in two components. (1) Topics and discussion points which we will take on during our meetings, for which students will need to read the literature and materials provided in advance (up to 20 pages of text). (2) Practical component, where each student plans and executes a mini-experiment or a practical task related to the course.

## Tentative Course Outline:

I — Introduction. The Tools of Modern Digital Citizenship: fediverses, end-to-end encryption, online mobilization, and others

Format: Lecture

## BLOCK I — Justice of Access and Exclusion

II — Digitalization of social services: risks and benefits

Readings:

Tuikka, A. M. (2019). Evaluating Digitalization of Social Services from the Viewpoint of the Citizen. In Conference on e-Business, e-Services and e-Society (pp. 23-30). Springer, Cham.

Lindgren, I., Madsen, C. Ø., Hofmann, S., & Melin, U. (2019). Close encounters of the digital kind: A research agenda for the digitalization of public services. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(3), 427-436.

III — Balancing effectiveness and equal access in public services

Readings:

Ranchordás, S. (2022). The Digitization of Government and Digital Exclusion: Setting the Scene. In *The Rule of Law in Cyberspace* (pp. 125-148). Springer, Cham.

Guenther, J., Young, M., & Smede, B. (2022). Ameliorating Digital Inequalities in Remote Australia. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Social Problems* (pp. 1-21). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

IV — Citizens and the civil society as national security issue

Readings:

Mireanu, M. (2014). The criminalisation of environmental activism in Europe. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai-Sociologia*, 59(2), 87-103.

(fragments) Brückenhaus, D. (2017). *Policing Transnational Protest: Liberal Imperialism and the Surveillance of Anticolonialists in Europe, 1905-1945*. Oxford University Press.

Schlembach, R. (2018). Undercover policing and the spectre of 'domestic extremism': the covert surveillance of environmental activism in Britain. *Social Movement Studies*, 17(5), 491-506.

## V — Algorithmic bias and its impact on individual well-being

Readings:

Thiem, A., Mkrtchyan, L., Haesebrouck, T., & Sanchez, D. (2020). Algorithmic bias in social research: A meta-analysis. *PloS One*, 15(6), e0233625.

Cowgill, B., & Tucker, C. E. (2019). Economics, fairness and algorithmic bias. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.

Johnson, G. M. (2021). Algorithmic bias: on the implicit biases of social technology. *Synthese*, 198(10), 9941-9961.

Lee, M. K. (2018). Understanding perception of algorithmic decisions: Fairness, trust, and emotion in response to algorithmic management. *Big Data & Society*, 5(1), 2053951718756684.

## BLOCK II — The Epistemology of News and Online Communication

### VI — The impact of media funding on information percolation and content of news

Readings:

Bajić, D., & Zweers, W. (2020). *Declining media freedom and biased reporting on foreign actors in Serbia*. The Hague: Clingendael Report, European Policy Center.

Nyarko, J., & Teer-Tomaselli, R. E. (2018). The interface between media funding and agenda setting: The conduit for media independence. *Journal of Creative Communications*, 13(1), 34-53.

Cantero Gamito, M. *The European Media Freedom Act (Emfa) as Meta-Regulation*. Available at SSRN 4137170.

### VII — Institutionalized media *vs* citizen reporting: which is closer to the truth?

Readings:

Mutsvairo, B., & Salgado, S. (2022). Is citizen journalism dead? An examination of recent developments in the field. *Journalism*, 23(2), 354-371.

(fragments) Coe, P. (2021). *Media freedom in the age of citizen journalism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

### VIII — Are Twitter news to be trusted? Information sourcing in the age of digital media

Readings:

Sterrett, D., Malato, D., Benz, J., Kantor, L., Tompson, T., Rosenstiel, T., & Loker, K., and others (2019). Who shared it?: Deciding what news to trust on social media. *Digital journalism*, 7(6), 783-801.

Luo, Y. F., Yang, S. C., & Kang, S. (2022). New media literacy and news trustworthiness: An application of importance-performance analysis. *Computers & Education*, 185, 104529.

Zervopoulos, A., Alvanou, A. G., Bezas, K., Papamichail, A., Maragoudakis, M., & Kermanidis, K. (2022). Deep learning for fake news detection on Twitter regarding the 2019 Hong Kong protests. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 34(2), 969-982.



Xu, W., & Sasahara, K. (2022). Characterizing the roles of bots on Twitter during the COVID-19 infodemic. *Journal of computational social science*, 5(1), 591-609.

## IX — What is misinformation? How to combat it?

### Readings:

van der Linden, S. (2022). Misinformation: susceptibility, spread, and interventions to immunize the public. *Nature Medicine*, 28(3), 460-467.

Ecker, U. K., Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Schmid, P., Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N., & Amazeen, M. A., and others (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(1), 13-29.

Morosoli, S., Van Aelst, P., Humprecht, E., Staender, A., & Esser, F. (2022). Identifying the Drivers Behind the Dissemination of Online Misinformation: A Study on Political Attitudes and Individual Characteristics in the Context of Engaging With Misinformation on Social Media. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 00027642221118300.

## X — Creating trustworthy news feeds and verifying news sources

### Readings:

Ünal, Y., Şencan, İ., & Kurbanoglu, S. (2022). News Consumption and Sharing Behaviors of Individuals in the Post-truth Era. In *European Conference on Information Literacy* (pp. 16-28). Springer, Cham.

Zeng, H. K., Wu, T. Y., & Atkin, D. J. (2022). Check the Report and Comments: The Veracity Assessment of Unfamiliar News on Social Media. *Digital Journalism*, 1-20.

Folkvord, F., Snelting, F., Anschutz, D., Hartmann, T., Theben, A., Gunderson, L., & Lupiáñez-Villanueva, F., and others (2022). Effect of Source Type and Protective Message on the Critical Evaluation of News Messages on Facebook: Randomized Controlled Trial in the Netherlands. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 24(3), e27945.

Brookes, S., & Waller, L. (2022). Communities of practice in the production and resourcing of fact-checking. *Journalism*, 14648849221078465.

## BLOCK III — Participation, Digital Literacy and Governance

## XI — Transparency in digital media *vs* public accountability

### Readings:

(fragments) Csanádi, M., Gerő, M., Hajdu, M., Kovách, I., Tóth, I. J., & Laki, M. (2022). Dynamics of an Authoritarian System: Hungary, 2010–2021. Central European University Press.

Saeed, G., Kohler, J. C., Cuomo, R. E., & Mackey, T. K. (2022). A systematic review of digital technology and innovation and its potential to address anti-corruption, transparency, and accountability in the pharmaceutical supply chain. *Expert Opinion on Drug Safety*, 21(8), 1061-1088.

## XII — Digital literacy and political attitudes: is there a "democratic dividend" from digital education?

## Readings:

Moon, S. J., & Bai, S. Y. (2020). Components of digital literacy as predictors of youth civic engagement and the role of social media news attention: the case of Korea. *Journal of Children and Media*, 14(4), 458-474.

King, K. (2019). Education, digital literacy and democracy: the case of Britain's proposed 'exit' from the European Union (Brexit). *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(2), 285-294.

(fragments) Polizzi, G. (2020). Information literacy in the digital age: why critical digital literacy matters for democracy. *Informed Societies*, Chapter 1.

## XIII — Digital democracy and online participation

## Readings:

Lutz, C., Hoffmann, C. P., & Meckel, M. (2014). Beyond just politics: A systematic literature review of online participation. *First Monday*, 19(7), 1-36.

Hargittai, E., & Jennrich, K. (2016). The online participation divide. In *The communication crisis in America, and how to fix it* (pp. 199-213). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Saglie, J., & Vabo, S. I. (2009). Size and e-democracy: online participation in Norwegian local politics. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 32(4), 382-401.

(fragments) Vaccari, C., & Valeriani, A. (2021). *Outside the bubble: Social media and political participation in Western democracies*. Oxford University Press.

XIV — Digital participation *vs* social inequalities

## Readings:

Grasso, M., & Giugni, M. (2022). Intra-generational inequalities in young people's political participation in Europe: The impact of social class on youth political engagement. *Politics*, 42(1), 13-38.

Wang, L. (2022). Race, social media news use, and political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 19(1), 83-97.

Einstein, K. L., Glick, D., Godinez Puig, L., & Palmer, M. (2022). Still Muted: The Limited Participatory Democracy of Zoom Public Meetings. *Urban Affairs Review*, 10780874211070494.

Helsper, E. (2021). The digital disconnect: The social causes and consequences of digital inequalities. *The Digital Disconnect*, 1-232.

## XV — Equal access in digital education

## Readings:

Crompton, H., Chigona, A., Jordan, K., Myers, C. (2021). Inequalities in Girls' Learning Opportunities via EdTech: Addressing the Challenge of Covid-19. (Working Paper 31). EdTech Hub. 10.5281/zenodo.4917252. <https://docs.edtechhub.org/lib/D6PWC4I>

Yazcayir, G., & Gurgur, H. (2021). Students with Special Needs in Digital Classrooms during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Turkey. *Pedagogical Research*, 6(1).

Blikstad-Balas, M., Roe, A., Dalland, C. P., & Klette, K. (2022). Homeschooling in Norway during the pandemic-digital learning with unequal access to qualified help at home and unequal learning opportunities provided by the school. In *Primary and secondary education during Covid-19* (pp. 177-201). Springer, Cham.

**Course Credit and Workload:**

- Practical component:

Students can pick one practical assignment from a list provided before the course or propose their own assignment after consulting the instructor. The assignment should have to do with one of the topics which we discuss during the course.

The topic proposal should be accepted by the instructor by the time we finish block 1, that is, before class VI. It should be submitted before class X, unless a special timeline is needed to perform the activity. In the latter case, the timeline should also be accepted by the end of block 1.

- Attendance:

The seminar will be held in person. Hybrid attendance is possible (and recommended if you are not feeling well!).

- Preparation for the class:

Read the texts a few days in advance and more than once, giving yourself time to think about issues they raise and topics you want to discuss. On that basis, prepare 2-3 discussion points, which may include:

- (i) an elaboration and extension of a point in text you think could be pushed further that the text's author(s) did,
- (ii) a flaw in one of the arguments or a counterexample to one of the statements made in the text,
- (iii) a point in the text you do not understand, reason why you do not understand it, and possible ways to interpret the passage.

A short paragraph (approximately the length the description on page 1 of this document) for each talking point is a good length; longer than that is OK, but try not to go above one page total. Please send your talking points to me over email by Thursday evening in the week preceeding a given session. You might be asked to present your talking points during the seminar.

# DEMOCRACY AND POLITICAL PRIVACY

Radboud University, SEM 1 & 2, 2022/23, syllabus v. 0.1

---

<b>Instructor:</b>	Aleksandra Samonek	<b>Time:</b>	TBD
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:asamonek@protonmail.com">asamonek@protonmail.com</a>	<b>Place:</b>	Zoom & TBD

---

**Course Page:** TBD

**Office Hours:** TBD

**Description:** This course focuses on issues related to mass surveillance and its impact on democratic rule, as well as the ways which citizens use to counter the democratic deficit caused by surveillance. It will consist in two components. (1) Topics and discussion points which we will take on during our meetings, for which students will need to read the literature and materials provided in advance (up to 20 pages of text). (2) Practical component, where each student plans and executes a mini-experiment or a practical task related to the course.

## Tentative Course Outline:

I — Introduction. What is political privacy and how it conditions democracy

Format: Lecture

## BLOCK I — Political Privacy, Surveillance and Public Security in Non-Democracies

II — Three paradigms of privacy protection and surveillance: the EU, the USA and China: how are non-democracies different?

Readings:

Samonek, A. (forthcoming) Three Models of Privacy Protection: the USA, China and the EU, and Their Approach to Mass Surveillance.

Aho, B., & Duffield, R. (2020). Beyond surveillance capitalism: Privacy, regulation and big data in Europe and China. *Economy and Society*, 49(2), 187-212.

III — The role of oversight in modern day genocide

Readings:

Turkel, N. (2022). High-Tech Surveillance for Religious Persecution: Technology Enabled and Facilitated Uyghur Genocide in China. *Notre Dame L. Rev. Reflection*, 97, 310.

(fragments) Tyner, J. A. (2018). *The Politics of Lists: Bureaucracy and Genocide under the Khmer Rouge*. West Virginia University Press.

Clarke, M. (2021). Settler Colonialism and the Path toward Cultural Genocide in Xinjiang. *Global Responsibility to Protect*, 13(1), 9-19.

IV — Surveillance and authoritarianism

Readings:

Beydoun, K. A. (2022). The New State of Surveillance: Societies of Subjugation. *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.*, 79, 769.

Polyakova, A., & Meserole, C. (2019). Exporting digital authoritarianism: The Russian and Chinese models. Policy Brief, Democracy and Disorder Series (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2019), 1-22.

## V — Surveillance capital and authoritarian rule

Readings:

Wood, D. M. (2017). The global turn to authoritarianism and after. *Surveillance & Society*, 15(3/4), 357-370.

Huang, J., & Tsai, K. S. (2022). Securing Authoritarian Capitalism in the Digital Age: The Political Economy of Surveillance in China. *The China Journal*, 88(1), 000-000.

Wheelehan, Nora Mahon, "Make Orwell Fiction Again: Authoritarian Regimes' Use of Surveillance Technology in China and Russia" (2019). Senior Theses. 28. [https://research.library.fordham.edu/international\\_senior/28](https://research.library.fordham.edu/international_senior/28)

## BLOCK II — Political Privacy, Surveillance Capitalism, and Public Security

### VI — The role of surveillance capital in democratic decline

(fragments) Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power: Barack Obama's books of 2019. Profile books.

Zuboff, S. (2019). Surveillance capitalism and the challenge of collective action. In *New labor forum* (Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 10-29). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cinnamon, J. (2017). Social injustice in surveillance capitalism. *Surveillance & Society*, 15(5), 609-625.

### VII — Is the privacy *vs* security trade-off real?

Friedewald, M., Burgess, J. P., Čas, J., Bellanova, R., & Peissl, W. (2017). Surveillance, privacy and security. Taylor & Francis.

Strauß, S. (2017). A game of hide-and-seek?: Unscrambling the trade-off between privacy and security. In *Surveillance, Privacy and Security* (pp. 255-272). Routledge.

Talukder, S., Sakib, M., Islam, I., & Talukder, Z. (2020). Giving up privacy for security: A survey on privacy trade-off during pandemic emergency. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2007.04109.

### VIII — What are the costs and benefits of mass surveillance?

Readings:

Lichter, A., Löffler, M., & Siegloch, S. (2015). The economic costs of mass surveillance: Insights from Stasi spying in East Germany (No. 9245). IZA Discussion Papers.

Parra-Arnau, J., & Castelluccia, C. (2018). On the cost-effectiveness of mass surveillance. *IEEE Access*, 6, 46538-46557.

### IX — Surveillance spaces, security and perception of security

Readings:

(fragments) Bentham, J. (2011). *The Panopticon Writings*. Verso Books.

Koskela, H. (2003). 'Cam Era'—the contemporary urban Panopticon. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3), 292-313.

Marquez, X. (2012). Spaces of appearance and spaces of surveillance. *Polity*, 44(1), 6-31.

## X — Surveillance, sousveillance, and counter-surveillance

## Readings:

Fernback, J. (2013). Sousveillance: Communities of resistance to the surveillance environment. *Telematics and Informatics*, 30(1), 11-21.

Newell, B. (2020). Introduction: the state of sousveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 18(2), 257-261.

Huey, L., Walby, K., & Doyle, A. (2006). Cop watching in the downtown eastside: Exploring the use of (counter) surveillance as a tool of resistance. In *Surveillance and Security* (pp. 161-178). Routledge.

## BLOCK III — Political Privacy, Human Rights, and Democratic Principles

XI — Political privacy *vs* personal privacy

## Readings:

(fragments) Cohen, J. (2022). Privacy, Pluralism, and Democracy. In *Philosophy, Politics, Democracy* (pp. 303-325). Harvard University Press.

Samonek, A. (2021) How is Political Privacy Different from Personal Privacy? An Argument from Democratic Governance, *Diametros*, 18(70), 64-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33392/diam.1544>.

XII — Surveillance *vs* electoral freedom and voting independence

## Readings:

Papakyriakopoulos, O., Tesson, C., Narayanan, A., & Kshirsagar, M. (2022). How Algorithms Shape the Distribution of Political Advertising: Case Studies of Facebook, Google, and TikTok. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04720.

Singhal, D. (2022). How Electoral Bonds Open the Door for Legalizing Corruption in India?. *Supremo Amicus*, 28, 237.

Repucci, S., & Slipowitz, A. (2021). Democracy under siege. Freedom House. [https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/FIW2021\\_Abridged\\_03112021\\_FINAL.pdf](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/FIW2021_Abridged_03112021_FINAL.pdf)

Ahuja, A., & Chhibber, P. (2012). Why the poor vote in India: "If I don't vote, I am dead to the state". *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 47(4), 389-410.

XIII — Privacy protection *vs* data protection: case studies

## Readings:

Affonso Souza, C., César de Oliveira, C., Perrone, C., & Carneiro, G. (2021). From privacy to data protection: the road ahead for the Inter-American System of human rights. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 25(1), 147-177.

Zwitter, A., & Gstrein, O. J. (2020). Big data, privacy and COVID-19—learning from humanitarian expertise in data protection. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 5(1), 1-7.

## XIV — Privacy and human rights protection

## Readings:

Bygrave, L. A. (1998). Data protection pursuant to the right to privacy in human rights treaties. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 6(3), 247-284.

Hert, P. D. (2012). A human rights perspective on privacy and data protection impact assessments. In *Privacy impact assessment* (pp. 33-76). Springer, Dordrecht.

Joyce, D. (2015). Privacy in the digital era: Human rights online. *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, 16, 270.

## XV — Privacy and political activism

### Readings:

Michaelsen, M. (2017). Far away, so close: Transnational activism, digital surveillance and authoritarian control in Iran. *Surveillance & Society*, 15(3/4), 465-470.

Blum, F. (2021). African Political Activism in Postcolonial France: State Surveillance and Social Welfare by Gillian Glaes. *African Studies Review*, 64(4), E23-E25.

Castelli Gattinara, P., & Zamponi, L. (2020). Politicizing support and opposition to migration in France: the EU asylum policy crisis and direct social activism. *Journal of European integration*, 42(5), 625-641.

## Course Credit and Workload:

- Practical component:

Students can pick one practical assignment from a list provided before the course or propose their own assignment after consulting the instructor. The assignment should have to do with one of the topics which we discuss during the course.

The topic proposal should be accepted by the instructor by the time we finish block 1, that is, before class VI. It should be submitted before class X, unless a special timeline is needed to perform the activity. In the latter case, the timeline should also be accepted by the end of block 1.

- Attendance:

The seminar will be held in person. Hybrid attendance is possible (and recommended if you are not feeling well!).

- Preparation for the class:

Read the texts a few days in advance and more than once, giving yourself time to think about issues they raise and topics you want to discuss. On that basis, prepare 2-3 discussion points, which may include:

- (i) an elaboration and extension of a point in text you think could be pushed further that the text's author(s) did,
- (ii) a flaw in one of the arguments or a counterexample to one of the statements made in the text,
- (iii) a point in the text you do not understand, reason why you do not understand it, and possible ways to interpret the passage.

A short paragraph (approximately the length the description on page 1 of this document) for each talking point is a good length; longer than that is OK, but try not to go above one page

total. Please send your talking points to me over email by Thursday evening in the week preceeding a given session. You might be asked to present your talking points during the seminar.