

**Title**

The end of forgetting: Strategic agency beyond the Panopticon

**Authors**

Jonah Bossewitch

Communications Doctoral Program, Columbia University, USA

Aram Sinnreich

School of Communication and Information, Rutgers University, USA

**Abstract**

The rapid explosion of information technologies in recent years has contributed to a substantive change in the social dimensions of information sharing, and is forcing us to revise substantially our old assumptions regarding the knowledge/power dynamic. In this article, we discuss a range of strategic information-management options available to individuals and institutions in the networked society, and contrast these ‘blueprints’ to Foucault’s well-known Panopticon model. We organize these observations and analyses within a new conceptual framework based on the geometry of ‘information flux,’ or the premise that the net flow of information between an individual and a network is as relevant to power dynamics as the nature or volume of that information. Based on this geometrical model, we aim to develop a lexicon for the design, description, and critique of socio-technical systems.

**Keywords**

surveillance, privacy, transparency, sousveillance, panopticon, memory, new media, software studies, identity, quantified self

**Author Bios**

Jonah Bossewitch is a doctoral candidate in communications at Columbia University and a Technical Architect at the Columbia Center for New Media Teaching and Learning. He writes about surveillance and madness, and is investigating the politics of memory at the intersection of corruption in psychiatry and the pharmaceutical industry. He blogs at <http://alchemicalmusings.org>.

Aram Sinnreich is an Assistant Professor at the Rutgers University School of Communication and Information. His work centers on the power dynamics surrounding emerging cultures and technologies, and on the policies that regulate these fields. His website is <http://aram.sinnreich.com>.

**Corresponding Author:** Jonah Bossewitch, CNMTL, Columbia University, 505 Butler Library, 535 West 114<sup>th</sup> Street, New York, NY 10027, USA. Email: [jonah@ccnmtl.columbia.edu](mailto:jonah@ccnmtl.columbia.edu)

In recent years, the digitization and databasing of sociocultural information has led to a glut of data that upends traditional knowledge/power dynamics. Older models of structure and agency based on the presumption of informatic scarcity are giving way to newly emergent forms and practices centered around shaping the flow of information, influencing knowledge production mechanisms, and efficiently assimilating and exploiting oceans of data. In other words, social power is not only premised on what is concealed, it is increasingly constituted in the act of revelation, and in the methods by which we collect and reveal information to and about ourselves and others.

We have seen these new dynamics play out in a variety of highly publicized political and social events in recent years, from Iran's 'Twitter Revolution' of 2009 (Keller, 2010), to Wikileaks' 2010-11 publication of a quarter-million sensitive and classified diplomatic documents (Shane and Lehren, 2010), to the 'hacktivist' denial-of-service attacks (e.g. 'Operation Payback': Mackey, 2010) and document leaks (e.g. incriminating Bank of America emails: Rushe, 2011) undertaken by the group known as Anonymous (Coleman, 2011). In response to these kinds of informatic assaults on previously secretive institutions, some have hardened security and attempted to tighten their perimeters (Zureik and Salter, 2005), while others have adopted a strategy of 'radical transparency' (Clemmitt, 2010), presumably in an effort both to capitalize on the distributed intelligence of today's networked information seekers, and to forestall such attacks.

These rapid shifts in the informatic practices of organizations and institutions in the network society are forcing social actors and theorists to reevaluate their traditional understanding of the knowledge/power dynamic, and to rethink the role that information plays in the sociopolitical sphere (Lyon, 2007). In short, our society requires new models of communication that capture the contours and trade-offs of informatic transparency and opacity. To put it another way, Foucault's (1995)

metaphor of the panopticon, though still relevant (Elmer, 2003), needs to be supplemented with a wider range of architectural blueprints.

This article attempts to provide such a set of blueprints, disentangling the related discourses surrounding transparency, privacy, and surveillance by introducing the concept of ‘information flux.’ The resulting models provide us with the concepts and language to conduct a more productive debate over the struggles to control information flows, and to better understand the personal, social, and cultural implications of these outcomes. Although the authors name these blueprints according to the abstract sociographic heuristics we have developed to represent them (e.g. ‘Black Hole,’ ‘Promiscuous Broadcaster’), we also relate them to a range of actual and theoretical cultural practices (e.g. the ‘quantified self’ movement, face painting) in order to demonstrate their concrete relevance and applicability.

Thus, the authors aim to articulate a space of behavioral possibilities that encompasses the broad spectrum of communicative choices available in an era we describe as ‘The End of Forgetting.’<sup>1</sup> These possibilities are not merely descriptive but strategic in nature, and are calculated to provide both scholars and activists with a lexicon to demonstrate the range of options that now exist for all individuals and institutions throughout the networked society. Awareness is a precondition for action, and in this article the authors aim to demonstrate how our theoretical abstractions are useful for analyzing communicative behaviors, situating these behaviors within a range of possible choices and contexts, and in turn, providing a context for deliberate action. We believe that, in the face of the communication infrastructure’s increasing scope and complexity, individuals will require simple and effective models of participation to avoid paralysis and to catalyze strategic agency.

### **The End of Forgetting**

Remembering has always been a primary function of media, dating back to the invention of the alphabet and writing (Plato, 1999). Software is especially good at this function, and the digital era can be understood as the cultural absorption of a general technique for representing data *and processes* in a manner that can be stored, retrieved, and reproduced. Although the challenges of long-term digital preservation are formidable, purging digital records is an effort which can actually cost more than it saves (Mayer-Schonberger, 2009). Unlike matter or energy, information does not obey any conservation laws; it can be shuffled around and duplicated freely without affecting the original (Barlow, 1996; Siegfried, 2000). Thus, with duplication, transmission, and storage costs approaching zero, tracking down and deleting information that has already been released to the world at large can be a Sisyphean effort.

The relationship between recent social trends in surveillance and transparency and the concomitant improvements in the technologies of representation, storage, and access is undoubtedly complex. Attempts to establish fixed causal relations between cultural practices and their technological counterparts are often challenging, as these categories ultimately represent different aspects of unified phenomena (Bijker, 2001). For instance, dramatic improvements in record keeping can be correlated with dramatic shifts in the rate and volume of information flow. Yet the direction, quality and volume of these flows clearly suggest profound implications for power dynamics on both interpersonal and macro-social scales.

Increasingly, machines function as cognitive prostheses, and communication media inch ever closer to approximating the phenomenology of lived experience. Records continue to extend, evoke, and replace our experience of memories and, in many ways, digital records are already more faithful than actual memory. Yet, unlike memories, records are effectively permanent, part of an ever-growing

archive (Gandy, 2006). But if the end of forgetting is upon us, we must also ask: Who is doing the remembering?

The political impact of these sociotechnical changes is becoming increasingly apparent, as various constituencies maneuver to increase the flow of information in their direction. Citizens and advocacy groups like the Sunlight Foundation are clamoring for more transparency in government and the private sector, even as it has been discouraged at times by the government itself (e.g. *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Secret Service* [Civ. Action No. 06-310; D.D.C.], a recent case in which the White House fought to keep visitor logs secret in the face of Freedom of Information requests). Governments and corporations continue to invest heavily in the apparatuses to surveil, analyze, predict, and influence the behavior of their citizens and customers (Mattelart, 2010). Repressive regimes around the world have operationalized these systems, in ways that pose grave new threats to activists and human rights (Morozov, 2011). Organizations of all kinds are clamoring for increased intra-network transparency in their communications, often at the expense of individual privacy.

Perhaps no segment of society has more thoroughly internalized these new dynamics than youth culture. Today, most young people (and an increasing number of adults) throughout networked society volunteer an ever-growing volume of personal data, from the mundane to the profound, using services such as Facebook, Foursquare, and Twitter. This behavior resembles transparency, but the asymmetrical control over the so-called ‘data exhaust’ is cause for concern. Though boyd and Hargittai (2010) have shown that ‘the majority of young adult users of Facebook are engaged with managing their privacy settings on the site at least to some extent’ (n.p.), the scope and functionality of these privacy settings is limited, unclear, and frequently revised. And, with lawmakers and consumer advocates clamoring for federal oversight of Facebook’s consumer tracking practices (ElBoghdady and Tsukayama, 2011), there

is little question that the power dynamic over personal data and information continues to place an ever greater degree of control in the hands of marketers and aggregators.

Aside from the obvious concerns this development poses regarding privacy and exploitation, it also raises the spectre of a deeper, ontological crisis. Historically, members of our society have taken for granted that we know more about our lives than any third party possibly could, and this knowledge has been vital to our sense of ourselves. The fact that digital databases can now tell volumes more about us than we know about ourselves suggests that the very process of identity-construction is in distress (Yesil, 2005).

### **Information Flux**

These competing flows of information exchange are happening within a rapidly changing social context. While individuals, communities, and institutions negotiate the directional flows of information, the sheer amount of information being exchanged continues to escalate. The vast number of records that are being collected, correlated, and analyzed will have a strong impact on personal and organizational identity, irrespective of the net direction of information flow. However, while the rise in informatic volume seems increasingly inevitable, the net direction of its flow remains to be decided. This open question—who is doing the remembering?—is an essential component of the emerging knowledge/power dynamics.

The physical sciences make frequent use of a measurement known as flux: the rate of flow of ‘stuff’ passing through a given surface. The flow of particles, fluids, heat, and electro-magnetic fields can all be quantitatively described by this analysis, yielding valuable generalizations and predictions (Feynman, 1970). The description of this flow has a geometric representation that is useful for

imagining the logical space of possibilities. Many physical laws have been formulated based on the direction, rate, and net passage of stuff across the boundaries of the surfaces being studied (Maxwell, 1954; Newton, 1999).

This model, represented as information flux, may also be helpful for conceptualizing the shapes and qualities of emerging information societies. While the sheer quantity of information changing hands is certainly an important factor in understanding the current transformations, equally important are the relative rate at which various individuals send and receive information (Author, 2008), the gradient of the information flow, and whether the flux is outgoing or incoming.

Consider our 'personal information clouds' as metaphorical enclosing surfaces (Lamming, 1994). The information flux represents all the information that passes through this boundary. If current trends continue, we will soon face a reality in which data collection, storage, and analysis are ubiquitous and pervasive. However, these capacities are not likely to be evenly distributed and there are already major variations in the net flux of information and the capacity to derive meaning from it (Lyon, 1994; Mattelart, 2010; O'Harrow, 2005; Stanley and Steinhardt, 2003).

Simply put, regardless of the quantity or nature of the information being captured, information flows can be divided into three broad geometrical outcomes: a) Positive flux—you are leaking information, and others have access to more than you do, b) negative flux—you gather and retain more information than you emit, c) neutral flux—everyone has equal access to everyone else's information, a situation one could describe as a form of perfect transparency.

The terms 'positive' and 'negative' flux are not intended to be normative, or to signify any ethical or strategic value. By mathematical convention, *positive flux* leaves a closed surface, and *negative flux*

enters a closed surface. Positive information flux is not necessarily a bad thing, and negative information flux is not necessarily good. In some circumstances, leaking information can be benign or even desirable, provided the person absorbing the information can be trusted. As Nippert-Eng (2010) illustrates through rich and detailed ethnographies, sharing secrets and confidences is inherently social and often used to foster intimacy. Children have negative flux in relation to parents, patients in relation to doctors, sometimes students in relation to teachers. If these authorities have good intentions, these relationships can work well. Parents, teachers, and doctors can also be terribly dangerous if they have malicious or unethical intent. As a society, we try organizationally to restrain the power of such information-rich actors, as well as governments and corporations, in order to keep them honest and socially beneficial. Regulations such as FERPA (1974), HIPPA (1996), and COPPA (1998) are all policies intended to protect individuals by legislating control over information flux.

A corollary of this detailed and permanent history is an increasing ability to predict, foretell and manipulate future behavior (Gandy, 1993). Additionally, variations in the information flux and in the expertise and resources to analyze this information, will determine who has access to these predictions. One can also extend the fundamental unit of analysis from an individual to a community or an organization, and describe the information flux within and across the boundaries of these groups.

The information flux model is a reductionist approximation that intentionally disregards some crucial features in the production of identity and meaning, in order to draw attention to other features. The authors acknowledge that information is produced in context, not in a vacuum, and its meaning is derived from that context. Information is produced within a network, and the reduction of this flow to a two-body problem disregards the information that one node might provide about another to third parties. Information is not synonymous with knowledge, and inferences and interpretations do not flow

freely across personal boundaries. Information is not homogeneous or arbitrarily interchangeable, and some pieces of information are far more valuable or private than others. Finally, the value of any piece of information is also variable, as different actors may be looking for different patterns or opportunities. Like a turbulent airflow, the real-world dynamics of information flows are complex—far too complex to apprehend in full detail; hence the need for accessible models.

The information flux model is useful for capturing the contours of the dynamics of knowledge exchange, and provides a language for comparing, critiquing, and judging competing forms of communicative strategies. All theories obscure certain features of a phenomena, and make others more salient. The information flux model is intended to complement other frameworks for evaluating the ethics of information flows in a meaningful context (e.g. Nippert-Eng, 2010, and Nissenbaum, 2009). Especially alongside these thicker descriptions, this reductionist instrument is a useful heuristic for identifying and articulating taxonomies of behavioral alternatives to be evaluated within strategic contexts. The model helps to identify blind spots, as well as locate and imagine practices across the space of communicative possibilities. It helps us to contrast radical transparency with its alternatives based on differential access to information flows and computing resources. Furthermore, the information flux model is generative, and is a valuable tool for anticipating and designing future communications platforms. Leveraging the information flux model as a heuristic was vital to our construction of the following taxonomy of strategic blueprints.

### **Beyond the Panopticon**

The Panopticon is central to Foucault's (1995) analysis of the knowledge/power dynamic and is regularly invoked as a starting point in conversations about surveillance societies (Lyon, 2006). By using Jeremy Bentham's schematic for a self-surveilling prison as a metaphor for the institutional

exploitation of imbalanced informatic relationships across a range of social milieus, Foucault both legitimized the technique of architecture-as-argument and made visible a power dynamic that was at once universally intuited and unacknowledged.

Yet the range of informatic architectures has widened in the decades since *Discipline and Punish* was first published, and some new blueprints must be added to the arsenal. In the past few years, many neologisms have emerged that gesture at the limitations of the Panopticon model<sup>2</sup>, though a complete review of this literature is beyond the scope of this article. Rather than simply adding another term to the mix, the information flux model attempts to provide an overarching framework for situating the traditional Panopticon alongside its modern variations. Can we update the Panopticon by introducing 21<sup>st</sup>-century building materials? Can we extend the Panopticon's analytic utility by substituting glass and mirrors for its concrete and steel, and outfitting the building with closed-circuit television cameras? What might this family of blueprints look like?

Using the flux model, the authors aim to sketch the dimensions of a space of strategic action within this environment, on several levels, including individuals, communities, organizations, and states. Below, we describe some specific strategies and thought experiments that may help us to clarify the challenges and opportunities surrounding privacy and identity in an information rich society. These examples are not meant comprehensively to catalog the available strategies, but rather to highlight the diverse range of strategies available. These examples also demonstrate the flexibility and utility of the information flux model, and suggest a systematic agenda for future research.

### **Traditional Panopticon**

The traditional Panopticon describes a prison where the inmates are surveilled by their guards from above. The inmates know they are being watched, though they don't always know when, and their

behavior is controlled by the mere threat of being watched. This standard model of surveillance can be construed as a positive flux of information emanating from the individual outwards to the institutions of power (Figure 1). It doesn't adequately capture the nuances and complexities of multi-directional information flows, but it does correspond closely to Orwellian 'Big Brother' scenarios (Lyon, 1994; Orwell, 1961), which can no longer be considered either speculative or delusional. As the American Civil Liberties Union (Stanley and Steinhardt, 2003) and professional journalists (O'Harrow, 2005) have documented, these architectures are rapidly becoming realities, and must be met strategically by the surveilled population.

[Figure 1]

### **Sousveillance Society**

A flip in the polarity of flux described by the traditional Panopticon model occurs when the individual participants disrupt the power relation of the traditional Panopticon by collaborating to watch the watchers (Figure 2). *Sousveillance* is a term used to describe the recording of an activity from the first person perspective of a participant (Mann, Nolan, and Wellman, 2003). The prefix 'sous' is French for 'from below,' to contrast the 'sur'-veillance, from above. By participating in the surveillance processes (both as surveillant and object of surveillance) actively and transparently, individuals can both mediate and understand the personal information they are transacting, and mitigate the inequity of information flow by surveilling the institutions in return.

This is the strategy undertaken by the protagonists in Cory Doctorow's (2008) novel, *Little Brother*, in which a group of teenage computer hackers, building a virtual samizdat network between the XBOX game consoles in thousands of kids' bedrooms, document and expose the abuses of power

committed by the Department of Homeland Security after they have been unjustly detained and tortured in the wake of a terrorist attack. The power of sousveillance has appeared in the headlines, as well—as when the integrity of a parole officer was questioned by a defendant on the basis of the status updates he published on MySpace (Dwyer, 2009).

[Figure 2]

### **Total Transparency**

This theoretical and unrealizable model describes a world of total transparency in which every person and organization has equal access to one other's information (Figure 3). This corresponds to a neutral information flux, forecast in David Brin's (1999) *The Transparent Society*. This model postulates the end of privacy, but it fails to adequately account for the differential access to analytic processing power available to different individuals and organizations in making sense—and use—of this data.

This strategy is often touted as the solution to institutional corruption, as open government and transparency movements continue to gain momentum and traction.<sup>3</sup> The communications of US Presidents must be made available to the public according to the Presidential Records Act of 1974. Similarly, US Federal court proceedings, including depositions, evidence, arguments, and rulings must be published in a manner accessible to the public without anyone having to request them, except when the court decides there is a good reason for the records to be sealed.

In the past few decades public policy has shifted from a focus on regulating specific institutional behaviors, towards focusing on broader ethics, such as transparency. For instance, although the FDA doesn't necessarily require that food manufactures use or ban certain ingredients, it does require them to add ingredient information to their packaging with the exception that better informed consumers will influence corporate behavior through their purchasing decisions (Graham,

2002). Some have placed great faith in the power of transparency to improve accountability and, in turn, to exert market pressure on institutional behavior. However, the success of these transparent systems hinges greatly on the details of their design.

[Figure 3]

### **Off the Grid**

The ‘off the grid’ strategy describes efforts to disappear as thoroughly as possible from the information exchange, and to reduce information flux to zero (Figure 4). For the individual, this strategy is enacted by actually disengaging from the telecommunications network, or by encrypting and obscuring the information one transacts, and by refusing to use credit cards, mobile phones, ATMs, or any of the myriad points of surveillance one now encounters in daily life. For instance, Theodore Kaczynski, the infamous ‘unabomber,’ lived in a cabin without electricity or running water in an attempt to disengage from what he called the ‘industrial-technological system’ (‘FC’, 1995). Similarly, Gene Hackman’s character in the 1998 film *Enemy of the State* (Scott, 1998), an ex-NSA operative named Brill, exemplified the extreme of this strategy, living within a self-constructed copper Faraday cage to shield him from electromagnetic detection.

[Figure 4]

### **Black Hole**

The ‘black hole’ strategy describes attempts to collect and analyze as much information as possible from the outside, while leaking as little as possible (Figure 5). As profiled in the Washington Post’s three-part investigative series ‘Top Secret America’ (2010), several US intelligence organizations embody this strategy, as domestic eavesdropping programs track and analyze massive volumes of data and metadata. Corporations like Google, Inc. and Facebook, Inc. have also built their empires around

this strategy (Andrejevic, 2007), underscoring an important point. What constitutes a leakage to users of these sites supports the exploitative black hole strategies of the service providers. One nodes's 'promiscuous broadcasting' is fodder for another's 'black hole.'

[Figure 5]

### **Promiscuous Broadcaster**

The 'promiscuous broadcaster' strategy can be practiced non-strategically or strategically depending on the actor's awareness and beliefs. It is similar to total transparency, but does not require symmetrical exchanges of information (Figure 6).

Some individuals ignore the threats of surveillance completely, rationalizing that 'I've got nothing to hide, ergo nothing to worry about,' or convincing themselves that the benefits to one's security represented by increased surveillance outweigh the detriments to one's privacy. In today's networked interactive environments, these people are leaking volumes of data (positive information flux). Others may act more deliberately by retaining copies of the information they broadcast. An extreme example of this strategy is Hasan Elahi's 'tracking transience' project. Elahi, a media artist and Associate Professor at the University of Maryland, was erroneously added to the US government's terrorist watch list in 2002, targeted by the FBI and subject to months of intermittent interrogation. His response was to broadcast openly (and also to retain) all the details of his life in a proactive attempt to clear himself of any suspicion of wrongdoing associated with profiling based on his name and/or ethnic background (Thompson, 2007). Elahi makes it clear he views this strategy not as an acquiescence to power, but rather as an act of agency. In his words, 'in an era in which everything is archived and tracked, the best way to maintain privacy may be to give it up.' (Elahi, 2011).

Organizations and knowledge communities have also successfully adopted the promiscuous broadcaster strategy, both internally and with outsiders. Academics promiscuously broadcast

information in journals, directed at each other, but accessible to anyone. Open source communities often practice radical forms of promiscuous broadcasting, publishing the minutiae of their communications and decision making processes. In both cases these communications are more complex and varied than a think-tank's or a corporation's messaging. This communications strategy increases the accountability and knowledge sharing within the community, but may confuse outsiders who are ill equipped to make sense of these raw exchanges.

[Figure 6]

### **Voracious Collector**

The 'voracious collector' strategy involves maintaining a consistent negative information flux, but it differs from the 'black hole' strategy in not requiring the participant to go partially 'off the grid' (Figure 7). A good way to imagine how an individual might follow this strategy is to consider how the right software might support this practice. The BioPort (Biography Portal) is a piece of 'intension-ware' that we have described in technical detail elsewhere (Author, 2005). The basic idea for this software begins with a combination blog, diary, and appointment book—essentially, a tool for constructing your autobiography in real time. We can even imagine informational transaction capabilities: Just as we receive little yellow receipts at the completion of financial transactions, the BioPort could keep track of all exchanges with 'informational receipts.'

To make this fictional scenario more vivid, consider a thin slice of your BioPort—your nutritional history. While Corporations like Walmart and McDonald's might want to use such data to target you with lower-nutrition, higher-margin foods, you would be able to use the same data to make sure your nutritional needs were being met adequately within your budget. Ultimately, you could transact the data with food providers to negotiate the best balance between nutrition, taste and cost.

The technology would have ramifications for identity-building, as well. With the right suite of

visualization and analysis tools, the BioPort could become the ultimate psychoanalytic device—one which allows individuals to know themselves better by helping them identify and discern recurring behavioral and informatic patterns in their own lives. It could also transform social spaces, by allowing communities to come together and securely share slices of one another's BioPorts.

Although the BioPort only exists as a thought experiment today, there are projects that represent concrete moves in this direction. For instance, the emerging 'quantified self' movement brings together hobbyists who exchange techniques for collecting and analyzing their own personal data using tools such as the open-source Locker Project (Wolf, 2010).<sup>4</sup> Similarly, the Harvard Berkman Center has initiated a Vendor Relationship Management project that implements a flux reversal strategy to help consumers manage their relationships with corporations.<sup>5</sup>

[Figure 7]

### **Disinformation Campaigns**

Another strategy for managing the net flux of information is to propagate *disinformation*, thereby reducing the flow of *accurate* information outwards and producing a more negative flux overall (Figure 8). This strategy is familiar at the institutional level, in a variety of contexts from political propaganda to advertising campaigns to corporate 'astroturfing' (Beder, 1998; Bernays, 1928).

It also has begun to appear as a strategy for individuals to mitigate the threats of surveillance on social networks (Brunton and Nissenbaum, 2011; Marx, 2003). Face Painting is an underground collaborative game designed to resist the privacy threats that Facebook and other social networks pose. From the Urban Dictionary:

*Face Painting (also referred to as 'MySpin') is internet slang for the practice of sprinkling a social networking profile with embellishments, fantasy, and satire, often with humorous or*

*political intentions. Face painters play with the truthiness of identity by conducting a campaign of misinformation to protect their true identity.*<sup>6</sup>

This obfuscation strategy, though it may appear on the surface to be no more than a mischievous lark, has significant ramifications for information flux. By reintroducing chaos and noise back into the system, face painters protect their identities with a campaign of disinformation, and game the corporate profiling technologies with odd juxtapositions and preferences. These campaigns also aim to raise awareness around omniscient surveillance, and in particular to critique Facebook's problematic privacy policies. Face painters have assembled teams for scavenger hunts, recruiting the children of corporate executives to join oppositional causes (e.g. the child of an oil company executive to join an environmental campaign, or the child of a record company executive to join a campaign for progressive Intellectual Property reform).

Face painting won't significantly divert the torrential flow of information, but it does cleverly illustrate how individuals can reassert control over their digital footprint, and redirect the net information flux if they are aware of its significance.

[Figure 8]

### **Spaces of Action**

This preliminary catalog of communicative strategies gestures at the span of choices available to actors in an information-rich environment. The information flux model helps us to discover and situate these strategies in relation to each other. An understanding of this range of possibilities is essential for creating a basis for effective agency and resistance.

Individuals, communities and organizations have very similar options within this space. They can choose actively to receive or ignore the information that flows past them. If they collect the information, they can archive, index, and analyze it. They can choose to send or withhold information about themselves. The information they broadcast can be truthful or spoofed.

This spectrum of strategies defines a space of action with varying information flux characteristics. Different strategies offer several routes to achieving a desired value of information flux. For example, negative flux can be increased by voraciously collecting more information or by broadcasting more disinformation. A technology like the BioPort is one way to support individuals maintaining a negative information flux, and continue living in a society where the flow of information is centered around the individual. This social reality is distinctly different than a perfectly transparent society. Prevailing currents are steering the flow of information away from the individual into the waiting hands of those who would benefit from the control over their records and memories. However, one can imagine technologies and strategies to redirect the flow of information back around the individual and achieve more balance and control over our digital footprints.

## **Conclusion**

Freud (1980) postulated a depth model of psychology in which suppression, repression, and the ability to forget are vital aspects of our psychological makeup. These defense mechanisms, which allow individuals to maintain their sense of self, rely upon their ability selectively to recall and subconsciously to filter the personal narratives that are consistent with the reality they want to believe. An individual's ability to cope with trauma and stress depends upon the function of forgetting. The tight relationship between memory and identity has been a mainstay of philosophy and psychology for centuries (Freud, 1980; Locke, 1996; Parfit, 1986). This terrain is most often explored in fiction by

examining the ways in which *loss of memory* alters, compromises, or threatens personal and social identity (Gilliam, 1995; Gondry, 2004; Hitchcock, 1958; Lethem, 2000; Marke, 1962; Nolan, 2000; Scott, 1998; Verhoeven, 1990). Yet depictions of *permanent memory* are far less common, with some notable exceptions (Borges, 2007; Brin, 1999; Clarke, 2009; Linklater, 2006; Naim, 2005; Spielberg, 2002; Vinge, 2007). The personal and social consequences of permanent memory deserve broader and more in-depth examination through art, fiction, social theory and advocacy alike.

Perhaps more troubling than the prospect of memories that can't be filtered and don't dissipate, is the impact of pervasive surveillance on the social function of deception. Arguably, modern day society is founded on lies, ranging from niceties between friends and neighbors, to corporate advertising and marketing, to political spin, to the lies people tell themselves to bolster their confidence and support their identities (Frankfurt, 2005; Goffman, 1997). Pervasive surveillance threatens to rip apart the fabric of constructive deception that currently weaves together individuals, social groups, and nations. The psychological and small-scale social effects of this dynamic can be seen in recent documentaries such as *We Live in Public* (2009) and *Catfish* (2010), and is detailed in the ethnographies gathered in Nippert-Eng's (2010) 'Islands of Privacy'.

The net flux of information flowing into and out of individuals, communities and institutions will have a significant impact upon the emerging models for network society. Depending upon whether the net information flux is negative, positive, or neutral, one can see dramatic shifts in the balance of knowledge and power that exists between citizens and governments, consumers and corporations, and even individuals and others.

A positive flux of information from institutions of power to individuals may improve social equality and individual agency by providing accountable checks and balances through distributed

oversight. However, the design of these information systems is complicated by the details of representation, storage, and access, which can undermine and thwart these balancing forces. Furthermore, reasserting the right to privacy, and even anonymity, may be a central component in sealing the personal information leaks that are distorting the balance in information flux, thereby providing a platform for democratic governance and social equality within an information society.

The exponential growth in the volume of data produced by individuals and institutions shows no signs of abating. The net direction of these informatic flows is hotly contested and continually renegotiated. Just as Gary Marx (2003) cataloged a range of behavioral techniques to neutralize and subvert the collection of personal information, this article catalogs a range of information collection and dissemination strategies that various actors can adopt to purposefully manage their information flows. This catalog is intended to be generative, and can be used to group and apply strategies that might not otherwise be obvious. Using the model the authors have set forth, we can systematically describe and compare informatic strategies and more easily identify tools to support them. For example, we can now describe categorically how the TrackMeNot browser plugin (Howe and Nissenbaum, 2009) enacts and reflects a disinformation strategy (Brunton and Nissenbaum, 2011), and thereby evaluate the strategic benefits of search query logging and spoofing relative to other practices of disclosure and obscurity.

The reductionist information flux model can also play a role in evaluating and gauging the impact of a new technology, and help actors to identify and configure tools to match that match their intentions. One of the central challenges in formulating a privacy strategy is paralysis in the face of overwhelming complexity (Barocas and Nissenbaum, 2009). As legislators, corporations, and activists work towards clarifying privacy policies, every party will benefit from a clear and standardized lexicon

for describing what information is being collected and analyzed, and by whom. Information flux is a critical element of these policies, and our model can play a vital role in formulating such a lexicon.

As networked memory and processing become increasingly central to social architecture, and information flux becomes increasingly vital to power dynamics, the authors have no doubt that a new cultural lexicon will emerge organically to describe the range of strategic options available to actors and institutions seeking to exploit the flow of information to their benefit. In time, these concepts may become second nature to everyone, yet another fact of life in networked society. In the meantime, the authors are confident that the framework we have laid out in this article will provide a useful context for future discussions and analyses by providing a lexicon that enables comparisons across disparate theories and examples, and a heuristic for critique and design.

## References

- Andrejevic M (2007) *iSpy: Surveillance and Power in the Interactive Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Barocas S and Nissenbaum H (2009) On notice: The trouble with notice and consent. Proceedings of the engaging data forum at The First International Forum on the Application and Management of Personal Electronic Information, Cambridge, MA.
- Barlow JP (1996) Selling wine without bottles on the global net: The economy of mind on the global net. In: Ludlow P (ed.) *High Noon on the Electronic Frontier: Conceptual Issues in Cyberspace*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Beder S (1998) “Public relations” role in manufacturing artificial grass roots coalitions’. *Public Relations Quarterly* 43(2): 21-23.
- Bernays E (1928) Manipulating public opinion: The why and the how, *American Journal of Sociology* 33(6): 958-971.
- Bijker W (2001) Social construction of technology. In: Smelser NJ and Baltes PB (eds) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Oxford, Amsterdam, etc.: Elsevier Science Ltd, 15522-15527.
- Borges JL (2007) *Labyrinths: selected stories & other writings*. New York: New Directions Publishing.
- boyd d and Hargittai E (2010) Facebook privacy settings: Who cares? *First Monday*, 15(8)  
<http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3086/2589>
- Author. (2005).
- Brin D (1999) *The Transparent Society: Will Technology Force Us to Choose Between Privacy and Freedom?* New York: Basic Books.
- Brunton F and Nissenbaum H (2011) Vernacular resistance to data collection and analysis: A political

theory of obfuscation. *First Monday* 16(5) (accessed 15 June 2011)

<http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3493/2955>

The Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (COPPA) (Pub.L. 105-277, 112 Stat. 2581-728) (21 October 1998).

Clarke AC and Baxter S (2000) *The Light of Other Days* (1st ed). New York: Tor Books.

Clem RL and Haganir RL (2010) Calcium-permeable AMPA receptor dynamics mediate fear memory erasure. *Science* 330: 1108-1112.

Clemmitt M (2010) Social networking: Are online social networks eroding privacy? *CQ Researcher* 20(32) (accessed 15 June 2011) <http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresrre2010091700>

Coleman G and Ralph M (2011) Is it a crime? The transgressive politics of hacking in Anonymous. *Social Text* (accessed 13 November 2011) <http://www.socialtextjournal.org/blog/2011/09/is-it-a-crime-the-transgressive-politics-of-hacking-in-anonymous.php>

Doctorow C (2010) *Little Brother*. New York: Tor Teen.

Dwyer J (2009) The officer who posted too much on MySpace. *The New York Times*, 11 March (accessed 15 June 2011) [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/11/nyregion/11about.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/11/nyregion/11about.html?_r=1)

Elahi HM (2011) You want to track me? Here You go, FBI. *The New York Times*, 29 October (accessed 31 October 2011) <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/30/opinion/sunday/giving-the-fbi-what-it-wants.html>

ElBoghdady D and Tsukayama H (2011) Facebook tracking prompts calls for FTC investigation. *The Washington Post* (accessed 30 September 2011) <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/facebook-tracking-prompts-calls-for-ftc->

[investigation/2011/09/29/gIQAVdsP8K\\_story.html](http://investigation/2011/09/29/gIQAVdsP8K_story.html)

Elmer G (2003) A diagram of panoptic surveillance. *New Media and Society* 5(2): 231-247.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99).

'F.C.' (1995) *The Unabomber Manifesto: Industrial Society & Its Future*. Jolly Roger Press.

Feynman RP (1970) *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Naim O (2005) *The Final Cut* [Motion picture] US: Lions Gate.

Foucault M (1995) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Frankfurt HG (2005) *On Bullshit*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Freud S (1980) *The Interpretation of Dreams*. New York: Avon Books.

Gandy O (1993) *The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Gandy O (2006) Data mining, surveillance and discrimination in the post 9/11 environment. In: Haggerty K and Ericson R (eds) *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gilliam T (Director) (2005) *12 Monkeys* [Motion picture]. US: Universal Studios.

Goffman E, Lemert, CC and Branaman A (1997) *The Goffman Reader*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gondry M (Director) (2004) *Eternal Sunshine Of The Spotless Mind* [Motion Picture]. US: Universal Studios.

Graham M (2002) *Democracy by Disclosure: The Rise of Technopopulism*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996 (P.L.104-191). (1996).

Hitchcock A (Director) (1958) *Vertigo* [Motion picture]. US: Universal Studios.

Howe D and Nissenbaum H (2009) TrackMeNot: Resisting surveillance in Web search. In: Kerr I, Cucock C, Steeves V (eds) *Lessons from the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy, and Identity in a Networked Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 23: 417-436.

Keller, J (2010) Evaluating Iran's Twitter revolution. *Atlantic*, 18 May, (accessed 15 June 2011)  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2010/06/evaluating-irans-twitter-revolution/58337/>

Lamming M and Flynn M (1994) Forget-me-not: Intimate computing in support of human memory. In: Proceedings of the '94 Symposium on Next Generation Human Interface, Toyko, Japan.

Lethem J (2000) *The Vintage Book of Amnesia: An Anthology of Writing on the Subject of Memory Loss*. New York: Vintage.

Linklater R (Director) (2006) *A Scanner Darkly* [Motion picture]. US: Warner Home Video.

Locke J (1996) *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Abridged. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub Co.

Lyon D (1994) *Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society* (1st ed.). Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.

Lyon D (2006) The search for surveillance theories. In: Lyon D (ed.) *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Lyon D (2007) *Surveillance Studies: An Overview* (1st ed.). London: Polity Press.

Marke C (Director) (1962) *La Jetee* [Motion picture]. US: Criterion Collection.

Mackey R (2010) 'Operation Payback' attacks Target MasterCard and PayPal sites to avenge WikiLeaks. *The New York Times*, 8 December, (accessed 15 June 2011)

<http://thelede.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/12/08/operation-payback-targets-mastercard-and-paypal-sites-to-avenge-wikileaks/>

Mann S, Nolan J and Wellman B (2003) Sousveillance: Inventing and using wearable computing devices for data collection in surveillance environments. *Surveillance and Society* 1(3): 331-355.

Marx G (2003) A tack in the shoe: Neutralizing and resisting the new surveillance. *Journal of Social Issues* 59(2): 369-390.

Mattelart A (2010) *The Globalization of Surveillance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Maxwell JC (1954) *Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism Vol. 1* 3rd ed. New York: Dover Publications.

Mayer-Schonberger V (2009) *Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in the Digital Age*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Morozov E (2011) *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Newton I (1999) *The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* 1st ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Nippert-Eng CE (2010) *Islands of Privacy*. Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press.

Nolan C (Director) (2001) *Memento* [Motion picture]. US: Sony Pictures.

O'Harrow R (2005) *No Place to Hide: Behind the Scenes of Our Emerging Surveillance Society*. New York: Free Press.

Orwell G (1961) *1984*. New York: New American Library.

Parfit D (1986) *Reasons and Persons*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Plato (1999) *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus*. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library.

Priest D and Arkin W. (2010). A hidden world, growing beyond control. *Washington Post*, 19 July (accessed 15 June 2011) <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/a-hidden-world-growing-beyond-control/>

Priest D and Arkin W (2010) National Security Inc. *Washington Post*, 20 July (accessed 15 June 2011) <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/national-security-inc/>

Priest D and Arkin W (2010) The secrets next door. *Washington Post*, 21 July (accessed 15, June 2011) <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/secrets-next-door/>

Rushe D (2011) Anonymous hackers release Bank of America emails. *The Guardian*, 14 March (accessed 15 June 2011) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2011/mar/14/anonymous-hackers-release-bank-america-emails>

Schulman A and Joost H (Director) (2010) *Catfish* [Motion picture]. US: Universal Pictures.

Scott T (Director) (1999) *Enemy of the State* [Motion picture]. US: Touchstone / Disney.

Shane S and Lehren AW (2010) Leaked cables offer raw look at U.S. diplomacy. *The New York Times*, 28 November (accessed 15 June 2011) <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/29/world/29cables.html>

Siegfried T (2000) *The Bit and the Pendulum: How the New Physics of Information is Revolutionizing Science* 1st ed. New York: Wiley.

Author (2008)

Spielberg S (Director) (2002) *Minority Report* [Motion picture]. US: Dreamworks Video.

Stanley J and Steinhardt B (2003) Bigger monster, weaker chains, the growth of an American surveillance society, ACLU Technology and Liberty Program, (accessed 15 June 2011) <http://www.aclu.org/technology-and-liberty/bigger-monster-weaker-chains-growth-american-surveillance-society>

Thompson C (2007) The visible man: An FBI target puts his whole life online. *Wired Magazine* 15(06), 22 May (accessed 15 June 2011) [http://www.wired.com/techbiz/people/magazine/15-](http://www.wired.com/techbiz/people/magazine/15-06/ps_transparency)

[06/ps\\_transparency](http://www.wired.com/techbiz/people/magazine/15-06/ps_transparency)

Verhoeven P (Director) (1990) *Total Recall* [Motion picture]. US: Tristar Pictures.

Vinge V (2007) *Rainbows End*. New York: Macmillan.


Timoner O (Director) (2009) *We Live In Public* [Motion picture]. US: Abramorama.

Wolf G (2010) The Data-Driven Life. *The New York Times*, 28 April (accessed 15 June 2011)

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/02/magazine/02self-measurement-t.html>

Yesil B (2005) *Blind spots: The social and cultural dimensions of video surveillance*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, New York University, NY.

Zureik E and Salter M (2005) *Global Surveillance and Policing*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.



*Figure 1: Panopticon*




Figure 4: Off the Grid




Figure 5.2.1.1.1.1.1




Figure 2. Double-headed Double-headed




Figure 7: Voracious Collector




Figure 9: Distortion



1 The authors would like to thank Eben Moglen, Todd Gitlin, Michael Schudson, Frank Moretti, Robbie McClintock, Nathan Graham and Gabriella Coleman for comments and inspiration.

Although we first introduced this term at the Media In Transition 6 Conference at MIT in 2009, *The New York Times Magazine* used it (apparently coincidentally) as the title of a 2010 article by Jeffrey Rosen on similar themes. The article is available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/25/magazine/25privacy-t2.html>.

2 See David Lyon, *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon And Beyond* (Willan Publishing (UK), 2006). E.g. **(1) Synopticon** - The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' Revisited MATHIESEN *Theoretical Criminology*.1997; 1: 215-234 **(2) Ban-opticon** - Bigo, Didier. 'The Birth of Ban-opticon : Detention of Foreigners in (il)liberal Regimes' *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Hilton Hawaiian Village, Honolulu, Hawaii*, Mar 05, 2005 <[http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p70735\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p70735_index.html)> **(3) Sousveillance** - Steve Mann, Jason Nolan and Barry Wellman. Equalize the relationship of surveillance by gathering more data on yourself than they have. 'Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Computing Devices for Data Collection in Surveillance Environments' in *Surveillance and Society*. **(4) Dataveillance** – Roger Clarke, 'Information Technology and Dataveillance', *Commun. ACM* 31,5 (May 1988) 498-512. <<http://www.rogerclarke.com/DV/CACM88.html>> **(5) Nonopticon** – Siva Vaidhyathan, 'Naked in the 'Nonopticon' Surveillance and marketing combine to strip away our privacy', *The Chronicle Review* Volume 54, Issue 23, Page B7 **(6) Netopticon** <<http://www.no-org.net/opticon/index.php?m=1>> **(7) Participatory Panopticon** - James Cascio, *Earth Witness*, *World changing* February 3, 2006, <<http://www.worldchanging.com/archives/004069.html>>. Special thanks to Elijah Saxon for helping to identify these usages.

3 For example, The Open Government Charity, <<http://opengovernment.org/>>, The Electronic Frontiers Transparency Initiative <<http://www.eff.org/issues/transparency>>, and the Sunlight Foundation <<http://www.sunlightfoundation.com>>.

4 <<http://lockerproject.org/>> (accessed 23 October, 2011).

5 <<http://projectvrm.net/>> (accessed 15 June 2011).

6 <<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=face+painting>> (accessed 15 June 2011).