

MPhil in Politics and International Studies
University of Cambridge

Communication Technology and Politics
2020-21 Lent Term

Course Organiser: Dr Sharath Srinivasan (ss919@cam.ac.uk)

Course Contributors: Luke Church (Computer Laboratory), Antoine Sander (CGHR, POLIS)

Drop in office hours: 4-5pm Wednesdays on Zoom (wait in waiting room; max 10 minutes unless no one waiting)

[Zoom link](#)

Meeting ID: 870 8930 7841

Passcode: 841841

Seminar times and locations:

1-3pm Wednesdays, starting on 27th January 2021 for 7 weeks.

Attendance at the seminars is required (attendance will be taken) and they will take place over Zoom. All attendees are expected to attend with video on. Etiquette for the seminar discussion will be discussed in the first seminar. Seminars will *not* be recorded unless previously arranged and with the written consent of all participants.

[Zoom link](#)

Meeting ID: 872 8415 2902

Passcode: 033823

Overview

The disruptive effects of the digital age for politics are incontrovertible, yet they arise out of a longer history of the relationship between communication technology and politics. From the development of writing, the invention of the printing press to social media, information and communication technologies have played an important role in political change. This module takes a historicised approach to the relationship between communication technology and politics to understand authority, power and political contestation in a digital age. The approach avoids presentism and exceptionalising transformations in our digital age as like nothing ever before, while also not underestimating the importance of recent upheavals in changing the actors, logics and practices of politics.

There is no shortage of contemporary scholarship, popular writing and reportage on the implications of digital technologies for politics: the impact of AI and algorithmic decision-making on bureaucratic and administrative power; the use and abuse of surveillance technologies in the time of COVID-19 and Black Lives Matter; bots, trolls, 'deep fakes', disinformation, conspiracy and distorted democracy; the international political economy of hyper-dominant technology companies and a new data colonialism; the commodification of the public realm and 'surveillance capitalism'; the importance of social media for protest and resistance from the 'Arab Spring' to Hong Kong; post-state imaginaries in an age of radical cyberlibertarians ... the list goes on. The module, however, only has seven weeks. So, it takes a step back and examines these currents alongside their historical antecedents organised around key selected themes in politics: the relationship between technology and politics; states and bureaucratic authority; colonialism,

empire and race; security and surveillance; capitalism and extraction; democracy and publics; protest and movement.

All along, we are taking up the essential question of politics, Lenin's "Who? Whom?" (who has power over whom?) and using a rich heritage of scholarship that has examined changes in when, for whom and how political power has historically manifested in and through information and communication technologies to situate our enquiry into changes in our digital age.

Learning Goals:

This course will explore current debates about the impact of digital technology on domestic and international politics and political economy. It will introduce students to a historicised understanding of the relationship between communication technology and politics through diverse disciplinary and empirical perspectives. It will develop foundations to critically interrogate current scholarship and public debate on digital technologies from these historical and analytical vantage points. The course will introduce students to empirical material from across the world and encourage students to expand their understanding through independent research and reading.

The course gives a strong emphasis to debate and critical discussion of texts in a spirit of openness, equality and constructive engagement. Students must devote considerable time and energy to read the assigned material in a careful and critical fashion, and make informed contributions in seminar discussions.

Readings

The syllabus is split into four categories. The first two are our compulsory readings for each seminar:

Antecedents: key text on the relationship between communication technology and politics (though not always explicitly) in history, both recent and distant.

Digital: specific texts addressing the theme in question in the context of digital communication technology

The third, *Currents*, lifts from the contemporary public discourse and provokes reflections on the here-and-now questions in our digital age. You may wish to start with one or more of these, but should not do so at the expense of the compulsory readings.

Finally, *Further*, are readings that you may wish to consult at your leisure or in the context of writing your course essay. Many more could be added, and some may be, during the course of the term.

Most readings are linked from this syllabus, either to iDiscover or related University of Cambridge linked sites (access with Raven login) or to copies of the texts on the OneDrive. The [OneDrive folder](#) with these texts and many others is worth consulting.

A few texts, such as Moore's *Democracy Hacked* are not yet online but consulted frequently, and so you might consider purchasing a copy. If you have any difficulties accessing texts, please let me know.

1. Communication technology and politics

What is technology? What counts as ‘communication technology’ and why are they important to politics? Does technology drive political change or do politics drive technological change? What is the history of that relationship? Why are these questions important in a digital age? How can we know whether the digital represents a radical break with preceding communication technology, or a continuation of these earlier developments? This session introduces some of the overarching questions concerning the relationship between technology and politics, which will help us establish the major axes on which the contemporary assessments of digital technology and politics turn.

Antecedents

Innis, H. (1951). *The Bias of Communication*. University of Toronto Press. pp. 33-60. (McLuhan’s teacher, an original expansive historical treatise, with attendant promise and peril)

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. MIT press. Introduction ‘[The Medium is the Message](#)’. (an early precis from the man with the message, our entry to many debates and interpretations since)

Postman, N. (1998). “[Five Things we Need to Know About Technological Change](#)”. Talk delivered in Denver Colorado March 28, 1998. (brisk, argumentative, urgent, from a public intellectual on media, culture and technology who never owned a computer, or a typewriter)

Winner, L. (1980). “[Do artifacts have politics?](#)” *Daedalus* 109(1), 121-136. (one thoughtful early take on the relationship between technology, broadly, and politics)

Beniger, J. R. (1986). *The control revolution: Technological and economic origins of the information society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Introduction](#), pp. 1-27. (our first encounter with ‘control’ as an analytical frame and the political economy of technology)

Digital

Barber, B. (1999). [Three Scenarios for the Future of Technology and Strong Democracy](#). *Political Science Quarterly* 113(4), 573-589 (a helpful text from the political mainstream, anticipating a digital age in its early years, that’s merely one possible starting point)

Currents

Helbing, D. *et al.* (2017). [Will Democracy Survive Big Data and Artificial Intelligence?](#) *Scientific American*

Bartlett, J. (2018). [How AI could kill off democracy](#). *New Statesman*.

Eby, M. (2020). [The Lost History of Socialism’s DIY Computer](#) *Jacobin*.

Further

Allen, M., & Hecht, G. (2001). Authority, Political Machines, and Technology's History. In, Allen, M., & Hecht, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Technologies of power: Essays in honor of Thomas Parke Hughes and Agatha Chipley Hughes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp1-23. [<https://book.ok.cc/book/955022/cd35ac>]

Hughes, T. P. (1983). *Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society, 1880-1930*. "Introduction" OR "Technological Momentum".

Heidegger, M. (1954). The question concerning technology. *Technology and values: Essential readings*, 99, 113.

Zimmerman, M. E. (1990). *Heidegger's confrontation with modernity: Technology, politics, and art*. Indiana University Press. Introduction

Derrida, J (1983). *Dissemination*. Plato's Pharmacy.

Lemmens, P. (2011). "This system does not produce pleasure anymore", an interview with Bernard Stiegler. *Krisis*, 1.

Latour, B. (1990). Technology is Society Made Durable. *Sociological Review, Monograph 38*, 103-132.

Ellul, J. (1962). The Technological Order. *Technology and Culture, Proceedings of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Conference on the Technological Order 3(4)*.

OR

Ellul, J. (1954). The Technological Society. Chapter 2: The Characterology of Technique, 64-148, Alfred A. Knopf.

Runciman, D. (2018). *How democracy ends*. Basic Books, esp. Ch. 3, 120-164.

McLuhan, M. (1961). *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. Prologue & "The Galaxy Reconfigured".

2. States and bureaucratic authority

Centralised authority, territorial governance, taxation, security and surveillance, nationalism, bureaucratic institutions, representation ... it is not difficult to read the story of communication technology in histories of state formation. From the relationship between the development of writing and the formation of early states, to libertarian “post-state” projects based on blockchain technology, communication technology has evolved alongside advances in patterns of rule and changes in the distribution of power. Bureaucratic institutions, which were both enabled by and shaped changing communication technologies and information ecologies, play a particularly important role in the rise of the modern state. Yet if information scarcity and control over the means of information collection and knowledge production characterise the ascendancy of the modern state, how does information abundance and networked logics of production change the logic of state authority – and the central place of states - in a digital world? Do digital technologies enhance the power of the state or on the contrary, erode it?

Antecedents

Scott, J. C. (2017). *Against the grain: a deep history of the earliest states*. Yale University Press, Introduction (for context), [especially Ch. 4, 139-149](#). (“writing makes states’: a rollicking read, as ever, from Scott, with an argument that invites critique, on purpose)

Weber, M. (2009). *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. Routledge. [Essay VIII: “Bureaucracy”](#); in particular, pp. 212-216: passages on technology, speed and bureaucracy. (crucial pages on information, communication and centralised bureaucratic authority from the pre-eminent theorist of the modern state)

Bimber, B. (2003). *Information and American Democracy: Technology in the Evolution of Political Power*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 1: Information and Political Change](#). (one, American, take on the role of information, and changes in information and its management/control, in the evolution of the democratic state)

Digital

Bimber, B. (2003). *Information and American Democracy: Technology in the Evolution of Political Power*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 3: The Fourth Information Revolution and Postbureaucratic Pluralism](#). (read in conjunction with Ch.1, an argument for what changes and does not when information is ‘abundant’)

Lessig, L. (2006). [Code 2.0](#). Basic Books. Chapter 1: Code is Law pp.1-8 (a constitutional lawyer’s brisk take on techno-libertarianism and its perils, and the state’s role to prevent it)

Moore, M. (2018). *Democracy Hacked: How Technology is Destabilising Global Politics*. Oneworld. Ch. 3 States: The Russia Model, and Ch. 7 Platform Democracy. (there are other types of state-tech configurations (and other non-state actors), so beware the presumptive liberal state lens)

Lucas, L. & Feng, E. (2018). [Inside China’s surveillance state](#). *Financial Times*. [free access to Cam students – sign in with CRS id]

Currents

Wainwright, O. (2020). [Seasteading – A Vanity Project for the Rich or the Future of Humanity?](#) *The Guardian*.

Chandler, S. (2018). [Bitnation, Liberland Puertopia and Other Micronations Are Gaining Independence via Crypto, but Crypto Alone May Not Be Enough](#). *Coin Telegraph*.

Further

Dematté, P. (1999). [The Role of Writing in the Process of State Formation in Late Neolithic China](#). *East and West*, 49(1/4), 241-272.

Biggs, M. (1999). [Putting the State on the Map: Cartography, Territory and European State Formation](#). *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 41(2), 374-405.

Harley, J. B. (1988). [Silences and Secrecy: The Hidden Agenda of Cartography in Early Modern Europe](#). *Imago Mundi*, 40, 57-76.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State*. Yale University Press, USA. Introduction.

Bovens M. & Zouridis, S. (2002). [From Street-Level to System-Level Bureaucracies: How Information and Communication Technology Is Transforming Administrative Discretion and Constitutional Control](#). *Public Administration Review* 62(2) pp. 174 -184.

Mueller, M. (2010). *Networks and States: The Global Politics of Internet Governance*. Introduction.

Gagliardone, I. (2014). [New media and the developmental state in Ethiopia](#). *African Affairs*, 113(451), 279-299.

Atzori, M. (2015). [Blockchain Technology and Decentralized Governance: Is the State Still Necessary?](#) SSRN

3. Colonialism and race

European colonialism and western imperialism were extractive projects yet not wholly or only reliant on brute force. Sandboxes for experimenting with new technologies of authority and the distinctly modern project of constructing knowledge as a means of managing power, colonialism and empire fused racial superiority with control of information and communications. The super-profits of global technology monopolies, the cross-border trade in data and racial profiling thus evoke comparisons, and they ask the question: in what ways are new digital empires being established on logics of empires past, and in what ways are they different? Is present day “digital colonialism” unipolar (US) or bi-polar (China & US) or supranational (Google, Facebook, Amazon etc)?

Antecedents

Cohn, B. S. (1996). *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press. <https://hdl-handle-net.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/2027/heb.01826>. Introduction, Ch 2 (a classic on the subject of the modalities of colonial rule that enacted classificatory knowledge, created social orderings and invited resistance)

Srinivasan, S., & Diepeveen, S. (2019). [Communication Technology and African Politics](#). *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press (a historical review of the politics-communication technology relationship from another colonised ‘world’, to inform accounts of post-colonial and digital eras)

McQuade, B I. (2013). [Review article: The Nineteenth Century Information Revolution and the Accomplishment of Rule: Information Infrastructures, Intelligence States, Colonial Discourses and Racial Knowledge](#). *Critical Sociology* 39(5), 781-90 (albeit a review article, a useful line of argument on the colonial intelligence state and the role of knowledge production and information technology)

Digital

Kwet, M. (2019). [Digital colonialism: US empire and the new imperialism in the Global South](#). *Race & Class*, 60(4), 3-26 (an explicit argument about (US) imperial power in a digital age from a South African vantage point)

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Introduction (a long but worthwhile read from a leading thinker on race and technology)

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press. [Introduction](#) & Ch. 1. (provocative, urgent and first-hand, has commanded widespread interest ... Intro is too short, Ch. 1 too long, so read briskly)

Currents

Lafrance, A. (2016). [Facebook and the New Colonialism](#). *The Atlantic*.

Further

Cohn, B. S., & Dirks, N. B. (1988). Beyond the fringe: the nation state, colonialism, and the technologies of power. *Journal of historical sociology*, 1(2), 224-229.

Shah, H. (2011). [*The production of modernization: Daniel Lerner, mass media, and the passing of traditional society*](#). Temple University Press. Chapter 1, "The Rise of Modernization Theory"

Aouragh M. & Chakravartty, P. (2016). [*Infrastructures of Empire: Towards a Critical Geopolitics of Media and Information Studies*](#). *Media, Culture & Society* 38(4)

Larkin, B. (2008). *Signal and Noise: Media, Infrastructure, and Urban Culture in Nigeria*. London: Duke University Press. Introduction and Chapter 1. [Online via Cambridge University Library](#).

Asseraf, A. (2019). *Electric news in colonial Algeria*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Benjamin, R. (ed). (2019). *Captivating technology: Race, carceral technoscience, and liberatory imagination in everyday life*. Duke University Press. [Introduction](#)

Purdeková, A. (2016). [*Mundane Sights of Power: The History of Social Monitoring and Its Subversion in Rwanda*](#). *African Studies Review* 59(2): 59-86

Breckenridge, K. (2005). [*The Biometric State: The Promise and Peril of Digital Government in the New South Africa*](#). *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 31:2, 267-282.

McCoy, A. (2009). *Policing America's Empire*. University of Wisconsin Press, USA. Introduction.

Schiller, H. (1976). Communication and Cultural Domination. *International Journal of Politics* 5(4), pp. 46-67: "The Technology of Cultural Domination".

4. Security and surveillance

Informational and communication technologies, and not just instruments of force, have been central to how centralised authority and modern states have sought to sustain a monopoly over coercion. Yet their role is far more complex than brute force because of how they mix coercion with consent. Communication power enables more efficient and targeted coercion, but it also enables regimes of truth, disciplinary authority and production of political subjectivities. As the volume, variety and speed of information expands in a digital age, surveillance and security logics have arguably become *the* frame through which contemporary politics and political economy is being understood. Are we seeing the decline of modern human agency and freedom? What are the implications for models of modern politics? What theoretical model best captures the current paradigm of digital surveillance (panopticon, control society, expository society, ...)?

Antecedents

Orwell, G. (1949). *1984*. Penguin. [Initial passages](#) (*but if you haven't read 1984, consider obtaining a copy and read on a bit more!*)

Foucault, M. (2012). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage. Chapter 3.3: Panopticism: pp. 213-228; pp. 243-248. (from Plague control to Bentham's architecture for disciplinary power ... seminal and salient today. Just focus on selected text; the pages in between are more historical and about the emergence of disciplines... less relevant for us, important for Foucault's wider project)

Lyon, D. (1994). *The electronic eye: The rise of surveillance society*. U of Minnesota Press. Ch.4 '[From Big Brother to the Electronic Panopticon](#)', pp. 57-80. (resonant and perceptive, for such an early text, sets a very good analytical scene)

Deleuze, G., & Joughin, M. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972-1990* (European perspectives). New York; Chichester: Columbia University Press. pp. 174-175, 177-182. (Optional! Not for the faint-hearted, but takes Foucault from discipline to control, from Bentham to the age of computers)

Digital

Harcourt, B. (2015). *Exposed: Desire and Disobedience in the Digital Age*. Harvard University Press. 'The Expository Society' (invites us to come full circle in this seminar) (*very optional for those with the latitude, see also: Part One, 'Clearing the Ground'; Part Four, 'Digital Disobedience'*)

Best, K. (2010). "[Living in the control society: Surveillance, users and digital screen technologies](#)" *International Journal of Cultural Studies*

King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. (2013). [How Censorship in China Allows Government Criticism but Silences Collective Expression](#). *American Political Science Review* 107(2). (the art of state surveillance from another vantage point)

Ansorge J. T. (2016). *Identify and Sort: How Digital Power Changed World Politics*. Oxford University Press. [Ch.4 'Technics and Towers'](#) (an attempt to find another Tower than Bentham's, to encapsulate our digital age)

Currents

Kwet, M. (2020). [The Microsoft Police State: Mass Surveillance, Facial Recognition, and the Azure Cloud](#), *The Intercept*, 14 July 2020

Singer, N. and Sang-Hun, C. (2020). [As coronavirus surveillance escalates, personal privacy plummets](#). *The New York Times*, 23 March 2020

Further

Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality TV: The work of being watched*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Virilio, P. (2005). *The information bomb*. Verso. Chapter 7.

Deibert, R., Palfrey, J., Rohozinski, R., & Zittrain, J. (2010). [Access controlled: The shaping of power, rights, and rule in cyberspace](#). MIT Press. Introduction.

Moore, M. (2018). *Democracy Hacked: How Technology is Destabilising Global Politics*. Oneworld. Ch. 3 States: The Russia Model, and Ch. 8 Surveillance Democracy

5. Capitalism and extraction

The crux of some of the biggest fears concerning our digital age is not simply the enormous accumulation of power (and wealth, but wealth here is power) in the hands of technology giants – the kind of power accumulation that previous communication technology barons, from railroad owners to telephone companies and media corporations also achieved – but the *means* of achieving it: namely, the surveillance and commodification of our everyday socio-political lives. How different is the digital age in this regard and does this difference matter? To what extent is the extractive logic of colonialism applicable/ equivalent to current data mining practices beyond geography, as Couldry & Mejias suggest?

Antecedents

Hobsbawm, E. (1975). *The Age of Capital*, Chapter 3: “The World Unified”, pp. 64-88.

Müller, S. M., & Tworek, H. J. (2015). [‘The telegraph and the bank’: on the interdependence of global communications and capitalism, 1866-1914](#). *Journal of Global History*, 10(2), 259.

Graeber, D. (2015). *The utopia of rules: On technology, stupidity, and the secret joys of bureaucracy*. Melville House. [Chapter 2: “Of Flying Cars and the Declining Rate of Profit”](#).

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Preface, [Chapter 3.4 ‘Postmodernization, of the Informization of Production’](#) pp. 280-303.

Digital

Fuchs, C. (2010). [Labor in Informational Capitalism and on the Internet](#). *The Information Society*, 26(3), 179-196.

Zuboff, S. (2018). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs. Introduction

Couldry, N. & Mejias U.A. (2019). [Data Colonialism: Rethinking Big Data’s Relation to the Contemporary Subject](#). *Television & New Media*. Vol. 20(4) 336–349

Morozov, E. [Digital Socialism? The Calculation Debate in the Age of Big Data](#). (2019). *The New Left Review*, v 116 May-June 2019.

Currents

Zuboff, S. (2020). [‘You Are Now Remotely Controlled’](#) *The New York Times*

Climate Home News (2017). [‘Tsunami of data’ could consume one fifth of global electricity by 2025](#). *The Guardian*.

Tufekci, Z. (2015). [Mark Zuckerberg, Let Me Pay for Facebook](#). *The New York Times*

Further

Poster, M. (2005). [Hardt & Negri's Information Empire: A Critical Response](#). *Cultural Politics: An International Journal*, 1(1), 101-118.

Berkhout, F., & Hertin, J. (2004). [De-materialising and re-materialising: digital technologies and the environment](#). *Futures*, 36(8), 903-920.

Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). [Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon](#). *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662-679.

Leonardi, P. M. (2010). [Digital materiality? How artifacts without matter, matter](#). *First Monday*.

Graham, M., Hjorth, I., and Lehdonvirta, V. (2017). "[Digital labour and development: impacts of global digital labour platforms and the gig economy on worker livelihoods](#)." *Transfer, The European Review of Labour and Research* 23, no. 2: 135–62.

Hess, M., and Coe, N. (2006). "[Making connections: Global production networks, standards, and embeddedness in the mobile-telecommunications industry](#)." *Environment and Planning A* 38: 1205-27.

Zuboff, S. (2015). [Big other: surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization](#). *Journal of Information Technology*, 30(1), 75-89.

Fuchs, C. *Digital Labour and Karl Marx*. See especially case studies.

6. Democracy and publics

Writing on American democracy, de Tocqueville wrote ‘[nothing but a newspaper can drop the same thought into a thousand minds at the same moment.](#)’ Perhaps nothing like the internet can drop continuously an infinite variety of thoughts into millions of minds at the same moment, but make each mind feel that they are having a conversation with their world. In a fast-paced decade, the lauding of ‘liberation technologies’ during the ‘Arab Spring’ has given way to grave fears of democracy’s epochal decline in a digital age. What has gone wrong and what might hold promise? By thinking on the role of communication technologies in the two fundamental forms of modern democratic politics - representative and participatory democracy - and how digital technology shapes each of them, we consider the proposition that without rethinking the meaning of public discussion and what enables and constrains it in our digital age, democracy is indeed imperilled.

Antecedents

de Tocqueville, A. [Democracy in America](#), vol 1. Introduction; Ch XI Liberty of the Press in the United States; * vol. 2. ‘[Of the Relation Between Public Associations and Newspapers](#)’.

Dewey, J. (2016 [1927]). [The public and its problems : An essay in political inquiry](#). Ch1 ‘Search for the Public’ and Ch4 ‘The Eclipse of the Public’.

Anderson, B. (2006). [Imagined Communities](#), Chapter 3.

Calhoun, C. J. (Ed.). (1992). [Habermas and the public sphere](#). MIT press. [Introduction](#).

Arendt, H. (1998 [1958]). [The Human Condition](#). The University of Chicago Press. Part II: The Public and the Private Realm, pp. 22-50 and Part VI The *Vita Activa* and the Modern Age, pp. 248-268.

Digital

Dahlgren, P. (2000). [The Public Sphere and the Net: Structure, Space, and Communication](#). In W. Bennett & R. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy*, pp. 33-55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511613852.003

Dean, J. (2001). “[Publicity’s Secret](#).” *Political Theory* 29:624-650.

OR Dean, J. (2008). “[Communicative Capitalism: Circulation and the Foreclosure of Politics](#).” In *Digital media and democracy: Tactics in hard times*, edited by M. Bolter (pp. 101-122). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [more direct and easier to read, but less conceptually nuanced]

Zuboff, S. (2018). [The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power](#). New York: Public Affairs. Conclusion

Dahlberg, L. (2011). [Re-constructing digital democracy: An outline of four ‘positions’](#) *New Media & Society*, 13(6), 855–872.

Moore, M. (2018). *Democracy Hacked: How Technology is Destabilising Global Politics*. Oneworld. Ch. 9 Democracy Rehacked

Currents

Pew Centre, Feb 2020. '[Many Tech Experts Say Digital Disruption Will Hurt Democracy](#)' (full report, read pp. 1-10), also [webpage walk through](#)

Morozov, E. (2015), [Socialize the Data Centres!](#), *New Left Review*.

'The real problem with fake news....': [Slavoj Zizek in RT's 'How to watch the news'](#), episode 03

Further

Wilhelm, A. G. (2000). [Democracy in the digital age: Challenges to political life in cyberspace](#). Psychology Press. Introduction and Chapter 1 'Cyberdemocracy's "Troubled and Frothy Surface"'

Runciman, D. (2017). [Political theory and real politics in the age of the internet](#). *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 25(1), 3-21.

Dahlberg, L., & Siapera, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Radical democracy and the Internet: Interrogating theory and practice*. Springer.

Barney, D. (2008). "[Politics and the Emerging Media: The Revenge of Publicity](#)." *Global Media Journal - Canadian Edition* 1, no. 1: 89-106.

Warner, M. (2002). [Publics and counterpublics](#). *Public culture*, 14(1), 49-90.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Broadway Books/Penguin. Ch. 10 'The Targeted Citizen'.

Howard, P. N. (2010). *The digital origins of dictatorship and democracy: Information technology and political Islam*. Oxford University Press.

Morozov on Howard, Howard on Morozov. (2011). *Perspectives on Politics*, pp. 895-900.

Nyabola, N., (2018). *Digital Democracy, Analogue Politics: How The Internet Era Is Transforming Kenya*, Zed Books, Introduction.

Karekwaivanane, G. (2018). "'Tapanduka Zvamuchese': Facebook, 'unruly publics', and Zimbabwean politics." *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 13, 1.

Zayani, Mohamed. (2015). *Networked Publics and Digital Contention: The Politics of Everyday Life in Tunisia*. New York: Oxford University Press.

On digital technologies and populism see 'Crosscurrents Special Section: Media and the Populist Moment' in *Media Culture, and society*, 40(5), 2018. in particular the essays by Gerbaudo and by Postill: <https://journals-sagepub-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/toc/mcsa/40/5>

Gounari, P. 2018. Authoritarianism, Discourse and Social Media: Trump as the 'American Agitator'. In: Morelock, J. (ed.) *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism*. London: University of Westminster Press., pp. 207-27

7. Protest and movement

Arising right at the same time as a seemingly inexorable rise in surveillance, extraction and the debilitation of democratic politics in our digital age is a surge in global protest and resistance movements: from Occupy, the ‘Arab Spring’ and Hong Kong to Black Lives Matter and global climate action. Yet surveillance technologies are also feared to be defeating these modes of resistance. We return, then, to Lenin’s ‘Who? Whom?’ question and how communication technology illuminates a dialectic between two dimensions of political power: the capabilities of power *over* others and the possibilities of power *with* others. Power *over* others is rarely primarily coercive. It is sustained with and through information and communication capabilities that also make possible power *with*. Similarly, exemplars of power *with* others that communicative affordances made possible were invariably sustained through, and hedged in by, the rigidities of organisational forms, economic structures, legal constraints and extant social hierarchies. The tension is age-old and needs to be understood if we are to get a grip on its configurations in a digital age.

Antecedents

Tehrani, M. (1980). [Communication and revolution in Iran: The passing of a paradigm](#). *Iranian Studies*, 13(1-4), 5-30.

Adams, P. C. (1996). [Protest and the scale politics of telecommunications](#). *Political Geography*, 15(5), 419-441.

Medina, E. (2011). [Cybernetic Revolutionaries: Technology and Politics in Allende’s Chile](#). Introduction and Conclusion

Straus, S. (2007). [What is the relationship between hate radio and violence? Rethinking Rwanda’s “radio machete”](#). *Politics & Society*, 35(4), 609-637.

Digital Age

Tufekci, Z. (2017). [Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest](#). Yale University Press. Introduction

Castells, M. (2015). [Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age](#). John Wiley & Sons. Introduction

Gerbaudo P. & Treré E. (2015). [In search of the ‘we’ of social media activism: introduction to the special issue on social media and protest identities](#). *Information, Communication & Society*, 18:8, 865-871.

Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: How not to liberate the world*. London: Penguin. Introduction.

Currents

Doffman, Z. (2020). [Black Lives Matter: U.S. Protesters Tracked By Secretive Phone Location Technology](#), *Forbes*, 26 June 2020.

Hill, K. (2020). [The Secretive Company That Might End Privacy as We Know It](#), *New York Times*, 18 Jan. 2020.

Tiffany, K. (2020). [Why K-pop Fans Are No Longer Posting About K-pop](#), *The Atlantic*, 6 June 2020.

Further

Gerbaudo, P. (2012). *Tweets and the Streets: Social media and contemporary activism*. London: Pluto Press.

Hardt & Negri, *Multitude*, “Inventing Network Struggles”. Works well with Castells, I particularly like the way in which they link the transformation of revolutionary movements to the post-Fordist restructuring of production they describe in the Empire passage listed above (see pp. 82-83).

Lance Bennett, W. & Segerberg A. (2012) [The logic of connective action](#). *Information, Communication & Society*, 15:5, 739-768. OR

Bennett, W., & Segerberg, A. (2013). [The logic of connective action : Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics](#) (Cambridge studies in contentious politics).

Earl, J., & Kimport, K. (2011). *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*. MIT Press.

Myers, D. J. (1994). Communication Technology and Social Movements: Contributions of Computer Networks to Activism. *Social Science Computer Review*, 12(2), 250–260.