

150914-STD-CCLRM-AU-DIGITALLIFEWRITING1st session

Speaker Key:

MS: Max Saunders
PA: Paul Arthur
C: Claire
JW: Julie Watson
AL: Amanda Lagerkvist
F: Female
A: Alfred
B: Becky
EK: Eveline Kilian
JR: Julie Rak
Craig: Craig
Male: Male
RG: Rob Gallagher
M: Margareta

00:00:00

MS: Okay, we'll get the next session going, which is the first of the thematic discussions on the topic of politics and digital life. Paul Arthur has very kindly agreed to chair and facilitate this one for us. And he'll do that from [0:00:20] with the microphone that doesn't move. We've got a microphone currently at the other end of the table which is on a long lead. Helen is very kindly going to sort of rove with that to take it to people who want to speak from elsewhere. So make sure you have the mic so that we can sort of capture the recording before you do that. So I will hand over to Paul, thank you very much.

PA: Thanks very much, Max. Is this turned on or do I need to do something more, do you think? Okay, that's better. Well, it was a wonderful opening session and I hope that in this session we can continue with some of the discussions that were begun, as well as taking it in new directions. And I thought it might be useful to pick up on some of the opening comments from the last session as a way of thinking about some of the issues that were raised. And possibly setting up a wider frame that we can use to explore questions that will arise in this thematic discussion on the politics of digital life, a very broad theme indeed. And an opportunity, I think, to reflect on some of the dramatic changes that have happened over the past two decades that run through almost everything that we are talking about. But the pace of change has been arguably almost so great that we barely have time to pause to reflect on the changes before things have

moved on and before the terrain has changed. I found myself in the previous session writing down madly, references to things that people were talking about and which is wonderful and I'm very grateful to have that chance to learn from all of you today and during the next couple of days.

00:02:26

I was struck when Craig held up his books because here we are, so I have a book in my hand and I'm thinking about the size of it, the feel of it, the order of it, the kind of active curation that went into it to create the order of things that is in the printed page. I know that we'll have many more discussions about the move from print to digital. But the first issue of the journal biography that was entitled Online Lives was Online Lives one and here we have Online Lives two. And Online Lives one was, well, more than 10 years ago, 2003, rather, I think it was. And it was really seminal work in that it set out for the first time the parameters of debate and the kind of contours of this field and described activity over the first 10 years of the web. But what it focused mainly on I think is true to say is diary writing, other forms of ... new forms of personal expression that were radical and empowering in their time, because for the first time people could write from the space of privacy of the computer and reach millions of people in an instant. And then it wasn't clear who those readers were or would be. And this was the very first time actually that this had been possible at least on that scale.

Of course people have always published things anonymously and had them circulated in centuries past to the different reasons and purposes. And sometimes they have reached mass audiences, but the scale of that public exposure of the intimate and the private in the first 10 years up until that first issue of Online Lives, it was an incredible period, and it's captured in that wonderful book, that collection. But at that time, and I'm thinking here about, you know, the role of internet in society, the web was an anarchic place, a space where institutions didn't want to be for risk of mixing with pornographers and goodness knows what. But also it was a space of websites that came and went very quickly, partly because there was, you know, the infrastructure was not there. And we sometimes talk about that in terms of the dark ages of the web, the digital dark ages, much stuff was lost, it didn't stick. Well, now we're in an almost opposite situation, it's near impossible to get rid of one's digital trace that is left. You know, although preservation and archiving and all these important issues remain key challenges. And it's really not clear whether something as durable as the book is likely to come about any time soon.

And I think in this session it would be useful to think historically as well as about the immediate moment, about how media has changed the way that we interact and the possibilities for self-expression. And I wonder whether it might be useful as a framing idea to think at least in some of our discussions and comments about the idea of freedom. And it strikes me that in the early era of the web, there was great freedom in the possibilities of having one's voice heard or at least circulated and finding new modes of expression, of self-expression of identity that were freeing and liberating and often were alternative identities. And there was very much that sort of play on being an alternative identity, man

or a woman or, you know, different ages, the pretending, the fraudulence, the sort of playful fraudulence of presenting oneself online. And at the same time, you know, you could say that the rise of surveillance over that period and of the tracking of our movements has been almost counter to those tendencies.

00:06:42

And now, you know, we talk about the freedom of social media which is incredibly freeing, communicating on a mass scale with audiences around the world and on a daily basis, on a minute by minute basis. But in that it's become clear that there are these huge constraints on our lives, we are being characterised increasingly by a kind of automated collection of data about ourselves and our movements, our preferences. So much so that there's almost no longer an idea of a mainstream, all of our media consumption is tailored to what we appear to have wanted or done online, because we're being so heavily tracked.

And just really to sort of finish up, what I wanted to say, the difficulty of removing one's digital trace has been highlighted and, you know, came to a head with the recent legal case about the right to be forgotten online which was the right to have your... Well, it was a case involving Google and it was the right to have your digital footprint removed, at least, to some extent so that you couldn't be found in search. Well, so that material that may be defamatory or, you know, that you didn't want to have appear for whatever reason. You have to have pretty good reasons actually to get your material removed. You know, this case was important and it points the way to a future, you know, wish to have more freedom, freedom of rights respected online.

So in this session we can open up to discussions about many, many different aspects of this changing world in which we have lived. But Online Lives two, I think it's a useful kind of counterpoint to that first one. It contains entirely different sorts of articles, and some of them focus on games, betrayal, encyclopaedic knowledge and big data. And so I highly recommend it to you, it's a fantastic article, collection, rather. When I came out of the first session today I wrote down some words that really stuck with me and they all point to some of these changes. They were, aggregation, mediation, touching through the digital, the overwhelming archive, distant reading, new institutional practices. And they show a completely different world from that world of Online Lives one only 10 years ago. So with those sort of opening comments and reflections on some of the themes of the first session and also the change over the past two decades, I'd like to open this to discussion. And the kinds of questions that might pick up on some earlier questions that were posed but couldn't be adequately answered, or maybe new ones that people would like to introduce, so the floor is open to you. And if someone would like to offer the first question then the microphone will travel to you and I encourage you to use it because we'll be recording the responses.

C: So thank you very much, Claire [0:10:38] from University Paris [0:10:41]. We have been discussing the role of data as a source of art creation. And some of us also have pointed

out the problems of appropriation and signature. And the topic I'd like to embark on is shouldn't we change our perspective, instead of viewing data as information, viewing it as a form of money. I'm going to give you an example, whenever we travel we go of course through airports and to access the Wi-Fi we need to fill in our personal details and as many of us have tried to fill it with bogus details because this bothers me. And I found out recently this week that it's no longer possible, if I enter bogus email the system says, "This doesn't exist, type in your real information." So it seems to me that in terms of politics we have to think, also we used to think that our expression was our voice or our ballot. But it seems to me that our personal data is part of the equation and as one has said, it's this notion of values and corporate use of our data, thank you.

00:12:10

JW: we in the US of course have become increasingly aware of the ubiquitous surveillance of our acts and our traces online. And Sidney and I had a long cut section from this paper where we think we're deeply about surveillance. And of course, I think it can't be seen simply as government agencies appropriating individuals because after all there are many ways in which individuals gladly give their data as users online. And not only that, but I think see social media as transparent sites for self-preservation and they may or may not. And to us one of the things that was interesting here is that in some ways we seem to be recurring, there's a couple of different models, right. One is the notion of self as transparent essence, which is very much an 18th century kind of notion, recurring here oddly in digital media. Certainly it is redefining all of our notions in a neoliberal moment of what something such as freedom or transparency might mean. And that perhaps one point of departure is to critique some of these fundamental expectations as the long enlightenment hangover. I'm Julie Watson.

PA: Not so much an answer or a response but I'm just like following up on what you were talking about. I'd just like to throw in a word I have found very useful to be thinking about some of these kind of ... especially that notion of commodification of information and knowledge and data is just that we keep the term 'value' in the front of our minds how things are valorised, how things are commodified. What kind of worth is being placed on things, I remember Oscar Wilde who I think wandered around here from time to time, that notion of the cynic is the person who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. For reasons having to do with the location that I live in, value has turned out to be a very useful term for recognising where there are contradictions or where there are fundamental disagreements about what something is or how it functions.

AL: Hello everyone, I am Amanda Lagerkvist, Media Studies, Stockholm University. I think one really important paradox of our contemporary digital life has to do with the fact that media are becoming more subjective and personalised. Our memories are more personalised and at once beyond subjective control. So this occurs at once, due to automation and I'm also thinking in terms of agencies. We need to discuss the range of agencies involved. So we are becoming, as we say in media studies, complicit interpassive users and at once compelled to act, so we're having this interpassive

moment and at once a compelled agency, so that's what I would like to bring into this discussion.

00:15:45

F: Hello, this is [0:15:47]. I am working in the area of life writing and I come from India. And as I was listening to Hassan [0:15:56], this notion of tracking transience. I was wondering what will ... I mean what kind of challenge, the challenge of writing biographies, the future biographies in the wake of digital or equally [0:16:14] what was digital as a maker, as a [0:16:16] marker of, you know, after digital. So because of numerous text exchanges and email and, you know, all sorts of kind of exchanges or interpersonal exchanges. So what kind of, you know, are we really able to track the transience? I mean that's something which was ... I mean [0:16:40] in my mind, I don't know I mean.

A: Alfred [0:16:53], University of [0:16:53] in Germany. I think freedom is the crucial word, whether we have the freedom or some other people and other agencies have the freedom of us. I mean the users and abusers of the digital media is of course the question where the users transfer into abusers. But it's also something to do with the idea of the conscious giving of material of ourselves and the many [0:17:26] parts and unconscious moments in which we pass on information without knowing it. So that all of a sudden there's a wide area of information that is given out without our knowledge and that is being used against ourselves. I mean as far as the quantifiable self is concerned, think of the health issues and the way in which insurance companies are now banking on the data that they cash in, in this unconscious way. Another area in which one could also think of is the freedom that users of the social media have in order to contribute data about themselves that is not looked over by any kind of agency. Or the way in which these media also open up comments and statements by people that they would not utter in conversation. Or if they were on a public media that has an audience, so for example, the increase of racist ideas that are now being spread on the internet and in digital data form is unheard of. And these are aspects which are freedom, but at the same time they're also the excess of freedom.

B: Hi, I'm Becky, I'm part of the Ego Media project. Two things that are sort of occurring to me here, and you're going to have to forgive me, I can't remember the name of the people who came to speak to us last year. But if anyone else from the Ego Media project can kind of pop in here. There's this notion of tethered data and how tethered to your individual self, your data might be as it moves around the internet as it's sold to different marketing companies etc. And I think that notion of how abstracted your data has become or how linked back to the sort of human subject, data about that subject can be, might be a very productive way of thinking about these questions about agency and freedom. The other thing was just ... this is not a new point, but the mediated subject as well, whether or not you agree or disagree with that notion of sort of elicitation of data, and that's what the digital environment is doing to us now. I think it's quite a productive one for sort of stimulating a debate about the subject, so those are two my thoughts.

00:20:12

EK: Thank you very much, Eveline Kilian, Humboldt University, Berlin. Can I link up with this on the question of agency which is something that interests me particularly. And if we think about the notion of complicity, for example, that has been mentioned before, obviously a kind of [0:20:32] model comes to mind, that there is a field of power which we are all involved. And we are not only dominated but we are also players in the field, although there are different levels of power. And somehow agency in that model resides with the individual to resist certain practices like giving bogus information rather than your real information. But I'm asking myself at this point, and this comes back to the question of abstraction, whether this model of individual agency still holds in that kind of context. Because there might be something like an uncontrollability of the medium where ... I mean as you have said, where we don't even know where the data go. And where individual agency seems to be a very helpless sort of insistence on my own freedom within that kind of medium that so many people control and that is so abstracted. And this is a question that I find particularly interesting, how to think of agency, whose agency, can it still be individual agency, or where is agency located in that kind of context?

JR: Hi, I'm Julie Rak from the University of Alberta. I am fascinated by the fact that agency is beginning to make a reappearance in this discussion. Because in the 90s, agency was a point of anxiety around which post structural theory organised itself. And then I think some of us thought we'd all solved it and it's pretty clear that digital cultures and digital societies have reanimated that discussion. And I'm really interested to see that, so I wanted to highlight that. In light of that I wonder if I could ask Craig to talk a bit more because we didn't have a chance, about the quantified academic self, and if you'd like to talk about Academia.edu in that context. Why do I say that? Because we can talk about privacy, ideas about privacy, for instance, in the American context, from the 19th century privacy was developed because of Fatty Arbuckle, and the problem of celebrity, right. So it was understood as a wall that you built to try to stop information from coming over. And I'm using that metaphor to live really, because of the problems we're seeing now with migration. And that wall wasn't possible to maintain, is a very defensive idea, privacy that comes from that. But there is also the other ideology that Paul alluded to from the earlier days of the internet which was anarchic and based on sharing, and on an altogether different idea of what the subject is. And so Academia.edu encompasses both ideas, so I'd be very interested to hear what you think about it.

Craig: Well, because this is a general discussion I don't think it would be profitable for me to answer anything. Two or three thoughts, the first one is just separate from that, but it ties into actually the last three which is the subject we're supposedly talking about is the notion of politics. So one of the things I would just throw in here, because we've already moved into the mode of agency and identity and so on and so forth, is that one of the fundamental concerns in dealing with politics is how people are constituted, or think of themselves as constituted as communities. And it seems to me that the political issue is more in some ways how people are brought together in awareness of common interest rather than because the atomisation, and it doesn't seem to me that we can always just assume that one of the things the internet is doing is in some ways atomising or

fragmenting individuals. There has always been an impulse of trying to use that as a way of creating virtual communities and so on and so forth, so I'll just add that in.

00:24:43

In terms of Academia.edu and those things, one of the things, and this is tied in to what we were saying about value earlier on. The notion of the commodification of all of this data, and in fact the commodification of everything, especially in distribution models, alright, is, you know, the medium is the profit is what's going on here. And what just came up, you can Google this, Elsevier has finally struck back, they have just indicated that they're going to issue a comprehensive lawsuit up against anybody who is posting previously published material on an Elsevier publication or platform. And that they're going to ask them to remove it from any kind of scholar space or being able to put up earlier stuff on Academia.edu and so on and so forth. This was coming for a while, you could see it happening. But what we're looking at, I think, as far as that's concerned is that issue of the mode of distribution and the notion that somehow or other, where I've been hitting it at the other end.

I'm in really an ambivalent mode as far as this is concerned. Because one of the other things that's going on, that many of us have kind of interest in is the communal involvement of creating academic knowledge. The model we're seeing in a commodified environment is an individual produces that they actually own that, that they contract with another person to distribute it and then the person who has been contracted to do that then has certain kinds of rights, to give you an idea. And that's expanded beyond academics, so just think about how ... one of the things that makes our lives different over the last 20 years is the number of binding legal contracts we might sign in a day. You do it every time it says we've [0:26:40] our cookie system, are you okay with that? You know, those contracts that none of us read but that we enter into, that notion of contractual handling over those kinds of materials it seems to me is crucial.

My concern is that in terms of value, it moves back to Paul's notion of the anarchic, that the notion that the material can go out sort of as is and that there needs to be no mediation, there needs to be no refereeing, there needs to be no editing. And it's all coming from the science environment where they're not concerned with a lot of the issues that we are. But for example, one of the things we are looking at with Academia.edu or whatever is the cutting out of any possible sustainable funds for the process of editing and putting together a journal because it's not seen that there's any value added by anybody. Because the notion is you do your research, it's ready to go when you do it and it goes right up online. Which in certain science models, makes sense, but does not make sense frequently if we want to like, for example, the symposium issues where we actually work for months to get people to work back and forth to improve the materials they're working on.

00:27:51

So I think one of the things we're hitting right now is a kind of crash of about 10 different kinds of academic models as to what the value of knowledge is. And that we're in a process of continual negotiation, but this particular week, what we're seeing is the empire is striking back, that the large digital distributors of academic knowledge, particularly in the sciences are getting ready to lay claim to the fact that they are the primary distributors and monetisers of the information. What I'll be interested in will be to see not so much what the faculty or the academics do, but what institutions do. Because they've been the ones have been fighting back by claiming stuff that is done funded by them, should actually be accessible to the people within their institution. So I think we're right in the middle of something that we don't understand.

Male: I would like to take the issue of agency, whether in public or in academic world, a little bit further and start maybe by looking at when media studies became a market issue with Marshall McLuhan, not only the medium is the message. But also what I'm thinking of is the extensions of man, he probably also meant the extensions of woman, [0:29:14] we have glasses which extend to our eyes, we have a typewriter which extends our hands and so on. And this is an issue that maybe has a relation to the role of the body in the digital age. This morning we saw Margaretta talking about her project where you have real women who talk about themselves in an assembly, in a hall. Where you can see them and where they are visible bodily objects with a voice and some kind of ideas. And then we go to your presentation, [0:29:47] and Julia where we have [0:29:47], where you said, you know, he photographs or has only images of the world in which he lives but without his body.

F: [0:30:00].

Male: Pardon.

F: [0:30:01].

Male: Okay, the other one, I'm sorry. So that is the point, what happens to the human body in the digital age? Are we a constitution of chemical elements as many of the writings now tell us? Are we a biological reservoir of entities that are at disposal? What happens to the idea of friends, if somebody has one million friends on Facebook, but no friend who will help him or her when they have a real problem in real life? I think this is a new kind of form of agency without body impact that seems to be also an interesting point I think.

F: [0:30:56], I'm a neurologist at King's. I found it very interesting listening to the discussion of bio and how complex it is in terms of agency. And I wanted just to offer just a little example about myself which might fit into this. And perhaps I'd want to see this before it was actually ever written down as we're being recorded. But some time ago the British Government decided that the colleges had to implement some structure for showing that

they provided equal opportunity or fair opportunity, particularly for women. And in science it was implemented by the Head of the Department of Health who said that the colleges wouldn't be able to apply for funding unless they achieved these levels of award. And King's, our local college had actually got a bronze and then sort of given up on working on it. And they had to try and think up a quick fix because they were going to have to move to silver very rapidly in order to stay in the game. And they sent messages to all their professors, female, even those who had been sacked through sort of savings. And said they'd like their pictures which they were going to put on the internet and they were going to put in the halls. And some of us acquiesced and some of us didn't, and subsequently they asked us to write bios.

00:32:35

And of course it's quite difficult to write bios when you're used to writing them in the male great man code, you know, when you're supposed to write something different. And I mean I was trying to think what am I supposed to do? So they sent me some templates and somebody said, "Oh, well, she'd been to university but then she'd had children and her husband was very encouraging and the college was very encouraging and before long she became a professor, you know." And I sort of thought what am I supposed to do, you know. So I then wrote something about having adopted children from abroad. And then because I wanted to put something personal at the same time as, you know, whatever your career thing is. And they wrote back and said, "But how many children," and this and that. And I was sort of feeling, okay, we've gone to the limit we can this. But it was an example, if you like, of how very complicated it was. And having promoted all this, some literature and presumably done something a little bit more substantial, the college contacted us this year and said, "Great news guys, we've now got the silver award." So I don't know what's going to happen after this but I was kind of involved in a very sort of problematic way in this process.

RG: Rob Gallagher, I'm also with the Ego Media project at King's. And I think that story raises some really interesting issues around what counts as agency today where it's often the capacity for you or maybe just your employer to recuperate or monetise properties of your body or your voice or your image. And that those are the kind of frameworks within which you can exert agency. I do think that question of agency and value is important as is that of kind of metaphor, because the data as money things sort of works but you can only really turn data into money in so far as you can aggregate it on a huge scale that isn't really available to any individual. And I've been quite interested in legal work on data where they're also proposing alternate metaphors whereby you might compare data to hazardous or combustible chemicals that if they're stored in small quantities might be inert or safe, but once you combine them in certain ways, get dangerous. And I think that's maybe somewhere where the humanities has a lot to say about metaphoricity and rhetoric and the ways these have legal and embodied effects sometimes.

00:35:06

F: I am [0:35:15], I represent, I think, mostly Estonian Literary Museum but also Tartu University and the issue I want to raise comes kind of from the side of working in an archive. There has been this question about the digital media, the restricting and the enabling properties of it. And it is, for me, it is this big question of which way a member institution should or can kind of engage in all kinds of digital activities or to facilitate, you know, different practices of presenting lives online. And it's like how is it, I guess, it's not possible to predict, but like how is it like how can we kind of plan ahead and think of how let's say this different kind of [0:36:10] of data when and how they might come together and very useful. But also in like potentially harmful ways of making the people who are kind of behind this data, or behind these stories, vulnerable. So this is not only a research question, it's a question of, I don't know, like politics of how a member institution should act and what it should support and what it should not pick up basically.

F: [0:37:06] from Michigan. Now, in dotage one forgets the idea one started to think about.

MS: Okay, you said it was going to be in code.

F: Yes, it's going to be in code. Anyway this is just a query because I'm troubled about the way in which the word 'freedom' gets introduced as if it's a transparent concept, as if we know what it is and as if it doesn't have to be historicised. And I mean I worry about all these issues, but I worry about trying to go at them analytically in what I would see as a nostalgic mode for something called freedom which is a figure for something. But it's not always the same thing for different groups of people in different locations at different times. So this is a kind of a call for a kind of anti-nostalgia in mobilising certain terms as if we know that we've lost it and it is a known quantity, that's all I want to say.

M: Margaretta from Sussex. It doesn't exactly follow but it's going back to initially what I'd understood as the post-digital era being about the question of law, particularly, governance perhaps is a better way to think of it more broadly. And so this is where one could say, "Well, what structures of governance have we got that we could start to use to ironically bring back agency, if not on an individual level, at least on a small group level?" And here sometimes I think well, I'd rather have government state surveillance than I would have invisible corporations. Do I have to choose? Is there a way to get these to combat each somehow or work together? I don't know, but I think part of the problem is that the state is outflanked at the moment, completely outflanked by global corporations. And this is what we're seeing with, you know, Facebook, the Facebook is the country now, you know, or whatever, or the international country. And in fact I was reading about its current work in India. I know Facebook is seemingly passé in terms of socialising but it doesn't seem to be passé in terms of control and questions of agency, at least as it's expanding into other countries.

00:40:07

But then I just wanted to mention something I read which was another tiny glimmer of hope by a Mike Anna who does this little article on where noxious social media turns public. And he has examples of where ... now, I'm so hopeless because I don't ever use these things but, you know, Airbnb was suddenly mobilised to get people to share houses for homeless people in the wake of the New York terrible storm. And then he has several others which are commercial social media sites that are entirely about data as money. But he says we need to look at when they are suddenly called upon and see it in their interest to make it a free service now when the internet is no longer all about free anarchy and ludic play. There is still a moment you can kind of go backwards or forwards from a commercial form of network. And yes, I think there are things now being done with the migrant needs through other SMS's. Yeah, another one was Sydney when there was a moment of terrorism and the taxi service where you share...

F: Uber.

M: That's it, Uber was suddenly ... first had started charging extra fees for people to take their service out of town and then they were shamed and they went, "Okay, actually we'll make it completely free." So what was it? And he says, "Well, you could be completely cynical and say of course they're just jumping on this, this is just a great promotion stunt." But actually, well, even if it is, does that matter? The point is it, you know, this is what we need to do is take good case studies, a bit like you did with the artists and say, "What can we get from them and multiply it."

F: I'm [0:42:15] from Brown University and just a comment as these very interesting remarks gather a bit of density that the critical vocabulary seem to be extraordinarily important in talking about the politics of digital life. And one question I would raise is the extent to which terms like freedom, agency and surveillance are the ... have the most traction on specific examples. Or whether there are new terms that permit or provide another kind of interior knowledge of or breaking apart of some of the activities that we're seeing. And so maybe I'm thinking of the very first talk by [0:43:01] interesting talk that made use of the term 'interruption' or a term like 'disruption' or 'intensification' may map better onto what's occurring in the digital, that will give us additional critical traction. So I'm thinking, you know, in the US at least we don't need to choose between government and corporate surveillance, we enjoy both fairly fully. But what we see in both is that the digital provides a kind of intensification of everyday life and a scaling up intentionally or unintentionally of all effects. This doesn't necessarily have only negative or only positive valences, one can make use of them in a number of ways which is what you see in the model of disruption coming out of Silicon Valley. But again, my question is simply, what are the new critical vocabularies that will get us the most traction on the digital?

PA: We are coming up to the end of our session, but are there some final questions that people have in their minds that they'd like to present at this stage? And I think that's a lovely and important point to be ... to conclude on if we want to, which is the [0:44:29] to

develop vocabularies, critical vocabularies so that we can actually identify the common ground and frameworks for discussing it. But are there any other questions?

00:44:42

F: Yes, there is just a recommendation to read Jose Van Dijk's work on Dataism as a Religion, I think that offers a new critical traction. I don't know if you've seen her work, Jose Van Dijk, yeah, The Culture of Connectivity but also her work in Surveillance and Society is fabulous.

F: Sorry, [0:45:08] down here?

F: Jose Van Dijk, she's a Dutch scholar and her book is called The Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media. But then her new take on Dataism as a Religion is published in Surveillance and Society and it's all about criticising our notion of raw data.

PA: Thank you. Well, any final comments? One more, Claire, good.

C: Just a perhaps sort of playful suggestion, that in thinking about the politics of digital life we might also think about the life of digital politics. And whether that's a helpful model, and I suppose I'm thinking of Snowden leaking data and Wikileaks and so on. But also the way that conventional politics is having to reinvent itself through digital and social media forms. So we've just seen in Britain the Corbyn campaign where people have been mobilised at very local levels and individuals have been using their own computers in order to traffic, as it were, in political connections with other individuals. And that seems sort of an interesting mutation or evolution, again, perhaps part of a bigger dynamic of democratisation through fragmentation which then itself becomes an aggregation. So I suppose I'm going back to that question about how does the digital fit with the non-digital and what we might learn from what the world of conventional politics is doing with new media.

PA: I wonder whether, Max, you'd like, or Claire to say something about the lunchtime slot or any business, you know, any announcements before we wind up.

MS: Yes, very quickly to say that lunch is here at the other end of the room. And we'll be staying here, so Claire wants to just add something.

C: Yes, I'm thinking in terms of housekeeping, in the wake of what everybody has been saying about embodiment, the nearest loos are turn right, down the stairs by the doors or turn left around the corridor and on your right hand side, so I hope embodiment is more comfortable that way.

00:47:58

PA: Well, thank you everyone for a fantastic session, I thought it was really stimulating and such wonderful avenues of enquiry opened up and we can continue to pursue them over the next couple of days. So let's put our hands together for ourselves [applause].