

Circumscribing PETs

Seda Gürses
CS, K.U. Leuven

PETS ASSUMPTIONS

- * privacy = data confidentiality
- * No trust on the Internet
- * if information is revealed:
 - * anonymity/pseudonymity
 - * separation of pseudonyms
 - * consent for a purpose
 - * obligations

THE INDIVIDUAL

- * individuals responsible for:

- * protection of data

- * awareness of risks

- * time and attention

- * bureaucratic pleasure

- * great reference: manu luksch's film faceless.

- * cctv images = legal ready made

DAILY PERSPECTIVE ON SURVEILLANCE

- * *our societies are organized as networks*
 - * *the characteristics of each node are determined primarily by its connections, rather than its intrinsic properties*
 - * *hence isolation is an undesirable option.*
 - * *ask accountability of those holding power (Stalder)*
- * **PETs: anonymity and separate pseudonyms problematic.**

MARKETING PERSPECTIVE ON SURVEILLANCE

- * *The control of the consumer to determine his digital identity is at a minimum limited.*
- * *[T]he consumer is constituted by language and the language governing the electronic marketplace is constituted by databases, the consumer does not exist outside this constitutive field of discursive power.*
- * *PETs provide no more than a false perception of autonomy.(Zwick)*

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SURVEILLANCE

- * *it is the creation of a private, domestic sphere apart from the public realm, that is the privacy problem.*
 - * *certain populations and issues are relegated to this private sphere*
 - * *the public/private distinction then serves as a tool of social silencing and repression.*
 - * *the most important privacy issue is the social construction of the public/private divide itself.*
- * *the only private thing right now is data-processing and databases (Phillips)*
- * **PETs: should allow the negotiation of the public/private**

PERFORMATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON SURVEILLANCE

- * *we are surrounded by our data bodies (Poster)*
- * *surveillance space disrupts the boundary between concepts of public and private*
- * *surveillance space opens other debates:*
 - * *ownership of imagery and data selves*
 - * *freedom of image/data circulation*
 - * *the multiplicity and discontinuities of data experience*
 - * *the emotional instability of security systems*
- * *new subjectivities, new counter-surveillance strategies (McGrath)*

INFORMATION PERSPECTIVE TO SURVEILLANCE

- * due to potential aggregation any piece of information has multiple data subjects
- * PETs do not protect against breaches based on discriminatory categorization.
- * Pets: should include feedback on potential linkages and population inferences

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

- * de-stress the individuals with respect to data protection
- * look for further pets concepts beyond data concealment
 - * feedback and awareness systems: public data mining
 - * tools to negotiate the private/public divide
 - * for individuals
 - * also for communities (collaborative privacy)
- * demand transparency and accountability
- * pets: a necessity
 - * scrutinize & make transparent limits of pets

* THANKS TO:

* THIBAUT D'ALTON, ANONYMOUS CITY

* MICHELLE TERAN, SURVEILLANCE CINEMA

* [HTTP://WWW.UBERMATIC.ORG/MISHA/
PROJECTS.HTML](http://www.ubermatic.org/misha/projects.html)

* [HTTP://WWW.FLICKR.COM/PHOTOS/
61371963@N00/SETS/
72157602083521147/](http://www.flickr.com/photos/61371963@N00/sets/72157602083521147/)

* MANU LUKSCH, FACELESS

* [HTTP://WWW.AMBIENTTV.NET/2007/
FACELESS/](http://www.ambienttv.net/2007/faceless/)