Data in Era of Surveillance Capitalism

-By Kshitij Goel

Carl Shapiro and Hal R. Varian's "Information Rules: A Strategic Guide to the Network Economy" (1998) provides a foundational understanding of how information behaves in the economy. Despite being published before the rise of big data and social media, many of its insights remain remarkably relevant to the current data economy.

Key points:

a) Information as an Economic Good: Shapiro and Varian argue that information is an experience good with unique economic properties. Unlike traditional goods, information is costly to produce but cheap to reproduce. This characteristic fundamentally shapes the economics of information-based industries.

b) Network Effects: The authors introduce the concept of network effects, where the value of a product or service increases as more people use it. This concept is crucial for understanding the dominance of large tech platforms in today's digital economy.

c) Versioning and Pricing Strategies: Shapiro and Varian discuss various strategies for pricing information goods, including versioning (offering different versions of a product at different prices) and bundling. These strategies are widely used in the digital economy and have implications for how we might conceptualize the value of personal data.

d) Lock-in and Switching Costs: The book explores the concepts of lock-in and switching costs, which help explain why users often stick with particular platforms or services even when alternatives exist. This has significant implications for data ownership and control in the digital age.

Relevance to Data Royalty: Shapiro and Varian's work provides a crucial framework for understanding the economic properties of data. Their insights into network effects and lock-in help explain the concentration of power in the hands of large tech companies, underlining the need for new approaches to data governance. Their discussion of pricing strategies for information goods could inform approaches to valuing personal data in a Data Royalty system.

The Economics of Data

Building on Shapiro and Varian's work, more recent scholarship has examined the unique economic characteristics of data in the age of big data and artificial intelligence.

Key points:

a) Data as a Non-rival and Non-excludable Good: Unlike physical goods, data can be used by multiple parties simultaneously without diminishing its value. This property challenges traditional economic models and has implications for how we conceptualize data ownership.

b) The Data-Network-Learning Cycle: Scholars like Viktor Mayer-Schönberger and Thomas Ramge have described a "data-network-learning" cycle, where more data leads to better services, attracting more users, which in turn generates more data. This cycle helps explain the rapid growth and dominance of large tech platforms.

c) Challenges in Valuing Personal Data: Determining the economic value of personal data is complex. The value often lies not in individual data points, but in the insights derived from large-scale data analysis. This presents challenges for creating a fair system of compensation for personal data.

d) Data Markets: There have been various proposals for creating markets for personal data. However, these face numerous challenges, including information asymmetries, privacy concerns, and the difficulty of defining clear property rights for data.

Relevance to Data Royalty: Understanding the unique economic properties of data is crucial for developing a viable Data Royalty system. The non-rival nature of data suggests that traditional property rights models may not be appropriate. The challenges in valuing personal data highlight the need for innovative approaches to determining fair compensation.

Surveillance Capitalism

Shoshana Zuboff's "The Age of Surveillance Capitalism" (2019) provides a critical perspective on the current data economy, highlighting the urgent need for new models of data governance and value distribution.

Key points:

a) Definition of Surveillance Capitalism: Zuboff defines surveillance capitalism as "a new economic order that claims human experience as free raw material for hidden commercial practices of extraction, prediction, and sales." This framework provides a powerful critique of the current data economy.

b) Behavioral Surplus: Zuboff introduces the concept of "behavioral surplus" - the excess data collected beyond what is necessary for product or service improvement. This surplus is the key raw material of surveillance capitalism, used to create prediction products that anticipate what users will do now, soon, and later.

c) Instrumentarian Power: The book discusses the rise of "instrumentarian power," which aims to know and shape human behavior toward others' ends. This power, wielded by large tech companies, poses significant threats to individual autonomy and democratic order.

d) The Right to the Future Tense: Zuboff argues for "the right to the future tense" - the ability to imagine, intend, promise, and construct a future. She contends that surveillance capitalism, by seeking to predict and control behavior, infringes on this fundamental human right.

Relevance to Data Royalty: Zuboff's work underscores the urgency of developing new models of data governance. The concept of Data Royalty can be seen as a potential response to surveillance capitalism, aiming to rebalance power dynamics and ensure individuals benefit from the value their data creates.

Digital Rights and Data Governance

The Evolution of Privacy Rights in the Digital Age

The concept of privacy has evolved significantly in response to technological changes, with important implications for data governance.

Key points:

a) Historical Overview: The right to privacy has roots in various legal traditions, but its application to digital data is relatively recent. The evolution of privacy rights reflects changing societal norms and technological capabilities.

b) Key Legal Frameworks:

- The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) has set a new global standard for data protection, introducing concepts like the right to be forgotten and data portability.
- The California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) represents a significant step towards comprehensive data protection in the United States.

c) Right to be Forgotten: This concept, enshrined in the GDPR, allows individuals to request the deletion of their personal data under certain circumstances. It raises complex questions about the balance between privacy rights and other interests, such as freedom of information.

d) Tension between Privacy and Innovation: There's an ongoing debate about how to balance robust privacy protections with the potential for data-driven innovation. Some argue that strict privacy regulations could stifle innovation, while others contend that strong privacy protections are necessary for sustainable technological development.

Relevance to Data Royalty: Any Data Royalty system would need to be designed with careful consideration of privacy rights. The evolving legal landscape of data protection provides both opportunities and constraints for the development of new data governance models.

Data Ownership and Control

The question of who owns and controls data is central to debates about data governance and the digital economy.

Key points:

a) Current Models of Data Ownership: In most jurisdictions, personal data is not treated as property in the traditional sense. Instead, individuals have certain rights regarding their data, while companies that collect the data often have broad rights to use it.

b) Data as Property: Some scholars and policymakers have proposed treating personal data as property that can be owned and traded. However, this approach faces numerous challenges, including the difficulty of defining clear boundaries of data ownership and the risk of exacerbating existing inequalities.

c) Data Trusts and Data Commons: Alternative models like data trusts (where data is managed by a trustee on behalf of a group) and data commons (where data is treated as a shared resource) have been proposed as ways to balance individual rights with collective benefits.

d) Implications for Innovation and Privacy: Different models of data ownership and control have varying implications for innovation and privacy. For example, strict individual ownership might protect privacy but could limit the potential for beneficial data analysis, while more open models might facilitate innovation but raise privacy concerns.

Relevance to Data Royalty: The concept of Data Royalty implies a certain model of data ownership or control. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to data governance is crucial for developing a viable and effective Data Royalty system.

Neo-liberal Approaches to the Digital Economy

Key Principles of Neo-liberalism in the Digital Context

Neo-liberal economic theory has significantly influenced policy approaches to the digital economy. Understanding these principles is crucial for contextualizing current debates and proposing alternative models.

Key points:

a) Free Market Emphasis: Neo-liberal theory emphasizes the efficiency of free markets in allocating resources and driving innovation. In the digital context, this has often translated into a hands-off approach to regulating tech companies.

b) Minimal State Intervention: Neo-liberals generally argue for limited government intervention in markets. In the digital economy, this principle has been used to argue against stringent data protection regulations or attempts to break up large tech companies.

c) Consumer Choice: Neo-liberal theory emphasizes consumer sovereignty, arguing that consumers should be free to make their own choices in the marketplace. In the digital economy, this principle is often invoked to justify the current model where consumers "pay" for services with their data.

d) Innovation and Creative Destruction: Drawing on Schumpeter's concept of creative destruction, neo-liberals argue that the disruptive effects of digital technologies are part of a healthy economic process that drives progress and efficiency.

Relevance to Data Royalty: The concept of Data Royalty challenges some core neo-liberal assumptions about the digital economy. Understanding these principles is crucial for anticipating potential objections to the Data Royalty model and crafting effective counterarguments.

Critiques of Neo-liberal Approaches

This subsection explores various critiques of neo-liberal approaches to the digital economy, incorporating insights from "In Service of the Republic: The Art and Science of Economic Policy" by Vijay Kelkar and Ajay Shah (2019).

Key points:

a) Market Failures in the Digital Economy: Kelkar and Shah argue that market failures are pervasive in complex economic systems. In the digital economy, these failures include externalities (where the social costs or benefits of an activity are not reflected in market prices), information asymmetries, and the tendency towards monopoly due to network effects.

b) Role of the State: While neo-liberal theory emphasizes minimal state intervention, Kelkar and Shah argue for a more nuanced approach. They contend that the state has a crucial role in

addressing market failures and providing public goods, which is particularly relevant in the digital economy.

c) Policy Complexity: Kelkar and Shah emphasize the complexity of policy-making in modern economies. They argue against simplistic, one-size-fits-all solutions, instead advocating for careful analysis of specific contexts and potential unintended consequences.

d) Inequality and Power Concentration: Critics of neo-liberal approaches point out that the current structure of the digital economy has led to significant wealth concentration and power imbalances. The dominance of a few large tech companies raises concerns about market competition and democratic accountability.

e) Data as a Public Good: Some scholars argue that data should be treated as a public good rather than a private commodity. This perspective challenges the neo-liberal emphasis on private property rights and market-based solutions.

Relevance to Data Royalty: Kelkar and Shah's work provides valuable insights for developing a Data Royalty framework. Their emphasis on addressing market failures and the need for nuanced policy approaches aligns well with the goals of the Data Royalty concept. Their framework for effective policy-making in complex systems could inform the design and implementation of a Data Royalty system.

Universal Basic Income and the Digital Economy

The Concept of Universal Basic Income

Universal Basic Income (UBI) has gained increased attention in recent years, particularly in discussions about the future of work in the digital economy.

Key points:

a) Definition and Characteristics: UBI is typically defined as a regular, unconditional cash payment given to all members of a society. Key characteristics include universality, unconditionality, and regularity.

b) Historical Context: While often seen as a novel idea, UBI has a long history, with proponents ranging from Thomas Paine to Milton Friedman. Recent interest has been driven by concerns about technological unemployment and growing inequality.

c) Arguments For and Against: Proponents argue that UBI could provide a safety net in an increasingly precarious job market, reduce poverty, and increase individual freedom. Critics contend that it could be prohibitively expensive, reduce work incentives, and potentially lead to inflation.

Relevance to Data Royalty: The concept of Data Royalty shares some similarities with UBI, particularly in its aim to provide a universal benefit. Understanding the debates around UBI can inform the development of a Data Royalty model.

UBI in the Context of Technological Unemployment

The potential for widespread job displacement due to automation and AI has been a key driver of interest in UBI.

Key points:

a) Projections of Technological Unemployment: Various studies have attempted to quantify the potential impact of automation on employment. While estimates vary widely, there is a general consensus that significant job displacement is likely in the coming decades.

b) UBI as a Response: Proponents argue that UBI could provide a safety net for those displaced by technology and smooth the transition to a more automated economy. It could also support individuals engaged in unpaid but socially valuable work, such as caregiving.

c) Alternative Proposals: Other suggested responses to technological unemployment include job guarantee programs, reduced working hours, and investment in education and retraining. These are often presented as alternatives or complements to UBI.

Relevance to Data Royalty: The concept of Data Royalty can be seen as a potential response to technological unemployment, providing an income stream not tied to traditional employment. Understanding the debates around UBI and technological unemployment can help position Data Royalty within broader discussions about the future of work and income.

Data Dividends and Tech-Funded UBI

This section examines proposals for funding UBI through mechanisms related to the digital economy, drawing on ideas from all three key texts.

Key points:

a) Data Dividend Proposals: Several politicians and scholars have proposed "data dividends" - payments to individuals for the use of their personal data. These proposals share similarities with the concept of Data Royalty.

b) Tech Tax Proposals: Some have suggested funding UBI through taxes on tech companies or automation. These proposals often draw on the idea that companies benefiting from automation should contribute to supporting displaced workers.

c) Economic and Political Feasibility: Both data dividend and tech tax proposals face significant challenges in terms of implementation and political feasibility. Issues include determining the value of data, enforcing compliance, and potential impacts on innovation and competitiveness.

d) Relationship to Surveillance Capitalism: Drawing on Zuboff's work, we can see data dividend proposals as attempts to rebalance the power dynamics of surveillance capitalism. However, critics argue that they might legitimize rather than challenge the fundamental model of data extraction.

e) Policy Complexity: Kelkar and Shah's emphasis on policy complexity is highly relevant here. Any data dividend or tech-funded UBI system would need to navigate a complex landscape of economic incentives, privacy concerns, and international competition.

Relevance to Data Royalty: These discussions provide crucial context for the Data Royalty proposal. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of existing proposals can inform the development of a more robust and feasible Data Royalty model.

Existing Models of Data Governance

[This section remains as previously outlined, covering Estonia's X-Road System, India's DEPA, and the EU's Data Governance Act]

Gaps in the Literature and Research Opportunities

This section identifies key gaps in the existing literature and outlines opportunities for further research.

Key points:

a) Integration of Economic and Rights-Based Approaches: Much of the literature focuses either on the economic aspects of data or on data rights and privacy. There's a need for more integrated approaches that consider both economic efficiency and individual rights.

b) Practical Implementation of Data Valuation: While there's significant theoretical work on the value of data, there's a lack of practical, implementable models for valuing individual data contributions.

c) Cross-Cultural Perspectives: Most prominent work on data governance comes from Western contexts. There's a need for more research on how different cultural and economic contexts might shape approaches to data governance.

d) Long-Term Impacts: Given the rapidly evolving nature of the digital economy, there's a need for more speculative work on the long-term impacts of different data governance models.

e) Interdisciplinary Approaches: The complex nature of data governance requires more interdisciplinary research, combining insights from economics, law, computer science, and social sciences.

Conclusion

This literature review has synthesized insights from a wide range of sources, with particular emphasis on the works of Shapiro and Varian, Zuboff, and Kelkar and Shah. These works provide a rich theoretical context for the proposed Data Royalty framework.

Shapiro and Varian's work offers crucial insights into the economic properties of information goods, which underpin the modern data economy. Zuboff's critique of surveillance capitalism highlights the urgent need for new models of data governance that protect individual rights and democratic values. Kelkar and Shah's emphasis on policy complexity and the need for nuanced approaches to market failures provides valuable guidance for developing practical, implementable solutions.

The concept of Data Royalty emerges as a potential bridge between these perspectives, aiming to address the economic realities of the data economy while safeguarding individual rights and promoting more equitable distribution of the value generated from personal data.

The gaps identified in the literature underscore the need for innovative approaches to data governance that can address the challenges of the digital economy while promoting individual

rights and economic justice. The Data Royalty concept, as developed in this thesis, aims to contribute to filling these gaps and advancing the dialogue on equitable and sustainable models for the digital economy of the future.