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1 Introduction

Surveillance is becoming an increasingly important issue in light of present discourses which position Europe and the rest of the world under potential terrorist attacks. On an almost weekly basis, newspapers around the world include front page headlines of such horrific acts. To mention some of the most recent ones in Europe alone: the terrorist attacks of 11/13 in Paris, the suicide bombing 03/19 in Istanbul and the attacks 03/22 in Brussels. Each of the above mentioned terrorist outrages not only resulted in many casualties but also in masses of injured people. Worldwide, people express their shock, and the support on social media platforms for the targeted countries is massive. These current developments give rise to big discussions on the issue of increasing surveillance measures in order to both prevent future terrorist attacks and investigate and identify suspected terrorists. The central problem seems to lie in knowing where to draw the line between national security and privacy rights. The debate also garners extensive media attention, e.g. the article “Could More Online Surveillance Have Saved Paris”, which was posted immediately after the terrorist acts of 11/13, suggests that while the increased collection and analysis of online data might support investigations after a terrorist act, it is unlikely to actually prevent such a terrorist attack like the one in Paris (cf. Risen, 2015, para. 12). Another article which was posted on the very same day points out that the attacks in Paris might revive the discussion about encrypted communication and security technology (cf. Fowler & Liedtke, 2015, headline).

In addition to these conversations in the media, there is another related case which attracts global attention and which concerns the dividing line between national security and privacy rights, namely the current encryption battle between the FBI and Apple. In the wake of the mass shooting in San Bernardino, California on 2 December 2015, the FBI requested Apple to unlock the iPhone owned by one of the shooters. Yadron et al (2016) explain that this current case is only the tip of the iceberg of a long debate by the government and Apple regarding the thin line between national security and the privacy rights of its customers (cf. para. 3). It was only in 2014, in response to the NSA disclosures by Snowden, that Apple actually increased the iPhone’s encryption. The following statement by Apple CEO Cook shows the company’s reluctance to succumb to the government’s current demand: “We have no sympathy for terrorists. But now the US government has asked us for something we simply do not have, and something we consider too dangerous to create. They have asked us to build a backdoor to the iPhone” (as cited in
Yadron et al, 2016, para. 10). Whatever the final legal decision will be, it will probably have tremendous implications for the ongoing global debate on surveillance and security technology.

Furthermore, the movie *A Good American* by the Austrian director Friedrich Moser, which had its Austrian premiere in Graz at the *Diagonale* 2016, addresses both the value of encryption and the questionable efficiency of the current mass surveillance conducted by the NSA. In the Q&A after the premiere in Graz, the protagonist Binney, former NSA encryption analyst, made it clear that, in his view, the current surveillance measures are the wrong tool to prevent terrorist attacks and that the problem can be traced back to the terrorist attacks of 9/11. As I will show in chapter 5, 9/11 had three major consequences with regard to the development of surveillance measures both in the US and across the globe. In addition to Moser’s film, 9/11 literature is a body of work which has successfully and innovatively addressed these real-world issues in the context of a post-9/11 culture of surveillance (see next paragraph).

Being a future English teacher in Austria who observes these current developments and ongoing debates over increased monitoring in response to terrorist attacks gave rise to the following question: How to deal with these topics in Austrian secondary schools, where students are familiar both with the theme of 9/11 and might be avid users of surveillance devices? The fact that for the majority of my students 9/11 is probably just history and that many of them are most likely unaware of the mass surveillance that is being conducted on them, encouraged me to seek a way to address these vital issues in school – a context which, in my view, is a crucial issue and should be discussed and not ignored. Therefore, but also in relation to the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, this diploma thesis proposes one approach to didactize 9/11 in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom in Austrian secondary schools. The selected approach includes a reading project with the focus on surveillance after 9/11. The books that were chosen for the reading project are Dave Eggers’s *The Circle* (2013) and Cory Doctorow’s *Little Brother* (2008), which are both part of post-9/11 literature. As the critical comparative analysis of the books in chapter 6, which intends to justify the use of these particular books, will demonstrate, both books depict crucial aspects of current discussions about surveillance, such as privacy,

---

1 The abbreviation EFL is sometimes used synonymously with the abbreviation ESL, which stands for English as a Second Language. However, Bell (2011) clearly emphasizes the difference between the two terms: the former refers to the English teaching in a country in which English is not the dominant language and where students have a shared language and culture. In contrast, the latter concerns the teaching of English in a country in which English is the dominant language and where students might have mixed nationalities (cf. para. 2 & 3). As this diploma thesis aims at didactizing 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools, the term EFL will be used in the following chapters.
political liberty, justice, fear and security. As a consequence, the books closely reflect their readers’ everyday experiences and so make them more easily comprehensible for the reading audience. I argue that both books want to challenge their readers’ ideas about these issues of surveillance, but employ different means of doing so. Whereas Eggers uses satirical tools, such as irony and exaggeration, to reveal his main characters’ misconceptions in regard to surveillance, Doctorow focuses on didacticism in the form of simplified explanations of technical information related to monitoring by the main character, who is not only tech-savvy but is also strongly convinced of his rights in terms of surveillance.

My diploma thesis first provides three other chapters as a theoretical basis and a fourth chapter, including the teaching materials itself, as a prelude to the analysis in chapter 6. Chapter 2 deals with the relevance of teaching 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools, as well as addressing the importance of creating materials on 9/11 for English classes in Austria. Chapter 3 examines the advantages of employing literature in the EFL classroom, which supports my choice of creating a reading project in order to didactize 9/11. Chapter 4 provides a detailed description of the activities of the designed reading project “Surveillance after 9/11”, which gives insight into the chosen approach to didactize 9/11 by using literature and focusing on surveillance. All teaching materials can be found in the appendix. Chapter 5 contains an extensive definition of surveillance, and three sub-chapters provide theoretical background knowledge on surveillance and thus offer an explanation as to why surveillance was adopted as the focus of the reading project. Finally, the conclusion provides a summary of the main points, and results of my diploma thesis.
2 Literature review

As already stated in the introduction, the aim of this diploma thesis is to propose a way of didactizing 9/11, using literature and focusing on surveillance, in the English classroom in Austrian secondary schools. Before discussing the merits of employing literature in the EFL classroom, describing the designed teaching materials and justifying its emphasis on surveillance in the subsequent chapters, I first address the overall relevance of teaching 9/11 in English lessons in Austria and creating materials for them.

In her 2004 presidential address to the American Studies Association, Fishkin (2005) draws special attention to “the transnational turn in American Studies” (passim). The term ‘transnationalism’ comprises a broad concept and consequently, definitions can differ. In general, ‘transnationalism’ concerns the “exchanges, connections and practices across borders, thus transcending the national space as the primary reference point for activities and identities” (“Migration and Transnationalism: Opportunities and Challenges”, 2010, para. 1). These links can be of economic, political or cultural nature (cf. Huff, n.d., para. 1). The term was first used around 1920 and since the 1990s it has been frequently used in the context of migration (“What is transnationalism?”, n.d., slide 2). The process of globalization is closely connected to transnationalism as it furthers mobility and communication across the globe and thus, individual nations increasingly lose their relevance (cf. Huff, n.d., para. 2). The cultural aspect of transnationalism is most important for the purpose of my diploma thesis. Here, in particular, the focus is on the worldwide cultural exchange by means of the book, music and film industries as well as the internet.

In this 2004 address Fishkin first mentions that the famous US author Mark Twain had already expressed doubts about the existence of something that can be considered solely American (cf. 2005, p. 19). Thus, she argues that “understanding the multiple meanings of America and American culture in all their complexity…requires looking beyond the nations’ borders, and understanding how the nation is seen from vantage points beyond its borders” (ibid., p. 20). In other words, Fishkin indicates the importance of looking at the US from a transnational perspective and of considering “the nation as a participant in a global flow of people, ideas, texts, and products” (ibid., p. 24). One way of putting this into practice is looking at events that happened in the US from an Austrian perspective. Thus, teaching about the 9/11 terrorist attacks, an event that happened on US soil, and its major consequences, can be considered as relevant in an Austrian secondary school context. Discussing this tremendous American event in English
classes in Austria by means of employing American (and also Canadian) literature, not only enhances the students’ insight into American society and its culture but it also improves their understanding of their own everyday life experiences, which are influenced by the effects of this very event (cf. ibid., p. 32). Hence, Fishkin’s advocacy for the increased focus on transnationalism in American studies, which also comprises the discussion of American events and the related social and cultural implications in school contexts outside the US, makes it relevant to raise the question of how to didactize 9/11 in Austrian secondary school English classes.

This transnational turn coincides with the ‘intercultural competence’ which is a competence that is mentioned in the English curriculum for Austrian secondary schools. This competence is only one of a number of skills that can be fostered by a project based on 9/11 and thus, the teaching of the terrorist attacks of 9/11 in English lessons in Austria is also relevant with regard to the Austrian curriculum for secondary schools. In general, the curriculum does not list any topics but mainly competences. Additionally, it also includes a list of contributions to educational fields and overall didactic principles. The English curriculum is part of the curriculum for modern foreign languages. According to this curriculum, ‘intercultural competence’ involves both the conscious perception of similarities and differences between countries and their relevant cultures and the critical engagement with one’s own experiences in Austria (cf. Bundesministerium für Bildung und Frauen [BMBF], 2016). The 9/11 project that was designed for this diploma thesis supports this competence as it asks students to actively engage with American culture and literature after 9/11 and relate it to their own environment in Austria.

The curriculum also states the general objective to understand social contexts (cf. ibid.), which can also be fostered by teaching 9/11 in English classes. The section on teaching principles in the English curriculum suggests the discussion of current social, economic and political developments and processes of globalization (cf. ibid.). It also points out that English classes should give insight into the society, the politics, the economy and the culture of English-speaking countries (cf. ibid.). The fact that the project on 9/11 can help to promote and cover the above mentioned competences and didactic principles in Austrian secondary schools, demonstrates its relevance with reference to the curriculum. The description of the teaching materials in chapter 4 will illustrate in more detail how the 9/11 project of this diploma thesis encourages these competences and teaching principles.
In addition, it is also helpful to examine the history curriculum as it advocates cross-curricular teaching in order to foster the overall goal of general citizenship education (cf. BMBF, 2016). Thus, teaching 9/11 in English classes can support the Sachkompetenz mentioned in the history curriculum. According to the curriculum, this competence includes the understanding and the political knowledge of institutional rules and international dependencies and correlations (cf. ibid.), which can be both enhanced by means of teaching 9/11 in school. Moreover, the history curriculum emphasizes the importance of history to understand current developments (cf. ibid.). As the description of the reading project in chapter 4 will show, the teaching materials on 9/11 intend to raise students’ awareness and understanding of the connection between the terrorist attacks in 2001 and the global surveillance at present. In addition, the curriculum also mentions the discussion of new forms of security concepts and policies (cf. ibid.) which are both vital aspects of the designed project based on 9/11. Last but not least, the curriculum highlights the existence of students’ critical faculties, which is part of the overall objective of the 9/11 project of this diploma thesis. This review of the English and the history curriculum demonstrates the great relevance of engaging students in a project on 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools.

To conclude this chapter, I deal with the relevance of creating teaching materials on 9/11 for English classes in Austrian secondary schools. An online review of teaching materials on 9/11 for Austrian students shows that the existing materials are either outdated or in German and thus, not really appropriate for current English classes. At first sight, the online search on the internet reveals the existence of a host of teaching materials on the 9/11 terrorist attacks. However, most of these materials are intended for students within the US. As a consequence, the selection for English teachers in Austria is rather limited. Nevertheless, there are some sources which seem to offer useful teaching materials for Austrian students. One example is the 111/2011 edition of the magazine Unterricht Englisch with the title “9/11-Ten Years On”, which, as the title implies, was published in the year of the 10th anniversary of the destruction of the Twin Towers. This particular issue of the magazine contains six teaching units on 9/11. Each of the units employs a different medium, such as a song, a poem or a movie, and thus, multiple perspectives on the terrorist attacks of 9/11 are offered. The only problem with this source is that it was published before the NSA disclosures by whistle-blower Snowden. In other words, the fact that it does not include a perspective on the ongoing discussion of surveillance as a result of 9/11 makes the teaching materials slightly outdated. The same is true for the 5/2011 edition of Praxis Fremdsprachenunterricht-Englisch, entitled “Walking between the Twin Towers”, which was
also published with regard to the 10th anniversary of 9/11. It proposes a motivating introduction to the topic and the use of various images and text types. Similar to the above mentioned magazine, it seems to provide useful teaching materials on 9/11 which, however, do not address the current developments regarding global mass surveillance. In addition, the Austrian Schulportal schule.at and the German Bildungsserver² have a section on 9/11 which includes a collection of links and articles for history classes. As all the information is in German those sources are perhaps useful for English teachers in Austria to gain some background knowledge on 9/11. However, the data on 9/11 which are provided by those two web portals are not really suitable teaching materials for the English classroom. Lastly, I refer to the article “Der Staat überwacht seine Bürger” by Lehrer-online, which actually focuses on the surveillance measures in the wake of the destruction of the Twin Towers. Unfortunately, the article which is intended for teaching 9/11 in secondary schools is in German, was published in 2007 and thus, it only offers an out-of-date perspective. This review of teaching materials on 9/11 makes no claim to completeness and there might be other useful sources which are not mentioned here. Nevertheless, it reveals the lack of up-to-date teaching materials on 9/11 for English classes in Austria and thus, it demonstrates the relevance of creating new teaching materials on 9/11.

² For more information visit the two websites: https://www.schule.at/portale/politische-bildung/detail/materialien-zum-thema-terrorismus-und-911.html?parentuid=109127&cHash=5161ce90e2f214a404ac70dd67179bb5 and http://www.bildungsserver.de/9-11-9775.html
The value of employing literature in the EFL classroom

The following chapter discusses the advantages of using literature in the EFL classroom, a subject which is not without controversy among teachers. This is apparent in Lechner’s diploma thesis (2014), which examines Austrian secondary school teachers’ beliefs about the use of literature in the EFL classroom. Her research shows that 84% of teachers surveyed believed that employing literature in their English classes was too time-consuming (cf. Lechner, 2014, p. 63). As an explanation for their lack of time, half of the teachers listed the new standardized Matura (cf. ibid., p. 64). According to Lechner, this is connected to the teachers’ conflicting beliefs regarding the usability of literature with respect to the new standardized Matura (cf. ibid., p. 112). In other words, Lechner’s survey demonstrates that a vast majority of the participating teachers believed that using literature in the EFL classroom did not prepare their students for the new standardized Matura, and thus, they considered it as “extra work that they had to do in addition to all the other activities they had to do with their students” (ibid., p. 106).

Another reason for the decreased use of literature in EFL classes is the fact that the objective of more recent approaches in language teaching, such as the Communicative Approach, is that students become “communicatively competent in a speech community” (Hymes cited in “Communicative Language Teaching”, n.d., para.10). As a consequence, some teachers might conclude that using literature is an inefficient way to reach this objective. Collie and Slater (1987/1992) mention this issue in their introduction of Literature in the Language Classroom where they state that “literature was thought of as embodying a static, convoluted kind of language, far removed from the utterances of daily communication” (p. 2). According to Lechner (2014), this is also reflected in the teacher training curricula at Austrian universities (cf. p.11). The University of Graz is the only university in Austria that requires all students wishing to become English teachers to attend a course that focuses on how to use literature for language teaching (cf. ibid., p. 12).

However, as indicated above, the beliefs of the teachers participating in the survey were inconsistent and, as Lechner (2014) points out, one teacher even reported that she considered the use of books in English classes as a perfect preparation for exam questions at the Matura (cf. p. 112). In line with this teacher’s opinion, and the obligatory course dealing with literature for language teaching at the Karl-Franzens-University in Graz, the following section is intended to show the numerous merits of employing literature in the EFL classroom in order to justify my decision to didactize 9/11 by means of a reading project.
Before going into greater detail about the advantages of using literature in English classes in Austrian secondary schools, I briefly address the issue of defining the term ‘literature’ in the context of school. As both Lazar (1993/2012) and Lechner (2014) illustrate, defining the term ‘literature’ is complex and tends to be subjective (cf. p. 5; p. 6). Numerous scholars have offered their own ways of defining literature and those definitions serve different purposes. As both Lazar (1993/2012) and Lechner (2014) point out, a definition which is useful for teachers should not be restricted to the once traditionally considered literary canon, but rather open to involve contemporary works too (cf. p. 5; p. 7). Thus, for the purpose of this diploma thesis, Lazar’s (1993/2012) following short and open definition is used: “[‘Literature’ means] those novel, short stories, plays and poems which are fictional and convey their message by paying considerable attention to language which is rich and multi-layered” (p. 5). It is important to emphasize that this definition also comprises Young Adult Literature, which has not been the case before the late 1960s (cf. Lechner, 2014, p. 7). I consider this extension valuable in the school context, where Young Adult Literature is a good means to stimulate younger students to enjoy reading before they are able to tackle thicker and more difficult books. Moreover, *Little Brother*, which I chose for the reading project of my diploma thesis, is also a young-adult novel. Bernick et al seem to support the idea of considering this book as literature when they state that the book is not only interesting for young readers but also for adults, who should not “let that label limit [them]…[as] the issues and action are complex” (2010a, p. 433).

The following part deals with six advantages of using literature in the EFL classroom. This discussion does not refer to the teaching of literature for the sake of literature itself but rather for the purpose of enhancing the students’ learning process of English. The following list is not to be regarded as complete, but merely illustrative of the substantial value literature adds to the EFL classroom, which in turn should encourage teachers to actually take the time to employ literature in their English classes, e.g. in form of reading projects which are similar to the one described in the next chapter. As mentioned above, this section also serves as the explanation for my choice of creating a reading project in order to didactize 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools.

The first advantage of using literature in the EFL classroom is the motivation and the sense of achievement that is triggered in the students when reading books in the target language. Surkamp (2007) emphasizes the particular motivation factor of novels and short stories as they offer riveting stories, give readers the opportunity to immerse themselves in another world, foster the readers’ identification with the characters and are generally entertaining (cf. p. 178).
Similarly, Lazar (1993/2012) states that “a good novel or short story may be particularly gripping in that it involves students in the suspense of unravelling the plot [and t]his involvement may be more absorbing for students than the pseudo-narratives frequently found in course books” (p. 15). This is also connected to the fact that apart from newspaper articles, advertisements, maps and train timetables literature is also “‘authentic’ material” (Collie & Slater, 1987/1992, p. 3) that is suitable for the EFL classroom. This authenticity is crucial since it increases the students’ feeling of their classroom work having relevance for their own life experiences (cf. Lazar, 1993/2012, p. 15). In this regard, Bredella (2001) highlights the *lebensweltliche Relevanz* (i.e., ‘relevance to one’s realm of experience) of literature (cf. p. 258). He explains that even though literary texts are fictional, their claim to knowledge is not reduced but rather increased. This is due to the fact that authors can invent new worlds which are intended to help the reader in understanding the real world (cf. ibid., p. 261). Bredella elaborates on this view by explaining that when authors create their worlds in literature they have relative autonomy (cf. ibid., p. 263). To put it differently, authors have the freedom to create all kinds of worlds in their literary texts; however, once they have set the conditions of the particular world created, they have to adhere to this internal logic in order to display the events and actions of the characters as probable. In order to illustrate this further, Bredella (2007) also uses the terms *welterzeugende* and *welterschließende Kraft* of literature in one of his other works. The former refers to the fact that literary texts generate their own worlds and the latter emphasizes that these created worlds give insight into the real world of the reader (cf. pp. 68-69). Thus, Bredella (2001) argues that the particular significance of literature is that it provides readers with diverse worlds which are never totally disconnected from the real world (cf. p. 263). This explains the students’ motivation when engaging with literature. In addition, being able to read a real book in the target language, i.e., a book which is intended for English native speakers, can be a successful experience for students and increase the students’ pride and self-confidence (cf. Lazar, 1993/2012, p. 15).

The second benefit of employing literature in the EFL classroom is that literature improves the students’ interpretative skills. As the definition of literature indicates, literary texts often have multiple meanings and thus, readers are required to be “actively involved in ‘teasing out’ the unstated implications and assumptions” (ibid., p. 19). This view is also supported by Delanoy (2007) who discusses Blau, Bredella and Said to argue that literature develops general critical interpretation skills as readers have to deal with ambiguous and omitted aspects which are necessary for understanding literary texts (cf. pp. 170 & 173). Delanoy also points out that the
highest competence level in reading in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages\(^3\) also comprises this critical interpretative competence; unfortunately, however, the document neither includes a detailed definition of this competence nor an explanation of how students are supposed to develop it (cf. ibid., p. 173) In this context, Surkamp (2007) mentions the concept of top-down processing which concerns the fact that readers use their own world knowledge and experience to fill gaps in literary texts (cf. p. 180). This is illustrated by Bredella (2007) who describes the students’ involvement in the interpretation process based on the specific example of Wright’s short story “Almos’ a Man” (cf. pp. 81-82).

The third merit of employing literature in EFL classes is what Lazar (1993/2012) denotes as the “educating [of] the whole person” (p. 19), which concerns the students’ imagination, critical abilities and emotional awareness. In this regard, Collie and Slater (1987/1992) use the term “personal involvement” (p. 5) to emphasize literature’s value in providing readers with the opportunity to immerse themselves imaginatively in literary texts, to experience the characters’ perspectives and to share their emotions (cf. ibid., p. 6). Bredella (2001) mentions the crucial point that even though readers are involved in a literary text, they are, at the same time, also outside of it, which entails a certain distance (cf. p. 268). This distance enables a critical reflection by the readers on their own lives and beliefs in comparison to those of the characters in the literary texts. According to Bredella, the emotions which are evoked by reading literature are a prerequisite for this reassessment of the readers’ own realities and thus, they should not be dismissed in school (cf. ibid.). Furthermore, Lazar (1993/2012) argues that if teachers “ask students to respond personally to the texts…[they] give them, they will become increasingly confident about expressing their own ideas and emotions in English” (p. 19). Hence, using literature in the EFL classroom stimulates the imagination of the students, enhances their critical abilities to reflect on their own lives and improves their emotional awareness.

The fourth value of the use of literature in the EFL classroom lies in the fact that literary texts give readers access to the culture and the way of life in English speaking countries (cf. Collie & Slater, 1987/1992, p. 4). For students who might not have the means to visit or stay abroad in an English speaking country this is a great way to get insight into and a better

\(^3\) The Common European Framework of References for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment, short CEFR, provides descriptions of six different levels of foreign language proficiency and is intended, inter alia, to offer a reference frame for school curricula in Europe. The CEFR’s focus on listing specific competences has also influenced the new standardized Matura in Austria (cf. “Education and Languages, Language Policy”, n.d., para. 2 & 3).
understanding of the target culture. Collie and Slater (1987/1992) acknowledge that the worlds in literary texts are obviously created ones but, nevertheless, they emphasize that the “vivid imagined world [of literary works] can quickly give the foreign reader a feel for the codes and preoccupations that structure a real society” (p. 4). Lazar (1993/2012) raises two other important issues which demonstrate the complexity of this topic. First, it is difficult to determine which aspects of a certain culture are reflected in its literature and how reliable this depiction is. A circumstance that is also dependent on the specific definition of ‘culture’ one is using (cf. p. 16).

The scholar elaborates on this point by opposing the fairly open anthropological definition of culture as “the values, traditions and social practices of a particular group” (ibid.) with the more rigid definition of culture as “the discernment and knowledge traditionally possessed by the well-educated, enlightened and cultivated native speaker” (ibid.). Depending on which definition teachers adopt, they will probably select different books for their students. Teachers also have to consider the classification of popular culture, which might be more interesting for many students (cf. ibid.). Second, there is not one single culture that is mirrored by English literature, as the language is used worldwide (cf. ibid.). Considering these points, it is highly significant that teachers ask their students to obtain a critical perspective on the cultural facet of literature in the sense that “underlying cultural and ideological assumptions in the texts are not merely accepted and reinforced [by students], but are questioned, evaluated and, if necessary, subverted” (ibid., p. 17).

The fifth advantage of employing literature in EFL classes is that literary texts increase “students’ [linguistic] language awareness” (Lazar, 1993/2012, p. 18) of general characteristics in the English language. As indicated above, one argument against using literature in English classes is that it differs substantially from the English used in everyday communication. In other words, some teachers might be concerned that using literature in their EFL classroom means that their students engage themselves with “‘wrong’ uses of language” (ibid.). But the key issue is that if students are encouraged to study deviant and uncontroversial uses of the English language in literature, they simultaneously have to consider the standard norms and recognize the differences (cf. ibid.). To put it in a different way, examining nonstandard expressions in literature supports students not only in identifying those special stylistic features in literary texts but also in gaining awareness of “how this effect is achieved by departing from a norm” (ibid., p. 19). Thus, the use of literature in the EFL classroom fosters students’ linguistic awareness of general language features of English, such as collocations (cf. ibid.).
Lastly, the sixth reason for using literary texts in the EFL classroom is that literature can be used as a motivating prompt for writing tasks and also improves writing skills, two issues which are often neglected (cf. Surkamp, 2007, p. 185). As Surkamp points out, the fact that literary texts can raise the students’ motivation for writing in the target language is connected to the topics and the methods (cf. ibid.). As far as the thematic aspect is concerned, literary texts are especially suitable as writing prompts because they encourage students to respond and give their own opinions. In contrast to most texts in school books, which often focus primarily on the introduction of new vocabulary or new grammatical structures, students feel personally addressed by literary texts and they can use their own everyday life experiences when engaging themselves with writing tasks related to them (cf. ibid.). Thus, literary texts are authentic and motivating writing prompts as they provide the students with a thematic context for their writing tasks (cf. ibid.). In regard to the methodic aspect, dealing with literature in EFL classes often comprises methods which focus on the learners and their individual comprehension of the literary texts (cf. ibid., p. 186). Examples of such tasks for students are keeping a reading diary, writing a critical response to a central statement of the text or composing a letter to one of the main characters. These and similar writing tasks can enhance the students’ overall writing motivation as they allow complete creative freedom and they take the human need for communication seriously (cf. ibid.). In addition, Surkamp (2007) argues that writing skills are fostered by the use of literature in the EFL classroom (cf. p. 186). She mentions that one crucial advantage is that literary texts can provide an overall frame for several writing exercises and thus, connect them thematically with each other. In other words, students can practice different text types, such as letters, diary entries and reviews, on the basis of one literary text (cf. ibid.). Surkamp also highlights the fact that, after having read the book and understood the content, the learners can dedicate their full attention on the writing process (cf. ibid., p. 187). Furthermore, literary texts provide students with formal templates, enhance their English vocabulary and sprachgefühl, i.e., ‘a feel for the language’, and encourage them to experiment with new words and structures (cf. ibid, p. 188). Thus, this paragraph illustrates that – even though generally not mentioned that often in didactic discourse – employing literature in EFL classes has major beneficial effects on the students’ motivation for writing exercises and their general writing skills. To conclude, even though some teachers may be reluctant to employ literature in their EFL classes, the foregoing discussion clearly illustrates the great merits of using literature in the EFL classroom.
4 Surveillance after 9/11: Reading Project

This chapter contains the reading project “Surveillance after 9/11”, which I designed to didactize 9/11 in 6th or 7th grade of Austrian secondary schools. In this reading project, which lasts between five and six periods in school, students have the choice of either reading *The Circle* by Eggers or *Little Brother* by Doctorow. In order to extend the selection for their pupils, I recommend that teachers also include the book *Surveillance* (2007) by Jonathan Raban in the reading project. This post-9/11 novel, which features a journalist’s life and her journey of discovering a fake Holocaust memoir by using the internet, would add another interesting perspective on contemporary surveillance. However, I will not include an analysis of *Surveillance* here as this would go beyond the scope of this diploma thesis. Both *The Circle* and *Little Brother* deal with the main focus of this reading project, surveillance, and important aspects that are related to it, which will be illustrated in the analysis of the books in chapter 6. The reading project is divided in six different parts to achieve its overall goal of didactizing 9/11 by focusing on the mass surveillance which was triggered by the terrorist attacks and its global consequences. It is crucial to point out that the project does not have the intention to stoke the pupils’ fears; in contrast, it wants to raise the students’ awareness of surveillance and cause a reflection on their own beliefs and habits in a global monitoring era, hence furthering their critical thinking skills.

The first part of the reading project has the main objective of supporting the students in choosing a book for the project. The second part aims at introducing pupils to the topic surveillance and the possible dangers connected to it. Part three is comprised of several activities regarding facts and forms of commemoration of the terrorist attacks of 9/11 which is the basis of the project. The fourth part is intended to have students experience the atmosphere in the US after 9/11, which includes a discussion of the PATRIOT ACT, the NSA and vital aspects of mass surveillance. In the fifth part of the reading project pupils should discuss contemporary consequences of global surveillance in Austria by means of a comparison with the books and they should reflect on their own habits on the internet, e.g. when using Facebook or Google. As already mentioned above, transnationalism provides a relevant frame for engaging Austrian students in the described activities. The sixth and last part of the project involves the students’ overall reflection on the reading project itself. The following description of the exercises in the different parts shows that, apart from reading, the project also includes writing, listening and speaking tasks.
In addition, the reading project also includes recommendations for home exercises for the students. I do not expect teachers to follow all the directions in the project strictly as individual activities or home exercises might be modified in order to meet the needs of a particular school class. Nevertheless, the reading project provides teachers with a detailed outline illustrating one possible way to teach 9/11 in an Austrian school context. The project comprises a student’s booklet and the corresponding teacher’s package. In the following section I describe all the activities which are part of this reading project. The complete student’s booklet and the teacher’s package including all accompanying handouts, PowerPoint Presentations, and notes on materials needed and time frames are part of the Appendix of this diploma thesis.

**Instructions for the teacher:**

**PART 1**

**Activity 1.1**

**Objective:**
The aim of this activity is to determine and activate the prior knowledge and assumptions students have about 9/11 and surveillance.

**Description:**
Each student receives a blank sheet of paper. Explain that you are going to write down three terms on the board (one after the other) and the students have to create mind maps for each of them on their sheet of paper. For each mind map they have exactly two minutes. Write down the first term ‘Facebook/Google’ and set a timer (two minutes). Tell the students to stop when the time is up. Then write down the second term ‘9/11 terrorist attack’ and after two minutes the third term ‘surveillance’. Ask the students to hand in their mind maps after the activity.

**Activity 1.2 – Book-choosing activity**

**Objective:**
The aim of this activity is that students choose a book according to their interests and reading level/habits. It should also enhance students’ motivation and responsibility by allowing them to choose their own books.
Description:
Ask your students to use the computers/tablets to inform themselves about the books The Circle by Eggers and Little Brother by Doctorow (additionally: Surveillance by Raban). For each book they get a little card, which they have to complete during this activity. At the end of the lesson, the students hand in the card of the book of their choice. The students and you set a deadline for having read the books, i.e., the 2nd (or 3rd) period of the reading project.

Activity 1.3 [recommended as home exercise]:
Reading the book

PART 2

Activity 2.1
Objective:
The aim of this activity is to provide an overall frame for the reading project. The students are introduced to the main topic of the reading project, surveillance, and consider possible dangers connected to it.

Description:
Introduce the reading project “Surveillance after 9/11”.
Step 1: Brainstorming the word ‘surveillance’ – write the word on the board and students can go to the board and add what comes to their minds.

Step 2: Watch two short video clips which indicate the danger of surveillance; ask students to take notes while watching the videos (on page 2 of student booklet → Hand out the student booklets if students do not have them yet.)
Are you being watched through your webcams and security cameras? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjL8wplRXRk

DHS – We’ll be watching you: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=es-eZnyxx2E
After watching the video clips students have to decide which of the facts they find most threatening. They should mark the different facts with 1, 2 or 3 exclamation marks in order to indicate how they feel about each one.

**Step 3**: Discussion time: How do you feel about this? Which are the most threatening facts? Why?

**Conclusion for this activity**: The US is a country where freedom is an important value. This raises the following question: WHY HAS THE US INTRODUCED SO MUCH SURVEILLANCE?
In order to find out we need to look back at the year 2001… (see PART 3)

### PART 3

#### Activity 3.1
**Objective:**
The aim of this activity is that students reflect individually on the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and, in addition, learn ten important facts about the attacks.

**Description:**
You introduce 9/11: Let’s talk about 9/11. First of all, we will watch two videos of the attacks. The first video shows how the first plane hits the North Tower. The second one covers the last five minutes of a phone call, while the North Tower collapses. It is important to highlight the potential problems that could occur when watching these disturbing videos. Depending on the needs of a specific class, teachers might also choose to rely on photo footage instead.

After watching the videos: Ask your students to do the free writing activity on page three of their booklets. Explain that they should write about whatever comes to their minds after having seen those two video clips. They have to keep writing for three minutes (without lowering the pen). You will time the activity, allow three minutes, and announce the end of the activity. Ask your students, if anyone wants to share some of their thoughts. If yes, give some time to share, if not continue with the PowerPoint presentation. This sharing should be completely voluntary and is intended to provide your students with the opportunity to share their feelings if they feel the urge to. Continue with the PowerPoint presentation to go through the ten important facts.
Activity 3.2
Objective:
The aim of this activity is to familiarize students with six different 9/11 memorials. Students should participate in group decisions in order to choose their favorite memorial as a group. In addition, they have to provide a justification for their choice.
Description:
Hand out info cards (one memorial per student) – students get three minutes to read the short descriptions. Afterwards groups of six are formed (each group member has a different memorial). Each student has approximately one minute to present his/her memorial to the group. At the end they choose their favorite memorial as a group and explain why it is the best one.

Activity 3.3 [recommended as home exercise]
3.3.1 In the next period you are going to work with certain sections and chapters of Data and Goliath. There will be six sections/chapters, i.e., six groups. Form six groups and hand out the sections/chapters accordingly. Each student has to read the allocated section/chapter (approx. seven pages).
3.3.2 Tell the students to ask three people (parents, grandparents, older siblings, friends…) about their memories of September 11, 2001. Where were they when the attacks happened? How did they find out about the attacks?
Ask your students to create a one minute video (using eyejot/their mobile phones/webcams) to report on/summarize their findings. In order to give students enough time for the successful completion of this task, the recommended deadline for this home exercise is the end of the project.

PART 4

Activity 4.1
Objective:
The aim of this activity is that students receive important information on the National Security Agency [NSA], its mission and how the mission changed after 9/11. In addition, they learn about the legal justification of mass surveillance, with the focus on the PATRIOT ACT.
Description:
Introduce the activity: Last class we dealt with the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and how the attacks have been commemorated. As you can imagine, the atmosphere in the US after 9/11 was intense – many people had lost loved ones, wanted revenge and asked how the government stood by and allowed the attacks to happen. Bush immediately declared the ‘War on Terror’ and one of the major consequences was a massive augmentation of surveillance in the US and the whole world. The main justification was that surveillance is necessary to prevent attacks like 9/11. The government’s primary eavesdropping organization is the NSA which had already existed long before the terrorist acts of 9/11 happened. However, the attacks changed the organization’s mission drastically. Let’s have a quick look at the history of the NSA.

Use the PowerPoint presentation to talk about the history of the NSA, its mission and its legal justification. Useful information while going through the presentation:

Slide 1: Read out the title of the presentation and point out the official seal of the NSA.

Slide 2: The NSA was formed in 1952 by President Truman. It was and still is, part of the US military, and started out as an organization exclusively focused on foreign intelligence-gathering. This mission rose in importance during the Cold War. It gathered more and more information as both capabilities and the amount of communication to be collected increased. Some of this was useful, though a lot of it was not. This mission’s importance should have diminished with the fall of Communism in the late 1980s and early 1990s. For a while it did, and the NSA’s other mission, to protect communications from the spying of others, grew in importance. The NSA became more focused on defense. (Schneier, 2015, pp. 62-63)

Slide 3: But eavesdropping became more intense after 9/11.

Slide 4: “Never again” was an impossible mandate, of course, but the only way to have any hope of preventing something from happening is to know everything that is happening. That led the NSA to put the entire planet under surveillance. Traditional espionage involved government against government. But the terrorist enemy is different. It isn’t a bunch of government leaders “over there”; it’s some random terrorist cell whose members could be anywhere. Modern government surveillance monitors everyone, domestic and international alike. The goal of the NSA’s surveillance is neatly captured by quotes from its top-secret presentations: “collect it all”, “know it all” and “exploit it all”. Most of the NSA’s money for its modern surveillance infrastructure came from the post-9/11 war effort in Afghanistan and Iraq. (ibid., pp. 63-65)

---

The information on the PowerPoint slides and the corresponding notes below are based on Schneier’s *Data and Goliath*. The following excerpts are all direct quotations that include several omissions which, however, are not explicitly indicated, in order to avoid the disruption of the teacher’s flow of reading.
**Slide 5:** One obvious question arises: is this legal? The real answer is that we don’t know. The current authority for NSA surveillance comes from three places Executive Order 12333 (signed by President Reagan in 1981), Section 215 of the USA Patriot Act (enacted in Oct 26 2001) and Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act (2008). (Schneier, 2015, p. 65)

**Slide 6:** Close look at the PATRIOT [Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001”]: allows the NSA to collect “any tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items)”—about anyone, not just foreigners—“for an investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.” That last bit might sound like a limitation, but a secret court interpreted this to include the continuing collection of telephone metadata for every American. (ibid.)

**Slide 7:** Mass surveillance is different. If you’re truly worried about attacks coming from anyone anywhere, you need to spy on everyone everywhere. And since no one country can do that alone, it makes sense to share date with other countries. US intelligence agencies partner with many countries. (ibid., p. 76)

**Activity 4.2**
**Objective:**
The aim of this activity is that students create posters in order to summarize certain sections of Schneier’s *Data and Goliath*. By familiarizing themselves with the allocated sections of the book, they gain some theoretical background knowledge on important aspects of contemporary surveillance.

**Description:**
Ask your students to get into the previously formed groups (according to the section they read for their previous home exercise). First they should discuss the section and decide on the key ideas. Using these key ideas, they should create a poster which is supposed to provide a summary of their section of *Data and Goliath*.

**Activity 4.3**
**Objective:**
The aim of this activity is that students deal with different contemporary aspects of surveillance and the data that is collected. By having students present the information to their classmates, the activity should also further students’ presentation skills.
Description:
Each group presents their poster for approx. 3-5 minutes. The other students take notes on information that they want to remember. They should use the space provided in their student booklet (page 4-5).

PART 5

Activity 5.1
Objective:
The aim of this activity is that students use their books to discuss the contemporary consequences of global surveillance in Austria. Students should actively engage with the books and use them for comparisons to their everyday life experiences.

Description:
Divide your students into groups of 2-4 (according to the novel that they chose; each group member has to have read the same book). They stay in this group to work on the activities on pages 5-9 of their reading project booklets. Among others, the group should discuss the following questions:

How realistic are the forms of surveillance in the book? (Compare to info from last class)
What gadgets and/or apps actually exist in Austria? What gadgets do you use and what are the consequences of using those devices?
What is the impact of surveillance on political liberty and justice in the book? Is the data collected by monitoring used to make a person look guilty?
How does surveillance limit the characters’ privacy in the book?
How is surveillance used to prohibit dissent in the book?

Activity 5.2 [recommended as home exercise]
Completing the activities on p. 10-12 of reading project booklet

Activity 5.3
Objective:
The aim of this activity is that students reflect on their own habits on the internet and the usage of applications on their mobile phones.
Description:
Step 1: watching a part of the following video clip (as an introduction to the reflection part)
The dangers of the internet, from 3:29 – 4:19 (topic privacy):
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uquRzrcwA18
Step 2: Ask your students to complete pages 13 and 14 individually, not in groups. Emphasize that this is a “no talking” exercise.

Activity 5.4
Objective:
The aim of this activity is that students share their good expressions (from the previous home exercise) within their groups.
Description:
Ask your students to meet in the groups from the previous period. They have to share their expressions and each student has to add five additional ones to their list.

PART 6

Activity 6.1
Objective:
The aim of this activity is that students reflect on the entire reading project.
Description:
Hand out the reflection questions and ask the students to answer the questions individually. No talking during this activity. Collect the reflection handouts when the students are done.

Activity 6.2 [recommended as home exercise]
The students have to write a critical response to the following statement (see below or page 15 of student booklet). They should consider the characters’ actions in the book and the discussions in class. Students should state if they agree or disagree with the statement. Collect the home exercises.

“If you aren’t doing anything wrong, then you have nothing to hide” (Schneier, 2015, p. 125).
5 Focus on surveillance

The reading project, which was designed to didactize 9/11 in the Austrian school context, has a clear focus on surveillance. The following sub-chapters give an insight into why this particular focus was chosen. Before going into detail, it is crucial to define the term ‘surveillance’. Lyon, who leads the Surveillance Studies Center at Queen’s University, offers a detailed definition of ‘surveillance’ in his book *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. According to Lyon’s (2007) definition, ‘surveillance’, which is derived from the French word *surveiller*, meaning to watch over, is “the focused, systematic and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction” (p. 14). When elaborating on this definition, Lyon explains that he uses the term ‘systematic’ to refer to the deliberate factor of surveillance and the term ‘routine’ to highlight that monitoring has become a natural part of people’s everyday lives in modern societies which depend on information technology and bureaucracy. However, it is crucial to point out that there are exceptions, such as police surveillance, which can be both rather general and random in its initial search for suspects (cf. ibid., p. 14-15). As far as information technology is concerned, Lyon emphasizes that while it makes observation easier, it does not mean that other forms, such as face-to-face surveillance, are no longer used. The definition also includes the important term ‘purpose’, which concerns the fact that surveillance always has a particular aim – either positive or negative. In other words, people may watch over you to ensure your safety or they may seek to influence your behavior (cf. ibid., p. 15). Lastly, Lyon refers to the asymmetry of surveillance as “it usually involves relations of power in which watchers are privileged” (ibid.). However, he adds that often people also participate willingly in surveillance (cf. ibid.), which is discussed in more detail below.

To justify the teaching materials’ emphasis on surveillance, I first show how the 9/11 terrorist attacks resulted in a massive augmentation of mass surveillance inside the US. In order to provide evidence of this connection I discuss three important consequences of the destruction of the Twin Towers with regard to surveillance in this chapter. In addition, to address the distinction between mass surveillance and targeted surveillance, reference is made to Binney, the protagonist in Moser’s documentary *A Good American*, in which he claims that a specific form of targeted surveillance, i.e., a system called ThinThread, could have prevented 9/11. In the next sub-chapter, to stress the influence on Austria and countries other than the US, I demonstrate how globalization and US surveillance hegemony facilitated global observation after 9/11.
Additionally, the second sub-chapter illustrates how surveillance discourses and policies in the EU mirror or even exceed those in the US.

5.1 Surveillance in the wake of 9/11 in the US

In this section I make the claim that mass surveillance was substantially increased in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and demonstrate this on the basis of three main consequences of the attacks. Initially, however, it is vital to highlight the following point mentioned by Murakami Wood and Wright (2015): “9/11 seems less like a transformative trigger event for surveillance, an axis around which ‘everything changed’, and more like an opportunity for the confirmation and strengthening of existing trends” (p. 135). Nevertheless, according to Lyon (2015), there can be no doubt that the terrorist attacks of 9/11 “shape[d] the direction of surveillance decisively…, the aftermath of which hugely boosted security-related surveillance [in the US]” (p. 143). Similarly, Evangelista (2002) describes the increase of surveillance gear in the US one year after 9/11:

These days, if you feel like somebody’s watching you, you might be right. One year after the Sept 11 attacks, security experts and privacy advocates say there has been a surge in the number of video cameras installed around the country [U.S.]. The electronic eyes keep an unwavering gaze on everything from the Golden Gate Bridge to the Washington Monument…. [For example,] a group of anti-surveillance activists [say]…they have seen a 40% increase in new cameras in New York’s financial district since last September [2001] (online).

The first crucial consequence of 9/11, which significantly supported the augmentation of mass surveillance after the terrorist acts in the US, is that it provided the government and the NSA with a justification for surveillance in terms of national security (cf. Lyon, 2015, p. 143). The use of perceived threats, such as crime, drugs and terrorism, by the US government to increase its control over the general public, has a long-standing tradition (cf. Bloss, 2007, p. 210). According to Whitaker (2003), 9/11 is an example of how “the historical cycle in which violent threats generate the expansion of arbitrary and intrusive powers of government is being repeated. Once again, the constitutional protection of rights is being dismissed…as an inconvenient impediment to safety” (p. 52). In this regard, constructivist international relations scholars discuss the process of securitization, which is employed by politicians to justify surveillance. According to Buzan and Wæver (2003), ‘securitization’ can be defined as the following:

[it is] a successful speech act through which an intersubjective understanding is constructed within a political community to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and to enable a call for urgent and exceptional measures to deal with the threat (p. 491, emphasis in original).
The definition implies that as a result of constructing terrorism as a threat to the general public, a “situation of urgency” (Schulze, 2015, p. 201) can be generated, which in turn justifies violations and transgressions of laws which – under normal circumstances – would never be accepted by the public (cf. Stritzel, 2007, p. 361; Reyes, 2011, p. 785). This extension of federal laws in the US after 9/11 is discussed in more detail below. Reyes (2011) explains that politicians often establish “pseudo-causality” (p. 793) where they use hypothetical statements in the form of topoi. Schulze (2015) mentions the following as an example of a security topos: “we are threatened (premise), therefore we must do X (claim) without giving reasons why X is the best or only solution for this particular problem” (p. 201).

These phenomena are also apparent in the rhetoric employed by the Bush administration after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. On the evening of 9/11, Bush held a speech to the nation, in which he aimed to construct terrorism as an urgent threat both to the US and the entire world: “Our first priority is…and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks” (as cited in Eidenmuller, 2006, para. 4). The phrasing already suggests that these precautions, which are likely to involve extensions of existing policies, will be justified by the urgency of the situation. In addition, he refers to 9/11 as an event which threatened “[people’s] sense of safety and security” (as cited in Eidenmuller, 2006, para. 7), hence, he implies the need for an increase in security measures. This is in line with a 2002 letter, released this year, which deals with how 9/11 increased President Bush’s authority in terms of electronic surveillance. The letter includes the following statement:

Under the current circumstances, in which international terrorist groups continue to pose an immediate threat, we have concluded that such surveillance would be reasonable under the Fourth Amendment because it advances the compelling government interest of protecting the nation from direct attack (as cited in Chalfant, 2016, para.4).

The passage has the same structure as the exemplary security topos discussed above. It involves the premise that back then, shortly after 9/11, the US was strongly threatened by international terrorist groups, which entailed the claim that surveillance measures had to be enhanced. The argument is framed in terms of national security and does not include a reasoning of why surveillance is the best or the only solution.

In addition, the Bush administration’s construction of terrorism as being an immediate threat to the general public also supported the justification of the creation of the Department of Homeland Security [DHS] after 9/11. As part of their mission, the official website of the DHS includes the following statement: “Protecting the American people from terrorist threats is our
founding principle and our highest priority” (“Prevent Terrorism and Enhance Security”, n.d., para. 1). The alleged urgency, which was addressed above, is illustrated by the fact that only 11 days after the terrorist acts, Ridge, 43th Governor of Pennsylvania, was designated as the White House’s first Director of the Office of Homeland Security (cf. “Creation of the Department of Homeland Security”, n.d., para. 2). According to Kaplan (2003), the use of the term ‘homeland’ – in contrast to e.g. ‘domestic’ or ‘national’ – bears great significance. The American Studies scholar argues that ‘homeland’ may be associated with “uprootedness, deracination, and desire” (p. 89) and as a result, the term creates a feeling of insecurity rather than security. Thus, even though the term ‘homeland security’ includes the term ‘security’ itself, which may be intended to defend the US against threats from outside the border, it actually evokes the image of “the homeland [being] in a state of constant emergency from threats within and without” (Kaplan, 2003, p. 90). This in turn supports the justification for government intrusions into the lives of the American people by way of mass surveillance (cf. ibid.) In addition, Kaplan compares the space ‘homeland’ with Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, which has received considerably less attention in the public discourse. The US located a prison camp on this space which is “not clearly under the sovereignty of either nation, nor seemingly subject to national or international law” (Kaplan, 2005, p. 832). According to Kaplan, the usage of ‘homeland’, which suggests the removal of borders, is strongly connected to the lawless Guantanamo Bay; both encouraging the idea of spaces without real limits for the conduct of the US government (cf. 2003, pp. 91-92).

The second important consequence of 9/11 is that the NSA was granted a large amount of money by the government to drastically increase and modernize its surveillance apparatus. In essence, after 9/11, a substantial amount of the taxpayers’ money was used to fund the NSA’s conversion from analog to digital surveillance equipment. This is supported by Murakami Wood and Wright (2015) who argue that 9/11 resulted in a “renewed commitment to funding” (p. 135). In addition, Moser’s movie A Good American explicitly addresses the government’s massive funding of the NSA due to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The film shows how, after 9/11, Drake, a colleague of the NSA encryption mastermind and whistle-blower Binney, refers to his former NSA boss Baginski “who reportedly said ‘9/11 was a gift to the NSA, we’re gonna get all the money we need and then some’” (as cited in Canahai, 2016, para. 4). Furthermore, the movie displays Binney himself remembering the following statement by the then vice president of SAIC, one of the private companies providing the NSA with information technology support: “We can milk this cow for 15 years” (ibid., para. 10), which could even imply a misappropriation
of federal funding. This idiom clearly highlights how the tax payers’ money – rather like a cash cow – kept flowing into the NSA’s hands in the wake of 9/11. In addition, the image of a cow which, when artificially inseminated, can be milked for a long time, suggests that 9/11 put the NSA and its partners in the position of being able to keep requesting money from the government for a rather long time. In other words, after 9/11, the NSA could constantly enhance their surveillance equipment, which entails a massive augmentation of mass surveillance in the US.

The third significant consequence concerns the legal changes made due to the terrorist acts of 9/11, which expanded the scope of conducting mass surveillance on its citizens by the US government, in particular the NSA, the police and the DHS. According to Bloss (2007), “particularly after 9/11, they [campaigns against public threats such as…and the ‘war on terror’] have given rise to several federal laws that bestow greater surveillance powers on the police [and other intelligence agencies]” (p. 213). In the following, I deal with the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act [USA PATRIOT ACT5], which probably involves the most crucial modifications of federal laws in the wake of 9/11, in more detail. Nevertheless, it is important to point out that there are also various other laws, such as the Electronic Communications Privacy Act [ECPA] and the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act [CALEA], which were revised due to the 9/11 terrorist outrage (cf. ibid., pp. 218-219).

In general, the PATRIOT ACT, which was passed within two months after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (cf. Schneier, 2015, p. 227), comprises the modification or revision of fifteen federal laws which deal with surveillance in regard to counter-terrorism and foreign intelligence (cf. Bloss, 2007, p. 214). The justification of this legislation can be traced back to the government’s creation of urgency due the immediate threat of terrorists after 9/11, discussed above. Schneier (2015) puts it the following way:

[The PATRIOT ACT] was a wish list of police and intelligence powers and authorities, passed overwhelmingly in both houses with minimal debate. No one in Congress read it before voting. And almost everyone in the country wanted the law to pass, despite not understanding its provisions (p. 227).

This statement implies that both politicians and the general public were acting hastily when passing the PATRIOT ACT shortly after the 9/11 terrorist acts. In the following section I elaborate on some of the changes of federal laws which were part of this new legislation.

---

5 In the following only referred to as PATRIOT ACT.
First, the PATRIOT ACT contains the expansion of statutory definitions, such as of ‘domestic terrorism’ and of ‘terrorist organization’, in order to “‘widen the net’ on potential illegal acts or actors thereby expanding the ability of the police [and other intelligence agencies] to engage in surveillance or conduct investigations in a broader range of alleged criminal or foreign intelligence-related activities” (Bloss, 2007, p. 215). Second, the revision of language used in the PATRIOT ACT also aims at increasing the agencies’ wiretap authority. Previously, the demonstration of a particular cause was necessary to obtain a wiretap search warrant. According to Bloss, the PATRIOT ACT substantially reduced this particularity requirement by including vague terms. An example of this obscurity is that it allows the investigation of any foreign intelligence information as part of a terrorist investigation (cf. ibid.). Third, the legislation involves significant changes of the statutes regarding U.S. bank reporting. When conducting an investigation related to terrorism or a foreign actor, which provides another example of vague expressions, the PATRIOT ACT gives federal authorities the permission to both “obtain financial information...[and] seize the bank accounts, assets, and property if ordered by the court” (ibid., p. 217).

As mentioned above, the documentary A Good American features the NSA whistleblower Binney and his revelations about the NSA’s controversial actions before and after 9/11 and the invention of ThinThread, a computer system which he claims “would absolutely have prevented 9/11” (as cited in Matheou, 2015a, para. 4). The film is interesting for a host of reasons, but for the purpose of this diploma thesis, it offers a clear illustration of the difference between mass surveillance and targeted surveillance. According to Lyon (2015), the line which previously separated the two forms of monitoring is becoming blurred (p. 149). The following discussion of metadata and encryption based on the movie A Good American suggests, however, that such a distinction is still possible. In the film, the former NSA analyst Binney explains that ThinThread is a computer system which uses metadata on phone and e-mail conversations in order to conduct targeted surveillance. As far as metadata is concerned, Schneier (2015) explains that metadata is context as opposed to data which is content (cf. p. 23). As an example, metadata on an e-mail is not the content of the e-mail but the e-mail addresses of the two participants and the time and date when the e-mail is sent. Additionally, Schneier points out that “when you have an entire population under surveillance, the metadata is far more meaningful, important, and useful” (ibid., p. 23). This is in line with Binney’s explanation in the film that ThinThread supposedly solved the NSA’s largest problem, namely a massive data overload (cf. Mayer, 2011,
This renders ThinThread a highly efficient monitoring tool, both for mass and targeted surveillance. As highlighted by Mayer, the crucial point is, however, that Binney and his colleagues “installed privacy controls and added an ‘anonymizing feature,’ so that all American communications would be encrypted until a warrant was issued. The system would indicate when a pattern looked suspicious enough to justify a warrant” (ibid., para. 27). This very fact prohibits mass observation and makes ThinThread a useful tool for targeted surveillance which is also in accordance with the law. According to director Moser, ThinThread is not only a “programme that would have prevented 9/11…[but also] the perfect alternative to mass surveillance” (as cited in Matheou, 2015b, para. 12).

However, *A Good American* shows that – only a few days prior to the terrorist attacks of 9/11 – ThinThread was abandoned by former NSA director Michael Hayden. Matheou mentions that instead of ThinThread “the then NSA director General Michael Hayden commissioned Trailblazer to be the agency’s signature surveillance system, farming billions of dollars of work to the private sector” (2015a, para. 11). Thereby, the movie also illustrates the government’s outsourcing of surveillance, which has since become a common trend. This was shocking enough for Binney and his team, but to worsen the situation, when the NSA upgraded its surveillance gear in the wake of 9/11, as discussed above, the organization started using the technology of ThinThread without the previously installed privacy protections. The result was a tool for mass surveillance illegally used by the NSA to spy on American citizens after 9/11 (cf. Shorrock, 2013, para. 8). According to Binney, the new “N.S.A.’s data-mining program is so extensive that it could help ‘create an Orwellian state’” (as cited in Mayer, 2011, para. 42). He and his team were so disgusted by these developments that they left the NSA soon after the destruction of the Twin Towers in 2001 (cf. ibid., para. 43).

### 5.2 Surveillance in the wake of 9/11 outside the US

Now, after the demonstration of how 9/11 fostered a great intensification of mass surveillance within the US, I discuss how globalization and US surveillance hegemony assisted monitoring outside the US, thus creating a global surveillance society after 9/11. At the end of this chapter, I briefly deal with the EU surveillance discourses and policies after 9/11 which can be considered similar to or even harsher than those in the US. Prior to Snowden’s revelations in 2013, the general public had little knowledge of the extent to which their governments were conducting mass surveillance on them. It can be assumed that before Snowden leaked the NSA documents
people outside the US generally underestimated the large scale of mass global observation and thus, “the thought of a global surveillance society was considered conspiratorial at the time [pre-Snowden]” (Verde Garrido, 2015, p. 155). Roughly three years after Snowden’s revelations, the existence of a global surveillance society hardly seems deniable any longer.

The first reason which facilitated the emergence of such a global surveillance society is globalization. Verde Garrido points out that monitoring has become global partly because “contemporary society is itself global and digital [and g]lobal economy results from the interconnectedness of the world’s national economies” (ibid.). In other words, the use of the internet and applications on mobile phones, such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, connects people worldwide and hence, increases the potential for global surveillance. Similarly, Lyon (2007) mentions both the globalization of economy and politics as factors that bring about a globalization of surveillance (cf. pp. 134-135). In addition, Ball and Murakami Wood (2013) argue that due to the fact that being watched is part of people’s everyday lives around the globe, see Lyon’s definition above, surveillance can be described as global (cf. p. 1). As briefly indicated in the previous discussion of the NSA’s actions before and after 9/11, government surveillance agencies increasingly cooperate with private companies in order to pursue their surveillance ambitions. According to Ball and Murakami Wood, the result of this synergy, in particular focusing on information and communications, is “a [global] normalisation of surveillance as a life-practice” (ibid., p. 3).

Another reason which has strongly supported surveillance outside the US after 9/11 is American surveillance hegemony. In the following section I show why the US can be considered a surveillance hegemony and how being in this position aids them in their goal to surveil people worldwide, which in turn fosters a global surveillance society. Keiber (2015) defines American surveillance hegemony as an extension of existing US hegemony (cf. p. 171). The scholar points out that surveillance hegemony is “more specifically reliant on security discourses, rather than the (neo)liberal discourses that underpin the broader US led hegemonic order” (ibid.) The framing of surveillance in terms of security already points to the second factor which renders the US a surveillance hegemony as discussed below. The first, and also more obvious reason, refers to the “extraordinary material surveillance capabilities of the US” (ibid., p. 172), and is demonstrated by its excessive funding. Gellman and Miller (2013) mention that the US intelligence budget for 2013 was $52,6 billion and that almost a third of this large sum was
intended for counterterrorism measures (cf. para. 12). In this respect, the hegemonic position of the US – in terms of surveillance – seems unquestionable.

However, it is crucial to point out that financial means are not the only reason for American surveillance hegemony, as it is also connected to certain norms – accepted by other states – about the implementation of surveillance on an international level (cf. Keiber, 2015, p. 172) Anti-terrorist norms significantly changed after 9/11 and this normative shift was apparent in the US’s understanding of counterterrorism as “an international responsibility all states share” (ibid.). In other words, after 9/11 the US defined surveillance measures in terms of international security for which all countries were responsible. Even though counterterrorism was considered a shared responsibility, it does not seem surprising that one country would take the lead in the international ‘War on Terror’. The 2003 national strategy for combating terrorism by the White House clearly attributes this leading role to the US, which again indicates American surveillance hegemony. Keiber also highlights the hegemonic position of the US when he states that “[the idea is that] the US approach to surveillance would be dominated by cooperative efforts with more capable states and assistance for weaker states to shore up their domestic surveillance capability” (ibid., p. 173). None of the other states would have the means to provide this kind of support to the other countries.

To conclude this particular section, I provide two examples of how this hegemonic position helps the US to pursue its global surveillance ambitions, which in turn entails a general increase of global surveillance. The first example concerns hundreds of information-sharing agreements between the US and other countries (cf. Keiber, 2015, p. 175). One vital agreement, the Homeland Security Presidential Directive [HSPD], was signed under the Bush administration in 2003 and resulted in a “Terrorist Watch List” (ibid., p. 176). The fact that this list is a result of American surveillance hegemony is emphasized by Keiber who states that “the US uses its leverage but does not command by fiat” (ibid.). That is to say, while the US does not force other countries to participate in the agreement it does, however, offer incentives such as a visa waiver or data from the watch list itself. Keiber underscores the fact that, as a result, the US has managed to gain access to the data from “roughly 20 per cent of states in the world presenting nearly 700 million people” by 2012 (ibid.). This clearly illustrates the substantial increase of global surveillance due to American surveillance hegemony.

The second example is that the US provides other countries around the world with a screening system called PISCES [Personal Identification Secure Comparison and Evaluation
System], which is intended to support border security. The US employs its hegemonic position both to distribute and sustain the PISCES program (cf. Keiber, 2015, p. 176). The fact that other countries are using its system enhances US surveillance power as they can ask for information on particular suspects or request analysis data when conducting maintenance. Furthermore, by providing participating countries with specific data, the US can influence the screening in favor of its interests (cf. ibid., p. 177). To conclude this part on globalization and American surveillance hegemony, I use the following quote by Keiber to indicate the likely development of global surveillance: “If the present continues on the trajectory of more surveillance by states over individuals globally, surveillance will be normalized as a global phenomenon dealt with by international – not domestic – states structures” (ibid., p. 179, emphasis in original).

Lastly, a brief discussion of the EU surveillance discourses and policies since 9/11 shows how they reflect or even surpass the ones in the US. It can be assumed that the majority of EU citizens underestimate the EU’s surveillance capabilities and measures in the wake of 9/11 and that most people probably believe that the US monitoring policies are considerably harsher than the EU ones. This is connected to the fact that discussions about implementing controversial surveillance policies in the EU are often hidden from the general public (cf. Hayes, 2009, p. 81). However, the report “NeoConOpticon” by Hayes, who works for Statewatch, gives insight into the developments of surveillance in the EU and shows many similarities and even some aggravations to US observation phenomena. First, the report shows that, similar to US rhetoric after 9/11, the EU discourse about surveillance measures focuses on security without a serious consideration of privacy or civil liberty concerns. In his extensive report, Hayes argues that “the word ‘security’ now serves to justify making permanent measures that just a few short years ago appeared ‘exceptional’” (ibid., p. 79). As discussed above, the DHS was created in the wake of 9/11 in the US and in this report Hayes points out strikingly similar developments in the EU:

Whereas before 2001 the concept of Homeland Security had not even entered the popular lexicon, after 9/11 corporations were quick to establish divisions mirroring the restructured federal state apparatus in the USA and the newly established DHS. European defence [sic] companies were quick to follow the lead of their US counterparts, leaving them well placed to exploit the EU’s own embrace of homeland security (ibid., p. 19).

The justification of observation in terms of homeland or national security is, however, not the only similarity revealed in Hayes report. As I illustrated in the above chapter, the massive funding related to security and surveillance equipment after 9/11. This US notion is also apparent in the EU. In 2004, The Group of Personalities wrote a report in which they suggest that funding
for security research in Europe and the US should be similar (cf. ibid., p. 11) Hayes’ report shows that monies in other areas of the EU budget were made available for funding the security research (cf. ibid., p. 19). To conclude, I address the legal developments regarding surveillance in the EU since the terrorist attacks of 9/11. As discussed above, the highly controversial PATRIOT ACT was passed under the Bush administration within two months of 9/11. In his report Hayes argues that some laws in the EU even surpass these legal modifications in the US:

While the PATRIOT ACT has achieved notoriety, the EU has, quietly, adopted legislation on the mandatory fingerprinting of all EU passport, visa and residence permit-holders, and the mandatory retention—for general law enforcement purposes—of all telecommunications data (our telephone, e-mail and internet ‘traffic’ records), all air traveler data (on passengers into, out of and across Europe) and all financial transactions” (ibid., p. 43).

The passage clearly highlights the magnitude of legal changes introduced in the EU in order to support mass surveillance in Europe. The statement also indicates that, as already mentioned above, those controversial changes were kept from the general public, which in turn explains people’s underestimation of EU surveillance capabilities after 9/11.

5.3 Vital aspects of contemporary surveillance

After discussing surveillance in the wake of 9/11 in and outside the US, this chapter provides a theoretical background on the following crucial and controversial aspects of contemporary surveillance in the real world: privacy, political liberty and justice as well as fear and security. As far as surveillance in literature is concerned, Kammerer (2012) argues that, in general, “the public is more likely to gain its understanding of surveillance from fiction than from academic studies” (p. 104). The well-known book 1984, which deals with a form of mass surveillance not all too far-fetched from the present situation, was already written in 1949. However, it is important to point out that the notion of Big Brother as a dystopian thought in the first half of the 20th century, together with various other risk scenarios, demanded the contemporaneous readers to stretch the limits of their imaginations in order to be able to grasp the fictional world of such texts as Orwell’s 1984. I argue that in Eggers’s The Circle and Doctorow’s Little Brother the aspects of surveillance are much closer to the readers’ everyday experiences today, even if they are not necessarily aware of their own exposure to surveillance. In other words, the fact that the books are so germane to the readers’ realities makes the topic more easily comprehensible to them. In addition, I claim that both books encourage a reflection on and a comparison to their own beliefs and habits in the world where modern technology is used for monitoring. Kammerer (2012) supports this argument as he states that “by presenting alternative worlds, novels [about
surveillance]…aid us in the reflection of our own situation” (p. 105). Similarly, Marx claims that literary works “can convey the experience of being watched or of being a watcher” (as cited in Kammerer, 2012, p. 105).

The first step to justify the above-mentioned claim about the two books’ closeness to their readers’ realities is outlined in the subsequent theory section and provides a theoretical background for privacy, political liberty and justice as well as fear and security. The second step is a demonstration of how these very aspects are dealt with in the two books, which is done by means of a detailed analysis in the next chapter.

5.3.1 Privacy

One of the most vital controversies of surveillance in everyday life is privacy, which has been discussed more and more often recently. This is due to the fact that in the wake of 9/11, as indicated above, communication is monitored and gathered on a global scale by agencies such as the NSA. In addition, Google and Facebook, each used by more than a billion people around the world, provide an incredible amount of data. These trends have been raising grave concerns about the “value of individual privacy in the digital age” (Greenwald, 2014, p. 2). Before elaborating on these concerns, it is essential to define the term ‘privacy’. According to the Cambridge Dictionaries Online, ‘privacy’ is defined as “someone's right to keep their personal matters and relationships secret” (n.d.a, online). This definition grants a person the right to maintain secrecy over personal information. In addition, the Business Dictionary offers the following definition which explicitly refers to surveillance: “the right to be free from secret surveillance and to determine whether, when, how and to whom, one’s personal or organization information is to be revealed” (n.d.b, online). Both definitions clearly emphasize a sense of entitlement, which stands in sharp contrast to the common misconception that people who insist on their privacy have something to hide. In 2009, Google CEO Eric Schmidt claimed: “If you have something that you don’t want anyone to know, maybe you shouldn’t be doing it in the first place” (as cited in Esguerra, 2009, para. 1). However, in accordance with the definitions above, Schneier (2015) argues that “privacy is an inherent human right, [sic] and a requirement for maintaining the human condition with dignity and respect” (p. 126). Several studies suggest physical and emotional consequences of the lack of privacy: immune system deficiency, depression, angst and low self-confidence. People basically lose their dignity (cf. ibid., p. 127). Similarly, Greenwald (2014) asserts that “privacy is essential to human freedom and happiness” (p. 173).
As a consequence of mass surveillance after 9/11, this right of privacy has been constantly diminished, which can be illustrated by means of the opposition of the terms *eternal* and *ephemeral*. People tend to consider interactions and conversations as ephemeral, which was true in the past. However, more recently, the majority of conversations happen online and are thus saved on computers eternally (cf. Schneier, 2015, pp. 127-128). When Snowden leaked important NSA documents in 2013, he provided journalists with a letter in which he stated that “all new communications records that can be ingested and catalogued by this system are intended to be held for [ ] years” (Greenwald, 2014, p. 24). He used the symbol [ ] to imply that “everything you say and do will be associated with you forever” (Schneier, 2015, p. 127). This clearly contradicts the definitions from above and is both a violation and a reduction of people’s privacy in the everyday world. Losing the temporary component is highly alarming to Snowden. He states that one of the singular merits of the Internet is the opportunity for people to “explore who they are and who they want to be” (Greenwald, 2014, p. 46). Snowden adds that this “works only if we’re able to be private and anonymous, to make mistakes without them following us” (ibid.).

However, it is crucial to mention that oftentimes people willingly give up their privacy. One reason for this is that people want to be identified in order to access e-mail and bank accounts (cf. Schneier, 2015, p. 131). In addition, convenience is another factor for people to voluntarily submit themselves under surveillance. This is true for people who use applications like Google maps, Yelp or Uber, which necessarily need to know your location. Last but not least, many companies make sure that users do not realize the intrusion on privacy. Applications are advertised as free, which allows customers to forget that they themselves, i.e., the data about them, are the price (cf. ibid., pp. 50-51).

### 5.3.2 Political liberty and justice

Two other fundamental aspects of the ongoing surveillance debate are political liberty and justice. Concerns have been voiced that mass surveillance poses a serious hazard to people’s political liberty and the justice system. Before going into detail, I first define both the concepts ‘political liberty’ and ‘justice’. The former is defined by Dictionary.com as “the right to express oneself freely and effectually regarding the conduct, makeup, and principles of the government under which one lives” (n.d., online). For the purpose of this thesis, the following definition of ‘justice’ by the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary is employed: “the process or result of using laws to fairly judge and punish crimes and criminals” (n.d., online). Thus, put simply, people who
live in a country with political liberty and justice are entitled to the freedom of speech with respect to their government’s actions and principles. In case somebody is suspected to have committed a crime, the person is treated justly according to the laws in this country. That is the case in theory at least.

According to Schneier (2015), apart from the financial costs, the most significant cost of surveillance is jeopardizing the freedom and fairness described above: “if you have enough data about someone, you can find sufficient evidence to find him guilty of something” (p. 92, emphasis in original). Greenwald (2014), agreeing with Schneier, indicates that the NSA collects data on people without any particular justification (cf. p. 141) and as discussed above, data can be saved eternally and exploited when needed. The fact that mass surveillance happens warrantless violates political liberty and justice. After the 9/11 terrorist acts, this becomes even more problematic with “the expansion of the legally loaded terms ‘terrorism’ to include conventional criminals” (Schneier, 2015, p. 92). This is also true for the government’s interpretation of the highly controversial PATRIOT ACT: “an interpretation so broad that even the law’s original authors were shocked to learn how it was being used” (Greenwald, 2014, p. 113).

Furthermore, it is important to point out the arbitrariness and variability of the definition of ‘wrong’. An action or a statement considered inoffensive today might be judged as wrong tomorrow or in several years. The information on the action or statement is permanently stored, which implies severe limitations to our political freedom (cf. Schneier, 2015, pp. 92-93).

The fact that people’s right to express their opinions has been reduced substantially is a form of government censorship enforced by mass surveillance (cf. ibid., p. 95). One direct consequence is ‘self-censorship’, which, according to Cambridge Dictionaries Online, is the “control of what you say or do in order to avoid annoying or offending others, but without being told officially that such control is necessary” (n.d., online). For the purpose of this thesis, the others in this definition can be replaced by the government. In addition, it is important to highlight the last part of the definition which refers to the voluntary nature of self-censorship. In other words, the government does not officially ban certain topics but “if people know the government is watching everything they say, they are less likely to read or speak about forbidden topics” (Schneier, 2015, p. 95). A significant survey was conducted in 2013 by PEN America6. The results showed that a large number of participants had changed their behavior in response to

---

6 PEN America is a membership association of well-known writers and editors advocating freedom of expression based in New York City. (see http://www.pen.org/about)
Snowden’s leaks of NSA documents. In particular, 24% of the participants stated the conscious avoidance of specific topics on the phone or in e-mails (cf. Greenwald, 2014, p. 178). Another poll, carried out by Harris in 2014, demonstrates that nearly half of the participants changed their online behavior, i.e., what they say and what they do online, because of the revelation of the NSA’s surveillance methods (cf. Cobb, 2014, para. 2).

The first consequence, in reference to the self-censorship of journalists and writers, is that people are less informed. This chilling effect can be seen as a severe threat to society, but the second consequence, relating to the self-censorship of the general public, might be considered as even more serious: people who start to align their behavior to the standard social norms, produce a compliant society. Schneier (2015) puts it the following way: “In response, we do nothing out of the ordinary. We lose our individuality, and society stagnates. We don’t question or challenge power. We become obedient and submissive. We’re less free” (p. 97).

Naturally, one could also argue that the self-censorship caused by mass surveillance “promote[s] what some may consider desirable behavior” (Greenwald, 2014, p. 180). Two important names in this context are Jeremy Bentham and Michel Foucault, who already explored this idea and similar ones long before 9/11 and the surveillance era. The former was the English philosopher and social theorist who designed the Panopticon in the late 18th century. The Panopticon is “a system of observation in which people could be placed under the possibility of surveillance without knowing whether they were actually being watched” (Mann et al., 2003, p. 334, emphasis in original). The inventor Bentham suggested the use of this architectural concept particularly for prisons but he also recommended it for schools, hospitals and even workplaces (cf. ibid.). As people can never be sure, if they are actually being surveilled, they themselves align their behavior to the expected norm. This implication refers to Foucault’s discipline society, described in the following statement:

[T]he major effect of the Panopticon [is] to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power…; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers (as cited in Mann et al., 2003, p. 334).

Since the coinage of Panopticon, various people have modified the word in order to describe more recent trends related to monitoring. Mann, for instance, uses the term neo-panopticon to refer to the usage of new technologies to conduct mass surveillance. These make it possible to put

---

7 The Harris Poll, formerly known as Harris Interactive, is a market research company located in Rochester. (see http://www.theharrispoll.com/)
people in public places in such situations, where they might be under surveillance and this knowledge is enough to make them behave correctly (cf. Foucault cited in Mann et al., 2003, p. 335). This argument is supported by numerous studies that have been conducted to illustrate how mass surveillance can alter people’s behavior in a positive way. Greenwald (2014) mentions a study about a Swedish soccer stadium which shows that the implementation of security cameras decreased the audiences’ disorderliness by 65% (cf. p. 180). In addition, a 2009 report on the effectiveness of CCTV surveillance cameras, reveals that CCTV systems in car parks reduced crime by 51% (cf. Welsh and Farrington, 2009, online).

Nevertheless, Greenwald (2014) argues that “overwhelmingly, the effect of being watched [by means of new technologies] is to severely constrain individual choice” (p. 180). This is also supported by Deleuze’s control society model, which draws upon Foucault’s concept of the discipline society. Muir (2015) explains that “the control society does not discard these [former Foucauldian] elements, but rather, builds on their foundations with altogether less visible infrastructures which exist in multiple spaces and domains” (p. 360). In other words, the control society model highlights the novel fluidity of observation caused by the use of new technologies to conduct surveillance. According to Muir, the result is a “surveillance society” (ibid.), which, as indicated by Schneier’s quotation above, is a society that stagnates. More explicitly he claims that “there is value in dissent…[to] improve as a society” (Schneier, 2015, p. 97). Looking back on the history of individual countries around the globe clearly suggests that people first had to challenge existing powers systems before achieving progress. To name just a few well-known examples: Martin Luther King, Jr., Gandhi and the suffragists. A more recent example is Julian Assange, the founder of the company WikiLeaks. Greenwald (2014) points out that governments have often tried to demonize the personality of a person challenging its power and that this strategy was also used on Assange. The result is deterrence; when dissidents are considered as crazy and emotionally instable, other people are less likely to become dissidents themselves (cf. pp. 226-227).

The last issue to be discussed in regard to political liberty and justice is government secrecy. The mass surveillance conducted by the government generates a contradiction to its own actions and the fact that after 9/11, “almost anything can be a secret” (Schneier, 2015, p. 99). A useful term in this respect is ‘doublethink’, a word which was invented by George Orwell in his above mentioned novel 1984. ‘Doublethink’ refers to “the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them” (Jura, n.d., para. 1). In case of
the US government, this means that people should accept that the government seeks to know all (which is an explicit goal of the NSA (cf. Cole, 2014, para. 2)), i.e., transparency of people worldwide, while no one is allowed to know anything about its actions (cf. Greenwald, 2014, p. 169). This major imbalance between a government and its citizens is another severe limitation of political liberty and justice.

When Obama was running for President, one part of his campaign claimed that his administration would be the most transparent one in history and that it would advocate whistle-blowers. However, the administration turned out to do the complete opposite: not only are most of its actions classified, but also more whistle-blowers have been prosecuted than under all previous US administrations combined (cf. Greenwald, 2014, p. 50). It is important to point out that without whistle-blowers like Snowden, we would know far less about the governments’ actions and the NSA’s eavesdropping methods and strategies. Snowden himself states: “I will be satisfied if the federation of secret law, unequal pardon, and irresistible executive powers…are revealed for even an instant….I have been to the darkest corners of government, and what they fear is light” (as cited in Greenwald, 2014, p. 32).

As indicated above, hackers and whistle-blowers are nowadays often “[discredited] as psychologically damaged…[a] way in which intelligence services fight back against those who would seek to reveal their activities” (Murakami Wood & Wright, 2015, p. 136). Before I explain how the connotations of these two terms changed over time, I briefly address the difference between the terms and how they are used in this diploma thesis. According to the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, a hacker is “a person who secretly gets access to a computer system in order to get information [or] cause damage” (n.d., online) and a whistle-blower is “[a person] who reveals something covert or who informs against another” (n.d., online). Recent examples of Edward Snowden and Julian Assange illustrate how technological experts can use their expertise to leak secret information about the government or other organizations to the general public. Thus, for the purpose of this diploma thesis, I use both terms together to refer to a person who uses hacking skills to reveal covert information about the government or an organization to the public. In contrast to the primarily negative connotations of hackers and whistle-blowers at the present time, Dudek and Johnson (2011) point out that “in the 1980s, being a computer geek set one apart and turned nerds into heroes” (p. 185). It can be argued that these people perform what Bourdieu calls “acts of resistance [which] are struggles against power and authority” (as cited in Dudek & Johnson, 2011, p. 189, emphasis in original). To put it differently, these hackers and
whistle-blowers perform acts of resistance by revealing – primarily conflicting – information on governments and organizations. Using their skills and new technological tools to fight the norms enforced by these governments and organizations may cause the attribution of positive connotations to the two terms. In this sense, hackers and whistle-blowers are one example of how new technologies empower, instead of limit, people in the fight against the imbalance of powers caused by the “asymmetrical nature of surveillance” (cf. Mann et al., 2003, p. 334) and government secrecy.

Another way, which also includes the use of new technologies, to monitor and reveal government secrecy and thus, to compensate the imbalance of power due to surveillance, is inverse surveillance which is a form of sousveillance, a term coined by Mann to denote the surveilling of surveillers (cf. ibid., p. 332). Whereas sousveillance generally refers to people recording themselves during an activity (cf. Mann, 2002, section A society with only oversight is an oversight on our part, para. 1), inverse surveillance focuses more specifically on “using tools [such as wearable cameras or computer hacking] to observe the organizational observer…to neutralize surveillance” (ibid., p. 333). To put it differently, inverse surveillance empowers ordinary people to reestablish the initial balance which was destroyed by the “institutionalization of Bentham’s Panopticon” (ibid., p. 347).

Therefore, it is quite understandable that the government, the NSA and similar organizations have to keep some information secret. However, the public should know as much as possible about its governments’ actions in order to hold them accountable and to maintain political liberty and justice. To put it in Greenwald’s (2014) words: “Transparency is for those who carry out public duties and exercise public power. Privacy is for everyone else” (p. 209).

5.3.3 Fear and security
To conclude this part on key aspects of surveillance in people’s everyday lives today, it is important to deal with fear and security. Both topics have been prevalent in public discussions, especially in the wake of the recent terrorist acts not only in the US but also in Europe. Before proceeding with these two aspects, both terms are defined first. In order to provide a definition of ‘fear’, I refer again to Cambridge Dictionaries Online which defines ‘fear’ “as an unpleasant emotion or thought that you have when you are frightened or worried by something dangerous, painful, or bad that is happening or might happen” (n.d., online.) For the purpose of this thesis, the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary offers a suitable definition of ‘security’: “measures taken
to guard against espionage or sabotage, crime, attack, or escape” (n.d., online). Fear and security are closely connected, which can be illustrated by the example of the terrorist attacks of 9/11: the public’s fear after 9/11 was enormous and many people instantly demanded measures to protect against such attacks in the future.

The interesting point about fear is that people usually focus on one unusual and dramatic danger, while they ignore other threats which are more common (cf. Schneier, 2015, p. 135). As an example, people are more afraid of terrorists than of the police, even though, according to Syrmopoulos, “a U.S. citizen is actually 58 times more likely to be killed by a police officer than by a terrorist” (2015, headline). A 2014 article by Washington's Blog makes the matter even more obvious by using statistics to compare the likelihood of death from terrorism to other causes of death. Two striking examples mentioned in the blog are the following ones: (1) “Americans are 110 times more likely to die from contaminated food than terrorism” (Washington's Blog, 2014, online) and (2) “Americans are just as likely to be ‘crushed to death by their televisions or furniture each year’ as they are to be killed by terrorists” (ibid.). Nevertheless, people focus on terrorism as the primary threat. This irrational way of dealing with fear made it easier for the government to use 9/11 – and consequently the need for security – as a justification for its massive augmentation of surveillance.

However, both Greenwald and Schneier consider this justification as rather questionable. First, the data that is collected by means of the security measures established after 9/11 is hardly used to fight terrorists or to provide national security. Greenwald (2014) argues, “given the actual surveillance the NSA does, stopping terror is clearly a pretext” (p. 202). Second, and more importantly, there is not a single case which proves that mass surveillance helped prevent an act of terrorism (cf. ibid.).

Schneier, in accordance with whistle-blower Binney, mentions the following three reasons why mass monitoring is the wrong tool to stop terrorist acts and thus, clearly suggests the use of targeted surveillance.

- Mass surveillance is subject to a relatively high error rate. Using the mathematics of detection, he explains that even if the accuracy is increased, the system will still accuse millions of people falsely. In fact, mass surveillance adds more data and this bulk of irrelevant data makes the detecting of terrorists even more difficult (cf. Schneier, 2015, pp. 136-138).
• Each terrorist attack is singular, which makes mass surveillance detection methods unreliable (cf. ibid., p. 138).

• In contrast to ordinary people who usually do not consciously hide their activities, terrorists are people who do not want to be detected. Thus, mass surveillance can be applied more easily to the general public than to terrorists (cf. ibid.).

This implies that millions of dollars are spent on observation systems which do not guard the society against terrorism, thus contradicting the definition of security from above. Reason (1) indicates that mass surveillance does not only not guard the public, but it even makes it less secure.

To conclude the section on fear and security, I discuss the value of encryption. In his book *No Place To Hide* Greenwald relates the story about how he was first contacted by Snowden in December 2012. In his first e-mail, written under the pseudonym Cincinnatus, Snowden urged Greenwald to start using PGP [Pretty Good Privacy] encryption. The website Dictionary.com provides the following suitable definition of ‘encryption’:

> [Encryption is] the process of encoding a message so that it can be read only by the sender and the intended recipient. Encryption systems often use two keys, a public key, available to anyone, and a private key that allows only the recipient to decode the message. (n.d., online)

The encryption system PGP is based on this model, i.e., it uses a public and a private key, which is illustrated in figure 1. The fact that Snowden wanted to communicate with Greenwald only when he used encryption, implies that Snowden believes that encryption provides security.

![Figure 1. Asymmetric key mechanism. The principle behind the encryption system PGP. (Megahed, 2011, section GNU Privacy guard)](image-url)
He confirms this assumption in an online Q&A in 2013. He adds that because of computer problems, so called vulnerabilities, even encryption cannot provide total security (cf. Schneier, 2015, p. 144). Nevertheless, both Greenwald and Schneier recommend using encryption as they believe that it makes mass surveillance less effective and requires the government and the NSA to pick targets (ibid.).
6 Analysis of Eggers’s *The Circle* and Doctorow’s *Little Brother*

After having provided a theoretical background on privacy, political liberty and justice as well as fear and security, the following section of my diploma thesis comprises an analysis of how these aspects are addressed in Eggers’s *The Circle* and Doctorow’s *Little Brother*. The following analysis is performed in terms of reception studies, i.e., it focuses on “the ways in which [the two] literary works are received by readers” (“Reception Theory”, n.d., online). Reception theory goes back to the German literary scholar Hans Jauss (1921-1997) and his outline of the ‘reception-aesthetics’ in 1970 (cf. ibid.). Using this approach, I do not aim to reconstruct or reproduce the actual reception of concrete readers, but rather to reveal the potential meanings of the texts (cf. “Überblick zu Literaturwissenschaftlichen Theorien/Modellen und Methoden (Auswahl)”, 2009, p. 12). In order to describe how current thoughts about surveillance are dealt with in the two books I draw especially on numerous book reviews. It is important to point out that my readings of the novels are more in-depth than those the students in Austrian secondary schools are likely to develop themselves.

The two books *The Circle* and *Little Brother* that were chosen for the reading project are both part of post-9/11 literature. What they have in common is a discussion of crucial aspects of current debates about surveillance, such as privacy, political liberty, justice, fear and security. The overall theme surveillance is also apparent through the titles of the two books. Eggers’s title *The Circle* denotes the name of the powerful internet company where the main character Mae starts working at the beginning of the dystopic science fiction novel. It also alludes to the company’s goal to close the circle, which is a metaphor for complete transparency or, more explicitly, overall mass surveillance. Similarly, Doctorow’s dystopic young-adult science fiction novel *Little Brother* is a reference to the well-known notion of Big Brother in Orwell’s 1984, which is a symbol for the constant total surveillance of the general public. As indicated above, I argue that in times where mass surveillance is steadily increased, these books are fairly close to their readers’ everyday experiences and thus, encourage the readers’ reflection and reevaluation of their own ideas about these controversial issues of surveillance. This is also supported further by the fact that both novels are set in the very near future.

A significant difference between the two books is the way they aim at challenging their readers’ own beliefs about surveillance. *The Circle* belongs to the genre of Menippean satire, which is a subcategory of satire. In general, satire employs various comic tools, such as irony,
parody, exaggeration and double-entendre, in order to provide social criticism (cf. “Satire”, n.d.a, para. 1). In other words, a satire holds up human vices and follies to ridicule by using the mentioned literary devices (cf. Elliott, n.d., para. 1). According to the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, the term was first used in 1501 and might originate from the Latin words satira and lanx satura; the second term can be translated as a dish made of different ingredients (cf. “Satire”, n.d.b, online). From the outset, satire has been used extensively not only in literature, but also in other areas of human life, such as television, media or visual art. Consequently, there are various forms of satire and a classification into the following three types helps to distinguish between different satirical literary works: Horatian, Juvenalian and Menippean (cf. “Satire”, n.d.a para. 2). The last category “deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes… and presents people as mouthpieces of the ideas they represent” (Frye, 1957, section Specific Continuous Forms (Prose Fiction)) and it is those mental attitudes and ideas that are being ridiculed. This form of satire, which also comprises Eggers’s The Circle, has received renewed attention by postmodernists, particularly by Thomas Pynchon (cf. Petronius, 1996, p. 19).

With regard to the closeness to the readers’ everyday experiences several writers, such as Felix Salmon and Graeme McMillan, and some tech-people have raised criticism about Eggers’s misrepresentation of the internet in The Circle. The people who criticize the lack of verisimilitude of the book seem to make the assumption that Eggers wanted to represent reality. However, in a Q&A with McSweeney’s, Eggers himself states that the book is not about a real company like Facebook or Google and that he neither visited a tech-company’s campus nor interviewed employees of such a company. In this Q&A Eggers explains that he “wanted this book to be free of any real-life corollaries” (as cited in Mc Sweeney, 2013, question 2). Referring back to my claim above, I agree with Hewitt and argue that the fictional world of Eggers’s The Circle is close to people’s everyday experiences without an absolute claim of truth. This is due to the fact that the fictional world created in The Circle is a satirical way to challenge its readers to reflect upon their own beliefs in times of modern technology and surveillance. Exact correspondence is not required here, as illustrated by Hewitt’s statement: “It’s less about [a representation of] Silicon Valley and it’s more about looking at ourselves” (as cited in Bosman and Miller, 2013, last para.). Similarly, Atwood (2013) argues the following:

---

8 Perry Hewitt is Harvard’s chief digital officer and has been employed at various tech companies before. For more information see https://www.cxotalk.com/perry-hewitt-chief-digital-officer-harvard-university
This, then, is the “real” world to which Eggers holds up the mirror of art in order to show us ourselves and the perils that surround us. But *The Circle* is neither a tract nor an analysis but a novel, and novels always tell the stories of individuals (para. 7).

In contrast to Eggers’s satire, Doctorow’s *Little Brother* falls into the category of didacticism, a type of literature in which the message is more important than the aesthetics (cf. “Didacticism”, n.d., para. 1) In other words, didactic works are primarily “written to inform or instruct the reader” (ibid.). Mendlesohn (2008) highlights this didactic dimension in *Little Brother* when he states that, in contrast to many other young-adult science fiction books, this novel actually gives attention “to the way the world works” (para. 7) and teaches its readers something. More explicitly, he argues that “Little Brother is fiercely, unashamedly didactic” (ibid.). This didacticism is also openly announced by the author himself when he gives insight into the writing process of this book in an e-mail interview. Doctorow explains that at the beginning of the writing process, he knew that there was some technical information that he wanted to include in his book (cf. Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 435). In the interview Doctorow writes that “Little Brother [is a book that] assumes that the reader would love to have explicit information about some of the secret stuff going on that explains how the world works and how we got to where we are” (as cited in Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 436). This stands in contrast to Eggers’s attitude displayed in the statement above, which is connected to his lack of doing research on technology used for surveillance in the real world. In this way, the fictional world of *Little Brother* – set in the near future of San Francisco including realistic features and detailed explanations of aspects of surveillance and technology in everyday life – is even closer to the reader’s reality than *The Circle*. This is also supported by the following statement by Dudek and Johnson (2011):

> The two Afterwords in *Little Brother* use similar rhetoric to that of Marcus when he addresses the reader, outlining the details of particular technological techniques, which has the effect of blurring the boundaries between Marcus’s fictional world and the hacking world that informs the novel (p. 188).

The following analysis provides an in-depth insight into the way the two novels address the above mentioned contemporary aspects of surveillance. First, Eggers’s *The Circle* is analyzed and then, in order to illustrate both similarities and differences, Doctorow’s *Little Brother* is analyzed in comparison to the former novel.
6.1 Eggers’s *The Circle*

6.1.1 Privacy

In the previous chapter’s section dealing with the theoretical background of privacy in times of surveillance, I discussed the misconception in the everyday world that people who insist on their right to privacy have something to hide. Even though definitions of privacy clearly indicate that people have the right to privacy, many people are still subject to this misconception (cf. Schneier, 2015, p. 125) and thus consider other people’s rigid insistence on their right to privacy suspicious. This real-life misconception also occurs in the fictional world of Eggers’s *The Circle*, allowing readers to experience it while reading the novel. I claim that the book does not only intend to make its readers experience the common misconception but rather challenge it. As the subsequent analysis shows, this is accomplished by the use of the two satirical tools irony and exaggeration. The former refers to the fact that most of the characters in the book are depicted as fully convinced of the very misconception that should be questioned by the readers. It is expected that the readers know more than the characters and experiencing the characters’ views and actions should make them reconsider their own beliefs about the right to privacy. The latter concerns the hyperbole of certain actions, behaviors and events in the book. In other words, the extremeness of the characters’ approval of the misconception, displayed through their exaggerated behavior, aims again at the readers’ ability to challenge the misconception which is common in the everyday world.

In *The Circle* the specific term ‘surveillance’ is hardly used, but instead the book opts for the euphemistic word ‘transparency’. The fact that transparency entails surveillance is barely addressed by most of the characters. The focus clearly lies on all the advantages of transparency, which is illustrated by the fact that four main characters particularly approve of total transparency and thus, are subjects to the misconception mentioned above. These characters are Mae, Annie, Francis and Bailey. However, the significant differences between these four characters and their development become evident during the course of the novel. I argue that these differences encourage readers to compare their own beliefs to those of the different characters, also considering their differing developments. Atwood (2013) supports this view when she argues that “[The Circle] demands that the reader think its positions through in the same way that the characters must” (para. 30). In the following section, I demonstrate both how the characters’ beliefs differ and how their beliefs change throughout the novel.
The characters Francis and Bailey are both flat characters: they are portrayed as firmly believing in this misconception without changing their opinion during the story. Bailey’s strong conviction is illustrated in a conversation with Mae who asks him: “So you’re saying there should be no secrets” (Eggers. *The Circle*, p. 291). Bailey responds: “I have thought on [sic] this for years, and I have yet to conjure a scenario where a secret does more good than harm. Secrets are the enablers of antisocial, immoral and destructive behavior” (*TC*, p. 291). In the course of this conversation he adds:

But my point is, what if we *all* behaved as if we were being watched? It would lead to a more moral way of life. …We would finally be compelled to be our best selves….Finally, finally, we can be good. In a world where bad choices are no longer an option, we have no choice but to be good (*TC*, p. 292).

Francis’ firm belief is visible in his enthusiasm about his project ‘ChildTrack’, which aims at tracking every single step of children by inserting a chip in their bones, restricting their privacy severely. In addition, Francis also videotapes Mae’s and his intimate interaction in his bedroom. When Mae demands the deletion of the video, Francis reacts appalled: “‘Did you say ‘delete’?’ he said, jokingly, but the meaning was clear: *We don’t delete at the Circle*” (*TC*, p. 205, emphasis in original).

In contrast to Francis and Bailey, the main character Mae’s beliefs and developments are more complex. If this higher level of complexity renders her a round character is debatable. Ullman (2013), for example, considers Mae as trivial and argues that she “must be more than a cartoon” (para. 14). In contrast, I label Mae as a round character due to the great change she undergoes throughout the novel, which is analyzed below.

Mae starts out as a character that believes that a certain degree of privacy is normal. This is illustrated by the fact that in the beginning she does not stay at the Circle campus after work. In addition, S. Stevenson (2013) mentions Mae’s “lack of social media presence” (p. 82) at the beginning of the novel. In other words, in the beginning, she does not post any photos or zings, for which she gets questioned by her team leader Dan: “We have no record of you being there. No photos, no zings, no reviews, notices, bumps. Why not?” (*TC*, p. 179) It can be assumed that the majority of younger readers can easily relate to Dan. This is due to the fact that popular culture, such as American TV shows, Hollywood films and its actors, and American social networks (e.g., Facebook, Instagram and Twitter), has familiarized the younger generation of readers with the concept of giving public status updates about one’s opinions, moods or location, which is an example of transnationalism.
However, Mae’s opinions are changed completely as the story unfolds – as T. Stevenson (2013) puts it “Mae’s seduction by the Circle is total.” (p. 44). The change – or the seduction – is significantly influenced by various Circle members. Josiah and Denise, for example, urge her to participate in the campus community instead of leaving the campus after work. The following quote, which is an example of irony and exaggeration, reveals a key moment in which Mae starts reconsidering her beliefs about privacy:

Denise was looking at Mae intensely. “Mae, I have to ask a delicate question.” “Okay,” Mae said. “Do you think…Well, do you think this might be an issue of self-esteem?” “Excuse me?” “Are you reluctant to express yourself because you fear your opinions aren’t valid?” Mae had never thought about it quite in this way, but it made a certain sense. Was she too shy about expressing herself?…Denise narrowed her eyes…“Not to say this kind of attitude is antisocial, but it’s certainly sub-social, and certainly far from transparent (TC, p. 189, emphasis in original).

Denise’s grave concerns about Mae’s behavior in this passage – her denoting it as ‘sub-social’ – are clearly exaggerated. This overstatement is intended to create irony to the readers who are expected to challenge Denise’s conduct.

As a consequence of this conversation with Josiah and Denise, Mae substantially enhances her presence on the various social platforms. The following quote shows how she uses the time after her work to increase her ‘PartiRank’, the Circle’s internal system to measure the online participation of its member’s:

Mae looked at the time. It was six o’clock. She had plenty of hours to improve, there and then, so she embarked on a flurry of activity, sending four zings and thirty-two comments and eighty-eight smiles. In an hour, her PartiRank rose to 7,288. Breaking 7,000 was more difficult, but by eight o’clock, after joining and posting in eleven discussion groups, sending another twelve zings, one of them rated in the top 5,000 globally for that hour, and signing up for sixty-seven more feeds, she’d done it (TC, p. 191).

The quote includes terms and phrases that refer to one’s online behavior in the internet, such as ‘sending comments and smiles’, ‘joining and posting in discussion groups’ and ‘signing up for feeds’. It is likely that younger readers are familiar with this vocabulary as a result of using American social networks, e.g., Facebook and Twitter, which is another example of transnationalism.

Another decisive moment is Mae’s conversation with Bailey after she stole the kayak. As a result, she presents ‘her’ thoughts on stage to the other Circle members. The following quotation gives insight into Mae’s development and shows that she still has some doubts at this point: “Mae turned to look at the three lines together. She blinked back tears, seeing it all there. Had she really thought of all that herself? SECRETS ARE LIES | SHARING IS CARING |
PRIVACY IS THEFT” (TC, p. 305, emphasis in original). However, on the next page of the novel, Mae’s decision to ‘go transparent’ is announced. The expression ‘to go transparent’ is used in The Circle to describe someone’s decision to start wearing a camera all the time, which is an example of sousveillance. Both her ex-boyfriend Mercer and the mysterious Kalden, who turns out to be one of the founders of the Circle, Ty, repeatedly try to make Mae reconsider her beliefs. Both characters are discussed in more detail below. Their attempts fail completely and Mae starts to truly live the ‘privacy is theft-conviction’:  

They saw her as a role model and inspiration. And this felt good. This felt truly valuable to Mae. The customers made her better. And serving them while transparent made her far better. She expected this. She apprised by Steward that when thousands, or even millions, are watching, you perform your best self. You are cheerier, more positive, more polite, more generous, more inquisitive. But he had not told her of the smaller, improving alterations to her behavior. ...So she stayed within the bounds of moderation. And she found it freeing. She was liberated from bad behavior. She was liberated from doing things she didn’t want to be doing, eating and drinking things that did her no good. Since she’d gone transparent, she’d become more noble (TC, pp. 330-331).

The demonstration of the ‘Demoxie’, which is a device that allows asking questions that have to be answered by all the Circle members/participants within 60 seconds, seems to be a moment in which Mae’s development could change its direction. The last question of this demonstration is the following: “Is May Holland awesome or what?” (TC, p. 408) Mae decides to negate the question, expecting to be the only voter to do so. However, the result shows that only 97% of all the Circle members affirmed the question. As a consequence, Mae is truly shocked and the incident makes her reconsider her beliefs for a short moment:  

And then it occurred to her, in a brief and blasphemous flash: she didn’t want to know how they felt. The flash opened up into something larger, an even more blasphemous notion that her brain contained too much. That the volume of information, of data, of judgments, of measurements, was too much, and there were too many people, and too many desires of too many people, and too many opinions of too many people, and too much pain from too many people, and having all of it constantly collated, collected, added and aggregated, and presented to her as if that all made it tidier and more manageable—it was too much (TC, pp. 413-414).

However, she instantly abandons these concerns, which reveals her deep conviction of total transparency developed throughout the novel: “But no. No, it was not, her better brain corrected. No. You’re hurt by these 368 people. This was the truth. She was hurt by them, by the 386 votes to kill her” (TC, p. 414). By talking to her, Francis comforts Mae and afterwards she realizes:  

She needed time before she’d be ready, but she would know—she needed to know, it was her responsibility to know…. The elegance of it all, the ideological purity of the Circle, of real transparency, gave her peace, a warming feeling of logic and order (TC, p. 419).
Mae’s major transformation is highlighted again on the final page of the novel when she visits her friend Annie, who is in coma due to a collapse related to the device ‘PastPerfect’, which is discussed below. Instead of worrying about her friend who might die, Mae is upset about the fact that she cannot know Annie’s thoughts, something she considers as her right:

What was going on in that head of hers? It was exasperating, really, Mae thought, not knowing. It was an affront, a deprivation, to herself and to the world. She would bring this up with Stenton and Bailey, with the Gang of 40, at the earliest opportunity. They needed to talk about Annie, the thoughts she was thinking. Why shouldn’t they know them? The world deserved nothing less and would not wait (TC, p. 497).

Similarly to Mae, Annie’s beliefs change significantly in the course of the story and thus, she can also be considered a round character. However, her development throughout the novel is in the exact opposite direction of Mae. At the beginning of the novel, Annie is one of the most important members of the Circle, part of the Gang of 40. She gets Mae a job at the Circle and is the one quietening Mae’s initial suspicions about the incident with Alistair:

When Alistair wanted to do his brunch, he probably just asked for a search of everyone on campus who had visited the country, took pictures or mentioned it in an email or whatever. So then he automatically gets a list, and sends his invitation out. It saves about a hundred hours of nonsense (TC, p. 111).

This passage reveals that Annie does not consider a search of everyone on the Circle campus as a privacy violation and she even highlights the convenience of this tool.

As discussed in the theoretical part, convenience, which is mentioned by Annie in the previous quote, is a crucial factor why many people willing submit themselves under surveillance in the everyday world. This sentiment is also apparent in The Circle as the Circle members constantly seek to improve technology in order to make everyday life more practical without considering the privacy implications. According to Atwood (2013), the initial aim of Ty, who invented the system called ‘TruYou’, a tool that combines a person’s entire online activities in one single account, was not “to take over the world, but [to make it] simpler” (para.14). Similarly, Schmitz (2015) argues that all the tools invented by the Circlers are promoted as convenient without addressing the tools’ potential for mass surveillance (cf. p. 14). The main character Mae displays this very attitude when she makes the following suggestion: “[What if] you use your Circle account to pay taxes, to register to vote, to pay your parking tickets, to do anything. I mean, we would save each user hundreds of hours of inconvenience” (TC, p. 393). Another example is the subsequent statement by Brandon, also a Circle member:
Now everything you had on your other phone and on your hard drive is accessible here on the tablet and your new phone, but it’s also backed up in the cloud and on our servers. Your music, your photos, your messages, your data. It can never be lost (TC, p. 43).

As a last example, Mae’s doctor clearly focuses on the convenience factors rather than the privacy implications when she explains the versatile features of a sensor which Mae swallowed unknowingly. Mae’s reaction to the doctor’s explanation reveals another notion which was discussed in the theoretical part, namely the fact that people in the everyday world often do not realize the actual price of ‘free’. S. Stevenson (2013) also mentions that The Circle illustrates how companies “eagerly offer their free technological tools in exchange for our online souls” (p. 82) and how the offer is accepted willingly by people. When Mae hears that the sensor is free, she seems to be satisfied without questioning the massive amount of data that is collected on her. To put it differently, she does not seem to challenge the sensor as a potential violation of her privacy:

Now it’s active. It’ll collect data on your heart rate, blood pressure, cholesterol, heat flux, caloric intake, sleep duration, sleep quality, digestive efficiency, on and on. A nice thing for the Circlers, especially those like you who might have occasionally stressful jobs, is that it measures galvanic skin response, which allows you to know when you’re amped or anxious. When we see non-normative rates of stress in a Circler or a department, we can make adjustments to workload, for example….It detects your posture, so you know when you need to reposition yourself. Blood and tissue oxygen, your red blood cell count, and things like step count. (TC, pp. 155-156) “And of course,” Dr. Villalobos said, “all that data is stored in the cloud, and in your tablet, anywhere you want it. It’s always accessible, and is constantly updated.”…“And this is free?” “Of course it’s free.”…“It’s so pretty,” Mae said (TC, p. 159).

The fact that Annie clearly emphasizes the convenience factor at the beginning of the novel indicates that Annie starts out to be a highly convinced Circle member, reassuring Mae whenever she has doubts: “After the interview, at her desk, Mae scolded herself. What kind of person was she?…Annie texted back, told her not to worry, that it was just a slap on the wrist, a correction, a common thing for newbies” (TC, pp. 190-191). In the course of the story, Annie is traveling to Europe, China and Japan and when she returns Mae has already gone transparent. From the first encounter after Annie’s return, it becomes obvious that Annie has changed and that the two women are not as close as they were before:

Now the figure stopped. It was Annie. She turned, slowly made her way down the steps and, when she saw Mae, she smiled a practiced, exhausted smile. They hugged…. “Everyone,” Mae said, “this is Annie…my close personal friend. Say hi, Annie.” “Hi,” Annie said. “So how was the trip?” Mae asked. Annie smiled, though Mae could tell,
through the briefest of grimaces, that Annie was not enjoying this. But she conjured a happy mask and put it on (TC, p. 350).

A private conversation in the bathroom suggests that Annie is jealous of Mae’s sudden attention from everyone: “’I mean, you’re like a meteor here. It’s insane. People are coming to *me* trying to get to *you*. It’s just …so crazy.’ Something had crept into Annie’s voice that Mae recognized as envy, or its close cousin” (TC, p. 354, emphasis in original). As the interest in Mae constantly grows, Annie volunteers to be the first person to have her ancestry mapped with the ‘PastPerfect’ device. This decision has a severe impact on Annie’s character development. From this moment onwards, she is the one asking Mae for advice and reassurance. The more information about Annie’s ancestors is revealed, the more uncertain Annie gets about the Circle’s core values: “Annie had sent a very strange zing out into the world. It said *Actually, I don’t know if we should know everything*” (TC, p. 439, emphasis in original). Annie and Mae meet again in the bathroom to talk about this zing post:

“How could you have sent that?” “It’s what I believe, Mae. You have no idea.” “I know I don’t. What idea do you have? You know what kind of shit you’re in? How can you of all people espouse an idea like that? You’re the poster child for open access to the past and now you’re saying…What are you saying, anyway?” “Oh fuck, I don’t know. I just know I’m done. I need to shut it down” (TC, p. 439).

As these passages show, the ‘PastPerfect’ system is Eggers’s way to make the loss of the ephemeral, discussed in the theoretical part, tangible to his readers. Schmitz (2015) supports this argument, as she states that this pilot project shows the consequences of the combination of data and the absent ‘forgetfulness’ of the internet (cf. p. 14). Using the example of the mistake of Annie’s parents, which is revealed by ‘PastPerfect’, Eggers gives credit to Snowden’s concerns that mistakes from the past will be following people. In *The Circle* it is exposed that Annie’s parents, when she herself was only six years old, watched a man drown and did not report it to the police. The novel also displays the severe consequences for the relatives of the people affected. Annie is disgusted by her parents and says: “’It’s so sick. Oh shit,’…‘Now I don’t have parents’” (TC, p. 444). As information is saved eternally, deletion becomes impossible: “’And Bailey said?’ ‘He can’t do anything. You know him’” (TC, p. 443).

The total destruction of Annie’s beliefs into the Circle is illustrated by the fact that she collapses at work at the end of the novel. As a result, Annie is in the coma, while Mae is sitting next to her keen on knowing what Annie is thinking (see quote above).
To conclude this section which shows how various characters in *The Circle* engage with the everyday world notion of total transparency and ‘if you insist on privacy you have something to hide’, it is also important to deal with the Congresswoman Santos. She is the first politician in the novel who decides to go transparent. When she announces her decision, she clearly indicates that people who will not follow her example should be called into question. To answer the inquiry of what she would do if another person did not want a meeting to be public, she states:

“Well, then they will not meet with me”, she said. “You’re either transparent or you’re not. You’re either accountable or you’re not. What would anyone have to say to me that couldn’t be said in public? What part of representing the people should not be known by the very people I’m representing?” (*TC*, p. 210)

The decision of the Congresswoman to go transparent including her statement above has a enormous impact on the political sphere in the book. The politicians who hesitate to go transparent come under enormous pressure: “The question, from pundits and constituents, was obvious and loud: If you aren’t transparent, what are you hiding?…If you weren’t operating in the light of day, what were you doing in the shadows?” (*TC*, p. 241) This illustrates again how Eggers employs irony to make his readers challenge their own ideas of transparency and privacy in times of global mass surveillance.

In the discussion of privacy in the theoretical part, I emphasized the fact that the definitions of privacy indicate the right to privacy, which is often misunderstood by people in the everyday world. In the following part, I argue that in *The Circle* this notion of entitlement for privacy is illustrated to its readers through the character Kalden. Throughout the novel, Kalden repeatedly tries to convince Mae and the readers that they have the right to privacy. This act of ‘over-explaining’ by Kalden is criticized by Ullman (2013, para. 12). However, it can be assumed that the large number of Kalden’s warnings during the story, which is a form of exaggeration, indicates the importance of the issue to Eggers. This assumption is supported by Andre (2014) who claims that Eggers uses exaggeration in order to make his points clear to the readers (last para.).

In the beginning, this notion is not apparent immediately as Kalden is depicted as the mysterious guy Mae falls in love with. As ‘SeeChange’ cameras are installed all around the Circle campus, he keeps hiding for a while and as a consequence, Mae suspects him to be a spy. Kalden’s true intentions are revealed, once he hacks the audio and calls Mae to tell her the following: “Most of what’s happening must stop. I’m serious. The Circle is almost complete and Mae, you have to believe me that this will be bad for you, for me, for humanity” (*TC*, p. 323).
But this revelation seems to be too late, as Mae has already gone transparent and has become firmly convinced of the Circle’s values: “But he was not normal. He was some kind of spy here. Some kind of anarchist, doomsayer. What had he meant when he warned of the completion of the Circle?” (TC, p. 325)

Kalden keeps trying to change Mae’s mind by emphasizing the importance of the issue: “Mae. Please. This is life or death.” (TC, p. 403) But his efforts, similarly to Mercer’s attempts, which are discussed below, remain unsuccessful. Finally, Kalden identifies himself as Ty and they meet one last time, as Ty claims that “her life,…, was at stake, and Annie’s and her parents” (TC, p. 483). During their conversation Ty tries to convince Mae that closing the Circle is fatal as it means that people lose their privacy entirely: “There used to be the option of opting out. But now that’s over” (TC, p. 484). At the end he gives a note to Mae, hoping that she would read it to her audience. The note includes the following parts:

“The Rights of Humans in a Digital Age.”…“We must all have the right to anonymity.”
“Not every human activity can be measured.” “The catastrophic is true understanding.”
“The barrier between public and private must remain unbreachable.”…“We must all have the right to disappear” (TC, p. 490).

This passage, particularly the last sentence, clearly supports the view that privacy is an essential human right, which agrees with the definitions of privacy and Schneier’s claim that privacy is a natural right that everyone should have regardless any surrounding factors (cf. 2015, p. 126).

Lastly, I show that the severe physical and emotional consequences of a lack of privacy in the everyday world, mentioned by both Schneier and Greenwald, are demonstrated further through the characters Mercer and Mae’s parents. The previous discussion of Mae’s and Annie’s developments throughout the novel already indicated the large impact surveillance can have on the physical and emotional well-being of a person. This part continues the earlier discussion on the serious consequences of a lack of privacy by analyzing both Mercer’s and Mae’s parents’ actions and beliefs.

At the beginning of the novel, Dan explains to Mae that the Circle “is a place where our humanity is respected, where our opinions are dignified, where our voices are heard” (TC, p. 47). However, Mercer is convinced of the opposite and he tries to convey that to Mae repeatedly throughout the novel. When she visits her parents, he uses a simile of eating chips to make his point:

You know how you finish a bag of chips and you hate yourself? You know you’ve done nothing good for yourself. That’s the same feeling, and you know it is, after some digital binge. You feel wasted and hollow and diminished (TC, p. 135).
It can be assumed that most readers know this feeling of inner emptiness after having finished an entire bag of chips all by themselves, which makes the simile fairly effective for the reading audience. Mae’s answer, however, illustrates that Mercer’s attempt to make her reflect fails: “I never feel diminished” (TC, p. 135). Mercer also supports Mae’s parents when, in exchange for health service, ‘SeeChange’ cameras are installed in their house. Mae’s parents complain that it is rather stressful to be observed all the time and to answer thousands of messages of people wishing them well. In his first letter to Mae, Mercer describes the physical and emotional consequences of the ‘SeeChange’ cameras on Mae’s parents and how he assisted them in concealing some cameras:

I wrote this note after seeing them, both of them strung out, exhausted by the deluge you unleashed on them. It’s too much, Mae. And it’s not right. I helped them cover some of the cameras. I even bought the fabric….They want to be alone. And not watched. Surveillance shouldn’t be the tradeoff for any goddam service we get (TC, pp. 369-370).

After Mae videotapes her parents in the bedroom by mistake, her parents are scandalized and forbid her to contact them, unless in private. Mercer’s second letter to Mae predicts the emotional and physical consequences of the lack of privacy enforced by the Circle and its inventions. Additionally, it also reveals his big fear and the great sacrifice Mercer is willing to make, leaving everything behind, in order to sustain at least some privacy:

You people are creating a world of ever-present daylight, and I think it will burn us all alive. There will be no time to reflect, to sleep, to cool….I’m moving north, to the densest and most uninteresting forest I can find….You don’t want your data, you need mine. You’re not complete without it. It’s a sickness….We’ll be living underground, and in the desert, in the woods….There will be those who live under the surveillance dome you’re helping to create, and those who live, or try to live, apart from it. I’m scared to death for us all (TC, p. 437).

The passage implies that Mercer would rather live in the middle of nowhere than lose his respect and dignity by submitting himself to total surveillance through the ‘SeeChange’ cameras.

The situation becomes aggravated when Mae uses the ‘SoulSearch’ program to look for Mercer. By doing so, Mae wants to demonstrate to Mercer what is best described by using Greenwald’s book title; that there is No Place to Hide. As some people who participate in the search locate Mercer in a cabin in the woods, he flees in panic: “a blur of brown and white and green, Mercer’s mouth was a terrible slash of anger and fear….Mercer’s voice, filled with venom: ‘Fuck!’ he yelled. ‘Fuck you!’” (TC, p. 461) Mae expects Mercer to surrender but “a look of unmitigated horror transformed his face. Mae had never seen him look like this before.” (TC,
p. 462) Mercer “in disappointment most profound” (TC, p. 464), “his face…[showing] real panic” (TC, p. 464) makes the biggest sacrifice he could make:

His truck was crossing the highway, speeding toward its concrete barrier, so fast that it was impossible that it could hold him back. The truck broke through…a tiny object dropping from the bridge over head and landing, like a tin toy, on the rocks below. Though she knew this object was Mercer’s truck, and she knew, in some recess of her mind, that there could be no survivors of such a fall, she looked back to the other cameras…. But there was no one on the bridge (TC, pp. 465-466).

The fact that Mercer commits suicide in order to keep his dignity as a human being, should remove any possible doubts about the severe emotional and physical consequences of a lack of privacy due to surveillance. One could say that Mercer’s suicide is not realistic. However, as stated at the beginning of this chapter, I argue that Eggers uses the satirical tool exaggeration in order to challenge his readers and make them reflect on their own beliefs about privacy.

6.1.2 Political liberty and justice

In the theoretical part I discussed Schneier’s concern that if someone has enough data about you, they can find sufficient evidence to find you guilty of something. Similarly, Greenwald is concerned about mass surveillance happening without warrants. This is a serious threat to ordinary people in the everyday world which the majority is probably not aware of. The following section illustrates how Eggers’s The Circle provides its readers with a concrete example of how data can be exploited to convict a particular person, i.e., Senator Williamson, who challenges a certain power system, i.e., the internet company the Circle.

Senator Williamson demands the breakup of the Circle as, according to her, it is “a monopoly in its purest sense…[which] stifles competition and is dangerous to our way of free-market capitalism” (TC, p. 174). The majority of the Circle’s members seems unconcerned about the dissent by a senator who “was known for her occasionally outside-the-mainstream-positions” (TC, p. 174). However, Mae seems to be uncertain as she asks Annie of whether she is concerned about the news. Annie’s response implies that she already knows what is going to happen to the Senator: “You mean, like she’s going to actually get somewhere with this? No” (TC, p. 175). Shortly afterwards, Annie reveals the news to Mae that “[Williamson] got busted for all kinds of weird stuff. She’s under investigation for a half-dozen things, all kinds of ethical violations. They found everything on her computer, a hundred weird searches, downloads–some very creepy stuff” (TC, pp. 207-208). Mae’s attitude of not questioning this apparent chance at all is another
example of how Eggers uses irony to imply the exact opposite: he wants his readers to realize how data, collected by means of mass surveillance, can be used against them:

And there was a wonderful thing that tended to happen, something that felt like poetic justice: every time someone started shouting about the supposed monopoly of the Circle, or the Circle’s unfair monetization of the personal data of its users, or some other paranoid and demonstrably false claim, soon enough it was revealed that that person was a criminal or deviant of the highest order….And it made sense. Who but a fringe character would try to impede the unimpeachable improvement of the world? (TC, p. 241)

As previously discussed, Mercer and Ty both want to reverse Mae’s development throughout the novel. By doing so, they also try to make her aware of the fact that the leaders of the Circle actually use the personal data gathered about people to exploit it whenever someone challenges their power. First, Mercer attempts to point out the obvious to Mae:

You think it’s just a coincidence that every time some congresswoman or blogger talks about monopoly, they suddenly become ensnared in some terrible sex-porn-witchcraft controversy? For twenty years, the internet was capable of ruini…not until your Three Wise Men, or at least one of them, was anyone willing to do it (TC, p. 261).

However, Mae does not stop to reflect about what Mercer is trying to tell her and she considers him paranoid. When Ty wants to convince Mae to read his note to the audience at the end of the novel, discussed above, he also refers to the incident of Williamson: “What do you think happened to Williamson?…You think that’s a coincidence? That’s about the hundredth person Stenton’s done that to” (TC, p. 488). Even though Ty is one of the founders of the Circle, Mae does not believe him, rendering this last effort to make her aware of the misconception futile.

The theoretical section on political liberty and justice also included an extensive discussion of self-censorship and its consequences for individuals and for the society as a whole. Schneier describes that as a result of surveillance, people change their individual habits to comply with the norm, through which they lose their individuality. However, Greenwald also points out that some people describe these behavioral changes as a positive effect of mass surveillance, which is connected to Bentham’s Panopticon. This idea is also supported by several studies from the real world. In the following part, I argue that Eggers’s The Circle illustrates self-censorship with the example of Mae’s change of behavior after going transparent. Wilson (2013) supports this claim with the following statement: “As Mae’s transparency increases, she quits being herself” (para. 8). In addition, I demonstrate that the novel addresses the argument that self-censorship can lead to desirable behavior through the characters Mae and Bailey.
To justify the former statement, I examine Mae’s behavior with a particular focus on before and after the ‘SeeChange’ cameras and her going transparent. Before the broad installation of ‘SeeChange’ cameras and before Mae goes transparent, Mae is involved in activities which can be considered as nonstandard. For instance, Mae goes kayaking, meets strangers on a fishing boat and starts drinking wine with them without even knowing their names. T. Stevenson (2013) states that “Mae’s kayaking trips…symbolise a private involvement with the physical world that she and other Circlers are throwing away” (p.45). The following passage implies Mae’s awareness of the fact that her behavior deviates from the norm: “And in silence, Mae thought about how Annie, or her parents, would react to seeing her out here, drinking wine in the afternoon on a barge. With strangers who lived on a barge. Mercer, she knew, would approve” (TC, p. 143). As discussed above, Mercer resists the Circle and its values of complete transparency. The last sentence of the quote foreshadows his resistance and indicates that Mercer is a symbol for nonconformity. At this point, Mae seems to appreciate Mercer’s nonconformity, but only a short time later, she considers his ‘out-of-the-box-thinking’ as “paranoid” (TC, p. 261) and “ignorant” (TC, p. 261).

When ‘SeeChange’ cameras are installed on the Circle campus, Mae starts modifying her behavior at work, which can be considered as the initial phase of her self-censorship due to panoptic conditions. The following quote shows how Mae starts adapting her behavior to the norm without considering these changes as a potential threat to lose her individuality:

She began to think a bit harder about the clothes she wore to work. She thought more about where she scratched, when she blew her nose or how. But it was a good kind of thinking, a good kind of calibration (TC, p. 243).

Challenged by Mercer, who argues that she has become “incredibly boring” (TC, p. 263), Mae steals a kayak during the night and paddles to the Blue Island. This incident can be considered as her last act offside of the norm. It is crucial to emphasize that Mae believes that there are no ‘SeeChange’ cameras on the beach. As a consequence of this event, Mae decides to go transparent. Due to the fact that millions of people are watching Mae throughout the whole day, she changes her behavior significantly. She becomes “cheerier, more positive, more polite, more generous [and] more inquisitive” (TC, p. 330). In addition, Mae stops drinking soda and energy drinks and she stops eating processed food. Mae also reduces her alcohol consumption as “anything immoderate would provoke a flurry of zings of concern, so she stayed within the bounds of moderation” (TC, p. 331). Mae’s drastic change of behavior due to surveillance is an
example of self-censorship and as Schneier (2015) would say, Mae ends up doing “nothing out of the ordinary” (p. 97).

Nevertheless, numerous studies, some of which were mentioned in the theory part, have shown that self-censorship caused by mass surveillance, can lead to desirable behavior. One example of how Eggers addresses this notion in his novel is Mae’s perception of her behavioral changes. The following quote shows that she definitely considers her transformation as positive: “She was liberated from bad behavior. She was liberated from doing things she didn’t want to be doing…, she’d become more noble” (TC, p. 331). Another character who openly supports this notion is Bailey: “Who would commit a crime knowing they might be watched any time [sic], anywhere? My friends in the FBI feel this would cut crime rates down by 70, 80 percent in any city where we have real and meaningful saturation” (TC, p. 67). The subsequent conversation between Mae and Bailey shows how they both agree that self-censorship caused by mass surveillance leads to desirable behavior:

Would you have behaved differently if you’d known about the SeeChange cameras at the marina?” “Yes.” Bailey nodded empathetically. “Okay. How?” “I wouldn’t have done what I did.” “So in general, would you say you behave differently when you know you’re being watched?” “Sure. Of course.” “And when you’ll be held accountable.” “Yes.” “Good. And do you remember my talk from earlier in the summer, about the ultimate goal of SeeChange?” “I know it would eliminate most crime, if there was full saturation.” Bailey seemed please. “Right. Correct” (TC, pp. 282-283).

The passage indicates that if Mae had known that there was a possibility that she was being surveilled, she would not have committed the crime, which is connected to the basic idea of the Panopticon and also of the newer form neo-panopticon. In other words, the quote suggests that if there were ‘SeeChange’ cameras almost everywhere in the fictional world of The Circle, its inhabitants would never know if they were actually surveilled or not, and as a consequence, they would behave responsibly. Thus, Bailey’s ultimate goal with the ‘SeeChange’ cameras is the realization of Bentham’s initial concept for prisons with modern technology in the general public. There can be no doubt that reducing crime is a good thing. However, Mae’s development to become an obedient and submissive woman, shown in chapter 6.1.1, implies that Eggers wants his readers to consider Schneier’s concerns about self-censorship enacted by mass surveillance.

The next section deals with another controversial aspect of surveillance related to political liberty and justice in everyday life in The Circle, namely government secrecy. The discussion in the theoretical part addressed the contradiction of the US government and the NSA with respect to secrecy about their own actions while advocating transparency elsewhere. Schneier and
Greenwald are only two of many people in the everyday world who demand a significant reduction of government secrecy. I claim that the novel does not only provide a critique of government secrecy, which agrees with Schneier’s and Greenwald’s criticism, but also demonstrates to its readers how government transparency can be implemented by means of sousveillance. I show, however, that in the novel, government transparency leads to the transparency of everyone, which stands in contrast to Greenwald’s (2014) argument that transparency is “[only] for those who carry out public duties and exercise public power” (p. 209). The fact that transparency is demanded of everyone in the novel can be traced back to the previous discussion of Mercer’s suicide, which already indicated that Eggers employs exaggeration to challenge his readers’ beliefs about the right to privacy in a global surveillance society.

In general, members of the Circle clearly criticize government secrecy and advocate government transparency, which is illustrated, for instance, in Stenton’s address to the whole organization:

There’s another area of public life where we want and expect transparency, and that’s democracy. We’re lucky to have been born and raised in a democracy...And yet still, so long after the founding of this democracy, every day, our elected leaders still find themselves embroiled in some scandal or another, usually involving them doing something they shouldn’t be doing. Something secretive, illegal, against the will and best interests of the public. No wonder public trust for Congress is at 11 percent (TC, p. 207).

The reaction of the other Circle members indicates their approval: “There was a wave of murmuring from the audience....‘And as you know, a certain senator was just revealed to be involved in some very unsavory business.’ The crowd laughed, cheered, tittered” (TC, p. 207). Thus, both the company founders and the whole Circle community agree in their criticism about politicians keeping secrets from the public in The Circle. This is a direct parallel to the concern of many scholars and also the general public about the way the US government and the NSA classify hundreds of their documents to hide important information from its citizens and the rest of the world.

As indicated above, The Circle does not only criticize government secrecy but also proposes a particular solution to the problem, using wearable cameras. The idea is that politicians conduct sousveillance by wearing a camera in form of a necklace at all times. Santos, the first politician to do so, explains how going transparent will prevent government secrecy:

I intend to show how democracy can and should be: entirely open, entirely transparent. Starting today, I will be wearing the same device that Stewart wears. My every meeting,
movement, my every word, will be available to all my constituents and to the world (TC, p. 210).

As analyzed above, Santos’ impact on the political sphere is massive. She triggers a chain reaction and within a few weeks more than 15000 politicians decide to go transparent. The consent among Circle members is that “this would immediately and permanently improve the quality of candidates. There would be no more back rooms, no more murky deal-making. There would be only clarity, only light” (TC, p. 242).

In the novel, the need for government transparency is instantly linked to the need for transparency of everyone, which contradicts Greenwald’s (2014) distinction between people who “exercise public power” (p. 209) and people who do not. This distinction, which is considered as vital by Greenwald, is eliminated in *The Circle*:

> As clarity among elected officials proliferated, there were rumblings inside and outside the Circle: What about the Circle itself? Yes, Bailey said, in public and to the Circlers; we should also be clear. We should also be open. And so started the Circle’s own transparency plan, which began with the installation of a thousand SeeChange cameras on campus (TC, 242).

This passage shows how the transparency of politicians results in the transparency of the Circle members. This in turn gradually leads to the transparency of everyone as both Circle members and non-Circle members start installing ‘SeeChange’ cameras on and off campus.

To conclude this section, I first show that, to some extent, the Circle’s mission is similar to the one of organizations like the NSA, seeking to know all. Subsequently, I point out two big differences between the Circle and organizations like the NSA: (1) the fact that all Circle members submit themselves under surveillance and (2) the Circle members’ attitude towards deletion of their own mistakes. As mentioned in the theory part, the US government, in particular the NSA, aims at transparency of people worldwide in order to know everything. This goal coincides with the following mission of the Circle: “ALL THAT HAPPENS MUST BE KNOWN” (TC, p. 68, emphasis in original). In other words, both the Circle and the NSA seek to “become all-seeing, all knowing” (TC, p. 71).

However, the two organizations differ significantly in two respects. First, when the Circle members promote their mission, they also include their own actions. This means that they not only advocate transparency of others but also of themselves. Thus, they put themselves willingly under surveillance, which is a glaring contradiction to the massive amount of classified documents of the NSA. To put it differently, the Circle’s definition of ‘everyone’ includes themselves, whereas the NSA’s does not. Second, the Circle members’ attitude about the deletion
of mistakes by their own members differs substantially from the NSA’s. For instance, when Mae videotapes her parents in their bedroom by mistake, she immediately talks to Bailey about what should be done about it. His reaction clearly illustrates the Circle’s attitude towards deletion of mistakes by its own members: “‘Mae, c’mon,’ he said. ‘You know we can’t do that. What would transparency be if we could delete anything we felt was embarrassing in some way? You know we don’t delete’” (TC, p. 372). In contrast, the US government and also the NSA demonize whistle-blowers like Julian Assange who give insight into their own actions and thus, also reveal some of their own mistakes. Additionally, Moser’s movie A Good American, which was discussed in the previous chapter, claims that the NSA could have prevented the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and that the organization tried to cover up their mistakes in the years after the attacks. Apart from showing this difference, the quote above also includes an example of informal speech, namely ‘c’mon’ which is short for ‘come on’. Here it can be assumed again that most non-native English readers understand this phrase because of having been exposed to American (and British) movies and songs. Similar examples of transnationalism on the linguistic level, which can include slang words and abbreviations, also occur in Little Brother: “dude” (Doctorow. Little Brother, p. 15), “tude” (LB, p. 53), “buzz-kill” (LB, p. 95), “thx” (LB, p. 136), “omg” (LB, p. 148) and “lol” (LB, p. 183).

6.1.3 Fear and security
Compared to the aspects of privacy, political liberty and justice, which play a major role in The Circle, fear and security are a minor focus in the novel. Nevertheless, security is an issue as many devices that are developed by Circle members aim at making the world safer. In the theoretical part I discussed the close connection between fear and security in the everyday world. In addition, I explained that many people focus on terrorism as the primary threat, even though numerous statistics show that being killed in a terrorist outrage in the US is far less likely than being killed by a police officer. After 9/11 people’s fear of terrorism was great and they immediately demanded security. The US government used this need for security as a justification for its large-scale augmentation of mass surveillance. I argue that The Circle illustrates this real-life process of fear leading to the need for security, which in turn is used to justify surveillance, with the example of the character Francis. Schmitz (2015) also mentions Francis’ project as an example of how monitoring tools in The Circle are disguised as security (cf. p. 14). It is crucial to emphasize, however, that overall, knowledge rather than security is the main justification for
surveillance, mostly euphemistically called transparency, in *The Circle*. This stands in contrast to the fact that the fear after 9/11 has been used to justify mass surveillance inside and outside the US. In addition, the theory part includes Schneier’s argument that mass observation makes the population less secure. In the following section I show that this idea is also briefly addressed in Eggers’s novel. To conclude this chapter, I deal with an interesting idea of the novel related to encryption and the picking of targets.

Francis is introduced as a character that got his job in the security team at the Circle because he managed to hack into the system further than anyone before. The project he is working on is called ‘ChildTrack’, which is intended to track children by inserting a chip in their bones. It is revealed that Francis had a rather difficult childhood as his parents were not able to raise him and his siblings. As a result, his two sisters were victims of child abduction. When Mae hears the story from Annie she looks devastated and Annie says: “Shit, look at your face. I shouldn’t have said all this” (*TC*, p. 59). Josef, however, who is also part of the conversation, says: “It’s important that you know….This is why he’s so passionate. I mean, his plan would pretty much eliminate the possibility of anything like this ever happening again” (*TC*, p. 59). The quote illustrates that Francis’ own fear of other children being abducted in the future, has created the urge in him to invent a security measure which prevents it. This urge is so intense that any possible objections seem irrelevant to Francis: “These are kids, and we’d do anything to keep them safe, right?” (*TC*, p. 88) When Mae expresses concern about the chip in the bone, Francis uses security to justify this type of surveillance:

Mae put down her burrito. “Really in the bone?” “Mae, think about a world where there could never again be a significant crime against a child. None possible….And the price is that the kids have a chip in their ankle. You want a living kid with a chip in his ankle, a kid who you know will grow up safe”…“You’re about to say or.” “Right, or do you want a dead kid? Or years of worry every time your kid walks to the bus stop?…I mean, this will begin a new golden age for you people. An age without worry (*TC*, pp. 90-91).

As the theory part indicates, the way Francis justifies his device, illustrated in the quote above, is a common practice by governments and politicians in the everyday world.

However, this argument plays a minor role in *The Circle*, as I demonstrate that knowledge is the main justification for surveillance/transparency. This is illustrated when Mae addresses the whole Circle community together with Bailey: “I understand that secrecy is part of, well, an aberrant behavior system. It comes from a bad place….Knowledge is a basic human right. Equal access to all possible human experiences is a basic human right” (*TC*, p. 303). After both
characters introduce the phrase “Sharing is caring” (*TC*, p. 304) to the audience, Bailey adds: “We all have a right to know everything we can. We all collectively own the accumulated knowledge of the world.” (*TC*, p. 304) As T. Stevenson (2013) points out, these statements are examples of doublethink “required to justify [the Circle’s inventions’] infringements of privacy and liberty” (p. 45).

Furthermore, the assertion that by adding more irrelevant data, mass surveillance makes people less secure, is briefly dealt with in *The Circle*. When Francis videotapes Mae’s sexual act in his room, she demands that he deletes the video. Francis reminds her that “Bailey would freak. He’d weep. It hurts him personally when anyone even considers the deleting of any information” (*TC*, p. 206). When Mae argues that she considers this kind of information as irrelevant to other people, Francis tries to reassure her: “No one will ever see it. You know that. Ninety-nine percent of the stuff in the cloud is never seen by anyone” (*TC*, p. 206). This indicates that the amount of data stored in the cloud is too much for anyone to look at. Schneier uses this argument to justify his theory that mass surveillance makes the detection of terrorists more difficult instead of easier.

Lastly, I discuss an idea in the novel that is connected to encryption and the picking of targets. In the theory part, I mentioned that both Greenwald and Schneier recommend the use of encryption to people in the real world. This is due to the fact that they believe that encryption might require the government and the NSA to pick targets. Encryption itself does not play an important role in the novel, but the idea of having to choose a focus or pick a target is important here. Stenton acknowledges this problem: “even when there are cameras everywhere, not everyone can watch everything. If a crime is committed at three a.m., who’s watching camera 982, right?” (*TC*, p. 427) Neither Schneier nor Greenwald mention ways to solve this ‘problem’ (from the government’s and NSA’s perspective). In contrast, in *The Circle* numerous solutions are proposed by young people who present their ideas to the Circle ‘braintrust’. One example is the idea of using colors, introduced by a guy called Gareth:

Any ex-cons living in the neighborhood would register as red or orange in the display. Or some other color, where you’d know they were residents of the neighborhood, but you’d also know they were convicts or whatever….See, this way the cameras are just part of it. The color-tagging tells you who’s anomalous, so you only have to pay attention to that particular anomaly (*TC*, pp. 426-427).

To some people this system might sound unrealistic, but in a Q&A with McSweeney’s the author Eggers stressed his difficulty to keep pace with the high speed of technological inventions in the real world while writing *The Circle*:
A lot of times I’d think of something that a company like the Circle might dream up, something a little creepy, and then I’d read about the exact invention, or even something more extreme, the next day. It happened with the names of some of the software and system features, too. I had to change a few names when I realized they already existed. But in general, I tried to write a book that wasn’t so much about the technology itself, but more about its implications for our sense of humanity and balance (as cited in Mc Sweeney, 2013, question 3).

Eggers’s statement illustrates that features like the ones suggested by Gareth could be invented in the near future, in fact they could be already put into practice by the time this diploma thesis is finished. This point highlights yet again the book’s closeness to its readers’ everyday experiences and the relevance of literature to the ongoing discussion of surveillance.

6.2 Doctorow’s Little Brother

6.2.1 Privacy

The analysis of The Circle showed that the novel intends to make its readers question the common real-world misconception that people who insist on their right to privacy have something to hide. This is accomplished by means of irony and exaggeration, as four main characters are highly convinced of this misconception. I argue that Little Brother also seeks to challenge its readers’ beliefs about this collective view, but that it employs a different method to achieve this goal. In contrast to The Circle, the main character in the young-adult science fiction novel, Marcus, does not approve of the common misconception but passionately believes in his right to privacy (cf. “Little Brother”, 2008, p. 55). In the following analysis I illustrate how Marcus strongly advocates his right to privacy and how he attempts to uphold it throughout the novel. This portrays him a character with similar beliefs to Kalden and Mercer in The Circle. The subsequent section also shows that the opposing side – represented by Mae, Bailey, Francis and Annie in The Circle – is embodied by Carrie Johnstone, the “severe haircut lady” (LB, passim), and, to some extent, by Marcus’s dad in Little Brother. Similar to The Circle, this novel provides its reader with both characters who approve of the misconception of the real world and who disapprove it. Thus, Little Brother also encourages a critical comparison of the reader’s own beliefs regarding privacy in a global surveillance era to those of the different characters in the book.

Right from the beginning of Little Brother, Marcus is depicted as a character who is “hyperaware of his surroundings” (Shoemaker, 2008, p. 122) with respect to the surveillance in his school and how he can evade it. His behavior in the initial phase of the novel foreshadows his
strong conviction of a person’s right to privacy. A vital moment in which he clearly demonstrates this belief is when he is first questioned by Carrie Johnstone aka “severe haircut lady” (LB, passim) in the truck. The following quote from the book illustrates his rejection when she asks him to unlock his phone for her:

“I’m not going to unlock my phone for you,” I said, indignant. My phone’s memory had all kinds of private stuff on it: photos, emails, little hacks and mods I’d installed. “That’s private stuff.” “What have you got to hide?” “I’ve got the right to my privacy,” I said (LB, p. 49).

The passage from the book clearly indicates that Marcus is strongly convinced that a person has the right to keep certain things, such as the content of his/her phone, private.

In contrast, Carrie Johnstone, who is questioning him, displays the common misconception held by many people in the real world. When Marcus refuses to unlock his phone, she immediately concludes that he has something to hide. In response to the boy’s reluctance to succumb to her pressure the woman states: “This is your last chance, kid. Honest people don’t have anything to hide” (LB, p. 49). The passage highlights how Johnstone considers Marcus’s insistence on privacy as a clear indication for his guiltiness. As the interrogation continues in the following days, the woman repeatedly shows this attitude: “We’ll be watching you everywhere you go and everything you do. You’ve acted like you’ve got something to hide, and we don’t like that.” (LB, p. 54) and “Say you’re innocent. You might be, though why an innocent man would act like he’s got so much to hide is beyond me” (LB, p. 54).

In response to Carrie’s accusations, Marcus takes a stand and addresses the reader in order to justify his right to privacy. His statement explains why Johnstone’s conclusions about him hiding something are both right and wrong at the same time. Marcus, thus, explains why the common belief that people who insist on their privacy have to hide something is significantly flawed:

The truth is that I had everything to hide, and nothing. Between my phone and my memory sticks, you could get a pretty good idea of who my friends were, what I thought of them, all the goofy things we’d done….There’s something really liberating about having some corner of your life that’s yours, that no one gets to see except you….It’s a little like nudity or taking a dump. Everyone gets naked every once in a while. Everyone has to squat on the toilet. There’s nothing shameful, deviant or weird about either of them. But what if I decreed that from now on, every time you went to evacuate some solid waste, you’d have to do it in a glass room perched in the middle of Times Square, and you’d be buck naked? Even if you’ve got nothing wrong or weird with your body—and how many of us can say that?—you’d have to be pretty strange to like that idea….It’s not about doing something shameful. It’s about doing something private. It’s about life belonging to you (LB, pp. 56-57, emphasis in original).
As the passage shows, Marcus’s explanation employs the comparisons of being naked and going to the bathroom in order to make his point. Both comparisons are taken from the readers’ real lives, which implies that the readers should have no difficulty imagining themselves in the situation described by Marcus. In case the readers were previously subjects to the commonly held misconception, these concrete examples should definitely make them reconsider their own beliefs.

As already indicated above, Marcus’s dad is another character who holds this view to some extent. In other words, the dad shows this attitude only in one section of the book, as his principles change throughout the novel. Marcus’s dad’s development is discussed in more detail below. The particular part where the dad is subject to the misconception is when masses of people are questioned because of “abnormal traffic patterns” (LB, p. 121). Marcus is indignant to the large number of innocent people who are accused falsely. He explains that most of those people had “nothing to hide at all” (LB, p. 121) and the rest of the people “were the people with something to hide—not guilty people, but people with secrets” (LB, p. 121). As a response, his dad reacts appalled: “Innocent? Guys cheating on their wives? Drug dealers? You’re defending them, but what about all the people who died? If you don’t have anything to hide—“ (LB, p. 123) This conversation illustrates the opposing views of Marcus and his dad with regard to keeping certain information secret or private.

As the story evolves, the readers can observe Marcus’s attempts to uphold his right to privacy. His first big action step, after being released from Treasure Island, is to start using ‘ParanoidXbox’, later known as ‘Xnet’, “a flavor of ParanoidLinux…[which] does everything it can to keep your communications and documents a secret” (LB, p. 87). The following quote describes his feelings when he reestablishes his privacy: “The best part of all of this is how it made me feel: in control. My technology was working for me, serving me, protecting me. It wasn’t spying on me” (LB, p. 88, emphasis in original). In addition, Marcus starts using a new e-mail address created “through the Pirate Party, a Swedish political party that hated Internet surveillance and promised to keep their mail accounts a secret from everyone, even the cops” (LB, p. 96). When Marcus realizes the intrusion of spies of the Department of Homeland Security into the ‘Xnet’, he implements his second big action step, namely the creation of a “web of trust” (LB, p. 152), which constitutes a safe network within the ‘Xnet’.

*The Circle*’s analysis also includes a discussion of how various characters, similar to people in the real world, willingly submit themselves to surveillance due to convenience. The
following section shows that this idea is also present in Little Brother. It is important to emphasize that, in contrast to the use of irony in The Circle, this notion is made apparent by explicit statements by the main character Marcus. In this context, both the theory section and the analysis of The Circle indicated another reason why people voluntarily accept surveillance: oftentimes people do not realize that they trade their own data for something that they considered free. In the subsequent section I also include one example which illustrates this sentiment in Little Brother.

The first time Marcus mentions both the convenience factor and the tracking that is connected to it is in regard to library books. All library books in his school have a certain tag, a feature which reduces the work for librarians. However, in the following passage, Marcus emphasizes the fact that as a result, the person who is carrying the book is also tracked:

Every one of them has an arphid—Radio Frequency ID tag—glued into its binding, which makes it possible for the librarians to check out the books by waving them over a reader, and lets a library shelf tell you if any of the books on it are out of place. But it also lets the school track where you are at all times (LB, p. 21).

Another example of such a tool, both simplifying a certain everyday life activity for the characters in Little Brother and at the same time tracking the subjects performing this very action, is the “arphid ‘contactless’ card that you waved at the turnstiles to go through [at BART stations]” (LB, p. 96). Doctorow again employs an explicit comment by Marcus, to make the reader aware of the implications: “They were cool and convenient, but every time I used one, I thought about how I was being tracked” (LB, p. 96).

In addition, Little Brother also illustrates how people are often oblivious to the fact that they exchange their data for devices which are promoted as free. At the beginning of the book, Marcus explains that students at Cesar Chavez High receive free laptops, which, at first sight, seems like a generous gesture. The following quote shows how it took the students some time to figure out that their data was being collected through their free laptops:

The SchoolBooks were the snitchiest [sic] technology of them all, logging every keystroke, watching all the network traffic for suspicious keywords, counting every click, keeping track of every fleeting thought you put out over the net. We’d gotten them in my junior year, and it only took a couple months for the shininess to wear off. Once people figured out that the “free” laptops worked for the man—and showed a never-ending parade of obnoxious ads to boot—they suddenly started to feel very heavy and burdensome (LB, p. 14).

The passage demonstrates the large amount of data gathered by the school under the guise of providing their students with free laptops.
One grave concern regarding surveillance in the internet age which is raised in the theoretical chapter, is the fact that information is stored forever. The previous analysis illustrated Eggers’s way of highlighting this issue in *The Circle* by means of the ‘PastPerfect’ tool, which maps Annie’s history. In the following section, I discuss three rather different examples in Doctorow’s *Little Brother* which highlight the loss of the ephemeral to its reader, and thus encourage a reflection on the reader’s own behavior on the internet. The first example is fairly close to the reader’s everyday life and refers to the fact that nowadays people often google others in order to obtain information that is oftentimes private, about them. When Carrie Johnstone is questioning Marcus, she openly admits the fact that she and her colleagues googled Marcus in advance: “We googled you, you know. You’ve posted a lot of ugly stuff on the public Internet” (*LB*, p. 49). This can be considered as an implicit warning by Doctorow to his readers, to be careful with the disclosure of their private information on the internet (cf. Mendlesohn, 2008, para. 8).

The second example, which is also true-life, concerns the use of mobile phones to record another person’s misconduct in the public. When Marcus organizes the “VampMob” (*LB*, p. 296) at the end of the book, he is threatened by Charles, who claims to have proof of his being the leader of this event: “I saw you *leading* the damned thing. And I *recorded* it, Marcus. So now I’m going to call the cops and we’re going to wait right here for them” (*LB*, pp. 315-316, emphasis in original). Charles does not explicitly mention that he is going to save the video recording forever; however, it can be assumed that it is quite unlikely that he deletes the recording. This example demonstrates to readers how they themselves could be recorded unknowingly by other people in their everyday lives at any time. Additionally, it implies that these recordings can be kept for a long time and that the owners can exploit them whenever needed.

The third example stands in sharp contrast to the two previous ones as it deals with a positive result of the fact that data can be stored potentially eternally. Marcus explains that he does not delete his stuff as it enables him to look at it again at a later point in time. This concerns “especially the stupid stuff” (*LB*, p. 56), which he explains by addressing the reader explicitly:

> You know that feeling you get sometimes where you’re sitting on the subway and there’s no one to talk to and you suddenly remember some bitter fight you had, some terrible thing you said? Well, it’s usually never as bad as you remember. Being able to go back and see it again is a great way to remind yourself that you’re not as horrible a person as you think you are (*LB*, pp. 56-57).

The ‘you narrative’ in this quote has the effect that Marcus gets even closer to the reading audience and thus, it might be easier for the readers to relate to the main character. Doctorow also
employs this technique for his didactic comments on modern technology through the character Marcus. Overall, this passage hints at the fact that Doctorow’s *Little Brother* wants to make the point that, in times of global surveillance, technology can be both limiting and empowering. This argument is discussed in more detail below.

In addition, Doctorow’s *Little Brother* addresses the severe and emotional consequences of being deprived of one’s privacy due to surveillance. These were already indicated in the discussion of the characters Mercer and Mae’s parents in the analysis of *The Circle* and I argue that Doctorow illustrates these consequences to his readers particularly with the character Darryl, who remains locked up in the secret prison on Treasure Island almost until the end of the novel. The following section also includes additional examples of Marcus and Jolu, who state their angst as a result of being constantly watched.

In contrast to Marcus, Jolu and Van, Darryl is not released from Treasure Island after a few days, but he is held there almost until the end of *Little Brother*. In the prison cell Darryl is kept under constant surveillance without any privacy. When Marcus finally manages to liberate his close friend, the reader is confronted with the physical and emotional consequences of Darryl’s lack of privacy due to surveillance:

I pounded on the other doors. “Darryl! Darryl, are you here?” “I’m here.” The voice was very small, and very hoarse. “I’m here. I’m very, very sorry. Please. I’m very sorry.” He sounded…broken. Shattered. “It’s me, D,” I said, leaning on his door. “It’s Marcus. It’s over—they arrested the guards….That’s when they opened Darryl’s cell. He had shredded his paper hospital gown. He was curled up, naked, in the back of the cell, shielding himself from the camera and our stares….He trembled and squeezed his eyes shut. “I’m sorry,” he whispered, and turned his face away (*LB*, pp. 350-352).

After Darryl’s release from the prison, he is brought to the hospital. When Marcus visits his friend, he talks to Darryl’s father who informs him about the current state of his son: “‘He’s sleeping,’ he said. ‘He woke up a little while ago and he started crying. He couldn’t stop. They gave him something to help him sleep’” (*LB*, p. 357). This implies that the impact of constant surveillance on a human being is severe and that the consequences can be long-term.

One could argue that parts of these consequences are also due to the fact that Darryl was kept in a prison, which is certainly a valid point. However, *Little Brother* shows that Marcus and Jolu also suffer from emotional consequences due to surveillance in their everyday lives after being released from Treasure Island. When the main character Marcus realizes that he is being surveilled by the Department of Homeland Security in his own room at home, he is terrified: “Now I was nearly out of my skin. It felt like I was back in jail, back in the interrogation room,
stalked by entities who had me utterly in their power. It made me want to cry” (*LB*, p. 84). Throughout the course of the book, his friend Jolu also confides his great angst to Marcus: “’No man, I don’t get scared. I’m scared. I’ve been scared since the minute the explosions happened. I’m so scared sometimes, [sic] I don’t want to get out of bed’” (*LB*, p. 159). Both examples support the claim that a lack of privacy due to surveillance can lead to serious physical and emotional consequences.

### 6.2.2 Political liberty and justice

One of the biggest differences from *The Circle* is that *Little Brother* includes the notion that the same technologies used for surveillance by the government or by certain organizations, such as the NSA, are nowadays also available to ordinary people, young people in particular, who can use them to disrupt the status quo. In other words, Doctorow’s novel intends to illustrate that the power imbalance described by Schneier and Greenwald in the theoretical chapter can in fact be overcome by the very technologies used for surveillance (cf. Dudek & Johnson, 2011, p. 194). The author Doctorow explains this himself in an e-mail interview when he writes that *Little Brother* proposes “the notion that technology cuts both ways and actually cuts harder against the establishment than it does against the anti-establishment” (as cited in Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 437). Miskec also refers to this notion as she argues that Doctorow’s *Little Brother* “considers how technology can corrupt, but how it can liberate, too, and it is technology-savvy teens who are the heroes of the story” (n.d., p. 73). Furthermore, research by Dudek and Johnson (2011) supports that “*Little Brother* demonstrates how technology can be used to empower young people…[featuring] computer hackers as heroes and by acknowledging a measure of the degree to which young people are now experts in information and communication technologies” (p. 186).

The following section shows that *Little Brother*, similar to *The Circle*, provides both a critique of government secrecy and a suggestion of how it can be reduced. However, the following analysis suggests that *Little Brother* focuses on the latter rather than the former. I would make the claim that the novel suggests the three following measures against government secrecy, which differ completely from the use of wearable cameras, a more general form of sousveillance, proposed in *The Circle*: (1) Performing acts of resistance using inverse surveillance. As discussed in the theory chapter, it can be argued that hackers and whistle-blowers perform acts of resistance which are often highly controversial in the real world. The
subsequent part illustrates that in *Little Brother* hackers and whistle-blowers are depicted as heroes who use technology to conduct inverse surveillance to reduce government secrecy. This first suggestion reflects the bigger argument made in the paragraph above. In my view, this should make the readers challenge their own beliefs about people performing such acts of resistance in the real world and appeal to their own potential of using technology for similar purposes. This is supported by Dudek and Johnson (2011) who argue that *Little Brother* demonstrates how “these fictional representations of hacker [and whistle-blower] heroes make a direct address to their readers to use their technological expertise to achieve…justice” (p. 184).

(2) Refusing the adoption of the desirable behavior induced by the use of panoptic methods. The theoretical part and the analysis of *The Circle* indicated how people align their behavior to the norm due to mass surveillance. This notion is also present in *Little Brother*, but more importantly it illustrates to the readers that a person’s refusal to modify his/her behavior can contribute to the reduction of government secrecy.

(3) Rejecting journalistic self-censorship by reporting delicate information gained through whistle-blowers. This refers to the fact mentioned in the theory chapter that people are less informed because of self-censorship by journalists due to mass surveillance. Doctorow’s novel implies the importance of journalists who dare to resist this self-censorship to decrease government secrecy. To conclude this chapter, I refer to examples of how *Little Brother* advocates political liberty and justice overall by means of explicit statements by the main character Marcus.

According to Mendlesohn (2008), in Doctorow’s *Little Brother*, government secrecy is described as the combination of power and privacy: “Secrecy is what you do to others; it is withholding information or demanding access to another's privacy, or demanding of others that they keep ‘private’ something you have done to them” (para. 9). This is illustrated by two statements of Carrie Johnstone in the section of the book where Marcus and his friends are held and questioned by the Department of Homeland Security. The first example shows how the woman demands more access to Marcus’s privacy: “How many 9/11s do you want us to suffer before you’re willing to cooperate? The details of our investigation are secret. We won’t stop at anything in our efforts to bring the perpetrators of these heinous crimes to justice” (*LB*, p. 64). The second one demonstrates how “severe haircut lady” (*LB*, passim) demands silence of Marcus about what they have done to him: “You will never speak of what happened here to anyone, ever. This is a matter of national security. Do you know that the death penalty still holds for treason in
time of war?” (LB, p. 65) After this threat, the woman asks Marcus to sign a few pages before he is released. Marcus’s reaction is an implicit example of how Doctorow’s Little Brother criticizes government secrecy: “I paged through the papers….It seemed that I was signing a declaration that I had been voluntarily held and submitted to voluntary questioning, of my own free will” (LB, p. 65). This short passage and the fact that Doctorow provides the reader with three different suggestions of how to decrease government secrecy, which are discussed below, are part of Little Brother’s overall critique of government secrecy.

The first idea to reduce government secrecy in Little Brother refers to the heroic performance of acts of resistance by hackers and whistle-blowers that employ the technological tools of inverse surveillance. According to Dudek and Johnstone (2011), the acts of resistance which Marcus performs at the beginning of the book, when he overrides the surveillance methods in his school, are motivated by self-interest (cf. p. 193). This changes throughout the book and Marcus starts using technology to “protest against the DHS’s increased technological surveillance” (ibid.). The following passage shows how his technology empowers him in his fight against the government: “My technology was working for me, serving me, protecting me. It wasn’t spying on me. This is why I loved technology: if you used it right, it could give you power and privacy” (LB, p. 88). Finally, some teenagers use the ‘Xnet,’ which was created and distributed by Marcus, to reveal government secrets about its use of surveillance methods in the ‘War against Terror.’ The movement is called “Abuses of Authority” (LB, p. 228) and it is “composed of ‘Little Brothers’ who watch back against the Department of Homeland Security’s antiterrorism measures, documenting the failures and excesses” (LB, p. 228). The term Little Brothers, which is the plural form of the title of the novel, is an allusion to Big Brother in Orwell’s 1984 (cf. Bernick et al., 2010a, p. 433). In Orwell’s famous novel, the notion of Big Brother is a symbol for the ubiquitous surveillance of people in Airstrip One. Thus, the notion of Little Brother refers to the opposite, namely inverse surveillance. In other words, the ‘Xnetters’ in Little Brother use technology to surveil their surveillers and by disclosing their misconducts they reduce government secrecy and, in more general terms, aim for political liberty and justice.

To justify the claim that ‘Xnetters,’ who are the hackers and whistle-blowers in Little Brother, are depicted as heroes, it is enough to analyze the depiction of Marcus, who represents the mindset of all ‘Xnetters.’ From the beginning of the novel onwards, Marcus is portrayed as a tech-savvy, passionate and critical thinking teenager who outsmarts the surveillance methods in his school and who, after his release from Treasure Island, declares war on no lesser opponent
than the Department of Homeland Security. As the story evolves, Marcus does not let himself become intimidated by the various obstacles during the story, but rather focuses on finding solutions. When he escapes Masha, he looks for help and thus reveals his true identity to two kids near the BART station. The following quote illustrates how the two boys revere Marcus as a real hero, once they realize who he is:

'We are so not worthy.'...’Dude, it is such an honor to meet you. You’re like our all-time hero-‘...What was becoming weirdly clear was that these two really did idolize M1k3y [i.e., Marcus’s pseudonym], and that they’d do anything I said (LB, p. 326).

Additionally, the fact that Marcus and the other ‘Xnetters’ win their ‘war’ against the Department of Homeland Security at the end of the book supports their representation as heroes in Little Brother. Last but not least, Doctorow also includes two Afterwords, one by the security technologist Bruce Schneier and one by the Xbox Hacker Andrew ‘bunnie’ Huang. Both men clearly advocate the mindset of hackers to the reader, which yet again upholds the claim that Marcus and the ‘Xnetters’ are depicted as heroes in Little Brother.

The second way that leads to a reduction of government secrecy in Little Brother concerns the refusal to adopt the desirable behavior which is expected due to panoptic conditions. Marcus, Van and Jolu are released from Treasure Island with the knowledge that there is always the possibility that they are being surveilled. In other words, the teenagers are not sure whether they are actually being observed but they have to assume that the Department of Homeland Security could be watching them at all times. This is an example of the Panopticon by Bentham, which was discussed in the theoretical chapter. The following passage from the book illustrates how Carrie Johnstone places Marcus under the possibility of surveillance:

We are going to send you home today, but you are a marked man. You have not been found to be above suspicion—we’re only releasing you because we’re done questioning you for now. But from now on, you belong to us. We will be watching you. We’ll be waiting for you to make a misstep. Do you understand that we can watch you closely, all the time? (LB, pp. 64-54)

The woman’s statements make it clear to Marcus that wherever he will go or whatever he will do in the future, the Department of Homeland Security could be watching him at all times. Even though the book does not describe the release of Van and Jolu, it can be assumed that they undergo a similar procedure.

Right after the release from Treasure Island, Marcus’s behavior displays his intimidation by the panoptic threats made by Carrie Johnstone: “I felt the eyes watching me from all directions. I hurried the rest of the way home. I didn’t look at the painted ladies or the gardens or
the housecats. I kept my eyes down” (*LB*, p. 76). The discovery of the bug in his keyboard makes the woman’s threat even more credible to Marcus:

My heart thudded in my ears. It was dark and quiet in the house, but it wasn’t a comforting dark. There were eyes out there, eyes and ears, and they were watching me. Surveilling me. The surveillance I faced at school had followed me home, but this time, it wasn’t just the Board of Education looking over my shoulder: the Department of Homeland Security had joined them (*LB*, p. 84).

The passage shows that finding the bug in the keyboard of his laptop reinforces Marcus’s awareness that the Department of Homeland Security could actually be watching him all the time.

Before I highlight how Marcus refuses to modify his behavior according to the norms expected by the Department of Homeland Security and thus decreases government secrecy, I discuss how both Van and Jolu bow to the pressure of the Panopticon. In the course of Marcus’s plans to fight the government, there is a point where Van cannot handle the situation anymore. The following quote shows how she withdraws from Marcus’s plan:

You could end up going to jail for this, Marcus, and not just you....Van looked like she was going to cry. She took a couple of deep breaths and stood up. “I can’t do it, I’m sorry. I can’t watch you do this. It’s like watching a car wreck in slow motion. You’re going to destroy yourself, and I love you too much, to watch this happen” (*LB*, p. 114).

As a result, Van is not part of Marcus’s group anymore and quits the fight against theDepartment of Homeland Security. This indicates how the adoption of the desirable behavior (from the government’s perspective) can stifle dissent, which was one big concern by Schneier discussed in the theory part. Soon afterwards, Jolu reaches the point where he cannot endure the circumstances any longer. During the secret party at the Sutro Baths he admits to Marcus that he cannot be part of his plans anymore:

I think I’m through. It’s too much risk. The DHS, you can’t go to war on them. It’s crazy. Really actually crazy.”...I think it’s great that you’ve got the bravery to do this all the time. But I haven’t got it. I can’t live my life in perpetual terror.” “What are you saying?” “I’m saying I’m out. I’m going to be one of those people who acts like it’s all okay, like it’ll all go back to normal some day [sic]. I’m going to use the Internet like I always did, and only use the Xnet to play games. I’m going to get out is what I’m saying. I won’t be a part of your plans anymore.”...Watching you try is like watching a bird fly into a window again and again” (*LB*, p. 159).

Similarly to Van, Jolu quits being a dissident and the quote above describes in detail how he will align his behavior to the expected norm.

Now after demonstrating that the notion of the desirable behavior is also apparent in *Little Brother*, I show how Marcus ultimately refuses to modify his behavior and contributes to the reduction of government secrecy. The analysis above illustrates that not only Van and Jolu but
Marcus too, is intimidated by the panoptic means of the Department of Homeland Security. As a consequence, he keeps the secret about what they did to him and his friends on Treasure Island for a long time. As Mendlesohn (2008) argues “Marcus realises late on that the most powerful thing that the regime has done to him is to make him scared to speak of what was done to him” (para. 9). The moment when Marcus receives a letter by Zeb, who tells him that Darryl is still alive, marks a turning point. The teenager finally manages to confide in his mother: “I took a deep breath and Mom got me a glass of water. I sat on the edge of my bed and she sat in my desk chair and I told her everything. Everything. Well, most of it” (LB, p. 251). After Marcus’s dad is also informed, he encourages Marcus to tell the story to the investigative reporter Barbara Stratford. Thus, Marcus becomes a whistle-blower, leaking important information on the misconduct of the government. Together with the journalist who agrees to report his story, which is discussed below, he reduces government secrecy in Little Brother.

As discussed in the theoretical part, journalistic self-censorship is a chilling effect of mass surveillance in the real world and the third suggestion to decrease government secrecy in Doctorow’s Little Brother emphasizes the importance of journalists who have the courage to report stories revealed by whistle-blowers. After Barbara Stratford is told the story, she immediately displays her willingness to report on the story and she highlights the fact that this is not only because of her acquaintance with Marcus’s mother:

I believe you. Not just because I know you, Lillian. The story sounds right, and it ties in with other rumors I’ve heard. But I’m not going to be able to just take your word for it. I’m going to have to investigate every aspect of this, and every element of your lives and stories. I need to know if there’s anything you’re not telling me, anything that could be used to discredit you after this comes to light. I need everything. It could take weeks before I’m ready to publish (LB, p. 261).

The passage also reveals the massive amount of work and research necessary to publish such a controversial story. After some time passes in the story, Barbara’s report is finally published by the Bay Guardian. The following quote shows how the public becomes more informed about the government’s actions due to her article:

But an extraordinary story told to this reporter by a young man who was arrested by the DHS minutes after the explosion suggests that our own government has illegally held many of those thought dead on Treasure Island, which had been evacuated and declared off-limits to civilians shortly after the bombing (LB, p. 324).

Thus, the journalist’s bravery to reject journalistic self-censorship, contributes to a significant reduction of government secrecy in Little Brother.
To conclude this chapter, I show how *Little Brother* advocates political liberty and justice overall by means of explicit statements by the main character Marcus. The analysis above already indicated that Marcus is strongly convinced of his right to privacy and the same is true for his right for political liberty and justice. Throughout the novel there are numerous situations in which Marcus explicitly refers to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which are both a symbol for the protection of people’s political liberty and justice. Some of his comments are discussed in more detail below.

The first two examples are taken from the section where Carrie Johnstone questions Marcus. Even though he is in a much weaker position, Marcus displays his strong conviction about political liberty and justice in the US: “I thought I lived in a country with a constitution. I thought I lived in a country where I had *rights*. You’re talking about defending my freedom by tearing up the Bill of Rights” (*LB*, p. 55, emphasis in original). The last sentence, which is an example of doublethink, refers to the woman’s attempt to justify the government’s measurements, including its surveillance methods, in the ‘War on Terror’ with the need for security, which will be analyzed in the next chapter. In the course of Marcus’s interrogations, the “severe haircut lady” (*LB*, passim) claims to have enough proof to put him in jail for a long time. The following quote demonstrates how Marcus is still convinced of his right for political liberty and justice; however, it also shows his doubts about the Department of Homeland Security acting according to this right:

"I didn’t believe it for a second. There’s no way a judge would say that all this stuff constituted any kind of real crime. It was free speech, it was technological tinkering. It wasn’t a crime. But who said that these people would ever put me in front of a judge (*LB*, p. 62)."

The next example demonstrates to the reader how Marcus insists on just treatment in his everyday life. The boy is questioned by two policemen and even though he knows that they are police officers he still demands that they prove their identities: “‘We just want to ask you a few routine questions.’ ‘Can I see your badges?’ I said. These guys were clearly cops, but it couldn’t hurt to let them know I knew my rights” (*LB*, p. 104). The passage indicates that Marcus considers it important to display knowledge of his rights to the authorities.

Another example which illustrates Marcus passionate belief in political liberty and justice is his answer to the following question by Mrs. Andersen, the teacher who replaces Ms. Galvez: “Under what circumstances should the federal government be prepared to suspend the Bill of Rights? (*LB*, p. 207)” Before the teacher even asks for her students’ opinions, Marcus starts
talking: “‘Never,’ I said, not waiting to be called on. This was easy. ‘Constitutional rights are absolute’” (LB, p. 207). When Charles lists several reasons to suspend the Bill of Rights, including national security, and the teacher actually writes his reasons on the board, Marcus reacts appalled: “I don’t get it. You’re making it sound like the Bill of Rights is optional. It’s the Constitution. We’re supposed to follow it absolutely” (LB, p. 208). This passage clearly demonstrates Little Brother’s overall plea for political liberty and justice and Marcus’s total inability to understand the opposite side, represented by Charles and the new teacher, intensifies the plea further.

In addition, Marcus cites a part from the Declaration of Independence to emphasize the fact that there is value in dissent (cf. Dudek & Johnson, 2011, p. 189), which agrees with Schneier’s claims discussed in the theory section. He reads the following passage of the Declaration of Independence to his classmates and Ms. Galvez in social studies class:

Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect [sic], their safety and happiness (LB, p. 180).

As Marcus points out, this section from the Declaration of Independence clearly emphasizes the fact that “governments should only last for so long as we believe that they’re working for us, and if we stop believing in them, we should overthrow them” (LB, p. 181). He makes this argument again, after Ms. Galvez was replaced by Ms. Andersen. The following quote illustrates how Marcus refers back to the founding of the United States in order to support his point: “The whole point of America is that we’re the country where dissent is welcome. We’re a country of dissidents and fighters and university dropouts and free speech people” (LB, p. 211). As a result, Marcus gets suspended for two weeks by the principal Mr. Benson who has been watching the scene in the classroom. This very fact violates Marcus’s right for political liberty and justice, which in turn reflects Little Brother’s overall plea for political liberty and justice in times of global surveillance.

6.2.3 Fear and security

In contrast to The Circle, security and fear play a major role in Little Brother. According to Mendlesohn (2008), the novel is “not a book about a disaster; it’s a book about how people respond, as people, to disaster and fear, and in particular how quickly paranoia descends” (para. 4). In this aspect the book corresponds closely to reality, illustrating the great fear that terrorist
attacks like 9/11 evoke in people and how governments can take advantage of this fear in order to justify their surveillance methods. *Little Brother* covers various aspects which are connected to this overall theme and which were also discussed in the theoretical chapter. In the following section I first show how, in contrast to *The Circle*’s main focus on knowledge, security is the main justification for mass surveillance in the ‘War on Terror’ in *Little Brother*. This also addresses the idea that – similar to the real world – this justification is a pretense which involves doublethink. In addition, the subsequent analysis clearly demonstrates how mass surveillance is the wrong tool for catching terrorists and how security measures fail in *Little Brother* (cf. Dudek & Johnson, 2011, p. 194). This agrees with Schneier’s arguments about the inaccuracy and the irrelevancy of data of mass surveillance – making the public less safe – and his advocacy for targeted surveillance (cf. 2015, pp. 136-138), discussed in the theory part. Furthermore, I argue that Marcus’s dad is a concrete example of “suburban angst” (Bernick et al., 2010a, p. 433) in the wake of a terrorist act, displaying the attitude that such an attack changes everything and that “we face an existential crisis graver than anything we’ve faced before” (Doctorow as cited in Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 437). The following analysis deals with his development throughout the novel, which, as Doctorow explains in an e-mail interview, is intended to make his readers “reevaluate this intuition they have that the threat [of terrorism] is so great now that we have to do anything and it justifies everything” (as cited in Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 437). Lastly, this section illustrates the didacticism of *Little Brother*, which was mentioned above in the theoretical chapter. I show how Marcus explains vital concepts and technological tools of and for security in a surveillance era (cf. Mendlesohn, 2008, para. 8), which, as Doctorow points out in the bibliography of *Little Brother*, exist in the real world.

Both the analysis of *The Circle* and the theory chapter show how mass surveillance can be justified by the need for security. Even though knowledge is the main justification in *The Circle*, the character Francis illustrates the process of how fear demands security, which in turn justifies the surveillance measures employed to ensure this security. *Little Brother* contains numerous examples of how, after the terrorist attack happens in San Francisco, mass surveillance is justified in terms of security throughout the novel. On Marcus’s first day of school after his release from Treasure Island he observes the massive augmentation of monitoring measures in response to the terrorist outrage on the Bay Bridge in San Francisco:

I’ve walked to school a thousand times, but today it was different. I went up and over the hills to get down into the Mission, and everywhere there were trucks. I saw new sensors and traffic cameras installed at many of the stop signs. Someone had a lot of surveillance
gear lying around, waiting to be installed at the first opportunity. The attack on the Bay Bridge had been just what they needed (LB, p. 89).

The quote implies that the terrorist attack provided the government with the perfect excuse for increasing the amount of observation tools used in everyday life. On his way to school Marcus encounters another example which illustrates the justification of mass surveillance with the need for security. When he wants to pay for his coffee in the Turkish coffee shop on 24th Street, the shop owner only accepts cash. He explains to Marcus that this was his own counter measurement to the government’s newly introduced surveillance methods in the wake of the terrorist act:

The security….The government. They monitor it all now, it was in the papers. PATRIOT ACT II, the Congress passed it yesterday. Now they can monitor every time you use your card. I say no. I say my shop will not help them spy on my customers….You think it’s no big deal maybe? What is the problem with government knowing when you buy coffee? Because it’s one way they know where you are, where you been (LB, pp. 90-91).

The PATRIOT ACT II in this quote is an allusion to the PATRIOT ACT in the real world, which significantly expanded the US government’s scope in terms of surveillance measures, as discussed in the theory part. It may be pointed out that the fact that the shop owner only accepts cash is more surprising in the US than in Austria as the use of debit and credit cards is far more common in the US. Some readers might be aware of this fact due to watching American movies, which is yet another example of the transnationalism addressed by Fishkin.

When Marcus enters his classroom, he discovers that a camera was installed in front of it. The following quote shows how the critical thinking teenager hints at the questionable justification of this surveillance measurement in school:

Why did we have cameras in our classrooms now? Terrorists. Of course. Because by blowing up a bridge, terrorist had indicated that schools were next. Somehow that was the conclusion that the Board [of the San Francisco Unified School District] had reached anyway….“Isn’t the point of terrorism to make us afraid? That’s why it’s called terrorism, right?”…“So aren’t we doing what the terrorists want from us? Don’t they win if we act all afraid and put cameras in the classrooms and all of that?” (LB, pp. 92-93, emphasis in original)

In response to these concerns, Charles, who, as Meer (2012) argues, “is a symbol of the Department of Homeland Security” (para. 1), displays the government’s rhetoric used to justify mass surveillance in terms of security: “Putting cameras in makes us safe, which makes us less afraid” (LB, p. 93). As Marcus instantly demands to know “safe from what?” (LB, p. 93), Charles’s answer “terrorism” (LB, p. 93) is supported by the nods of their classmates. Later in the book, after Ms. Galvez was replaced by Mrs. Andersen, this discussion in social studies class is
continued. The new teacher echoes, similar to Charles’s statement above, the government’s rhetoric regarding the justification of mass surveillance in terms of security:

The role of the government is to secure for citizens the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In that order. It’s like a filter. If the government wants to do something that makes us a little unhappy, or takes away some of our liberty, it’s okay, providing they’re doing it to save our lives (LB, p. 209).

This passage includes the notion of doublethink, which is illustrated by the students’ confused reactions to the teacher’s statement: “Doesn’t that mean that they can do anything they want, if they say it’s to stop something from hurting us in the future?” (LB, p. 209); “This sounds like you’re saying that national security is more important than the Constitution” (LB, p. 209) and finally Marcus’s rhetorical question: “How can you protect freedom by suspending the Bill of Rights?” (LB, p. 210) These contradictory views of doublethink support the argument that, as Greenwald argues in the real world, security from terrorists is a pretext for the massive augmentation of surveillance in the wake of the terrorist attack in *Little Brother*. This is also apparent when the police officers who question Marcus because of his abnormal usage of the BART defend their surveillance methods to Marcus’s mother: “‘Terrorists aren’t the only bad guys we catch this way,’ Zit said. ‘Drug dealers. Gang kids. Even shoplifters’” (LB, p. 108). In fact, as the analysis below will show, not a single terrorist is caught because of these measures in the novel, which is also a real-life concern by Greenwald mentioned in the theoretical part.

The next example that I discuss refers to the fact that immediately after the terrorist attack on Bay Bridge, Marcus and his friends are captured by the Department of Homeland Security in order to interrogate and surveil them. As mentioned in the theory part, Kaplan argues that the term ‘homeland’ elicits a sense of constant insecurity within the US, which in turn justifies enhanced government intrusion (cf. 2003, p. 90). This “profound sense of insecurity” (cf. ibid., p. 89) is mirrored in *Little Brother* as the Department of Homeland Security detains the high school students without the slightest hesitation:

It was a military-looking Jeep…The car skidded to a stop just in front of me, and I jumped back and lost my balance and ended up on the road. I felt the door open near me, and then saw a confusion of booted feet moving close by. I looked up and saw a bunch of military-looking guys in coveralls, holding big, bulky rifles and wearing hooded gas masks with tinted faceplates. I barely had time to register them before those rifles were pointed at me…Van was screaming something and Jolu was shouting and I looked at them for a second and that was when someone put a coarse sack over my head and cinched it tight around my windpipe, so quick and so fiercely I barely had time to gasp before it was locked on me… “Hey,” I said to the soldiers. “Hey, listen! We’re just high school
students…Someone went upside my head again. It felt like they used a baton or something-it was harder than anyone had ever hit me in the head before. (*LB*, pp. 39-41).

The quote shows that Marcus’s attempt to stop the soldiers of the Department of Homeland Security, by pointing out that he and his friends are only high school students, is to no avail. As pointed out in the theory part, in Kaplan’s view there exists a strong connection between the consequences of using ‘homeland’ and the lawless place Guantanamo Bay (cf. 2003, pp. 91-92). This is also illustrated in *Little Brother*, as after Marcus and his friends are picked up near the Bay Bridge they are detained and surveilled at Treasure Island, which is hetero-reference to the detention camp in Guantanamo Bay. In Zeb’s letter this reference is made explicit as he writes that they “call the prison Gitmo-by-the-Bay” (*LB*, p. 249). As in the real world, Doctorow’s *Little Brother* suggests that such sites do not contain any limits in regard to the treatment of prisoners.

In addition, the readers find out that “the two biggest taxi companies were going to give a ‘discount’ to people who used special cards to pay their fares, supposedly to make drivers safer by reducing the amount of cash they carried” (*LB*, pp. 122-123). The quote shows again how safety is the alleged reason to justify the implementation of these special cards, which, as Marcus indicates, can be used as a tracking tool due to all the information gathered “about who took which cabs where” (*LB*, p. 123). This example and all the others discussed above are realistic, provide clear insight in how surveillance can be justified in terms of security and reveal the questionability that is connected to it.

The theoretical part included a discussion of three different reasons by Schneier why mass surveillance is the wrong tool in the fight against terrorists in the real world. In the following section I show how *Little Brother* demonstrates the high error rate of mass surveillance, which is Schneier’s first reason, and thus, highlights how security measures fail. After Marcus, Van and Jolu are released from Treasure Island, the topic is raised for the first time in the novel. Marcus has a sudden insight which he shares with his friends:

“I’m right, aren’t I? All this crap, all the X-rays and ID checks, they’re all useless, aren’t they?” They nodded slowly. “Worse than useless,” I said, my voice going up and cracking. “Because they ended up with us in prison, with Darryl—“I hadn’t thought of Darryl since we sat down and now it came back to me: my friend, missing, disappeared (*LB*, p. 73).

The passage indicates that one major problem with mass surveillance is that it accuses many people falsely. This is illustrated further by the fact that Marcus is stopped and questioned by police officers who wonder about his abnormal traffic pattern. When Marcus realizes that the
policemen stopped him due to his way of riding the BART, he is outraged. In order to reassure the teenager, one of the officers says: “Look, Marcus, we’re on your side here. We use this system to catch bad guys. To catch terrorists and drug dealers. Maybe you’re a drug dealer yourself” (LB, p. 106). The policeman makes it seem as if they were using the surveillance measurements only against the bad guys, which is contradicted by the very fact that they are questioning Marcus. In addition, Marcus points out that many other people were accused falsely: “I wasn’t the only one who got screwed up by the histograms. There are lots of people who have abnormal traffic patterns, abnormal usage patterns. Abnormal is so common, it’s practically normal” (LB, p. 121). When Marcus’s dad defends the government’s surveillance measurements, which is discussed in more detail below, Marcus explicitly refers to the high error rate: “‘But most of the people they hold up aren’t doing anything wrong, Dad,’ I said….‘It’s crazy. For every guilty person they catch, they have to punish thousands of innocent people’” (LB, p. 123).

In response to his dad’s lack of understanding of his point of view, the teenager decides to prove to him and the government that this security measurement fails. In order to show how it fails, Marcus and his fellow ‘Xnetters’ “go around and randomly swap the tags on people, overwriting their Fast Passes and FasTraks with other people’s codes” (LB, p. 126). The following quote shows how Marcus explains this action step in his first blog entry written under the pseudonym M1k3y:

The important thing about security systems isn’t how they work, it’s how they fail….Maybe all the automatic screening is supposed to catch terrorists. Maybe it will catch a terrorist sooner or later. The problem is that it catches _us_ too, even though we’re not doing anything wrong. The more people it catches, the more brittle it gets. If it catches too many people, it dies (LB, p. 127).

This statement already implies the ineffectiveness of this system to catch terrorists. Furthermore, Marcus provides the readers of Little Brother with a short math lesson on the “paradox of the false positive” (LB, p. 128), which explains the high error rate of mass surveillance used to catch terrorists and which is discussed in more detail in the last section of this chapter. As indicated above, there has not been one terrorist being caught by means of mass surveillance in the entire novel. Marcus mentions this fact to his mother in order to convince her of his point of view: “Have you noticed that they haven’t _caught any terrorists_?” (LB, pp. 142-143, emphasis in original) The italics in the quote emphasize the fact that mass surveillance is the wrong tool to catch terrorists.
In connection with this argument, Schneier (2015) also mentions the fact that by adding more irrelevant data, mass surveillance makes it even more difficult to catch terrorists (cf. pp. 136-138). This point was also briefly addressed in The Circle, and in Little Brother Marcus mentions it in one of the discussions with his father:

“But by taking in all that data from the transit system, they’re creating the haystack,” I said. “That’s a gigantic mountain of data and there’s almost nothing worth looking at there, from the police’s point of view. It’s a total waste” (LB, p. 110, emphasis in original).

The passage implies that the mass monitoring methods which are employed in Little Brother, make the population less secure instead of providing them with security from terrorists, as claimed by the government. The novel also addresses the fact that the tax payers’ money is used to fund these expensive methods. During the interrogation by the police officers Marcus states: “I’m sure my parents will be anxious to hear how their tax dollars are being spent” (LB, p. 106). This idea is mentioned again in the discussion of Marcus’s dad’s development below. Thus, the novel illustrates how in the wake of the terrorist act on Bay Bridge, similar to after 9/11, a considerable part of the tax payers’ money is spent on enhancing surveillance methods which are justified by the need for security, but make people less safe.

In an e-mail interview the author Doctorow states that apart from young readers, who are the first target group of the book, he wants to address those people who support “the War on Terror because they have decided that they won’t be deterred from keeping their family and their nation safe regardless” (as cited in Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 437). In other words, those people are convinced that the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have changed everything and thus they are prepared to do and accept whatever it takes to keep themselves and their families safe. I argue that Doctorow’s Little Brother encourages readers to reconsider this attitude on the basis of Marcus’s dad and his change throughout the novel. In the following section I demonstrate that this change involves both the emergence of “suburban angst” (Bernick et al., 2010a, p. 433) in the wake of a terrorist act and the overcoming of this fear.

The first time the reader encounters Marcus’s dad is after Marcus returns from Treasure Island. When Marcus’s dad realizes that his son is alive, he shows true emotions, crying and hugging his son: “Dad actually got tears in his eyes….They each hugged me again, patting me with their hands as if to assure themselves that I was really there. They kept telling me they loved me” (LB, p. 80). This passage shows the great relief of Marcus’s dad and his mother and it indicates that his parents have feared the worst, i.e., that their son had been a victim of the
terorist outrage on Bay Bridge. When the policemen escort Marcus home, his dad, in contrast to his mum, does not feel indignant and he defends the work of the police officers: “‘Lillian, they were just doing their jobs.’…‘The world isn’t the same place it was last week’” (LB, p. 109). This statement clearly illustrates Marcus’s dad’s attitude that the terrorist attack has changed their lives significantly. In fact, he even claims that the whole world is not the same anymore. As the government keeps increasing its mass surveillance gear in Little Brother, Marcus and his dad argue constantly. In response to Marcus’s criticism about the police’s interrogations of people with abnormal traffic patterns, his dad claims that if he were pulled over by the police, he would consider it as his duty and he adds: “I’d be proud. It would make me feel safer” (LB, p. 124). As the passage shows, Marcus’s dad is a subject to the “suburban angst” (Bernick et al., 2010a, p. 433) in the wake of the terrorist attack that happened on Bay Bridge and he supports any surveillance measures which are supposed to ensure his security.

When Marcus’s dad is finally pulled over by the police three times in a row, which is a result of the switching of the ids by the ‘Xnetters’, he is outraged (cf. Mendlesohn, 2008, para. 4). His anger and the realization of the ridiculousness of the interrogations seem like a turning point in his development: “He was so angry I thought he was going to pop.…‘Holy crap, I mean, they’re spying on us all and they’re not even competent!’” (LB, p. 133) As a consequence, he even apologizes to Marcus:

“I was talking about competent surveillance. These guys were total amateurs. I’m sorry, son,” he said. “You were right. That was ridiculous.” He stuck his hand out and shook my hand, then gave me a firm, unexpected hug. “God, what are we doing to his country, Marcus? Your generation deserves to inherit something better than this.” When he let me go, I could see the deep wrinkles in his face, lines I’d never noticed (LB, p. 134).

This passage reveals the disillusionment of his dad and consequently, Marcus wonders if it was the right decision to destroy his father’s belief in the security measurements implemented by the government:

He’d been happy before, confident that his tax dollars were being spent to keep him safe. I’d destroyed that confidence. It was false confidence, of course, but it had kept him going. Seeing him now, miserable and broken, I wondered if it was better to be clear-eyed and hopeless or to live in a fool’s paradise (LB, p. 135).

Apart from displaying Marcus’s dad’s condition, the quote also refers back to the idea that the tax payers’ money is used to fund expensive mass surveillance equipment which does not even guard the public, but rather makes it less secure.
However, it turns out that Marcus’s dad does not actually change his attitude due to being questioned by the police. To Marcus’s horror, the next day, his dad advocates the government’s announcement of the increase of Homeland of Security Department enforcers in order to catch the terrorists. When Marcus voices concerns with regard to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, his father displays again his former attitude of “suburban angst” (Bernick et al., 2010a, p. 433), i.e., he believes that the terrorist act has changed everything and that security is top priority:

“The Bill of Rights was written before data-mining,” he said. He was awesomely serene, convinced of his rightness….This isn’t the time to be playing lawyer about the Bill of Rights. This is the time to make some sacrifices to keep our city safe (LB, pp. 137-138)

In this passage Marcus’s dad uses similar rhetoric to that of Mrs. Andersen and Charles when they justify mass surveillance measurements in terms of the need for security, which was discussed above.

As the situation is exacerbated, Marcus complains to his mother about his father’s oblivious attitude. In response to Marcus’s lack of understanding for his father’s opinions, his mother provides him and the readers with deeper insight into the origin of his father’s change. She confirms the assumption from above that his parents believed him dead after the terrorist attack:

“Marcus, we thought you were dead. Do you understand that? We were mourning you for days. We were imagining you blown to bits, at the bottom of the ocean. Dead because some bastard decided to kill hundreds of strangers to make some point.”…”Your father was ready to kill someone. Anyone. He was out of his mind. You’ve never seen him like this. I’ve never seen him like it, either….He’d just sit at this table and curse and curse and curse.”…”Something broke in your father. He loves you. We both love you. You are the most important thing in our lives. I don’t think you realize that” (LB, p. 143).

The mother’s explanation highlights the grave impact of the few days during which they considered Marcus a victim of the terrorist act on his father. As she continues, she also reveals to Marcus that his parents got almost divorced but stayed together because of him, which adds another layer of emotion. Soon after, Marcus is suspended from school and it seems as if there is no way to turn around his dad’s change due to the terrorist attack. Again he argues that Marcus has to “learn to live with the fact that we live in a different world today” (LB, p. 217) and he adds that he has to “face the fact that there are people who are hurting, who aren’t going to want to argue the finer points of Constitutional law when their lives are at stake” (LB, p. 217).

Eventually, the change of Marcus’s dad is brought to a sudden halt by Marcus’s revelation that he was kept in prison on Treasure Island during the first few days after the terrorist attack.
When his dad learns the news, he is furious and in an instant his change that had been building up as the story evolved is reversed and he can be himself again: “I’m not blaming Marcus. I know exactly who’s to blame. Me. Me and the stupid DHS. Get your shoes on, grab your coats” (LB, p. 254). The passage clearly shows that Marcus’s dad is himself again and that his anger helped him to overcome his angst. Consequently, he encourages Marcus to become a whistle-blower by relating his story to the reporter Barbara Stratford.

To conclude this chapter, I discuss several examples of how Doctorow’s *Little Brother* provides its reader with real-life technical information related to security in times of global mass surveillance. All these examples have a clear didactic purpose, which, as discussed in the previous chapter, is openly acknowledged by Doctorow. The author conveys this information on the real world through the main character Marcus, who, as analyzed above, is depicted as a teenager with extraordinary technical knowledge. The analysis below demonstrates that Marcus frequently addresses the readers explicitly in his comments and that most of the explanations have the form of a short lesson in a Cliff’s Notes or Spark Notes entry. In other words, Marcus’s technical explanations are simplified and only contain the most relevant information. This suggests that the author wants to avoid overcomplicated explanations in order to make the technical content comprehensible to as many readers as possible. In addition, it implies that the author wants to give the reader a basic-rather than an in-depth-idea of the concepts and tools related to security. This assumption is supported by Doctorow’s following statement which is taken from an e-mail interview: “You have to know some basic stuff to even know which questions to ask Google to find out more” (as cited in Bernick et al., 2010b, p. 436).

Right from the start Marcus provides the reader of *Little Brother* with insight into how he outsmarts the surveillance measures in his school. The following quote is a part of his explanation of TOR, The Onion Router, which he uses instead of the school’s network:

An onion router is an Internet site that takes requests for web pages and passes them onto other onion routers, and on to other onion routers, until one of them finally decides to fetch the page and pass it back through the layers of the onion until it reaches you. The traffic to the onion routers is encrypted, which means that the school can’t see what you’re asking for, and the layers of the onion don’t know who they’re working for (LB, p. 20).

This passage shows that Marcus’s simplified explanation lacks technical jargon and it can be assumed that it is comprehensible to the majority of the readers. As already indicated above, all the examples which are discussed in this section refer to concepts and tools that exist in the real world. As far as TOR is concerned, Doctorow even mentions the tool in his bibliography at the
end of the book and encourages the reader to start using it: “TOR, The Onion Router, which is a real technology you can use right now to get out of your government, school or library’s censoring firewall (tor.eff.org)” (LB, p. 377, emphasis in original).

The next example is Marcus’s explanation of how cryptography works. This explanation includes the following introduction which is intended to assure the readers that they will be able to understand the content: “I’m not going to try to explain it in detail because I don’t have the math to really get my head around it, either–look it up on Wikipedia if you really want. But here’s the Cliff’s Notes version” (LB, p. 97). The next quote shows that if Marcus uses technical words in his explanations, he immediately explains them in simple terms:

There are four parts to any crypto message: the original message, called the “cleartext.” The scrambled message, called the “ciphertext.” The scrambling system, called the “cipher.” And finally there’s the key: secret stuff you feed into the cipher along with the cleartext to make ciphertext (LB, p. 98).

The explanation of cryptography also includes historical information on the Nazi cipher which was called Enigma and the person who managed to crack it, Alan Turning. Later in the book, Marcus also provides the reader with an explanation of how to actually use cryptology. Similarly to the previous example, the explanation avoids technical jargon, which is illustrated by the subsequent quote: “In public-key crypto, each user gets two keys. They’re long strings of mathematical gibberish, and they have an almost magic property. Whatever you scramble with one key, the other will unlock, and vice versa” (LB, p. 151).

The second last example which is dealt with in this section is the explanation of Bayesian statistics. The concept is first mentioned by Marcus’s dad in one of his discussion with his son. The explanation by Marcus, which follows two pages later, also includes an introductory phrase which indicates to the reader that this explanation is not going to be overcomplicated: “Here’s some of how Bayesian stats work” (LB, p. 111). During his explanation Marcus also stresses the fact that he avoids unnecessary details: “this is how it works at core” (LB, p. 112). In addition, this example also includes a specific phrase at the end which highlights the simplicity of the concept to the reader: “It’s one of those great, simple ideas that seem obvious after you hear about it” (LB, p. 112).
Lastly, I discuss the explanation of the “paradox of the false positive” (*LB*, p. 128), an idea which was already mentioned earlier. To introduce this explanation Marcus addresses the reader explicitly: “here’s a math lesson you need to learn first. It’s called ‘the paradox of the false positive,’ and it’s a doozy“ (p. 128). The usage of the word doozy can be considered as a way of motivating the reader to actually read the explanation instead of skipping or skimming it. Similar to all the previous examples, this last one employs simple words and intends to convey the basic idea. Thus, the readers of *Little Brother* can gain crucial knowledge of technical information on security aspects in times of a global surveillance society in the real world.
7 Conclusion

15 years after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the world has become a global surveillance society, and this diploma thesis has illustrated that addressing these contemporary developments from the perspective of cultural studies is long overdue. In the introduction I referred to the almost weekly reminders in our newspapers, i.e., the terrorist acts conducted worldwide, which emphasize the gravity of the issue and which also provide governments with the justification to constantly increase surveillance measures. My research on contemporary surveillance and my analysis of the two novels The Circle and Little Brother suggests that these developments pose a substantial threat to people’s rights with regard to their privacy, political liberty and overall justice. Considering the present frequency of terrorist attacks and the snowballing character of technological advancement, the current trends of enhanced monitoring are unlikely to change, unless both governments and citizens alike begin to reconsider their beliefs and habits in times of global mass surveillance. Thus, this diploma thesis clearly advocates the teaching of 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools with a focus on the severe increase of mass surveillance connected to the attacks. The literature review in chapter two has demonstrated the great relevance of doing so with regard to the stronger focus on transnationalism in American Studies and the English and history curriculum for Austrian secondary schools. Moreover, it has revealed the lack of suitable, up-to-date teaching materials on 9/11 and its consequences for English teachers in Austria. Therefore, this diploma thesis has suggested a more up-to-date way of didactizing 9/11 in the EFL classroom in Austrian secondary schools.

The proposed approach relies on the merits of employing post-9/11 literature in EFL classes and on focusing on the consequences the terrorist attacks of 9/11 has for today’s Austrian students, i.e., being subjected to global mass surveillance. The numerous advantages of using literature in the EFL classroom were illustrated in chapter 3: Reading books in the target language not only help to increase the students’ motivation but can also improve their interpretative skills. Furthermore, it also supports the students’ personal education with regard to their imagination, critical thinking and emotional awareness. The use of literature also gives students access to the culture of English-speaking countries. Last but not least, by engaging themselves with literature, students can improve both their language awareness and their overall writing skills. Chapter 4 provides general information on the created reading project “Surveillance after 9/11” as well as detailed descriptions of the individual activities. Once again I need to emphasize that the intention of the designed reading project is to raise the students’
awareness of living in a global surveillance society and to encourage a critical reflection of their own beliefs and habits in an era that employs modern technologies to conduct mass surveillance on ordinary citizens; thus teachers should ensure that spreading of fear when dealing with issues related to terrorist attacks is avoided.

The three sub-chapters of chapter 5 address the question of why surveillance is the main focus of the reading project, which was created to didactize 9/11. Overall, this chapter highlights the fact that the current conduct of global mass surveillance is strongly connected to the historical event of 9/11. The first sub-chapter illustrates that the great increase of mass observation in the wake of 9/11 within the US is related to the justification of monitoring in terms of national security, the massive funding of monitoring equipment after 9/11 and the legal changes introduced in response to the perceived terrorist threat. The second sub-chapter, which focuses on the developments of observation after 9/11 outside of the US, indicates that both globalization and US surveillance hegemony supported the creation of a global surveillance society after 9/11. In addition, it also involves a brief discussion of monitoring discourses and policies in the EU and thus, this chapter demonstrates how Austrian students have been and are still being affected by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The chapter reveals – something that might come as a surprise to many – that some mass surveillance measures in the EU are even harsher than those in the US.

The third sub-chapter provides theoretical background knowledge on vital and controversial aspects of contemporary surveillance. As far as privacy is concerned, it has been shown that many people have the misconception that people who insist on their right to privacy have something to hide. In addition, the section explains the loss of the ephemeral in the Internet age and why people sometimes willingly submit themselves to being watched. Furthermore, the sub-chapter discusses serious concerns about political liberty and justice in times of global mass surveillance. The discussion provides insight into people’s self-censorship and its grave consequences, the idea of the desirable behavior, which is connected to the concept of Bentham’s Panopticon, and government secrecy, which also addresses the notion of doublethink, the dealing with whistle-blowers and hackers and the conducting of sousveillance to reverse the imbalance between the government and the general public. Lastly, there is an illustration of the close connection of fear and security with regard to terrorist acts, which is also related to people’s irrational way of dealing with fear. The discussion of three reasons by Schneier implies that the government’s justification of monitoring in terms of national security is questionable as mass
observation seems to be the wrong tool for fighting terrorism. The last point in this section highlights the value of using encryption in a global surveillance society.

The detailed analysis of Eggers’s *The Circle* and Doctorow’s *Little Brother* in chapter 6 shows how extensively and closely the two books deal with those vital aspects of contemporary mass surveillance and thus, suggests that the two books are good choices for the created reading project on 9/11. The analysis of *The Circle* indicates that the novel encourages the reader to challenge possible misconceptions with regard to privacy and to compare one’s own ideas and habits to those of the characters in the book. Additionally, it shows that the novel addresses the convenience factor, the ephemeral, the entitlement for privacy and the physical and emotional consequences that accompany a lack of privacy. Moreover, Eggers’s *The Circle* includes a concrete example of how data can be used to make someone look guilty and of how self-censorship is evoked by monitoring. The analysis also discusses the way the novel criticizes government secrecy and its proposed solution using sousveillance. Furthermore, the novel provides a specific example of how fear entails the need for security which in turn can be used to justify surveillance and it also implies that mass observation makes the population actually less secure.

The analysis of *Little Brother* shows that the novel deals with similar aspects with regard to contemporary mass surveillance, such as the common misconception about privacy, the voluntary submitting to observation, the loss of the ephemeral and the physical and emotional consequences of being deprived of one’s privacy, but it offers a different approach. Whereas Eggers employs satirical tools, such as irony and exaggeration, Doctorow’s novel is didactic and features a main character who strongly believes in his rights in times of surveillance and who is willing to fight for them no matter what. In contrast to *The Circle, Little Brother* also involves the idea that the current technologies used for monitoring can also empower people to reduce government secrecy by inverse surveillance, refusing to modify one’s behavior and by rejecting journalistic self-censorship. In addition, the analysis has shown that the book illustrates to the reader the inefficiency of current mass surveillance measures with respect to catching terrorists and that it deals with the angst and belief that terrorist attacks change everything. Lastly, Doctorow’s *Little Brother* also provides its reader with accessible explanations of modern technologies used for and against monitoring.
The proposed reading project “Surveillance after 9/11” seems to be a promising way to didactize 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools. However, it is difficult to assess the actual outcomes for Austrian students and thus, further research in terms of an empirical study of the actual teaching of the created materials is recommended. A first step is the implementation of the designed reading project in the sixth grades of the Graz International Bilingual School in the current semester, which will provide initial feedback from both teachers and students. It would be interesting to involve more schools in Austria in order to gain an extensive evaluation of the created teaching materials. In this respect it would be useful to analyze to what extent the created reading project encourages students to critically reflect on their beliefs and habits in a global surveillance era. Additionally, the evaluation could also focus on the teaching materials’ specific usefulness in regard to the new standardized Matura in Austria. But I would go even further and encourage other teachers to use the proposed reading project as a basis for the creation of their own teaching materials to didactize 9/11 in Austrian secondary schools.
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Whatsapp:
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Surveillance after 9/11: Reading Project

[Word cloud image with keywords like brother, censorship, Facebook, NSA, surveillance, Twin Towers, etc.]

Name:
Class:
School:
PART 1

Activity 1.1: Creating mind maps (specific words are announced by the teacher)

Activity 1.2: Choosing a book for the reading project with the help of book-choosing cards

Activity 1.3: Reading the book

PART 2

Activity 2.1: Brainstorming the word ‘surveillance’ and watching video clips illustrating the danger of surveillance; discussing reactions to the video clips

Take notes while watching the video clips using the space provided below. After watching the videos, decide which of the facts you find most threatening. Mark the different facts with 1, 2 or 3 exclamation marks in order to indicate how you feel about them.
PART 3

Activity 3.1: Watching video footage of 9/11 and learning 10 important facts about 9/11 (PowerPoint presentation)

After watching the video clips:

Free-writing

Write whatever comes to your mind after watching those two video clips. Keep writing for three minutes. Your teacher will set a timer and announce the end of the activity. Use the space provided below.
Activity 3.2: Dealing with six different 9/11 memorials
Read the info card about your memorial (handed out by the teacher) and report your findings in your group. Each group member presents his/her memorial to the group. Afterwards you choose your favorite memorial as a group and explain why this one is the best.

Activity 3.3:
3.3.1 Reading a section/chapter of Data and Goliath
3.3.2 Asking three people (parents, grandparents, older siblings, friends…) about their memories of September 11, 2001. Where were they when the attacks happened? How did they find out about the attacks? Create a one minute video (using eyejot/your mobile phone/webcam) to summarize your findings.

PART 4

Activity 4.1: Learning about the NSA’s mission and how the mission changed after 9/11; discussing the legal justification of mass surveillance with a particular focus on the PATRIOT ACT (PowerPoint presentation)

Activity 4.2: Creating posters to summarize certain sections/chapters of Data and Goliath.

Discuss the section/chapter within your group and figure out the key ideas. Use these key ideas to create a poster to summarize your section/chapter for the other groups.

Activity 4.3: Group presentations of the posters created in the previous activity (different aspects of mass surveillance and the data that is collected)

Present your group’s poster (for 3-5 minutes).

Take notes while listening to the other groups’ presentations:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
PART 5

Activity 5.1: Using the book to discuss contemporary consequences of global surveillance in Austria

For the following activities on page 5-9 work with the same partner/group of 3-4. (all group members must have read the same novel)

❖ Red and green cards

You get 5 red cards and 5 green cards.

Red question cards: Write 5 questions that you haven’t been able to answer when reading the book. Think of critical questions you have – not merely “comprehension questions”, e.g., “Why does Mae not stop to think about the Circle’s values when she is abandoned by her parents?”

9 The activities on pp. 112-119 are based on similar ones on http://epep.at/
**Green cards:** Write 5 interesting features/elements that you have come across in your novel: (clear statements about themes, characters, plot development, style and tone, setting, …)

Sign your cards, then put your cards in the middle and check if there are any similarities… Discuss the green cards first, and then try to find answers for your red question cards. Write down your answers and discussion notes. If you need additional info, check the internet, the library, or ask your teacher.

[* Character profile*]

Choose one of the main characters of your book and fill in the character profile for this character. Take a closer look at his/her personality. Who is he/she really? Look at the different levels of their personalities, starting with the environment (setting) they live in and move in towards their spiritual centers.

Slip into the character's mind and consider the following questions:

**Environment:** Where does your character live/work? What is this place like? How does it affect him/her? Who else is there? How do these other people influence him/her? How does your character get along with them?

**Behavior:** What does your character do? List a few important or typical actions or activities of your character

**Capability:** What is your character good at? What strategies does he/she use in the story? Does he/she use them openly and consciously? What skills does he/she have?

**Beliefs:** What are your character’s basic beliefs? Think of the various ideas that he/she thinks are true, and that your character uses as a basis of daily action. Beliefs can be both permissions and limitations. (e.g.: "I am strong! The positive forces will always win!" or "I am afraid of my stronger enemy, he will certainly kill me." or "I don't do this or that because I think it's wrong.")

---

10 The instructions sheet for this activity can be downloaded from the following website:
http://epep.at/?s=character+profile.
**Identity**: What are your character’s core values and his/her mission in life? What does your character want to achieve?

**Spiritual**: This is the deepest level of any character or person. Here we consider such metaphysical questions as "Why are we here? What is our purpose?" These questions are hardly ever asked or answered openly. Try to slip into your character's mind and answer these questions for him/her. What would he/she say?
Title of Book: ......................................................
Author: .............................................................
Character's name: ...........................................

Draw a circle diagram like the one above and write a few keywords or sentences into each layer of the character's personality. Use the space provided below.
Convenient or creepy?

Compare and discuss your reactions to the novel. What forms of surveillance did you consider useful? What forms of surveillance made you feel watched?

Surveillance

Discuss the following questions as a group:

How realistic are the forms of surveillance in the book? (compare to info from last class)

What gadgets and/or apps actually exist in Austria? What gadgets do you use and what are the consequences of using those devices?

What is the impact of surveillance on political liberty and justice in the book? Is data collected by monitoring used to make a person look guilty?

How does surveillance limit the characters' privacy in the book?

How is surveillance used to prohibit dissent in the book?

Take notes during the discussion:

___________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
**Activity 5.2:** Dealing with surveillance in the book and collecting good expressions

❖ **Points of view: What I would have done...**

Think about one of the main characters in the novel you have just read. Think of their actions, decisions and opinions in regard to surveillance. Do you disagree with any of them? Fill in the following diagram and explain what you would have done differently and how this would have influenced the story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character’s name:</th>
<th>My point of view:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions/Decisions</td>
<td>What I would have done:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would this have influenced the story?

If…………………. had………………….  

❖ **Good expressions**

Find five good expressions that you would like to remember and fill in vocab-cards for them. Then share them with your group-mates in class next time and transfer five of the new phrases of your group into your vocab-books or the space provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color/Symbol/Doodle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sentence I found in my book:

Second example sentence from my dictionary:

Useful collocations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word:</th>
<th>Color/Symbol/Doodle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence I found in my book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second example sentence from my dictionary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful collocations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word:</th>
<th>Color/Symbol/Doodle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence I found in my book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second example sentence from my dictionary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful collocations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word:</th>
<th>Color/Symbol/Doodle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence I found in my book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second example sentence from my dictionary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful collocations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word:</td>
<td>Color/Symbol/Doodle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence I found in my book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second example sentence from my dictionary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful collocations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Activity 5.3:** Reflecting on your habits on the internet/using apps on your phone

Look at the following logos\(^{11}\) – can you identify them? Write the names next to the logos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logo</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo1.png" alt="Facebook Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo2.png" alt="Instagram Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo3.png" alt="Google Maps Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo4.png" alt="Google Search Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo5.png" alt="Google Photos Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo6.png" alt="YouTube Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo7.png" alt="Spotify Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo8.png" alt="Snapchat Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo9.png" alt="Pinterest Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo10.png" alt="WhatsApp Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo11.png" alt="Strava Logo" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) All the logos of this activity were retrieved from Google. The exact links can be found at the end of the works cited section.
Answer the following questions individually.

What are the three applications that you use most often? How often do you use them? Why do you use them?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Do you know which of the applications from above require GPS data? Do you specifically activate GPS for those applications or do you have it activated all the time?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

All of these applications are free – why do you think this is the case?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Check the permissions for these applications on your phone. What are the three most risky ones that you are using?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

30 days without Facebook – would you accept this challenge? Why/ why not?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Activity 5.3: sharing good expressions within your group
Add five additional ones to your list.

PART 6

Activity 6.1: Reflecting on the reading project (“Time for reflection”- handout)

Activity 6.2:
Write a critical response to the statement below (approx. 300 words). Consider the characters’ actions in your book and the discussions in class. Do you agree/disagree with this statement?
Send the text to your teacher via e-mail.

“If you aren’t doing anything wrong, then you have nothing to hide” (Schneier, 2015, p. 125).
Surveillance after 9/11: Reading Project
Teacher’s Package

Topics: terrorist attacks of 9/11, surveillance, the power of the internet

>> learning about the terrorist attacks of 2001 (facts, commemoration)
>> encountering the US after 9/11 (Patriot Act, NSA, Surveillance)
>> experiencing the massive augmentation of surveillance that followed 9/11 through literature
>> discussing consequences in our daily lives in Austria (in comparison with the books)
>> reflecting on one’s own habits on the internet (Facebook, Google…)

Grade: 6th/7th form
Project time: 5-6 lessons
Books: (1) The Circle (by Dave Eggers)
      (2) Little Brother (by Cory Doctorow)
      [(3) Surveillance (by Jonathan Raban)]
PART 1

Main objective: Students choose a book for the reading project.
(Implied objective: Students experience the massive augmentation of surveillance that followed 9/11 by reading one of the books.)

Place: computer lab (or classroom using tablets)
If the computer lab is unavailable, print out the blurb + the first few pages of each book for the book-choosing activity and show the covers on the projector.

**Activity 1.1**

Time: 8 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is to determine and activate the prior knowledge and assumptions students have about 9/11 and surveillance.

Description: Each student receives a blank sheet of paper. Explain that you are going to write down three terms on the board (one after the other) and the students have to create mind maps for each of them on their sheet of paper. For each mind map they have exactly two minutes. Write down the first term ‘Facebook/Google’ and set a timer (two minutes). Tell the students to stop when the time is up. Then write down the second term ‘9/11 terrorist attacks’ and after two minutes the third term ‘surveillance’. Ask the students to hand in their mind maps after the activity.

Material needed for activity 1.1: one blank sheet of paper per student

**Activity 1.2 – Book-choosing activity**

Time: 35 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is that students choose a book according to their interests and reading level/habits. It should also enhance students’ motivation and responsibility by allowing them to choose their own books.

Description: Ask your students to use the computers/tablets to inform themselves about the books listed above. For each book they get a little card, which they have to complete during this activity. At the end of the lesson, the students hand in the card of the book of their choice. The students and you set a *deadline* for having read the books, i.e., the 2nd (or 3rd) period of the reading project.
Material needed for activity 1.2: three book-choosing cards\(^{12}\) per student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book title and author</th>
<th>New words per page</th>
<th>Comments about the book (What do you know after having researched the books online?)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Characters:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 1.3 [recommended as home exercise]: reading the book

PART 2

Main objective:
Students consider possible dangers of surveillance.

Activity 2.1

Time: 30-40 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is to providing an overall frame for the reading project. The students are introduced to the main topic of the reading project, surveillance, and consider possible dangers connected to it.

\(^{12}\) The cards are based on similar ones on http://epep.at/.
Description: Introducing the reading project “Surveillance after 9/11”.

Step 1: Brainstorm word ‘surveillance’ – write the word on the board and students can go to the board and add what comes to their minds.

Step 2: Watch two short video clips which indicate the danger of surveillance; ask students to take notes while watching the videos (on page 2 of student booklet → Hand out the student booklets if students do not have it yet)

Are you being watched through your webcams and security cameras? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjL8wpIRXRk

DHS – We’ll be watching you: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=es-eZnyxx2E

After watching the video clips students have to decide which of the facts they find most threatening. They should mark the different facts with 1, 2 or 3 exclamation marks in order to indicate how they feel about them.

Step 3: Discussion time: How do you feel about this? Which are the most threatening facts? Why?

Conclusion for this activity: The US is a country where freedom is an important value. This raises the following question: WHY HAS THE US INTRODUCED SO MUCH SURVEILLANCE?

In order to find out we need to look back at the year 2001… (= PART 3)

Material needed for Activity 2.1:

one reading project booklet per student

Are you being watched through your webcams and security cameras?: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjL8wpIRXRk

DHS – We’ll be watching you: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=es-eZnyxx2E

[Video clip that could be used in addition to the ones from above: The NSA knew our secrets. One year later, we know theirs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iZlUxHdnqhg ]

PART 3

Main objective:

Students learn some facts and forms of commemoration of 9/11.
Activity 3.1

**Time:** 20-30 minutes

**Objective:** The aim of this activity is that students watch video footage of 9/11 and are provided with the opportunity to respond to it individually. In addition, they also learn 10 important facts about the 9/11 terrorist attack.

**Description:** You introduce 9/11: Let’s talk about 9/11. First of all, we will watch two videos of the attacks. The first video shows how the first plane hits the North Tower. The second one covers the last five minutes of a phone call, while North Tower collapses. Ask your students to do the free writing activity on page three. Explain that they should write about whatever comes to their minds after having seen those two video clips. They have to keep writing for three minutes (without lowering the pen). You will set a timer, allow three minutes, and announce the end of the activity. Ask your students, if anyone wants to share some of her/his thoughts. If yes, give some time to share, if not continue with the PowerPoint presentation. This sharing should be completely voluntarily and is intended to provide your students with the opportunity to share their feelings if they feel the urge to. Continue with the PowerPoint presentation => go through the ten important facts.

**Material needed for activity 3.1:** PowerPoint Presentation “9_11 Presentation” (two links in the presentation: first plane hits: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ra8YmZThpgE and last five minutes of a phone call, while tower collapses: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RLW0jKKRXMo)
#1

- Four commercial jets were hijacked. American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into Tower One (the north tower) of the World Trade Center at 8:50 AM. United Airlines Flight 175 crashed into Tower Two at 9:04 AM. American Airlines Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon and United Airlines Flight 93 crashed into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

#2

- It is believed that the fourth jet was supposed to target the United States Capitol Building in Washington DC. Instead, the plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania as passengers on this flight fought with the hijackers and attempted to regain control of the plane.

#3

- Tower Two of the World Trade Center collapsed to the ground at about 10:00 AM. At 10:30 AM Tower One also collapsed.

#4

- The attacks resulted in the death of 2,977 people. The victims included 246 on the four planes, 2,606 in New York City, in the towers and on the ground, and 125 at the Pentagon. Men, women and children from more than 90 countries died in these attacks.

#5

- The 19 terrorist hijackers also died in the attacks. The hijackers were Islamic terrorists from Saudi Arabia and several other Arab nations who were reportedly backed financially by fugitive Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network.

#6

- In 2004, Osama bin Laden, the leader of al-Qaeda, claimed responsibility for the attacks. Al-Qaeda and bin Laden cited U.S. support of Israel, the presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, and sanctions against Iraq as reasons for the attacks.

Osama bin Laden was found in 2011, nearly ten years after the 9/11 attacks. In May 2011, he was killed by Navy Seals from the United States.

#7

- Cleanup of the World Trade Center site was completed in May 2002. The Pentagon was repaired within a year.

#8

- Only six people who were in the World Trade Center towers when they collapsed survived. Close to 10,000 other people were also treated for injuries and many of them were very severe.
Activity 3.2

Time: 15 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is to familiarize students with six different 9/11 memorials. Students should participate in group decisions in order to choose their favorite memorial as a group. In addition, they have to provide a justification for their choice.

Description: Hand out info cards (one memorial per student) – students get three minutes to read the short description. Afterwards groups of six are formed (each group member has a different memorial). Each student has approximately one minute to present his/her memorial to the group. At the end they choose their favorite memorial as a group and explain why it is the best one.

Material needed for activity 3.2: info cards about the six memorials (one per student; distributed evenly)
Flight 93 National Memorial

The Flight 93 National Memorial is located at the site of the crash of United Airlines Flight 93, which was hijacked in the September 11 attacks, in Stonycreek Township, Somerset County, Pennsylvania, about 2 miles (3.2 km) north of Shanksville, and 60 miles (97 km) southeast of Pittsburgh.

The memorial was made to honor the victims of Flight 93, who stopped the terrorists from reaching their target. A temporary memorial to the 40 victims was established soon after the crash, and the first phase of the permanent memorial was completed, opened, and dedicated on September 10, 2011.

Sources:
https://www.google.at/search?q=Flight+93+National+Memorial&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwik8_G4uc3KAhWCThQKHV1gAhIQ_AUIBygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=ncGh0xEJWoI2mM%3A [2016, March 12]

National September 11 Memorial – Reflecting Absence

The National September 11 Memorial is a tribute of remembrance and honor to the nearly 3,000 people killed in the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 at the World Trade Center site, near Shanksville, Pa., and at the Pentagon, as well as the six people killed in the World Trade Center bombing in February 1993. On September 11, 2011, a dedication ceremony commemorating the tenth anniversary of the attacks was held at the memorial. It opened to the public the following day.

The Memorial’s twin reflecting pools are each nearly an acre in size and feature the largest manmade waterfalls in North America. The pools sit within the footprints where the Twin Towers once stood.
Architect Michael Arad and landscape architect Peter Walker created the Memorial design selected from a global design competition that included more than 5,200 entries from 63 nations.

The names of every person who died in the 2001 and 1993 attacks are inscribed into bronze panels edging the Memorial pools, a powerful reminder of the largest loss of life resulting from a foreign attack on American soil and the greatest single loss of rescue personnel in American history.

Sources:
https://www.google.at/search?q=National+September+11+Memorial&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj3p47prs3KAhUG83IKHSMDBr4Q_AUIBygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=vSe0u3-eEHFncM%3A [2016, March 12]
https://www.google.at/search?q=National+September+11+Memorial&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj3p47prs3KAhUG83IKHSMDBr4Q_AUIBygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=zSjUT92ceNgGM%3A [2016, March 12]

National September 11 Museum

The 9/11 Memorial Museum tells the individual stories of the 2,977 people killed in the 9/11 terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and on Flight 93, as well as the six people who perished in the February 26, 1993 World Trade Center bombing. It was dedicated on May 15, 2014 and opened on May 21.

The museum chronicles the events of the day, explores the historical context leading up to them (including the February 26, 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center), and examines the aftermath, beginning in the days and weeks immediately following the attacks. It also considers a range of questions and issues arising from the 9/11 attacks that continue to define the world in which we live. In addition, in an area adjacent to visible remnants of original structural columns from the Twin Towers, an exhibition covers the history of the construction of the original World Trade Center.

Sources:
https://www.google.at/search?q=National+September+11+Museum&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj9xJexsM3KAhWBRw8KHOG1A0AQ_AUIBygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=a-VAdc-5Q2umQM%3A [2016, March 12]
https://www.google.at/search?q=National+September+11+Museum&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj9xJexsM3KAhWBRw8KHOG1A0AQ_AUIBygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=3hmuyZ84bsWALM%3A [2016, March 12]
One World Trade Center

Standing as a shining beacon for the new Downtown, and a bold addition the skyline, One World Trade Center is safe, sustainable, and artistically dynamic. Soaring to a symbolic 1,776 feet — it is the Western Hemisphere’s tallest building, and already an iconic New York landmark.

Designed by renowned architect David Childs, of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, LLP, One World Trade Center incorporates new architectural and environmental standards, setting a new level of social responsibility in urban design.

The 104-story building, a joint venture between The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and The Durst Organization, is designed to be the safest commercial structure in the world and the premier commercial business address in New York.

Sources:
https://www.google.at/search?q=One+World+Trade+Center:&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwijyc
H_vc3KAhUFDSwKHQTjDOIQ_AU1BygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=uiIgOoA8SWogM%3A [2016, March 12]
http://www.wtc.com/about/buildings/1-world-trade-center [2016, March 12]

Pentagon Memorial

The National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial is the first national memorial dedicated to the tragic events that occurred on Sept. 11, 2001. All 184 lives lost in the attack on the Pentagon are represented by “Memorial Units.” Each unit has a victim’s age and location at the time of the attack inscribed on it. The units are arranged along an age line, according to the year each victim was born. They are positioned to differentiate those who were on board American Airlines Flight 77 and those who were in the Pentagon, and each contains a pool of water that reflects light in the evenings. Surrounding the units are 85 Crape Myrtles (trees that will grow up to 30 feet tall) and the Age Wall, which grows one inch in height per year relative to the ages of the victims. According to the National Park Service, more than 225,000 people visit the memorial each year.
The design of the memorial was developed by Julie Beckman and Keith Kaseman and was selected from over 1,100 submissions. Construction began on June 15, 2006, and the memorial was dedicated and opened to the public on Sept. 11, 2008.

Sources:
https://www.google.at/search?q=pentagon+memorial&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjY7bbntM3KAhVltiwKHZeODiAQ_AUlBygB&biw=1366&bih=633#imgrc=mhnchbnoLBXSYM%3A%3BmhnchbnoLBXYM%3A%3BkVblrVBgV0Zk2M%3A&mhnchbnoLBXSYM%3A [2016, March 12]

Tribute in Light

The Tribute in Light is an art installation of 88 searchlights placed next to the site of the World Trade Center to create two vertical columns of light in remembrance of the September 11 attacks. It is produced annually by the Municipal Art Society of New York.

The two beams cost approximately $1626 (assuming $0.11 kWh) to run for 24 hours. There are 88 xenon spotlights (44 for each tower) which each consume 7,000 watts.

The Tribute in Light initially ran as a temporary installation from March 11 to April 14, 2002, and was launched again in 2003 to mark the second anniversary of the attack. As of 2013, it has been repeated every year on September 11. It had been announced that 2008 would be its final year but the tribute was continued in 2009. On December 17, 2009, it was confirmed that the tribute would continue through to the tenth anniversary of the attacks in 2011, but continued again in 2012.

Sources:
https://www.google.at/search?q=Tribute+in+Light&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi0maeIw83KAhWt2swHjDQvFwYj3A [2016, March 12]
Activity 3.3 [Recommended as home exercise]:

3.3.1 In the next period you are going to work with certain sections and chapters of *Data and Goliath*. There will be six sections/chapters, i.e., six groups. Form six groups and hand out the sections/chapters accordingly. Each student has to read the allocated section/chapter (approx. seven pages).

3.3.2 Tell the students to ask three people (parents, grandparents, older siblings, friends…) about their memories of September 11 2001. Where were they when the attacks happened? How did they find out about the attacks?

Ask your students to create a one minute video (using eyejot/their mobile phones/webcams) to report on/summarize their findings. *Deadline* for this home exercise is the end of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material needed for activity 3.3: sections/chapters of <em>Data and Goliath</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Data as a by-product of computing (pp. 13-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Data as surveillance (pp. 20-26 not covering “Mass surveillance anymore”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3: Data as surveillance (pp. 26-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4: Analyzing our data (pp. 33-40 not covering “Correlating different data sets”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5: The business of surveillance (pp. 46-51 not covering “The data broker industry”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6: Security (pp. 135-140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART 4**

**Main objective:** Students encounter the atmosphere in the US after 9/11: PATRIOT ACT, NSA and mass surveillance.

**Activity 4.1**

**Time:** 15-20 minutes

**Objective:** The aim of this activity is that students receive important information on the National Security Agency [NSA], its mission and how the mission changed after 9/11. In addition, they learn about the legal justification of mass surveillance, with the focus on the PATRIOT ACT.

**Description:**
Introduce the activity: *Last class we dealt with the 9/11 terrorist attacks and how the attacks have been commemorated. As you can imagine, the atmosphere in the US after 9/11 was intense – many people had lost loved ones, wanted revenge and asked the government stood by and allowed the attacks to happen. Bush immediately declared the ‘War on Terror’ and one of the major consequences was a massive augmentation of surveillance in the US – and the whole world. The main justification was that surveillance is necessary to prevent attacks like 9/11. The*
government’s primary eavesdropping organization is the NSA (National Security Agency) which already existed long before the 9/11 terrorist attacks happened. However, the attacks changed the organization’s mission drastically. Let’s have a quick look at the history of the NSA.

Use the PowerPoint presentation to talk about the history of the NSA, its mission and its legal justification. Useful information while going through the presentation:

Slide 1: Read out the title of the presentation and point out the official seal of the NSA.

Slide 2: The NSA was formed in 1952 by President Truman. It was and still is, part of the US military, and started out as an organization exclusively focused on foreign intelligence-gathering. This mission rose in importance during the Cold War. It gathered more and more information as both capabilities and the amount of communication to be collected increased. Some of this was useful, though a lot of it was not. This mission should have diminished with the fall of Communism in the late 1980s and early 1990s. For a while it did, and the NSA’s other mission, to protect communications from the spying of others, grew in importance. The NSA became more focused on defense. (Schneier, 2015, pp. 62-63)

Slide 3: But eavesdropping became more intense after 9/11.

Slide 4: “Never again” was an impossible mandate, of course, but the only way to have any hope of preventing something from happening is to know everything that is happening. That led the NSA to put the entire planet under surveillance. Traditional espionage involved government against government. But the terrorist enemy is different. It isn’t a bunch of government leaders “over there”; it’s some random terrorist cell whose members could be anywhere. Modern government surveillance monitors everyone, domestic and international alike. The goal of the NSA’s surveillance is neatly captured by quotes from its top-secret presentations: “collect it all”, “know it all” and “exploit it all”. Most of the NSA’s money for its modern surveillance infrastructure came from the post-9/11 war effort in Afghanistan and Iraq. (ibid., pp. 63-65)

Slide 5: One obvious question arises: is this legal? The real answer is that we don’t know. The current authority for NSA surveillance comes from three places Executive Order 12333 (signed by President Reagan in 1981), Section 215 of the USA Patriot Act (enacted in Oct 26 2001) and Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act (2008). (ibid., p. 65)

Slide 6: Close look at the PATRIOT ACT [Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001”]: allows the NSA to collect “any tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items)”—about anyone, not just foreigners—“for an investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.” That last bit might sound like a limitation, but a secret court interpreted this to include the continuing collection of telephone metadata for every American. (ibid., p. 65)

The information on the PowerPoint slides and the corresponding notes below are based on Schneier’s Data and Goliath. The following excerpts are all direct quotations that include several omissions which, however, are not explicitly indicated, in order to avoid the disruption of the teacher’s flow of reading.
Slide 7: Mass surveillance is different. If you’re truly worried about attacks coming from anyone anywhere, you need to spy on everyone everywhere. And since no one country can do that alone, it makes sense to share data with other countries. US intelligence agencies partner with many countries. (Schneier, 2015, p. 76)

Material needed for activity 4.1: PowerPoint Presentation “NSA Presentation”
Activity 4.2

Time: 25-30 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is that students create posters in order to summarize certain sections of *Data and Goliath*. By familiarizing themselves with the allocated sections of the book, they gain some theoretical background knowledge on crucial aspects of contemporary surveillance.

Description: Ask your students to get into the groups (according to the section they read for their previous home exercise). First they should discuss the section and decide on the key ideas. Using these key ideas, they should create a poster which is supposed to provide a summary of their section of *Data and Goliath*.

| Material needed for activity 4.2: (at least) one poster per group |

Activity 4.3

Time: 20-30 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is that students deal with different contemporary aspects of mass surveillance and the data that is collected. By having students present the information to their classmates, the activity should also further students’ presentation skills.

Description: Each group presents their poster for approx. 3-5 minutes. The other students take notes on information that they want to remember. They should use the space provided in their student booklet (page 4-5).

| Material needed for activity 4.3: - |
PART 5

Main objectives:
Students discuss the contemporary consequences of surveillance in Austria by means of a comparison with the books.
Students reflect on their own habits on the internet (Facebook, Google…).

Activity 5.1

Time: 30-40 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is that students use their books to discuss contemporary consequences of global surveillance in Austria. Students should actively engage themselves with the books and use them for comparisons to their everyday life experiences.

Description: Divide your students into groups of 2-4 (according to the novel that they chose; each group member has to have read the same book). They stay in this group to work on the activities on page 5-9 of their reading project booklets.

Material needed 5.1: 5 red cards and 5 green cards per student
Activity 5.2 [Recommended as home exercise]:

Completing the activities on p. 10-12 of reading project booklet

Activity 5.3

Time: 15 minutes

Objective: The aim of this activity is that students reflect on their own habits on the internet and the applications on their mobile phones.

Description:

Step 1: watching a part of the following video clip (as an introduction to the reflection part)  
The dangers of the internet, from 3:29 – 4:19 (topic privacy):  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uquRzrcwA18
Step 2: Ask your students to complete pages 13 and 14 individually, not in groups. Emphasize that this is a “no talking” exercise.

Material needed 5.3: -
Activity 5.4

**Time:** 15 minutes

**Objective:** The aim of this activity is that students share their good expressions (from the previous home exercise) within their groups.

**Description:** Ask your students to meet in the groups from last period. They have to share their expressions and each student has to add five additional ones to their list.

**Material needed 5.4:** -

PART 6

**Main objective:** Students reflect on the reading project.

Activity 6.1

**Time:** 15 minutes

**Objective:** The aim of this activity is that students reflect on the reading project.

**Description:** Hand out the reflection questions and ask the students to answer the questions individually. No talking during this activity. Collect the reflection handouts when the students are done.

**Material needed for activity 6.1:** one “Time for reflection”- handout per student
Time for reflection

Please answer the following questions and hand in the sheet to your teacher.

(1) On a scale from 1 to 10 (1…not useful and 10…very useful): How useful did you consider this reading project? Why/why not?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

(2) Please name three important facts/ideas… that you learned during the project.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

(3) Which part did you like best? Why?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

(4) Which part could be improved? Is there anything missing?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

(5) Was there a part that made you reflect? If yes, why?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
(6) Did the reading project influence your opinions on surveillance? If so, how? If not, why not?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

(7) Did you consider it helpful to read a book in order to experience and understand surveillance culture? Why/ why not?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

(8) Was there anything that was shocking or surprising to you?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

(9) Anything else that you want to add/personal comment?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Activity 6.2 [Recommended as home exercise]:

The students have to write a critical response to a statement on p.15 in their reading project booklets. Collect the home exercises.
Compulsory reading for teachers:


Recommended reading:


Further reading:


References for the Student’s Booklet and Teacher’s Package:

Videos (PART 2):

Are you being watched through your webcams and security cameras?:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjL8wpRXRk

DHS – We’ll be watching you: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=es-eZnyxx2E

The NSA knew our secrets. One year later, we know theirs:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iZIUxHdnqh

Videos (PART 3):

First plane hits: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ra8YmZThpgE

Last five minutes of a phone call, while tower collapses:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RLW0jKKRXMo

Facts (PART 3):

Information retrieved from https://kidskonnect.com/history/9-11/

Facts (PART 4):


Activities (PART 5): http://epep.at/ and http://epep.at/?s=character+profile

Video (PART 5): The dangers of the internet, from 3:29 – 4:19 (topic privacy):
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UquRzrcwA18
If students are interested in the exact timeline of 9/11:\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:46 a.m.</td>
<td>Hijackers deliberately crash Flight 11 into floors 93 through 99 of the North Tower (1 WTC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:03 a.m.</td>
<td>Hijackers deliberately crash United Airlines Flight 175 into floors 77 through 85 of the South Tower (2 WTC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:37 a.m.</td>
<td>Hijackers deliberately crash American Airlines Flight 77 into the Pentagon, near Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:59 a.m.</td>
<td>The South Tower (2 WTC) collapses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:03 a.m.</td>
<td>After learning of the other attacks, passengers on United Airlines Flight 93 launch a counterattack on hijackers aboard their plane to try to seize control of the aircraft. In response, the hijackers crash the plane into an empty field near Shanksville, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:28 a.m.</td>
<td>The North Tower (1 WTC) collapses. The 16-acre World Trade Center site is in ruins, with collateral damage affecting all adjacent properties and streets. A rescue and recovery effort begins immediately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If students want to know more about how to enhance their privacy:


14 The information in the following box was retrieved from https://www.911memorial.org/reflect-911