                              ***

                              ***

   >> SHMYLA KHAN: Thank you everyone for coming in. I know
everyone's a little tired by now, and thank you for being with
us and we have agreed so we will keep your interest and this
will bow a useful sort of use of time for you guys. So like I
said, I haave three panels. I think there will be a good
diversity. We just wanted, before I can move on to the
panelists and introductions, I wanted to ask the room how they
would define -- so we can get sort of like a -- what do you
think surveillance is, if you had to define it in a sentence,
for instance? Any volunteers? Okay. No one. I think that's
too simple of a question, maybe.
   >> I think for me it's a limited access with information.
   >> SHMYLA KHAN: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. That's perfect.
Okay. And can somebody like maybe give us like a few examples
of surveillance, like what would constitute surveillance? Yeah,
exactly. So I don't know if everybody heard, but like walking
down the street and feeling like you're being watched and
there's eyes on you. That feeling of being watched. What else?
So a lot of concerns about social media. And we'll be
discussing all of these. So what I -- so I did want to do
things where you expect certain answers just to make your point.
   Recently, when we talk about surveillance, we don't -- nobody
mentioned the identity of the person being surveilled. So
nobody mentioned, you know, he or she or what person, what
social class they come from. But we always have -- assume that
there is a person to be surveilled and that person inevitably,
most of the time in our discussion, subconsciously is a man, is
probably straight, and probably like is aware of their rights or

like comes from a social -- particular class. And for some
people it might be white or whatever, within your context.
   And so then we do our analysis based off of that, what we
imagine the surveilled to be. So a lot of the times, we don't
realize that surveillance has differentiated impact on different
people on the basis of their identity. And that's something
that we want to discuss and sort of explore. Hopefully, we can
sort of get into the meat of it, also, because it's today's
topic. Because we're talking about multiple identities here.
   But what we really want to do is when we think of
surveillance, we think of the state, for example, or now
increasing the social media company surveilling you. But we
really want to explore how the identity of the surveilled then
changes the dynamics of the surveillance level. So we have an
excellent panel here who are going to touch on different aspects
of that surveillance. And so the title of the panel is from a
feminist perspective, but we're not just talking about gender or
cuts across class, even -- some people are more susceptible,
religion, what your ethnic minority is and sort of like
basically what your body is and that becomes a site of
surveillance.
   So I'm going to introduce my panel members first, and so also
in the order that I think I'll be asking the questions from
them. So we have valentine who is the head of -- who is part of
the sexuality project, erotics. And then we have Haq who is a
manager. She's also a dear friend, and I've known her for a
long time. And she's now a GSD candidate at the university of
UC Berkeley so we're glad -- and she's also a lawyer. So I'm
going to ask her a lot of pressing questions about the legal
aspects of it.
   And then we have Ankhi Da is, who is a public policy director
at Facebook and she's going to be talking about -- so we have a
lot of questions about social media companies and it's great for
her to be here and sort of answer the concerns, the types of
concerns and surveillance that were just raised here. So I'm
I'm going to start with you, valentine. So because we are
talking about surveillance, but I think the definition of
surveillance is very important. So if you could talk about what
we mean by a feminist perspective to surveillance and how that
changes the overall definition and maybe talk about some of the
work that APC is doing around it and how that can inform
everybody else's work because a lot of us deal with the issue of
surveillance in one way or the other.
   >> Good afternoon. Very happy to be here. Can you hear me?
Yes, very happy to be here. So I think that when we started and
we talk about surveillance in feminist, we should say and ask
what is feminist. And I would say that feminist is a political
analysis. So I have minus five and minus six. I don't see
anything. When I put this, I got my site. This is a feminist
site. And feminist is politics. It's a way you look at the
world. And it's embodied. With me, it's more white than with
many of you.
   And sometimes it can be too much clean because there are
privileges in my whiteness. Of course, there are also degree
and scale of whiteness. The feminist is a political lenses to
the world. And it's based on solidarity and recognition. It's
not judgmental. That's why feminist is not only about women.
That's why feminist can be about LGBT. That's why feminist can

be also about men, straight men. Because feminist is a movement of liberation. And we very often forget. And so if we put these two things together, feminist and surveillance, surveillance it's related with the many things. I think the surveillance is so old. We all have always been surveilled. We have been surveilled when we were born because we were so small, so unable to move or crawl that we were surveilled.

   Yes, we have been loved and surveilled with love but with implication that we will have minors, unable to move ourselves, unable to understand where the risks are. So we all are surveilled. But then when we grow up, there is a big difference, and this difference emulated to gender, the gender that can be genitals but the gender that our presentation are mirroring, am I a woman or a man? Can you tell just looking at me? You can just project your idea, but you Doyne until I don't disclose, until I don't define myself. So we all our surveilled and surveillance has an implication of minority. We are looked at because someone has to take care of us. And now I would say women's and I say women specifically have a long, long, long history of being surveillance -- surveilled.

   We know this. And this experience, this limiting experience is the one to make us able to talk more than anyone else, and we know the surveillance is always been normalized. Why? Because the women's are minors in many cultures. In some, we have secularized the culture and we are less minors, but anytime something happen, there is a price, we come back to be minors. We need to be protected. It is in the off line world. It is in the online world. In the online world and social media and other, we have to be protected and protected become with filtering, blocking, controlling. Very often in this society, surveillance is linked with dictatorship. But surveillance is a very ordinary state of mind, and we also participate in surveillance. Tell me if your life, you never have despite to some friends of yours, looked what he or she was doing at night. Looked where of she was going at night.

   We are always advised society and we are very judgmental and sometimes we can create harm to the others. So it's important to understand that we are part of a surveillance system, but surveillance and power and technology make a big difference. My power of surveillance is ridiculous compared with the power of surveillance of government. And I would say big tech corporations.

   Why there is a need of normalizing surveillance? Because if we normalize, then we are all under control. But as the feminist movement, as women we fight against surveillance because to fight against the surveillance, we have the ability to decide to be invisible. And not to constantly under monitor. And this ability can be in everyday life or can be for very important things. So that's why it's important to feminist lenses.

   Neutrality doesn't exist. Neutrality is equal to men, usually white men, or in any society, the ones that control the power, the ones that have power. Without power, we cannot discuss about anything because power, it make the difference. We have now technology that can power surveillance and give surveillance an easiness it never had happened. And sometimes we just devour that freely. Sometimes those are vested without us knowing or against our will. But again, we are surveilling for our good.

But the good of who? We are surveilled because we are part of a
specific business model, that make all data, all single data,
come together becoming very, very rentable. It's a marketing.
We are a market. Each and every my daughter, it's there for a
market, not in its singularity, but in our complexity.
   And those datas are not by case. They have priorities, an
algorithm is a specific vision of the world amplified to a
specification that only machines can do. But the data had been
input by real people, and now those people can happen to be
women engineers, but to each a system of values, they belong.
And this little world can create an earth quake because these
where things become different. So that's why we need to have a
feminist lens because we have key word. Surveillance is linked
with gender, with sexuality, with race, and then all the other
people, and with privacy, and with anonymity, and with consent.
   Just the last. So what is really important is that when we
talk about surveillance, we don't talk in the vacuum. When we
talk about surveillance, we always know there is every day
surveillance that is constantly disregard. You have a partner,
it is very cheap -- partners surveill partners. Parents
surveill their daughters. And daughters are not surveilled for
their security or safety. They are surveiled for the common of
the family. It's an asset. It's not love. Let's incompetent
say lie to us. There is love, but love do not surveill. Love
talk. Love ask. Love provide safe space where we can discuss.
Surveillance is control over. Control over, it's about power.
   Government, corporation, they all are after their own power.
Power of money, power of the people. We are the people. And we
need the feminist lenses, feminist pall tick of technology, to
act at the level of the court, at the level of the design, at
the level of the use, at the level of the policy. Because if we
are not in each and every space with a political lens, a lens of
solidarity, we will be with shop. And I finish here now.
[APPLAUSE]
   >> Thank you so much for that. And I think something that
you -- you made a good point about some because we don't apply
sort of a feminist lens to surveillance a lot of times. We miss
certain kinds of surveillance that is happening. So when you
talk about surveillance, we're very quick to talk about the
state that is surveilling. But what about social surveillance
that we do of each other around us, and especially what you were
talking about, our partners surveilling another partner? And
that's also a power dynamic, but we usually miss it because our
lens is a little different. So that's the sort of -- the kind
of perspective that you are offering. It allows us to pick up
certain kinds of surveillances that we are missing. Now I move
on to Meh it, ab and I will also ask you to give a positive
definition of surveillance and how you see it as through a
feminist lens. And maybe also talk about how other issues that
it affects -- affects privacy. And so for example, protection
is something that is usually positive as a solution, and you
think that's a viable solution and maybe talk about the context
in which you work, which is south Asia
   >> MEHTAB KHAN: Thanks. I think valentine give us a very
good overview of the power structures that define surveillance
from a feminist perspective. I subscribe to a similar
definition, whereby I believe that the concept of surveillance
and privacy does not take into consideration the experience of

women and minorities. And people from disadvantaged groups.
This has been manifested off line in many ways for as far as we
know, you know, human history dates back.
   But each in the online spaces, it has started being manifested
in very unique ways. So I'll talk a little bit about the kind
of ways that it is manifested in south Asia. I'll use some
examples from Pakistan, and I will try to give my perspective on
the law and policy side of surveillance and what's missing and
what the consequence are, even when we do consider the gendered
perspective on surveillance.
   So I think that the organization that the digital rights
foundation has done extensive research on surveillance and --
that the experience of women is essentially different. And as
my colleague has explained, surveillance is something that has
come to the forefront in the online space because suddenly,
everybody, you know, that includes people in power, are feeling
like their lives are being intruded upon. So it's a political
issue because everybody's phones are being tapped, everybody's
e-mails are being recorded, whether it's a state sponsored
agency or somebody trolling you on Twitter, everybody's
susceptible to it.
   But this kind of experience of being watched, of being made to
modify your behavior, this is something that women and
minorities and disadvantaged groups are not, you know, strange
-- they're not strangers to it. When women are out in the
street, they might fear what time they're out at, what they're
wearing, who they speak to, and depending on the culture
context, what they're wearing, and this kind of behavioral
modification and censorship is manifesting online, as well. And
the way that women experienced online platforms, especially when
it comes to expressing themselves or being in a professional
field like as girls or activists, they are targeted in specific
ways.
   So the DRF found that through their help line that was
established about six months ago in Pakistan, that it was open
specifically for victims of cyber harassment online. And there
is an inextricable link between surveillance and harassment
because surveillance is continuous but you know you're being
surveilled because you're subject to harassment. It is being
subjected by, you know, bots or trolls online, on Twitter,
harassing you, you know, in the example of Pakistani women,
journalists specifically, if they speak against the government,
certain kinds of accounts start attacking them, certain kinds of
people start attacking them. Female journalists have taken this
as given. They think this is inevitable. They've accepted it
as part of their online experience, which is kind of sad,
because nobody should have to accept that this is the norm.
   And nobody should have to be subjected to gendered slurs,
attacks on character, attacks on your personal lives, just
because of the race, class, gender or religion you belong to.
And this is a manifestation that has been found online and this
is a result of continued surveillance. Another example of
coming back to the help line that was established, this was
established specifically to help the victims of cyber
harassment. Now, this is not limited to just women, but it does
show that certain people, majority of whom are women, experience
harassment on a regular baize and it has been shown by the
majority of cases being from women, for, you know, help from the

DRF based on harassment.

But the sad part is that even when they do report it or they seek help, the majority of them would not go to the relevant legal authority. So there is an established legal authority in Pakistan that deals with harassment cases, online harassment. But the majority of people affected by this said that they would not go to it, they would not report it, they would not seek help, either because they feel embarrassed or they don't trust it. They don't trust the system to help them, which is a good segue for me to discuss the policy and legal implications.

So, you know, surveillance on its merits has not even been considered by U.S. courts even though the revelations of the NSA surveilling U.S. citizens on mass were revealed several years ago, but it has still not been considered on its constitutional merits. Pakistan is no different. We've not considered the right to privacy, which is embodied in the Pakistani Constitution, is violated by surveillance. But surveillance has become an integral part of the law that has recently been passed. So the laws that deal with cybercrimes have certain provisions that on the face of it seem to provide some appeasement to victims of harassment.

But, you know, instead of getting protection, you end up being surveilled even more. So I'll just quickly tell you what the -- what the provisions of law are.

So the Pakistani electronic crimes act criminalizes behavior like stalking, sending pictures or messages without consent, sharing intimate pictures without consent. It also criminalizes simple acts like contacting someone when they don't want to be contacted. It is intended to protect women, but within the same framework, certain practices that have been instituted that will ensure not only the disadvantaged groups are subject to more surveillance, but everybody as a whole, whichever citizen, whether they're in power or not, is subjected to more and more surveillance. So the act actually legitimizes the collection of data from telecommunication companies for over a year. And you know, requires them to retain it for a year.

And they can seek data without informing the person in question. They can take data with a warrant given by the court on undisclosed grounds, and seek data about a person whenever -- basically whenever they wish. So because this has been institutionalized, it's very questionable whether law and policy and -- at least in Pakistan is being framed in a way that it would make online spaces safer or less scrutinizing for a woman. I'll just quickly take a little more time talking about privacy. Should I do that now?

So answering your question about whether privacy protections will necessarily result in better experiences for women or less surveillance for disadvantaged groups, I think privacy protections are only part of the solution, and that's where I want to relate it back to the off line space. So we all know that sexual assault is wrong, that, you know, slurs that are gendered towards women's characters are wrong. But still we see that rapes and sexual assaults, whether they're in the developed world or the developing world are underreported and under prosecuted. So even in the off line space, even though it's part of the law, it's wrong, but people are still not attuned to accept a woman's word when she says she's been assaulted.

Or she's not comfortable going to the relevant authorities and

reporting it. Similarly, online, even if you have a protection
under privacy law that states that, you know, women don't need
to give out certain data or if platforms were more responsive to
women's complaints, even then, I feel like there needs to be a
larger cultural shift that recognizes that the rape culture
exists online, too, and accordingly, people modify their
behavior towards disadvantaged groups that include women in
order to make it more inclusive. Law is not enough.
   >> SHMYLA KHAN: Thank you so much for that. And so and also
like you were talking about, sort of study and the link between
harassment and surveillance. So when we give a lot of female
journalists for our study, and we found that -- and we wanted to
compare them to their male colleagues and a lot of times the
kind of surveillance and its effects on the male colleagues was
very different than the women. So when somebody like -- when a
male colleague journalist wrote a controversial story, for
example, in the context of Pakistan, something to do with
blasphemy or civil violence or the civil military relationships,
they would get a threatening call from the agencies or they
would probably be dropped off, like sort of -- I don't want to
make light of it, but you know picked up for a violent. So but
with women, it was very different. Because the kind of state,
the surveillance that the state would extend to them would be a
phone call which wouldn't say your family would be in danger if
you continued talking about this. It would be like you live in
the society and we know that you talk to men sometimes. So that
can be used against you. So maybe keep that in mind next time.
So they're using the patriarchal structure and the notions and
expectations of what your gender constitutes to then use that
against you.
   The state is also not immune to those sort of trappings, as
well. So whereas like both times they're doing surveillance,
but the effect and experience is very different. And then I'll
move on to Ankhi. I want you to talk about like how much of a
conversation about the different experiences of women and
minorities is there amongst social media companies and how does
that reflect into their sort of community guidelines. And I'd
also like to talk about like certain cases have brought to light
about how surveillance can be -- can put certain people in
danger more and how social media platforms are somehow -- are
sometimes more culpable than they should be in these instances.
   For example, it was found that in America, the ACLU last year
filed a petition against an application called due -- where --
and they were taking information from Facebook and Facebook and
Twitter and Instagram and providing them information. And that
application was being sold to -- marketed to police authorities
to clamp down on black lives matter activists. And eventually
like the ACLU then sort of -- they said that after that, then,
as soon as this came to light, the social media companies
withdrew that sort of. But this kind of like potential for
abuse. And this was current, recently in Pakistan.
   There was a case where this woman was having an experience of
being attacked online. Of being attacked off line but she was
sharing the progress of her case continuously on her Facebook
profile and how she was being -- the challenges that she was
facing in the legal system. And those posts were then reviewed
by Facebook and taken down. And so how that sort of how that
sort of algorithm of the social media companies can be changed

to make sure that these kind of incidents don't happen, that if
somebody continuously reports it and that sort of speech is not
taken down. I'm sorry my question was a bit long.
   >> ANKHI DAS: So I would hike to start off by making three
points. I think there are two fundamental approaches. One is
when you talk of surveillance and particularly when it comes to
woman and minorities. Also, there is a salutation context,
there is a very important access of resources because that has
been a long-standing problem. The reason women don't have
participation in order to be able to negotiate these places
better because the anemic composition of the statistics you see
when you look at number of woman online as compared to men. I
can talk about India and I think it's reflected in a similar
proportionality in the rest of south Asia, as well. Because if
in India, you look at the comp vision of the internet, per se,
only 24 percent of woman are there. The rest of them are all
men. So there's going to be patriarchal domination. Obviously,
it's the same thing about the public safety concept, even in the
off line world.
   You need more women on the road to make sure our public spaces
are safe. Otherwise, you will have a dysfunctionality in terms
of physical safety being on the thread in terms of the
normalization of violence which I've talked about. And we see
that all the time in my country, also. So I think theirs is
very fundamentally access to resources which we can all cannot
just wish away. We have to acknowledge that. If you're looking
at solution in terms of the internet being this more equal
space, there has to be a very focused in terms of bringing woman
online. Speaking to groups like the FAT, which is the feminist
access to technology, it's a very sort of energetic and invasive
grass roots of woman in tech, engineers in India, as well as
looking at other work in the region.
   What we found working with these groups and in our research is
that typically what happens if you look at our device as an
internet -- if you're basically on a data plan, and if you have
a son and a daughter, in most of these countries, in most of
these societies, you will give the data plan to your son and not
your daughter. So you're sharing access to resources when
children are very young. And then when women and girls do get
access to resources, it's essentially a shared device. It's
either a hand me down or you're sharing it with, and it could be
a male relative. It could be a brother or somebody, a sibling,
who's older to you and therefore there is a certain power
structure of the family where they have these surveillance
powers which are because of normalization and again because of
social norms are the sort of dominant culture. And it take a
while before those things change. And you see a manifestation
of all these things online it. Takes time, a lot of work to
change this. So what we've been doing is working a lot with
campaign groups in India and south Asia. We are, as you know,
we have been in regular conversation with nicka and others in
Pakistan. In India, we did a very interesting campaign, which
is essentially he or she -- we did that work with groups like
center for social research where, you know, they sort of talked
about the language which men should have when they're talking to
woman. What is the counter speech which you need to create in
order to make -- show that the internet has a space that is
safer and a more civil space? This entire thing -- entire

notion of woman need to be wash that, how that construct needs
to be reorganized and rethought of.

There's also another campaign which we supported with
breakthrough, which essentially is a group of grass roots we do
first in raptors, people in the area of creative arts and
literature, essentially to do -- hack for change, which
essentially celebrated new models, new role models, so that the
millennials have something else as a reference point. And a lot
of this video consent went viral on the platform and created
that kind of engagement with the youth population.

Your second question was in terms of how our social media
platforms and the internet companies, thinking about this
particular of surveillance from a gendered lens perspective, I
think bringing woman online is a very important priority for all
companies, where there's Google, us, anybody, right, there is a
very strong focus on that. There have been copper statements
and investments which are probably being made in terms of making
sure we're working with the community and other people who are
invested in these efforts. We are also at the same time looking
at our community standards very closely, be talking to the
community, talking to civil society organizations, which is why,
you know, I mean all industry participants in the IGF discussion
forums to hear feedback and use that as a listening mechanism in
order to look at the refinement or sort of the evolution of the
community standards.

And we take that feedback. In terms of the automation
mistakes which you talk about, yes, we do make mistakes and
sometimes there are automation sort of misfires which do happen
in this instance which you refer to in Pakistan that was brought
to us by our local civil society network which was then
reviewed. Because as an intermediary, it's a down system.
Right? You report to us, we review it. The language
complications come into play. And therefore you need to have
people with language competencies looking at those reports.
Once the report was flagged to us, it got reviewed and those
posts, as you are aware, was reinstated, right? We apologize.
It's something we've been very upfront about, public about, and
said we made a mistake and this has been reinstated.

In terms of looking at surveillance broadly, I think what is
happening in the regional lot is that, and I think globally
also, but I think what is happening regionally more so, there's
increased polarization, as we all know in terms of different
points of view. Differences have never been so polarizing as
they are today, at this moment. And therefore in that context
when you look at the role of the state in terms of using
national security as a justification or public safety as a
justification to surveill, that becomes very problematic.

Facebook's approach in terms of countering or agitating
against surveillance is very well captured in the coalition
which we joined a few years back with the rest of the industry,
which is called reform government surveillance.org where we
basically push back in a very, very big way to maz surveillance
at this extremely well documented. We actually joined up in a
suit in the U.S., as you know, when those leaks became public
and filed an opposition in terms of making sure. And we are
always responsive in terms of the feedback which we get in terms
of refining our community standards.

So that's what I would say in terms of what we are doing

problematically and also in terms of policy in terms of
responding. And lastly, you talked about that, I think privacy
regulation development is happening in a lot of these countries.
I don't know what the status is in Pakistan, but in indoors
we're looking at an active consideration in terms of looking at
law and privacy regulation law. I think to the extent there are
principles and also informed current, the type of informed
consent is defined on a national legislation which then has some
degree of harmonization with global standards, that gives
certainty to both citizens of the world and also to different
cultures and also to companies in the context in which and the
framework in which they have to operate in.
    >> SHMYLA KHAN: Thank you so much. And everybody was quite
on time. So we have some time for questions. I ever some
myself, but I'll be less selfish and open it up to the floor.
So we'll take I think four questions at once and then get them
answered and see how time is and then revisit. So who would
like to ask a few questions?
    >> I was curious to know when we talk about changing off line
characters -- and I'm very curious -- you think about, yeah,
what -- since we talk about building counter narratives to deal
with dominating online narratives, I'm very curious if any of
you have thought about the idea of countersurveillance from a
feminist perspective and if so, what would that mean and is it
even feasible and just any thoughts.
    >> I'm not sure what you would count at countersurveillance,
but would you count text solutions as countersurveillance, like
safety apps for women? .
    >> I guess it could be. So one of the things I was thinking
about, this is just to -- is you know, I went to Buh it, an last
year and I went to the ruins, right, and I was looking around
and there were these two young men. And I was the only person
the and I was getting jittery because they were sort of coming
quite close to me. And I said okay, let me put myself on them
and sort of photograph them. Now, it's not that they were doing
anything to me, but in a sense, I was feeling powerless so I
don't put myself in the position of the surveilling because you
need to have a certain power to be able to surveill.
    But I was trying to use the cell phone as a mechanism of
countersurveillance from my position powerlessness to sort of
equate the thing. It's not a well thought through thing. I was
just curious.
    >> I think your example actually illustrates a very important
point, which is that technology empowers. And because you had
the power to take their picture impulse, just like anyone else,
you are in a position to call them out very publicly. And
honest space allows us to do that. Which I guess you could make
that a norm in the sense that -- and we've seen examples of that
online where women have posted pictures of men who sent them
obscene messages or women who post pictures of men who have
harassed them in off line spaces and asked people around the
share the post so that they could identify them.
    So definitely that could become a practice, and I think that
the use of technology to defend yourself was very empowering.
    >> Take control, huh? Take back the tech. Take control of a
technology. I would like to respond because it's true,
technology and power and women can use and fight back or build
up to the next level. But there is also -- you know, we live in

a very paradiagnostic. And I think we can be all innocent or we can be all together responsible of that degree of responsibility. I am saying so. Because you know in a world of surveillance, you feel compelled to comply and to behave like the nice woman, the nice girl, you know. And so we create a world that rain forth what we want to change. Because if I feel the attack, if I've been surveilled, punish it. If I will be diminished, then I'm forced to put up a behavior that again reinforce.

   And then we live in a constant hierarchy of what is relevant. So expression of idea is here. Sexual expression is here. Because sexual expression is not enough an idea. And in all this degree and all this game, we continues to lose -- technology empower, but all this analysis that we do, they require data. We all collectively provide data. But who controls and own the data? The wealth of knowledge that big corporation or government has to understand behavior, the why of thing, to need well turn bad. It's incomparable.

   So the raise class society, now we have a new category. Are the data brokers, the one that can analyze and the one that holds the data, they have power. They can determine when we go. And again, the algorithm is designed because my pulse is not following a timeline. It's not the last most important. It's buildup. It's crunched in a very specific way of showing. So I can cry for help, but if I'm in the ocean, no one will hear me. So how can we make sure that we are in the ocean but with an amplifier.

   >> SHMYLA KHAN: I can't have followup question to that. If we are to weaponize surveillance to use it against as countersurveillance, that raises maybe this is a theoretical question, but is surveillance inherently bad and is in and if it is, then can we -- what are the politics of us using it as a weapon for countersurveillance? And anybody in the audience can also take this up. Maybe we need to tackle this, is surveillance maybe a bad thing and this can get that question about countersurveillance.

   >> So to your point, I think what happens in south Asia, that existential nature of safety for woman is such a -- in today, that one could argue this is a scope and reason for doing the kind of stuff which beshocka was suggesting. Or I think the social media platforms have been utilized for naming and shaming these kind of sort of puppeteers or some of the harassers has had a disciplining impact in terms of reshaping norms, or at least has been able to expose. I will give you one data point. If you look at the -- if you just look at the longitudinal series in terms of the number of cases which would get reported ten years back -- the number of rape cases which get reported ten years back and the number of cases reported now, there would be night and day difference. Pick up the national statistics and you will see the difference. I think it has happened because these things are uncomfortable discussions in our cultures, but this is a discussion at the table. Woman is sitting at the table, talking about it. And I think there is this internal notion nof giving voice to this harm, which is why I think there is a case in terms of looking at safety apps, which you talked about.

   And also, I think just a voice, women having voice in order to expose a lot of this, using the naming and shaming tools in

different ways have acted as a counter measure to make sure that women have more access to these spaces.

>> Because safety apps came up, we did a study in India called gendering surveillance which looked at surveillance from a gender perspective. And in that, we analyzed about 50 safety apps and what we found was that a lot of them are like safety is constructed as a prize for good behavior. And in a lot of ways, it reads to a lot of part -- it is designed around partner surveillance. It is designed in a way that you are giving someone the power to -- like you are -- I'm sorry, I'm just losing my train of thought.

But essentially it's either someone that you know that the panic alert goes out to or the police or in some other cases, network publics like it could go to Facebook, et cetera so all three of these can come with different problems and when all the government funds set up for women safety go into either cameras or panic buttons, it can be extremely problematic in the absence of other measures. So we look at that in more detail and we find that safety apps are quite problematic. Also because they construct safety as a very -- they don't think of safety beyond very notions of safety. They don't think of data security, like the apps that basically know -- you're supposed to turn on your location so that each and every place you go to gets recorded.

And keeping that, if you look at the policy, it's basically two lines or half of them don't even have it. So the safety of all data that you're giving is nowhere in a safety app that is released by the police and like this is -- it's another matter that there's 50 different police safety apps also themselves.

So I think we should be careful about pushing for more safety apps because like there's I think 15 safety apps only by the name. So lots of that. Sorry, I have just I think one more question. Not a comment.

So we know the narratives of safety and surveillance are closely coupled and in another case study which we did is on mobile phone bans in India, in certain parts of India, and there we found that mobile phones create a space for privacy which breaks down social surveillance that has existed so you no longer know who your daughter is texting, whether she's talking to someone outside of your cast or your religion. So this creates a lot of social anxiety around surveillance systems of surveillance where people control on the body of your -- of women's rights. So there we find that women are really submersive in using the arguments against like powerful people in the family, like for example, the very narrow instances where mobile phones are allowed for young girls is when they go out to college because it's for safety. So the women also in the interviews said that, yeah, we manage to get phones because you know it's for safety. They do like 20 other things, but they want to tell their parents and say, you know, you want me to be safe, right.

So I was wondering in your help line that YouTube mentioned if you've come across any interesting, exciting, subversive things that women do to countersurveillance. Thanks.

>> So I don't want to talk too much about this, but we actually looked at a lot of studies that you do and we're really big fans of the work that you guys do. I think we're on here now that we're connected. But I think we got like this really cute case for this woman called us and she -- and her first

question was -- she was a bit older. So she asked us, who owns
Facebook. And we were just really confused and we're like, what
do you mean? I guess there's a complicated ownership structure.
Like no, give me the phone number of the person who owns
Facebook.

So old people and technology. So we were like, we don't have
the personal phone number. So she got really agitated and she
said but we were like but why do you need the phone number of
mark Zuckerberg? So she said that I want to -- I want to
suggest an amendment into like Facebook's permissions and that
women should have access to their husband's accounts.
[LAUGHTER]

>> And we said I don't know if that's possible. Maybe you
can try e-mailing him. And so that was really interesting how
-- I think you were talking about how she was also surveilled.
Like she wanted to use that surveillance, as well. So maybe
like the gender doesn't necessarily mean protect you from that
surveillance. We haven't had any of those sort of -- but this
is a common experience, where a lot of women have told us that
the only phone that they own, they leave at the office in their
drawer and they don't take it home because there's -- they won't
be allowed or sib surveilled because they will probably go
through the messages, their family members and things like that.
So they come up with these invasive solutions to sort of bypass
that.

Because it's only five more minutes, I'd like everybody to get
--

>> Thank you. My name is Louis. I'm from Malaysia. My
question is the abuse that Malaysia woman suffers, it's way more
than the Malaysia men and one of the reasons is because Malaysia
is a mostly man dominant country and a lot of women have been
subjected to remarks and criticism for not wearing the HIJAB
pause that is one of the pillars of Islam. And but the problem
with that, and to the extent that there's even a gymnast who won
like six medals in east Asia games but she was still criticized
because she's a Muslim woman and wore a leotard and she was
abused online and that's how bad Malaysia situation is.

But the problem is that I see two obstacles to improving that
situation. Firstly, it is the religion itself because religion
dictates how women should dress. So I think as was pointed out,
surveillance pop down from government but among the citizens
themselves, men are surveilling on how women should dress,
behave, how they should behave around men otherwise they will be
called names. And the second obstacle would be women
themselves, women who criticize other women for not dressing as
they should. How should we move on for people and address them.
Thank you.

>> Actually the answer to yours about ethical issues of
surveilling back is actually a term for that called surveillance
where you use surveillance as a mechanism and firstly I don't
see an ethical issue in that mainly because surveillance at the
end of the day is about power and when you surveill back, you're
taking it back and trying to balance the power a little more.
So in that case, is it ethically wrong? I mean, they're
surveilling you so you swale them. And someone has to -- like
there's a question of who watches the watchers, right? It's
like that. And that's what I think. And there are actually --
examples of this which happened in India, like there are lists

which I know certain communities run about colleges which have
homophobic professors. So they circulate the list among -- on a
need to know baize so students don't get into trouble with those
particular professors with their viewpoint or like that.
    Which I think is surveillance, but it's helping to create the
power a little more amicable. And that's one example I can
think of right off, having seen those lists. I just wanted to
add that. Thank you.
    >> And maybe you can answer the questions and maybe just have
two comments so we can distract this. Everybody can sort of go,
whoever wants to go first.
    >> SHMYLA KHAN: I think we got some very thought provoking
comments especially with regards to impacting cultural change as
far as surveillance is concerned. I want to go back to a really
good question about whether surveillance is inherently bad and
what do we define as offensive surveillance because we can't
deny, as was explained at the beginning of the session, that we
all, you happen, go and stalk someone's profile or we all watch,
you know, what others are up to. And we are all guilty of
judgment.
    Put I'll just add a legal perspective to it. Privacy has been
conceived of in terms of its constitutional limits as being
confined within the walls of your house. So within the walls of
your house, nobody can intrude and this has traditionally been
related to the state. So the state can intrude upon your
person, your property, without a war want or without good
reason. But now in the online spaces, the walls have come down.
There are no virtual walls, either, unless you count platforms
where you specifically add people or, you know, have closed
accounts. But since these barriers have changed, weave to ask
ourselves what kind of surveillance was going on that has been
made easier, what kind of surveillance should continue, what
powers of state should have, and what safety guards should exist
within the law and the constitution to prevent abuse.
    But obviously we also have to start considering nonstate
actors because they are part and parcel of surveillance of
disadvantaged groups, you know, how people -- how women are
treating other women and shaming them or how people think that
just because they hold a certain religious viewpoint that
they're free to express it abusively to someone else.
    >> So I will not answer asking a nostic person to the
question because I'm sure there are so many groups of women that
articulate the wonderful around religion, around faith, and
around power. But I will suggest each and every man of Malaysia
to raise his voice and to protect and to descent. Because the
community of descent is the one to level. On the rest, I will
say hawk. And I'm very happy about our conversation because we
didn't stay to the problem. We know that we are surveilled, but
we hack the system. Each and every individual, each and every
woman, girl, LGBT, anyone that has a civil form of
discrimination, take the power and rehack back.
    Because the girls that say it's frafor my safety, she was with
a great sense of humor. And that's ability to reverse is the
ability to contest the surveillance. But we don't -- don't have
to forget the age of power. I am completely irrelevant is the
ones who own the data, the ones who organize the data. AlDPRthm
make discrimination. Alegarthms are the main amplifier that we
see. We need to hack the algorithm. To hack the algorithm, we

need you because you own the algorithm. And we need to have open algorithm to see what and how to build because if we build in that equality, respect, love, then we will not have the mop because the mop will be called the solidarity, not to angst.

>> I think the transparency point overall is a discussion which has been an ongoing process, and you also know that. There's something I think all companies are cognizance of and I think forums like this then give an opportunity to have those continuing conversations. I think the way the transparency, you know, journey has -- I would call it a journey because there's no end point. It's a constant improvement process, and I think this entire point of algorithmic transparency which is an ongoing discussion which is going on. When we look to opportunities and multistate quarry forums such as IGF to make progress on these conversations.

>> SHMYLA KHAN: Okay. So that concludes our panel. I hope it was fun for you, and thank you to the audience. There were some really good points coming through. So thank you, everyone.

[APPLAUSE]

>> On 31st, if you are in Bangkok, there's a feminist where we talk about the feminist of the internet. We need the feminist solidarity.

[APPLAUSE]

(Session concluded at 5:03 p.m.)