

# Digital Geographies and Digital Surveillance Technologies. Power and space in the Italian society under control for public health.

Valentina Albanese<sup>1\*</sup> and Giorgio S. Senesi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, 56126 Pisa, Italy

<sup>2</sup>CNR, Istituto per la Scienza e Tecnologia dei Plasmi (ISTP), sede di Bari, 70126 Bari, Italy

\*corresponding author: [valentina.albanese@cfs.unipi.it](mailto:valentina.albanese@cfs.unipi.it)

## **A pandemic story from Italy**

Waking up in the morning represented a gamble every day: remembering where the day's flight would take me and where I would sleep the next night. An academic work conducted with a suitcase in hand. Home, planes, trains, hotels, trains, planes, home. Pandemic stopped all this. The morning alarm has been turned off for months. I prepared breakfast for my family and myself every day, I recovered the hugs, the smiles, the calm, the regular breathing. Rediscover the beauty of the roofs of southern Italy, observed from the balcony, discover sunsets from a window, learn to know my refuge, my home, inch by inch. I re-meant home spaces that have gradually become a total space. In a short circuit between the principle of the perennial movement imposed by the pre-pandemic everyday life and the sedentary lifestyle required by the state of emergency, the world seemed to return to a common human dimension. Of globalization we only saw the logic of perpetual dislocation, an infinite extension of displacements and possibilities while in the pandemic months the ideal connection of everything with everything became the biosphere. A codable sphere and no longer the network, incomprehensibly infinite. The biosphere made everyone immerse in the same air, share the same voids between bodies. Stasis suddenly won over an impossible frenzy that, who knows, maybe we have learned to keep under control.

## **Abstract**

Over the past decades digital technologies have been exploited to supply traditional measures employed to trace people behavior.

This chapter aims to discuss the current field of actual surveillance and age of surveillance capitalism with its contradictions. The main focus is on the Italian technology solutions deployed to tackle the spread of COVID-19.

One aspect of this chapter analyses the interaction between the procedures shaped by the Italian surveillance technologies implemented to discipline (e.g. social distancing) and control (e.g. prescribing spatial behavior) forms of governmentality. Another aspect of this research explores the very complex stratification of public and private spaces producing new spatiality during the pandemic.

A preliminary analysis of surveillance technologies deployed to struggle COVID-19 is reviewed and their biopolitical power in the current exceptional state discussed in the specific case of Italy.

From a biopolitical perspective, the Italian tracing policies have had an impact on the use of public and private spaces and forced confinement and, in a given justice perspective, the surveillance of bodies and their actions in space has influenced the entire public, social and individual geographies of people.

These two perspectives provide an essential lens of reading to understand the effects of surveillance technologies in the Italian society during the pandemic, leading to a further progress in the phenomenon of surveillance capitalism to which we have all been subjected for a long time.

## **1. New spatiality during the pandemic**

The COVID-19 pandemic can be described as the watershed between the organization of the world based on twentieth-century concepts and those generated by the digital revolution. The digital turn had already been present for some time and, as well, technological innovations were already present, but they had never been used in such a massive way, as happened in these first two years of pandemic. Therefore, it is reasonable to assess that the digital turn has found its momentum in the pandemic period to become a digital practice turn, that is, a turning point in practices, all practices, which have found their own digital alter ego to be maintained even during the periods of lockdown. . Digital geographies are certainly protagonists of territorial reconfigurations. Ash, Kitchin and Leszczynski (2018, p.29), assessed that "since the early 1990s, there have been a series of studies that have examined how the digital is mediating and augmenting the production of space and transforming socio-spatial relations". Certainly, the massive

use of technologies in the everyday life has accelerated this process. Thus, geography becomes essential to understand which relationships between the individual and the physical environment, i.e. the exterior, and the individual and social environment, i.e. the otherness, have emerged including also the dynamics of local resistance<sup>1</sup>. The new spatialities generated by the pandemic and by the repeated lockdowns can be evaluated at different scales. The confinement of the bodies inside private homes led us to reflect on the new spatiality of COVID-19, starting from the minimum scale, that of the body, then considering that of the house, and finally the urban one.

### 1.1 Bodies and spaces during the pandemic. The Italian case.

To understand what impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on body practices, two essential variables must be considered, i.e. the forced confinement in space and the transfer of personal data, from body temperature to tastes and emotions. Thus, surveillance capitalism has enriched its archives with an abnormal amount of data. Out of a psychological or medical analysis on confinement, but aiming to perform a geographical analysis, the two aspects of confinement and data transfer can be considered both expressions of forms of the power of those who generate, assemble and organize data. For this reason, our reflection moves from the forms of power that produce and act on data. A power that Isin and Ruppert (2020) call *sensory power*.

According to Foucault (1975) since the seventeenth century the relationship of power with life has changed sharply and can be summarized in the dichotomy of passing from the power of life or death (typical of feudal societies) to the power of allowing life or pushing to death. In the second case, the logic of sovereignty is modified and power becomes *biopower*, thus fulfilling the productive task of managing life. In this way the exercise of power with punishment ceases and is transformed into the management

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, “Carbonare” lessons were organized in public gardens in Milan, every Sunday afternoon in parks, in green spaces of neighborhoods, until the schools of all types and levels are back in presence and safety. They consist in itinerant lessons to guarantee the right to study for those who, due to the digital divide, could not deal with distance learning. The purpose of *carbonare lessons* was also to protest against the closure of schools during the peak of pandemic. <https://video.repubblica.it/edizione/milano/lezioni-carbonare-a-milano-gli-studenti-and-8220disposti-a-tutto-pur-di-tornare-in-classe-and-8221/371606/372211?ref=vd-auto&cnt=1&fbclid=IwAR0UbVaRDTPbG9bKBkZcDw6ooco24PxxKzf5wbkcP2L3spQW5JkPFSldy3s>.

of population growth, public hygiene and reproduction practices, and its effectiveness is linked to the development of new science and new knowledge. These are the means by which modern biopower recovers the ancient sovereign right of life or death. Biopower, expressed as the set of power-knowledge devices controlling the management of lives, has historically developed in two ways: disciplinary and biopolitical. In the contemporary world, discipline and biopolitics are supported by new technologies and, during the pandemic, they have entered by right as life-saving tools in a state of exception (Agamben, 2003), so generating the legitimate doubt if the civil liberties must be limited to safeguard public health or if this is a mere biopolitical power means (Kitchin, 2020) implemented with new and even more effective tools.

In Italy, we have been witnesses of two main ways of exercising biopolitical power: on the one hand, the attitudes and utilities of individual bodies have been strengthened by regulation and governmentality of daily practices and, on the other hand, biopower has manifested itself as a population biopolitics. In Italy, which has been hit by the virus immediately after China, the measures to be taken to contain and contrast the spread of COVID-19 were formally adopted with a series of Ministerial Decrees (DPCM). Italy was colored red, orange and yellow based on the number of sick people, in proportion to the number of places in intensive care units in hospitals. The rules for the confinement of bodies in private homes were initially referred only to the «red areas» and were then extended to the entire national territory<sup>2</sup>. These measures included: (a) the prohibition of any form of people gathering in public areas or places open to the public; (b) the ban of movement of people, except for journeys motivated by proven work needs or situations of necessity or travel for health reasons; (c) the recommendation to public and private employers to promote the use by employees of ordinary leaves and holidays breaks and to favor forms of smart working; (d) the suspension of teaching activities in presence in schools of all levels; (e) the suspension of events and sport competitions of all types and disciplines, in public or private places; (f) the suspension of all organized events in public or private places, including those of a cultural, recreational, sporting, religious and trade fair nature, even if carried out in closed places but open to the

---

<sup>2</sup> DPCM <http://www.governo.it/it/coronavirus-misure-delgoverno> (published March 9th, 2020)

public; (g) the suspension of civil and religious ceremonies; (h) the closure of museums and places of culture; and (i) the closure of most commercial activities.

The first phase of rigid lockdown ended on May 3, 2020 and, with the transition to the so-called Phase 2, the productive, cultural and social activities gradually began to resume, even if subject to compliance with some precautions, including social distancing and use of a mask indoors. The schools remained closed until the end of the school year 2019/2020. The spread of COVID-19 therefore resulted in a sudden and drastic reduction in social life in Italy, an extended transfer of professional activities to home private space and an immediate suspension of educational, working (with some exceptions), sport, social and cultural activities, some of which were allowed only at a distance. However, in all marginal areas where the digital divide is still present, these activities have been completely canceled from everyday life. Thus, at varying degrees, people experienced a condition of social isolation and limitation of freedom of movement outside home. In this scenario, the relationship between people and space has also inevitably changed, especially, between bodies confined to the totalizing home space. Thus, the bodies had to adapt their rhythms of life to allow for the forced intersection of formal and factual territoriality. Formal territorialities are well represented by the place of residence, while the factual ones are expressed in the places where various kinds of activities, e.g. work, study, sports, etc., take place. Formal territoriality generally do not coincide with the factual territoriality. Although for a few people formal and factual territoriality overlap, for most men and women of any age the two territorialities not only do not coincide but in certain cases are even mutually exclusive.

Reflections related to surveillance capitalism and sensory power add to the above considerations. Confinement, as mentioned above, marked the final entry into a digital age, through the dissemination of practices on a global scale and in every area of life. In Italy, the digital practice turn has highlighted issues on specific forms of exploitation, control and surveillance favored by *digitalness* in an insufficient welfare framework characterized by a weakness in public services, including hospitals and local health assistance, school and university. Although the technological paradigm that took place during pandemic was not surprising because signals were already evident since some time, we have witnessed its disturbing

and unexpected acceleration. This has exacerbated pre-existing economic and social, racial and gender inequalities. Furthermore, home has become also the workplace, a space no longer separated between production and reproduction, but a new battleground between productive and unproductive bodies. In this framework, digital media have represented the control center through which data related to (un)productivity accumulate to be then transferred, analyzed, stored and reused at will. The massive use of digitized daily practices has led to an unprecedented increase in what Klauser identified as automated, software-driven data analytics (Klauser, 2017).

Digital technologies have been inextricably intertwined with daily life, becoming mediators of identity and belonging (Albanese, Graziano, 2020) and redefining the relationships of territoriality not only between people in the home, but also between people and suspended space, i.e. public space.

## **1.2 Private and public spaces during the pandemic. The Italian case.**

The social distancing and the interruption of the physical relationship with the city that is part of our daily life have led to re-considering the relations with the territory in a markedly reduced perspective, that of the body, and in a very large perspective, the transcalar one. The dystopian relationship between the private space and the regulated, denied, public space, is of particular interest between the two opposite poles of the small scale of the body and the large global scale. The relationship of people with the external space, the public space, has been limited in time (only a few hours) and in space (only some areas). This space has become less and less intelligible. Since the access to the public space has been denied, it has taken the appearance of an indeterminate, evanescent space, while home became a total space. The lockdown periods have transformed living spaces into many heterotypical micro-spaces, islands in the home island. In these micro-spaces factual territorialities, e.g. shopping, social events, conferences, smart working, e-learning, etc., and formal territorialities have overlapped. In the cases where these territorialities were incompatible with each other, e.g. working vs keeping the TV on, Foucaultian heterotopias arised. Very quickly, Italians had to reconstruct the relationship with the space both from

an individual point of view and from a social, work point of view, etc. For this reason it is interesting to consider the total space of home in which formal and factual territorialities have been forced to coincide during lockdown periods. The bridge with the usual, assimilated proxemics of everyday life was digital and the ability to keep alive activities once outside home depended entirely on *digitalness*, i.e. both the ability to use digital tools and as a digital infrastructure of the territory and access to information and communication technologies, in summary the presence or absence of a digital divide.

During the lockdown periods, also including eventual quarantines, an even more intense dichotomy occurred between private space and public space because we were obliged to live in a total, factual, formal space, and use the external, public one as an exceptional one. The waiting space was also characterized by the destabilizing uncertainty of the continuous change of rules established by the Ministry of Health that have implied important consequences in terms of personal and social instability. The space enlarged and restricted by various ordinances has regulated the spaces of mobility, not only reduced but also variable, and those of consumption. The territoriality that has been expressed in the governed territory has highlighted very clearly an elected public space that was placed in the middle between the heterotopy of the private space and the utopia of the denied public space. The various Ministerial Decrees have exercised the political control of the territory by regulating the access to the public spaces and keeping alive some *exceptional* spaces (Agamben, 2003). For example, the various decrees provided also the guarantee to have access to some supermarkets, pharmacies and, in general, shops supplying goods deemed essential. Another instrument of governmentality followed this regulation of space, i.e. the regionalization of the pandemic, especially active all during its second phase. In Italy, during the second pandemic wave, restrictions differentiated on a regional basis to allow a slow, partial recovery of the national economy were present among the new measures to counter the relentless advance of COVID-19. The state of risk<sup>3</sup> measured on a weekly basis has determined the attribution of a color to each Region.

---

<sup>3</sup> The document from which the basic choices underlying the DPCM and the "colors" ordinance derive was drawn up by a working group including the Istituto Superiore di Sanità, INAIL, the Spallanzani Institute and the Conference of Regions. The data based on the surveys were uploaded every week by the regions to the database of the Istituto Superiore di Sanità; the sources of the data, therefore, were the regions.  
(<https://documenti.camera.it/leg18/resoconti/assemblea/html/sed0424/stenografico.pdf>)

The colors were yellow, orange or red, from a minimum to a maximum risk of contagion. The color of the regions determined the restrictions to be followed until the reduction of the risk indicator and consequent change of color.

This fragmentation of the national space into a colored space has generated new dichotomies on other scales, i.e. the regional ones, and has further prevented the reorganization of the practices of/in/ with the public space during the pandemic crisis. Thus, not being able to manage everyday micro-practices as usual, the society has lost those elements of stability and stabilization of social models (Ehn and Löfgren, 2010) that are also indispensable for the decoding of everyday life.

## **2. Digital Surveillance Technologies. The Italian case.**

During the first wave of COVID-19 pandemic, individual lives intersected more and more closely with new technologies. The quality of survival during the periods of forced confinement depended on the technological access. In those periods, years-old issues related to the access to new technologies and digital illiteracy i.e. issues relating to the digital divide, became very evident. Italy is at the bottom of the indicators on digitization in Europe and, if we agree with Sassen (2007) that cities are the docking and boarding points of world economy, a high digital divide is a fuel that feeds even wider gaps between territories. In the pandemic, the gaps have moved on a much smaller scale, at the urban scale, of course, but also at the private scale of the home, and down to the scale of the body, of individuals, who could or could not continue to work, to study, to communicate, to have a social life, although mediated by a technological device. The main causes of digital divide in Italy include: (a) the absence or inadequacy of technologies, e.g. devices, infrastructures, offered by the public sphere; (b) the absence of personal funds to purchase an internet connection and/or electrical connections; (c) the lack of training, i.e. digital illiteracy; and (d) obsolescence by private technology producers. During the pandemic, the effects of the digital divide affected all areas of human existence, accentuating the inequalities between people with and without access to ICTs, as in that historical moment the connection of homes with the remaining world

made the difference between those who have maintained a relationship with the outside and these who have not.

## **2.1. Governmentality and Digital Surveillance Technology.**

Given the limiting context of the digital divide, the power structures of digital citizenship have limited individuals and communities by determining who was included and who was excluded from physical, digital and social spaces. More than forty years ago Foucault (1988) considered that, starting from modernity, the biological life became the most important issue of politics and it is more correct to talk of biopolitics and not of politics, and the task of government art, which he calls “governmentality”, actually is the intervention in the biological lives of individuals. In addition to biopolitics and biopolitical power mentioned above, it is necessary to specify the term “biocapitalism”, which consists in the possibility of obtaining profit from living bodies, i.e. life itself, and which is one of the most important forms of contemporary capitalism. Biocapitalism can be schematically described in two ways, the first one is that of industries linked to biology, such as pharmaceutical industries, vaccines, etc., and the second more insidious one concerns the exploitation of emotions, values and cultural models by which these companies sell their products. These concepts lead directly to the great theme of surveillance capitalism and to the “Big Other” of which Zuboff (2019) deals in opposition to the “Big Brother” who guided our consumption before Internet was inextricably intertwined with our (on) life (Floridi, 2015). According to Zuboff, the “Big Others” are hired ad hoc to guide the preferences of specific groups of people by exercising a coercive power that does not require violence.

The “Big Others” generate new tastes, stimulate desires, guide choices and, to do so, they rely on the large amount of data collected (more or less legally) in huge databases that are often at the center of global scandals. The network and the technologies that make it work have assumed a central role for any form of political hegemony because the control of information, the control of personal data, which means controlling people, feed on digital knowledge (Deibert 2015; Winseck 2017). Therefore, the exceptional

moment of the pandemic was also experienced as an exceptional moment for the collection of personal data, justified by the reason of safeguarding world health.

In this scenario, digital surveillance technologies have made their way. In recent years, numerous critical studies of digital capitalism have been conducted, which have addressed the problem of medical data collection previously to the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, some authors (Fuchs, 2013; Terranova, 2000) have questioned who could benefit from health data. The dichotomy between the common good and private benefit has been studied in order to understand the practices of data generation and sharing which are difficult to control by individual citizens. Thus, the possibility of using digital to systems tracking people infected with the virus was immediately considered to counteract its spread. With the aim of protecting national and global public health, the media debate has exposed different digital solutions to monitor people infected with COVID-19 and those who have come into contact with them. The solutions proposed were different and with significantly variable impacts with respect to data justice. It was taken into consideration the digital controlling of gatherings usings aggregated data, and also geolocalizing and tracking individual movements, i.e., contact tracing. These hypotheses fall within a consolidated habitus that countries have historically developed, i.e. surveillance. Historically, surveillance has been of targeted type when it was necessary to react to an imminent threat, while it was of the mass type when it aimed to keeping generic state defense strategies in place. However, a relevant variable must be considered in these strategies. The frame of application of these surveillance techniques, as digital capitalism teaches, is no longer attributable to territorial borders but overcomes every demarcation of political space and moves in the cyberspace (Bethlehem, 2014). Therefore, the issue of contact tracing apps arises as a global as well as biopolitical issue, i.e. regulate the life of individuals by mass monitoring on a cyber-global scale.

*The body is immersed in a political field* (Foucault, 1975) and power is *a political technology of the body* (id.), thus biopolitics is the relationship between power and the body or, more precisely, the body is seen as a target of power. The object of the biopolitics of this pandemic was the population seen as a compact body, and the purpose of the state power was the health of the population. In these terms, the State sovereignty has

legitimized logically and rationally the biopolitical practice of digital surveillance of people movements and contacts. Thus, digital technologies have been used to manipulate life, manipulation understood as regulation and normalization of vital processes. This surveillance system appears as a space in which the bodies of individuals are subjected to a continuous control and end up by adhering to the imposed standards, in order to avoid normalizing sanctions.

## **2.2. Contact tracing app in Western democratic states.**

The main strategy adopted by Italy to contain the virus was the blockade of the entire nation and the obligation of quarantine for all citizens except those involved in work activities deemed essential to guarantee the basic necessities to the population. In addition, contact tracing apps have been created, which for privacy reasons in Western democratic states, included soft control strategies on their citizens. For example, cameras with facial recognition used in other countries were excluded. The Italian approach was thus distinguished by a greater softness by allowing the collection of anonymous data exclusively to analyze the progress of the virus. In particular, in the first phase of the pandemic, the first action implemented was that of a manual contact tracing by which healthcare personnel was required to report and reconstruct the contacts had with patients positive to the virus. Subsequently, after a long debate with some supporters and several detractors, the national contact tracing app called Immuni was launched.

As implemented in other Western democratic countries, the approach used to fight the virus has been *human driven* (Parola, 2020), i.e. investing in the human capital of citizens has meant in Italy the use of technology for most communication purposes. For example, the legislative choices of the Ministerial Decrees which, at various intervals, i.e. weekly, biweekly or monthly, decreed each time, new rules of immobility for Italians, occurred through the massive use of traditional and novel media. The substantial mass-media communication was useful not only to allow the legislative measures be known, but also to leverage on the social sensitivity and civil responsibility of citizens. Obviously, this social communication

style has also increased the normalization of digital surveillance operations by using the tool of digital communication as a consensus factory (Chomsky, Herman, 1995). To all of this, the “Immuni” contact tracing app has been added.

### **2.3. The Italian *Immuni*.**

The “Immuni” app was developed on the bases of the numerous issues related to data justice, and no citizen has been forced to download it. It could be downloaded on a voluntary basis and no movement restrictions were imposed on those who did not want or could use it. These citizens who decided to download the app did not disclose information on their exact location as Immuni was not developed with GPS technology but with Bluetooth technology, which is unable to release information regarding the precise location of the user. Thus, this app did not work by matching an exact location to an exact name but provided the users who downloaded it with an anonymous ID code. Based on this code, virus exposure notifications were sent, i.e. subscribed users were enabled to receive notifications on their device if they came in contact with a virus-positive individual. The Bluetooth technology used to face data justice issues was even more accurate because any close contact between a positive person is detected thanks to the strength of the Bluetooth signal.

Another choice made by the developers of the Italian app to control issues related to data justice was the decentralized design model. Actually, the numeric codes, besides being anonymous, were also provided as temporary, which means that the same person has not been entrusted with the same code for the entire time of the app use, but a different code programmed for each use of the app. Thus, another extremely important aspect was that there was not a single place for data storage, which was very relevant in addressing numerous data justice issues. In this regard, it is also important to consider the conservation of digital data for issues already raised by Taylor (2019, p.265): “There is an important disjuncture between the ethical parameters that are usual for researchers and the possibilities of the new digital data

sources. Given this, we may do well to look beyond the standard set of rules regarding privacy and data collection”.

Further, it is also important to underline how the central server receives the virus exposure notification. In the decentralized model of Immuni, only a list of codes of positive people not identifiable by name and surname is sent to the central server, and user contacts are registered only on his/her device. Therefore, only the individual personal device connects to the central server and check if the user has come into contact with a person/code positive to the virus by crossing the starting code with all those present in the list of positive codes in the central server and, if so, the server sends to the device owner an exposure notification. The Italian protocol of a decentralized type is thus certainly not a very invasive model, but is solid in terms of user privacy as the central authorities cannot identify positive citizens, their contacts, the duration of their meeting and geo-localize their movements, which are data considered sensitive and thus protected. Differently, if these data were provided to the central server, as it occurs for apps that use a centralized model, it would be possible to trace the social networks in which individuals enter. Certainly Immuni is not a perfect model, but is apparently among the least invasive.

### **3. Conclusions**

The management of the pandemic, due to its very exceptional nature, was not an easy task. Crying out the conspiracy is just as hasty as certain government measures and actions have been. Fear and threat, connected to situations of proximity, have pushed us to accept digital technologies as the only possible way to protect ourselves, but also to survive by keeping our daily activities, thanks to the mediation of digital devices. Aware of the exceptional nature of the initial situation, what we have attempted to discuss is the implementation of control and confinement strategies, certainly exceptional, but which have their roots in a long-standing tension towards governmentality, biopower and the capitalism of surveillance. As discussed above in ethical terms, although the Immune contact tracing app is not one of the worst cases it still raises important questions related to some of the ten rules for social control proposed by

Chomsky (2014). In particular, we are referring here to the rules 1) the strategy of distraction; 3) the gradualness; and 10) to know people better than they know themselves<sup>4</sup>.

The distraction strategy is the main element of social control. This concept is not new, but it dates back to the first century A.D. The expression “*panem et circenses*” (bread and circus games) with which Juvenal (127 A.D., p.81) indicated the elements necessary to sedate and control the people of Rome. This expression continues to be used currently and still indicates a demagogic attitude by which good food and entertainment are exploited to distract people from real problems. Generalist social networks of the latest generation are a relevant example of this. Therefore, there has always been a tendency to give up freedom in exchange for ephemeral fun. Graduality which refers to the gradual application of measures that, otherwise, would be unacceptable, is also a subtle instrument of governmentality. Would this be the case with Immuni?

Finally, from Chomsky to Zuboff, the problem of the transfer of personal data and the consequent control over bodies in their socio-political sense and over people in their emotional and personal sphere is at the center of a huge debate. Digital technologies are inextricably intertwined with our daily life and, in an urgent way, are increasingly assuming the role of mediators of identity and belonging (Albanese, Graziano, 2020) in replacing social, economic, cultural and playful spaces, etc. The loss of privacy and mass surveillance are the most important issues on which reflection is urgently needed. Starting from the academy, these issues invest as many areas as possible in search of a problematization and, subsequently, of a solution. In the case of contact tracing apps, all of them, in every nation, should have the sole purpose of monitoring the population for the sole purpose of reducing contagion and intercepting dangerous

---

<sup>4</sup> The ten Chomsky rules referred to are:

- 1.The strategy of distraction
- 2.Create the problem and then offer the solution
- 3.The strategy of gradualness
- 4.The strategy of deferring
- 5.Addressing people as children
- 6.Using the emotional aspect much more than reflection
- 7.Keeping people ignorant and in mediocrity
- 8.Encourage the public to be in favor of mediocrity
- 9.Reinforce the sense of guilt
- 10.To know people better than they know themselves

situations from a virological point of view in the shortest time. All new technologies however, from contact tracing apps to any digital tool that retrieves personal data, involve several doubts and issues related to the control, the power and the slow but inexorable release of personal information in the boundless databases. Whose database? Where from?

## References

- ALBANESE V., GRAZIANO T. (2020), *Place, cyberplace e le nuove geografie della comunicazione*, BUP, Bologna.
- AGAMBEN G. (2003), *Stato di eccezione*, Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.
- ASH J., KITCHIN R., LESZCZYNSKI A. (2018), “Digital turn, digital geographies”, in *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(1), pp. 25–43.
- BETHLEHEM D. (2014), “The End of Geography: The Changing Nature of the International System and the Challenge to International Law”, in *European Journal of International Law*, pp.9-23.
- CHOMSKY N., HERMAN E. S. (1995), *Manufacturing Consent*, Vintage Books, New York.
- CHOMSKY N. (2014), *Media e potere*, Bepress, Lecce.
- DEIBERT R. (2015), “The Geopolitics of Cyberspace after Snowden”, in *Current History. A Journal of Contemporary World Affairs*, 114.768, pp. 9-15.  
<http://www.currenthistory.com/Article.php?ID=1210>
- EHN B., LÖFGREN O. (2010), *The secret world of doing nothing*, California University Press, Berkeley.
- FLORIDI L. (2015), *The onlife manifesto: Being human in a hyperconnected era*, Springer Nature.
- FOUCAULT M. (1975), *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*, Éditions Gallimard, Paris.
- FOUCAULT M. (1988), *La volontà di sapere*, Feltrinelli, Milano.
- FUCHS C. (2013), “Theorising and analysing digital labour”, in *The Political Economy of Communication* 1(2), pp. 3–27.
- GIOVENALE S. G. (127 D.C.), *Satire*, X.
- ISIN E., RUPPERT E. (2020), “The birth of sensory power: How a pandemic made it visible?”, in *Big Data & Society*, July–December, pp. 1–15.
- KITCHIN R. (2020), “Civil liberties or public health, or civil liberties and public health? Using surveillance technologies to tackle the spread of COVID-19”, in *Space and Polity*, pp. 1-20.  
DOI:10.1080/13562576.2020.1770587
- KLAUSER F. (2017), *Surveillance & Space*, Sage, London.
- PAROLA J. (2020), “Controllo e regolazione sui “corpi”. Un confronto tra sistemi utilizzati durante l'emergenza sanitaria COVID-19”, in *Cambio. Rivista sulle trasformazioni sociali*, OpenLab on Covid-19.  
DOI: 10.13128/cambio-9967
- SASSEN S. (2007), *Deciphering the Global: Its Scales, Spaces and Subjects*, Routledge, London.
- TAYLOR L. (2019), “Ethics”, in ASH J, KITCHIN R., LESZCZYNSKI (eds.), *Digital Geographies*, Sage, London.
- TERRANOVA T. (2000), “Free labor”, in *Social Text*, 18(2), pp. 33–58.
- ZUBOFF S. (2019), *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, Profile Books.
- WINSECK D. (2017), “The Geopolitical Economy of the Global Internet Infrastructure Source”, in *Journal of Information Policy* 7, pp. 228-267.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/jinfopoli.7.2017.0228>