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| --- | --- |
| **Requires** | **Action** |
| adherence of the revised version to tripleC's layout and citation  style |  |
| \* You say that “Whilst much has been written about the implications of  social networks themselves, there has been little research into the nature  and activities of those who develop and maintain the platforms upon which  these networks rest”. I think one should go even into more detail here and  say that the predominant form of social networking sites analysis is  positivistic and uncritical and that more critical analyses of social  networking sites are needed. I have given a short overview of some of the  research, have criticized it and have made this argument in the following  two works, so a reference to it were interesting:  pp. 11-22 in: Fuchs, Christian. 2009. Social Networking Sites and the  Surveillance Society. Salzburg/Vienna: Research Group UTI.  <http://fuchs.icts.sbg.ac.at/SNS_Surveillance_Fuchs.pdf>  Fuchs, Christian. 2010. Social networking sites and complex technology  assessment. International Journal of E-Politics 1 (3): 19-38.  <http://fuchs.uti.at/wp-content/uploads/SNS.pdf> | reference to Christian Fuchs work included in paper |
| \* At the end of the introduction (section 1), an overview of which sections  will follow were appropriate. | New paragraph outlining sections added |
| \* You mention two studies by Spencer/Pahl and Turkle. They bemoan the loss  of community and how this relates to SNS. I suppose these two studies are  not critical and nature and do not discuss how the condition they bemoan  relates to capitalism. This might be interesting to mention in order to set  the context of your argument and show that capitalism as context is often  left out when analyzing “social media”. | New para added concerning lack of political critical awareness in most extant literature |
| \* section 2: development of the number of users of Facebook: please provide  data sources | References provided |
| \* Gramsci: quotations from Gramsci are given from secondary literature,  namely Jones (2006). I think it were better to refer to a primary work. The  most frequently-used English source for citing Gramsci is:  Gramsci, Antonio. 1973. Selection from the prison notebooks. London:  Lawrence & Wishhart. | Prison Notebooks acquired – refs introduced throughout |
| \* You mention Gill’s use of the term “historical block”. A quotation  by Gramsci defining what a historical block is were interesting in this  context. | Quotation added |
| \* “Gramsci’s work is today situated within the literature of cultural  criticism alongside other writers such as Loius Althusser, Michail Bhaktin,  and Michel Foucault…”: I think references to works by these three  authors, in which they refer to Gramsci, should be given; sic!: Louis | References added, though Bakhtin now removed – too complex to go into int this paper and would be a tangent |
| \* “Foucault in particular refused to see power as something exercised by a  dominant over a subservient class, insisting that power is derived from  discourses — accepted ways of thinking, writing, and speaking ⎯ and  practices that amount to power”: please make a reference to one of  Foucault’s book that covers this issue (e.g. the work selection titled  “Power”…) | Reference added |
| \* “Hardt and Negri’s vision of the world order, Empire, by contrast with  Gill’s analysis of a US led hegemony, takes a more poststructuralist,  Foucauldian stance”: I agree that there is a Foucauldian (and even a  strong Deleuzian) influence visible in Hardt’s and Negri’s work, but  that is only one side, the other side is a strong connection to Marx,  especially Marx’s “Grundrisse” (see Negri’s book “Marx beyond  Marx”, this works content can partly implicitly and partly explicitly –  in those passages where they refer to Marx – be found in “Labour of  Dionysos” (an overlooked earlier book they wrote together about state  theory), “Empire”, “Multitude” and “Commonwealth”- “immaterial  labour” = based on Marx’s concept of the General Intellect… | References made to their earlier more Marxian work. |
| \* “.Amazon, founded by Jeff Bezos in 1994, is the largest online retailer  in the US, and 3rd largest in UK.  Its market Capitalisation in Nov 2010 was  $75bn - 2nd after Google”: please provide a data source  \* “…eBay, which was valued in Nov 2010 at $40bn, fourth after Facebook.  Facebook itself, valued at $50bn in Jan 2011 (3rd after Amazon) – …”:  please provide a data source  \* “Thiel was the first and main Venture Capitalist behind Facebook.  He  owns 5.2% which he bought in Summer ‘04 for $0.5bn -  now worth $2.6bn”:  please provide a data source  \* “So successful has Peter Thiel become, he is now on the steering  committee of the Bilderberg Group,”: please provide an information source | Data sources added |
| \* “Utopian rhetoric surrounding Web 2.0 social networking creates an image  of a social space, mediated by transnational communication tools, that is  democratic, anti-hierarchical, open, and unconcerned with excessive  capitalist agendas.”: maybe it were good to mention an example of  techno-deterministic, techno-optimistic analysis of “social media” from  management/organizational studies. I think a really good example and  completely affirmative and uncritical is “Wikinomics” (and the follow-up  book) by Tapscott and Williams, see my review of their first book on this  issue here:  Fuchs, Christian (2008) Review Essay of “Wikinomics” (Don  Tapscott/Anthony D. Williams). In: International Journal of Communication.  Vol. 2 (2008). pp. 1-11. <http://fuchs.icts.sbg.ac.at/wikinomics.pdf> | Reference added |
| \* I think the analysis of the implications of Facebook’s accumulation  model is quite good. But I think you should more clearly explain, what  exactly in relation to Facebook the Gramscian hegemonic bloc is (whom does  it consist of? Where does Facebook’s venture capital come from? Who are  the major owning persons of Facebook and to which extent?  etc) and how  hegemony functions. Who exactly do the Facebook users agree and help  reproducing their own exploitation? And are there counter-hegemonic  potentials of social networking sites to question the capitalist character  of the Internet and to establish a communist Internet?  For the concept of the communist Internet see chapter 9 (=Conclusion) in:  Fuchs, Christian (2011) Foundations of Critical Media and Information  Studies. New York: Routledge. (the book is available as free download on  [gigapedia.com](http://gigapedia.com/)) | Additional Gramscian analysis of Facebook added to discussion section |
| \* There has been some earlier critical work about Facebook commodification  and its accumulation model. I think this should be mentioned. See:  Fuchs, Christian. 2011. An alternative view of privacy on Facebook.  Information 2 (1): 140-165. [special issue on “Trust and privacy in our  networked world“, edited by Dieter M. Arnold and Herman T. Tavani].  <http://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/2/1/140/pdf>  Fuchs, Christian. 2010. Labor in informational capitalism and on the  Internet. The Information Society 26 (3): 179-196.  <http://fuchs.uti.at/wp-content/uploads/class.pdf>  Andrejevic, Mark. 2010. "Social Network Exploitation." In A Networked Self:  Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites, edited by Zizi  Papacharissi, 82-101. New York: Routledge.  Both approaches is based on Marx’s Critique of the Political Economy. I am  not asking for an uncritical appraisal of mine and Mark’s work, but for a  maybe one-paragraph discussion. It were interesting to read your comments in this paragraph and critical comments are very much welcome. | Paragraph added to discussion section |
| Reviewer 2 |  |
| <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/issue/view/263/showToc> - read and refer to this literature | Scholz paper in this special issue referenced |
| Jodi Dean on  communicative capitalism | Purchased and referenced several times |
| Robins and Webster on the technoculture | Purchased – but not so interesting, to be honest |
| Andrejevic on  interactivity and the digital economy | Papers downloaded |
| Fred Turner's work on  the relationship between counter-culture and cyberculture | Purchased and referenced several times |
| It would have been helpful to  hear a bit more about how the commercial strategies that help achieve  hegemony function "on the ground" as it were. | Noted in additional paragraph in discussion section. |