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| --- | --- |
| **Requires** | **Action** |
| adherence of the revised version to tripleC's layout and citationstyle |  |
| \* You say that “Whilst much has been written about the implications ofsocial networks themselves, there has been little research into the natureand activities of those who develop and maintain the platforms upon whichthese networks rest”. I think one should go even into more detail here andsay that the predominant form of social networking sites analysis ispositivistic and uncritical and that more critical analyses of socialnetworking sites are needed. I have given a short overview of some of theresearch, have criticized it and have made this argument in the followingtwo works, so a reference to it were interesting:pp. 11-22 in: Fuchs, Christian. 2009. Social Networking Sites and theSurveillance Society. Salzburg/Vienna: Research Group UTI.<http://fuchs.icts.sbg.ac.at/SNS_Surveillance_Fuchs.pdf> Fuchs, Christian. 2010. Social networking sites and complex technologyassessment. 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 sectionswill follow were appropriate. | New paragraph outlining sections added |
| \* You mention two studies by Spencer/Pahl and Turkle. They bemoan the lossof community and how this relates to SNS. I suppose these two studies arenot critical and nature and do not discuss how the condition they bemoanrelates to capitalism. This might be interesting to mention in order to setthe context of your argument and show that capitalism as context is oftenleft 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 providedata 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. Themost 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 quotationby Gramsci defining what a historical block is were interesting in thiscontext. | Quotation added |
| \* “Gramsci’s work is today situated within the literature of culturalcriticism alongside other writers such as Loius Althusser, Michail Bhaktin,and Michel Foucault…”: I think references to works by these threeauthors, 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 adominant over a subservient class, insisting that power is derived fromdiscourses — accepted ways of thinking, writing, and speaking ⎯ andpractices that amount to power”: please make a reference to one ofFoucault’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 withGill’s analysis of a US led hegemony, takes a more poststructuralist,Foucauldian stance”: I agree that there is a Foucauldian (and even astrong Deleuzian) influence visible in Hardt’s and Negri’s work, butthat is only one side, the other side is a strong connection to Marx,especially Marx’s “Grundrisse” (see Negri’s book “Marx beyondMarx”, this works content can partly implicitly and partly explicitly –in those passages where they refer to Marx – be found in “Labour ofDionysos” (an overlooked earlier book they wrote together about statetheory), “Empire”, “Multitude” and “Commonwealth”- “immateriallabour” = 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 retailerin 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.  Heowns 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 steeringcommittee of the Bilderberg Group,”: please provide an information source | Data sources added |
| \* “Utopian rhetoric surrounding Web 2.0 social networking creates an imageof a social space, mediated by transnational communication tools, that isdemocratic, anti-hierarchical, open, and unconcerned with excessivecapitalist agendas.”: maybe it were good to mention an example oftechno-deterministic, techno-optimistic analysis of “social media” frommanagement/organizational studies. I think a really good example andcompletely affirmative and uncritical is “Wikinomics” (and the follow-upbook) by Tapscott and Williams, see my review of their first book on thisissue here:Fuchs, Christian (2008) Review Essay of “Wikinomics” (DonTapscott/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 accumulationmodel is quite good. But I think you should more clearly explain, whatexactly in relation to Facebook the Gramscian hegemonic bloc is (whom doesit consist of? Where does Facebook’s venture capital come from? Who arethe major owning persons of Facebook and to which extent?  etc) and howhegemony functions. Who exactly do the Facebook users agree and helpreproducing their own exploitation? And are there counter-hegemonicpotentials of social networking sites to question the capitalist characterof 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 InformationStudies. 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 commodificationand 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 ournetworked 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 theInternet. 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 ZiziPapacharissi, 82-101. New York: Routledge. Both approaches is based on Marx’s Critique of the Political Economy. I amnot asking for an uncritical appraisal of mine and Mark’s work, but for amaybe 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 oncommunicative capitalism | Purchased and referenced several times |
| Robins and Webster on the technoculture | Purchased – but not so interesting, to be honest |
| Andrejevic oninteractivity and the digital economy | Papers downloaded |
| Fred Turner's work onthe relationship between counter-culture and cyberculture | Purchased and referenced several times |
| It would have been helpful tohear a bit more about how the commercial strategies that help achievehegemony function "on the ground" as it were. | Noted in additional paragraph in discussion section. |