

POLITICAL EFFECTS OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AND SOCIAL MEDIA

PABLO BALÁN
Tel Aviv University
Spring 2025

Class Hours: Tuesday 15:15 IST
Office Hours: By appointment ([sign up here](#))
Office: Naftali, Room 530

Email: pbalan@tauex.tau.ac.il
Website: www.plobalan.com
Classroom: 425

Course Overview: Information is power—also in politics. This course explores the role of information technologies in politics and governance from the perspective of political economy, a discipline at the crossroads of economics and political science. The class has two goals: (1) to provide an analytic framework to think about the relationship between information and politics and (2) to provide a toolkit to critically read contemporary empirical research on the effects of information technologies and social media on politics. We will read cutting-edge (sometimes unpublished) empirical research on the following questions: Is social media undermining democracy? Can information technologies improve democracy? What's the role of social media in political protests? Does social media cause political polarization and misinformation? How can we fight misinformation? How do authoritarian regimes employ information technologies for political control? What are the political effects of AI and automation? The course should be of interest to students who want to pursue research, seek to design policies dealing with information technologies, and anyone who wants to have a solid scientific understanding of some of the most pressing questions of our time.

Goals: The course has two goals. First, to introduce to fundamental analytic concepts in political science and provide you with the tools to understand and criticize modern social science. Second, to introduce you to cutting-edge (sometimes unpublished) literature in social science on the effect of information technologies and social media. As such, the class requires basic statistical literacy. Do not panic: we will cover the tools to understand the materials we cover.

Etiquette: You are not alone in the class, so please be considerate of your fellow students: arrive on time, take notes of what has been discussed, and do not leave early unless absolutely necessary.

Mobile phones are not allowed during lectures. Barring necessity or a medical condition, I strongly encourage you not to use laptops, phones, or tablets.

Reading and Participation: This course is not the traditional lecture where a professor talks to a passive audience, but a discussion seminar. The class should be a joint effort. We will devote a significant fraction of the class to discussion. **I expect everyone to participate, so it is essential that you do the readings every week and come prepared to discuss them.**

Buckle up. I want to make sure that everyone participates and feels comfortable doing so. As it is the case in most social science classes, this course covers potentially controversial topics. Students should be prepared to engage scientifically with such topics. If you ever feel uncomfortable, you are invited to discuss any concerns with me.

Contact. If you have questions or concerns you should come to office hours. If you can't make it to office hours, you can contact me by email. I check my inbox twice a day, so please don't desperate if I don't answer immediately! I will do my best to respond within 24 hours.

Exam and grade. The final grade will be composed of:

1. Attendance and active participation: 20%. I will allow up to two unexcused absences (no questions asked) that will not affect your grade. Further absences require a medical or military certificate.
2. Final paper: 80% (Date TBD)

Attendance Policy: Attendance and informed participation are part of your grade and are crucial for the class to work. The goal is to create a collective learning environment. The class is not hybrid, but lectures are recorded and made available on Moodle. I don't give a traditional lecture and expect active participation.

Final Paper. A critical report on one or more scientific papers. Details to be announced during the semester.

AI Policy. I strongly encourage you to use AI. It can provide relatively accurate summaries of many things we learn. Use it to ask general questions, provide examples and counterexamples, compare and contrast arguments, etc. Note that using AI is not a substitute for doing the readings or writing original work. In written assignments, you will need to specify exactly how AI was used. I will specify allowed and prohibited uses of AI for the final exam when we discuss the final

exam guidelines.

Academic Integrity. Neither cheating nor plagiarism are tolerated by Tel Aviv University. Tel Aviv University defines plagiarism as “Submitting material that in part or whole is not entirely your work without attributing those same portions to their correct source.” Any assignment that plagiarizes will receive a zero and be reported to the university authorities. Please find more information on plagiarism under the following link, including explanations in Hebrew. <https://soclib.tau.ac.il/plagiarism>

Reading and Writing Social Science in English. The following resources may be useful for reading and writing social science.

- Farrell, Henry. [Good Writing in Political Science](#)
- Blattman, Chris. [How to Write an Essay](#)

In addition, TAU has excellent resources to help you succeed in English speaking classes. For more information, contact the [Center for Language Excellence](#). For example:

- [Listening to Lectures in English](#)

Recommended materials. While not required, I recommend you subscribe to *The Economist* and/or *The Financial Times* to be informed about current events. The following books are recommended, and sometimes we will read materials from them:

- Przeworski, A. (2018). *Why bother with elections?* John Wiley & Sons.
- Gurri, M. (2014). *The Revolt of the Public and the Crisis of Authority in the New Millenium.* Stripe Press.
- Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest.* Yale University Press.
- Rauch, J. (2021). *The Constitution of Knowledge: A Defense of Truth.* Brookings Institution Press.
- Sunstein, Cass R. (2018) *# Republic.* Princeton University Press.
- Bradford, Anu (2023). *Digital Empires: The Global Battle to Regulate Technology.* Oxford University Press.

- [Social Media and Political Dysfunction: A Collaborative Review](#)
- [The Economics of Artificial Intelligence: Political Economy](#)

Week 1 (March 18): Introduction (readings for this meeting are mandatory)

- (1) Przeworski, A. (2018). *Why Bother With Elections?* John Wiley & Sons. Chapters 1, 8, 11, and 12.
- (2) Gurri, M. (2014). *The Revolt of the Public and the Crisis of Authority in the New Millennium.* Stripe Press. Chapters 1 and 3.
- (3) Haidt, J. [Why the Past 10 Years of American Life Have Been Uniquely Stupid.](#) *The Atlantic*, April 11, 2022.
- (4) Lewis-Kraus, Gideon. [How Harmful is Social Media?](#) *The New Yorker*, June 3, 2022.
- (5) Tiffany, K. (2023). So Maybe Facebook Didn't Ruin Politics. *The Atlantic*, July 27, 2023.

To learn more (optional):

- (1) Munck, G. (2022). Arguing For Democracy (Twitter thread turned into a short note).
- (2) Rauch, J. (2021). *The Constitution of Knowledge: A Defense of Truth.* Brookings Institution Press. Chapter 1.
- (3) Tucker J.A., M. Roberts, P. Barberá, and Y. Theocharis (2017). From liberation to turmoil: social media and democracy. *Journal of Democracy* 28:46-59
- (4) Fukuyama, Francis, Barak Richman, and Ashish Goel, 2021. How to Save Democracy From Technology, *Foreign Affairs*, 100(1), pp. 98-110.
- (5) Haidt, J. [Yes, Social Media is Really Undermining Democracy](#), July 28, 2022.
- (6) Cowen, Tyler. [Maybe AI Isn't as Scary as We Thought.](#) *Bloomberg*, July 15, 2022.
- (7) Bachner, M. (2023). [Exposé unmasks Israel-led disinformation team that meddled in dozens of elections.](#) *The Times of Israel*, February 15 2023.
- (8) Landemore, Helene (2023). [Fostering More Inclusive Democracy With AI.](#) Finance and Development

Week 2 (March 25): The Toolkit

(1) Angrist, J. and J.S. Pischke (2014). Mastering Metrics: The Path from Cause to Effect. Chapters 1 and 2.

(2) Humphreys, Macartan. 10 Things to Know about Causal Inference. [\[Link\]](#)

(3) Long, Abby. 10 Things to Know About Reading a Regression Table. [\[Link\]](#)

To learn more (optional):

(1) Josh Angrist Video: [Ceteris Paribus](#)

(2) Josh Angrist Video: [Selection Bias](#)

(3) Josh Angrist Video: [Randomized Controlled Trials](#)

(4) Josh Angrist Video: [Reading Regression Tables](#)

(5) Nick Huntington-Klein. [The Effect: An Introduction to Research Design and Causality](#).

Week 3 (April 1): Information, Knowledge, Institutions

(1) Hayek, Friedrich August (1945). The Use of Knowledge in Society. *American Economic Review* 35(4): 519–530.

(2) Acemoglu, D. (2023). [Would AI-Enabled Communism Work?](#). *Project Syndicate*, June 28 2023

(3) Munger, M. (2023). [The Socialist Generation Debate](#). *American Institute for Economic Research*, May 30 2023.

(4) Shepsle, Kenneth (2010). Analyzing Politics. Chapter 4: The Geometry of Majority Rule.

[OPTIONAL, STRONGLY RECOMMENDED] (5) DeCanio, Samuel (2014). Democracy, the Market, and the Logic of Social Choice. *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3): 637–652.

To learn more (optional):

(1) Ryle, Gilbert (1945). Knowing How and Knowing That: The Presidential Address. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Vol. 46.

- (2) Polanyi, Michael. The Tacit Dimension.
- (3) Gibbons, Robert, and Laurence Prusak (2020). Knowledge, Stories, and Culture in Organizations. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*. Vol. 110.
- (4) Ludwig von Mises (2009) [1920]. Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth. In Hayek, F. A., eds. *Collectivist Economic Planning: Critical Studies on the Possibilities of Socialism*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- (5) Caplan, Bryan (2004). “Rational ignorance” and “Rational Irrationality”. In C. Rowley and F. Schneider (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Public Choice*.
- (6) Rauch, J. (2021). The Constitution of Knowledge: A Defense of Truth. Brookings Institution Press. Chapter 4.
- (7) Rogan, T. (2019). [Know-How](#). *Aeon Magazine*, May 15 2019.
- (8) Video: [Pandora’s Box: The Engineers’ Plot](#) (minute 24:50 until end).

Week 4 (April 8): Informational Foundations of the State and Democracy

- (1) Lee, M. M., and Zhang, N. (2017). Legibility and the Informational Foundations of State Capacity. *Journal of Politics*, 79(1): 118–132.
- (2) Ahmed, A. T., & Stasavage, D. (2020). Origins of Early Democracy. *American Political Science Review*, 114(2): 502-518.
- (3) Video: [On the Origin of the State](#)

To learn more (optional):

- (1) Mayshar, J., Moav, O., and Neeman, Z. (2017). Geography, transparency, and institutions. *American Political Science Review*, 111(3): 622-636.
- (2) Balán, P., A. Bergeron, G. Tourek, and J. Weigel (2022). Local Elites as State Capacity: How City Chiefs Use Local Information to Increase Tax Compliance in the D.R. Congo *American Economic Review* 112(3): 762-797.
- (3) Ober, J. (2008). Democracy and Knowledge: Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens. Princeton University Press. Chapters 3 and 4.
- (4) Stasavage, D. (2020). The Decline and Rise of Democracy. Princeton University Press. Chapters 3 and 4.

Week 5 (April 22): Can Information (Technologies) Improve Democracy?

(1) Caplan, Bryan (2004). “Rational ignorance” and “Rational Irrationality”. In C. Rowley and F. Schneider (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Public Choice*.

(2) Grossman, Guy, Kristen Michelitch (2017). Information Dissemination, Competitive Pressure, and Politician Performance between Elections: A Field Experiment in Uganda. *American Political Science Review*

(3) Garbiras-Diaz, Natalia, and Mateo Montenegro. (2022). All Eyes on Them: A Field Experiment on Citizen Oversight and Electoral Integrity. *American Economic Review* 112(8): 2631–68.

To learn more (optional):

(1) Grossman, Guy, Macartan Humphreys, Gabriella Sacramone-Lutz (2014). I would like u WMP to extend electricity 2 our village: On Information Technology and Interest Articulation. *American Political Science Review*. 108(3):688-705.

(2) Gottlieb, Jessica (2016). Greater Expectations: A Field Experiment to Improve Accountability in Mali. *American Journal of Political Science* 60(1):143–157.

(3) Dunning, T. and 27 other collaborators (2019). Voter information campaigns and political accountability: Cumulative findings from a pre-registered meta-analysis of coordinated trials. *Science Advances*, 5(7):eaaw2612

(4) Ferrali, R., G. Grossman and H. Larreguy (2022). Can low-cost, scalable, online interventions increase youth informed political participation in electoral authoritarian contexts? *PNAS*

(5) Enriquez, J.R., H. Larreguy, J. Marshall, and A. Simpser (2022). Online Political Information: Facebook Ads, Electoral Saturation, and Electoral Accountability in Mexico. Working Paper.

(6) Fujiwara, Thomas. 2015. Voting technology, political responsiveness, and infant health: evidence from Brazil. *Econometrica* 83(2):423-464.

(7) Bachner, M. (2023). [Exposé unmasks Israel-led disinformation team that meddled in dozens of elections](#). *The Times of Israel*, February 15 2023.

Week 6 (May 6): Do Information Technologies Erode Trust in Government?

(1) Gurri, M. (2014). The Revolt of the Public and the Crisis of Authority in the New Millennium. Stripe Press. Chapter 7.

(2) Guriev, Sergei, Nikita Melnikov, Ekaterina Zhuravskaya (2021). 3G Internet and Confidence in Government, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(4):2533–2613

To learn more (optional):

(1) Lorenz-Spreen et al. (2022). Digital Media and Democracy: A Systematic Review of Causal and Correlational Evidence Worldwide. Working Paper. (Meta-analysis)

Week 7 (May 13): Information Technologies, Collective Action and Protest

(1) Tufekci, Z. (2017). Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest. Yale University Press. Preface and Introduction.

(2) Fergusson, Leopoldo, and Carlos Molina (2019). Facebook Causes Protests. Working Paper.

To learn more (optional):

(1) Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova (2020). Social Media and Protest Participation: Evidence from Russia. *Econometrica*, 88(4): 1479–1514.

(2) Kuran, Timur (1991). Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989. *World Politics* 44(1):7–48.

(4) Campante, Filipe, Ruben Durante and Francesco Sobbrío (2018). Politics 2.0: The Multifaceted Effect of Broadband Internet on Political Participation. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 16(4), 1094-1136.

(5) Manacorda, Marco and Andrea Tesei (2020). Liberation Technology: Mobile Phones and Political Mobilization in Africa. *Econometrica*, 88(2): 533-567

(6) Larson, Jennifer. (2019). Collective Action in the Information Age: How Social Media Shapes the Character and Success of Protests. In *Protest and Democracy*, Eds. Moises Arce and Roberta Rice. University of Calgary Press.

(7) Bond RM, Fariss CJ, Jones JJ, Kramer ADI, Marlow C, et al. 2012. A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature*, 489: 295-298.

- (8) Hendel I, Nyhan B, Reifler J. 2017. Consumers activism: the cottage cheese boycott. *RAND J. Econ.* 48:972-1003.
- (9) Larson J, Nagler J, Ronen J, Tucker J. 2019. Social networks and protest participation: evidence from 130 million Twitter users. *American Journal of Political Science*, 63: 690–705.
- (10) Acemoglu D, Hassan TA, Tahoun A. 2018. The power of the street: evidence from Egypt's Arab Spring. *Rev. Financ. Stud.* 31:1-42
- (12) Cantoni, D., Yang, D. Y., Yuchtman, N., and Zhang, Y. J. (2019). Protests as strategic games: experimental evidence from Hong Kong's antiauthoritarian movement. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(2), 1021-1077.
- (13) Steinert-Threlkeld, Zachary (2017). Spontaneous Collective Action: Peripheral Mobilization During the Arab Spring.

Week 8 (May 20): Do Information Technologies Affect Repression and Censorship?

- (1) Xu, X. (2021). To repress or to co-opt? Authoritarian control in the age of digital surveillance. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(2), 309-325.
- (2) King, G., Pan, J., and Roberts, M. E. (2013). How Censorship in China allows Government Criticism but Silences Collective Expression. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2), 326-343.
- (3) Quian, X (2018). [The Rise of China as a Digital Totalitarian State](#). *The Washington Post* February 21, 2018.

To learn more (optional):

- (1) Stukal, D., Sanovich, S., Bonneau, R., and Tucker, J. (2022). Why Botter: How Pro-Government Bots Fight Opposition in Russia. *American Political Science Review*, 116(3), 843-857.
- (2) Boxell, Levi, and Zachary Steinert-Threlkeld (2002). Taxing Dissent: The Impact of a Social Media Tax in Uganda. *World Development* 158.
- (3) King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. E. (2014). Reverse-engineering censorship in China: Randomized experimentation and participant observation. *Science*, 345(6199), 1251722.

- (4) Yang, E. The Digital Dictator's Dilemma. Working Paper.
- (5) Ghodes, A. (2020). Repression Technology: Internet Accessibility and State Violence. *American Journal of Political Science* 64(3).
- (6) Beraja, M., Kao, A., Yang, D. Y., & Yuchtman, N. (2023). AI-tocracy. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138(3), 1349-1402.
- (7) Feldstein, Steven. (2019). How Artificial Intelligence is Reshaping Repression. *Journal of Democracy*.

Week 9 (May 27): Do Social Media Cause Polarization?

- (1) Sunstein, Cass R. (2018). # Republic. Princeton University Press. Chapter 3, especially pp.70-75
- (2) Levy, Ro'ee. (2021). Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *American Economic Review* 111(3): 831-70.
- (3) Nyhan, Brendan, et al. (2023). Like-minded sources on Facebook are prevalent but not polarizing. *Nature*: 1-8.

To learn more (optional):

- (1) Barberá, P. (2020). Social Media, Echo Chambers, and Political Polarization. In Persily and Tucker (eds.) *Social Media and Democracy: The State of the Field*. Cambridge University Press.
- (2) Guess, A. M., Barbera, P., Munzert, S., and Yang, J. (2021). The Consequences of Online Partisan Media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(14).
- (3) Zhuravskaya, E., Petrova, M., and Enikolopov, R. (2020). Political Effects of the Internet and Social Media. *Annual Review of Economics*, 12, 415-438.
- (4) Prior, Markus (2013). Media and Political Polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science* 16:101–127.
- (5) Lelkes, Yphtach, Gaurav Sood, and Shanto Iyengar (2017). The Hostile Audience: The Effect of Access to Broadband Internet on Partisan Affect. *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (1): 5–20

- (6) Boxell, Levi, Matthew Gentzkow, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2017. Greater Internet use is not Associated with Faster Growth in Political Polarization among US Demographic Groups. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114(40): 10612–10617.
- (7) Gentzkow, Matthew and Jesse M. Shapiro (2011). Ideological Segregation Online and Offline. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126 (4): 1799–1839.
- (8) Müller, Karsten, and Carlo Schwarz (2021). Fanning the Flames of Hate: Social Media and Hate Crime. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 19(4): 2131-2167.
- (9) Adena, M., Enikolopov, R., Petrova, M., Santarosa, V. and Zhuravskaya, E. (2015). Radio and the Rise of the Nazis in Prewar Germany. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130(4): 1885—1939.
- (10) Alcott, H. et al. (2020). The Welfare Effects of Social Media. *American Economic Review*, 110(3).
- (11) Jiménez-Durán, Rafael (2021). The Economics of Content Moderation: Theory and Experimental Evidence from Hate Speech on Twitter. Working Paper.
- (12) Mitts, Tamar (2021). Banned: How Deplatforming Extremists Mobilizes Hate in the Dark Corners of the Internet. Working Paper.
- (13) Barberá, P., Jost, J. T., Nagler, J., Tucker, J. A., & Bonneau, R. (2015). Tweeting from left to right: Is online political communication more than an echo chamber? *Psychological Science*, 26(10), 1531–1542.
- (14) Settle, J. E. (2018). *Frenemies: How Social Media Polarizes America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (15) Pariser, E. (2011). *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. London: Penguin.
- (16) Guess, Andrew M., et al. (2023). How do social media feed algorithms affect attitudes and behavior in an election campaign?. *Science* 381.6656: 398-404.
- (17) Pradel, F. et al. (2024). Toxic Speech and Limited Demand for Content Moderation on Social Media. *American Political Science Review*

Week 10 (June 3): Misinformation, Fake News, and Conspiracy Theories

(1) Guess, A., Nagler, J., and Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you Think: Prevalence and Predictors of Fake News Dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances*, 5(1).

(2) Kohler-Derrick, G. et al. (2021). The Supply of Conspiracy Theories in State-Controlled Media. Working Paper

(3) King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. E. (2017). How the Chinese government fabricates social media posts for strategic distraction, not engaged argument. *American Political Science Review*, 111(3), 484-501.

To learn more (optional):

(1) Nyhan B., (2020). Facts and Myths about Misperceptions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(3), 220-236.

(2) Tucker, J. A. et al. (2018). Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. Working Paper.

(3) Bowles, J. et al. (2022). Sustained exposure to fact-checks can inoculate citizens against misinformation in the Global South. Working Paper.

(4) Bowles, J., Larreguy, H., and Liu, S. (2020). Countering misinformation via WhatsApp: Preliminary evidence from the COVID-19 pandemic in Zimbabwe. *PloS one*, 15(10).

(5) Pennycook, G. and D. Rand (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition* 188: 39–50.

Week 11 (June 10): Combating Misinformation

(1) Bowles, J. et al. (2022). Sustained exposure to fact-checks can inoculate citizens against misinformation in the Global South. Working Paper.

(2) Pennycook, G., Bhargava, P., Cole, R., Goldberg, B., Lewandowsky, S., & Rand, D. (2023). Misinformation inoculations must be boosted by accuracy prompts to improve judgments of truth. Working Paper.

(3) Aslett et al. Online searches to evaluate misinformation can increase its perceived veracity. *Nature*

To learn more (optional):

(1) Arechar, Antonio A., et al. (2023) Understanding and combatting misinformation across 16 countries on six continents. *Nature Human Behaviour* 7.9 (2023): 1502-1513.

Week 12 (June 17): Political Consequences of Artificial Intelligence and Automation

(1) Raviv, Shir (2023). When Do Citizens Resist The Use of Algorithmic Decision-making in Public Policy? Theory and Evidence. Working Paper.

(2) Acemoglu, Daron. Harms of AI. NBER Working Paper.

(3) Selected papers from: [The Economics of Artificial Intelligence: Political Economy](#)

To learn more (optional):

(1) Gallego, A., & Kurer, T. (2022). Automation, digitalization, and artificial intelligence in the workplace: implications for political behavior. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 25, 463-484.

(2) Boix, Carles (2021). AI and the Economic and Informational Foundations of Democracy.

(3) Acemoglu, Daron. Harms of AI. NBER Working Paper.

(4) Gil, Elad (2023) [AI Regulation](#).

(5) Hanson, Robin. (2023). [What are reasonable AI fears?](#) *Quillette*

(6) Bai et al. (2022). Artificial Intelligence Can Persuade Humans on Political Issues. Working Paper.

(7) Jungherr, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Democracy: A Conceptual Framework. *Social Media and Society*.

(8) Erik Brynjolfsson, Danielle Li & Lindsey R. Raymond (2023). Generative AI at Work. Working Paper.

(9) Agarwal, Gans, and Goldfarb (2024). [Do we want less automation?](#) *Science*

(10) Ahmed et al. (2023). [The growing influence of industry in AI research](#). *Science*

(11) Allen, D. and G. Weyl (2024). The Real Dangers of Generative AI. *Journal of Democracy*

Week 13 (June 24): Taking Stock: Review

ADDITIONAL TOPICS (NO TIME TO COVER, BUT YOU MAY BE INTERESTED)

Collection on papers on different topics

- (1) [Social Media and Political Dysfunction: A Collaborative Review](#)

Regulation and Privacy

- (1) Cowen, Tyler and Luigi Zingales (2018). [Are Google and Facebook Monopolies?](#) Chicago Booth Review.
- (2) Bradford, Anu (2023). Digital Empires: The Global Battle to Regulate Technology. Oxford University Press.
- (3) Dvoskin, Brenda (2023). Expert Governance of Online Speech, 64 Harv. Int'l. L.J.
- (4) Ahmed et al. (2023). [The growing influence of industry in AI research.](#) *Science*

To learn more (optional):

- (1) Zuboff, Shoshana (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. New York: Public Affairs.
- (2) Wu, Tim (2016). The Attention Merchants: The Epic Scramble to Get Inside Our Heads. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- (3) Landemore, Helene (2023). [Fostering More Inclusive Democracy With AI.](#) Finance and Development
- (4) Bietti, Elettra (2022). [Experimentalism in Digital Platform Markets: Antitrust and Utilities' Convergence](#)
- (5) Gans, Joshua (2024). [Market Power in Artificial Intelligence](#)
- (6) Romer, Paul. [Taxing Digital Advertising.](#) May 27, 2021
- (7) Cowen, Tyler. Zeynep Tufekci's Facebook solution — can it work? Marginal Revolution, April 10, 2018
- (8) [The New York Times' Copyright Lawsuit Against OpenAI Threatens the Future of AI and Fair Use](#)

Algorithms and the Welfare State

(1) Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464): 447-453.

(2) Iversen, T, and P. Rehm (2022). *Big Data and the Welfare State. How the Information Revolution Threatens Social Solidarity*. Cambridge University Press.

To learn more (optional):

(1) Mullainathan, S. (2019). Biased algorithms are easier to fix than biased people. The New York Times.

(2) Byrnes, Nanette (2016). Why we should expect algorithms to be biased.

(3) Kleinberg, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., & Sunstein, C. R. (2020). Algorithms as discrimination detectors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(48), 30096-30100.

(4) Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., and Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2)

(5) Koulish, R., & Calvo, E. (2021). The human factor: Algorithms, dissenters, and detention in immigration enforcement. *Social Science Quarterly*, 102(4), 1761-1786.

(6) Doleac, Jennifer L. (2017). The effects of DNA databases on crime. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 9(1): 165-201

Leaks, Cyberattacks

(1) Oppenheimer, H. 2022. Weaponized Interdependence and Deglobalization: How the Snowden Leaks Shaped the Internet's Structure

Research Centers

(1) [Human-Centered AI, Stanford](#)

(2) [Center for the Governance of AI, Oxford](#)

(3) [Berkman-Klein Center for Internet and Society, Harvard](#)

(4) [Stanford Cyber Policy Center](#)