

# The Masquerade of Life, Our Many Selves and Issues of Privacy

Karen Armstrong

**Abstract**—This paper explores the importance of privacy in a contemporary online world. Crucial to the discussion is the idea of the Lacanian postmodern fragmented self and the problem of how to ensure that we have room to fully explore various aspects of our personalities in an environment which is—or at least feels—safe and free from observation by others. The paper begins with an exploration of the idea of the self with particular regard to the ways in which contemporary life and technology seems to have multiplied the various faces or masks which we present in different contexts. A brief history of privacy and surveillance follows. Finally, the paper ends with an affirmation of the importance of private space as an essential component of our spiritual and emotional well-being in today's wired world.

**Keywords**—Lacan, panopticon, postmodern, privacy, surveillance.

## I. INTRODUCTION

CHRISTOPHER BARZAK [1] proposes that “nothing is more real than the masks we make to show each other who we are”. Earlier, in *Faust*, Goethe [2] had remarked, “here too it's masquerade, I find: As everywhere, the dance of mind”; Oscar Wilde [3] had commented, “a mask tells us more than the face”; and more recently, Rushdie [4] suggests the layered nature of identity: “masks beneath masks until suddenly the bare bloodless skull.”

It could be said that we play different roles or create disguises or masks for distinct areas of our lives. Mark Leary in Aboujaoude [5], observes that, “while all cultures of the world have felt a seasonal need for disguise—think Halloween, Mardi Gras, Venetian masquerades, and Rio carnivals—reinvention and pretense are now pervasive and constant, thanks to a large degree to the internet. As a result, it is more difficult than ever to tell when one's mask is on and when it is off”. Leary and Kowalski [6] explore the idea that people are conscious of and wanting to manage the impression they create, thus we are constantly striving to present ourselves at our best. Aboujaoude [5] on the other hand, argues that often we do not care, that the internet brings out an e-personality which is much darker than the one we present in our face-to-face lives. He proposes that when we go online, “personality modifications can ensue, “grandiosity, defined as an exaggerated belief in one's importance and one's abilities, seems to be in the Internet's DNA...the sense of being outside of normal rules and of operating in an economic, legal and ethical vacuum... encourages the large-scale dreaming that

defines many of our online lives...the conquistador mentality remains at the heart of our quixotic approach to the virtual world”. One immediately thinks of Second Life and how avatars are often very different from the “real” person. Furthermore, Aboujaoude explains, “the grandiose objectives that mark many people's online lives tend to lie on the superficial side and are more preoccupied with reproducing short-lived attention than something substantive or lasting”. Thus, it could be proposed that sometimes we care about the impression we are making online and at other times, we are sucked into an “ethical vacuum” online and do not really care at all—neither about the impression we are making nor others in general. Thus, what is our true identity: the one we want to project for job interviews or possible new partners, or the unguarded one which seems to emerge without our even thinking about it when we feel “private” or without an audience? The one we present in our Facebook page, blog or twitter postings? Or the one in our private journals which we do not upload, where we may feel a right to express our unguarded most “unwatched” selves? The one we present in a paper missive which we then delete or rip up without sending, or the one sent when emotion rather than reason and reflection guides and we impulsively press “send”? Or the one we intentionally send after several days of editing and deliberation?

## II. TECHNOLOGY, ONLINE IDENTITIES AND SENSE OF SELF

Certainly the roots of the postmodern self began long before the online world. Lacan's vision of the self is outlined in his famous essay, ‘The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I,’ first published in 1949. Lacan [7] writes “‘Selfhood is really nothing but a fleeting, unstable, incomplete and open-minded mess of desires which cannot be fulfilled.’”

Ward [8] comments, “Lacan and Foucault propose that the stable, unified self has always been an illusion. In their view, our identity is the result of social factors—‘You are constructed by the social [e.g., language, geography, family, education, government, etc.] and are ultimately determined by it.’”

Anderson [9] puts it this way: “All ideas about human reality are social constructions.” In other words, he says, what used to be called the soul “is replaced with a collage of social constructs.”

Gergen [10] also proposes that, “...postmoderns are populated with a plethora of selves. In place of an enduring core of deep and indelible character, there is a chorus of invitations. Each invitation ‘to be’ also casts doubt on the wisdom and authenticity of the others. Further, the postmodern person senses the constructed character of all

K. Armstrong is concurrently on faculty with the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada and York University in Toronto Canada. (email:karmstrong@edu.yorku.ca).

attempts at being—on the part of both self and others.” We would argue that this observation seems to be going a bit far. However, Stephens [11] too, argues that “the implications of the [Postmodern] theory are large: It’s not just that we each have different sides to our personality; it’s that we have no central personality in relation to which all our varied behaviors might be seen as just ‘sides.’ We are, in other words, not absolutely anything.” Again, in this instance, we are not sure if this is entirely convincing however, he provides an illustrative example to which many of us can relate: “Connie spent her childhood in New Jersey. After her parents were divorced, her mother moved with the children to San Diego. Connie’s teen years were spent shuttling between father and mother on either coast. After she graduated from the University of Colorado, she moved to Alaska to work on a fishing boat, and then to Wyoming to become a ski instructor. Now Connie is working on a geological-survey vessel in the Antarctic, and is engaged to a man living in Portland, Oregon. Fred is a neurologist who spends many of his spare hours working to aid families from El Salvador. Although he is married to Tina, on Tuesday and Thursday nights he lives with an Asian friend with whom he has a child. On weekends he drives his BMW to Atlantic City for gambling.”

Schwartz [12] however, suggests the practical efficacy of regarding the personality as a system or a family of selves. He uses the common term “part” to argue against the concept of the self as monolithic, as in “part of me is afraid but another part says, ‘go for it’....one way to think about how parts and self operate is to imagine them as a kind of orchestra in which the individual musicians are analogous to parts and the conductor is the Self. “A good conductor has a sense of the value of each instrument and the ability of every musician, and is so familiar with music theory that he or she can sense precisely the best point in a symphony to draw out one section and mute another.” Indeed, he explains, “it is often as important for a musician to be able to silence his or her instrument as to be able to play the melody skillfully. Each musician, while wanting to spotlight his or her own talent or have the piece played in a way that emphasizes his or her section, has enough respect for the conductor’s judgment that he or she remains in the role of following the conductor yet playing as well as possible. This kind of a system is “literally” harmonious.” Of course, this metaphor encompasses Aboujaoude’s idea of an out of control e-personality if one conceives instead of a conductor gone wild or possibly even absent and the players are out of control and in disharmony.

Ornstein [13] too proposes that, “instead of a single intellectual entity, the mind is diverse and complex. It contains a changeable conglomeration of different kind of small minds...and these different entities are temporarily employed—wheeled into consciousness—and then...returned to their place after use. But to return to Schwartz’s metaphor of the conductor and knowing our various selves or parts and attempting to do our best, why do we generally feel that we have a “reputation to maintain”, that our truest or best self is in fact aligned more with our central core values and is harmonious and consistent instead of an unstable multitude of

possibilities? And why do we—or some central core within us-- feel shy or invaded at the prospect of possibly being watched and observed every moment by everyone—or at least anyone-- on the internet?

English [14] describes the distress of Aline Marie who was photographed praying after the Newton Connecticut shooting spree. Her photograph was “published on the website of National Public Radio (NPR) five days after the tragedy to illustrate a column about God and evil. The photo caption referred only to “people” gathering for a prayer vigil. “When she realized that she was being photographed while she prayed, she said that she felt ‘like a zoo animal...Furthermore, “(it was) most upsetting (that),” she said. “no one came up to me and said, “Hi, I ‘m from this paper and I took your photograph. No one introduced themselves. I felt violated. And yes, it was a lovely photograph, but there is a sense of privacy in a moment like that, and they didn’t ask.”

Why—if we are not doing anything ‘wrong’, is privacy important to us? Why do we feel invaded at times, as did Aline Marie? Gilliom and Monahan [15] propose that the world—in particular the online world—is a veritable panopticon where we have the unsettling feeling of being observed, even though there is seldom direct proof. It must be acknowledged that these infrequent moments--as the example of the woman “caught” praying or when we are called by our credit card company who can document precisely what we have bought this morning, this past second, or, for example when we possibly find out that we lost an employment opportunity due to some long-forgotten posting on Facebook—are extremely unsettling.

The panopticon (pan means “all” and optic means “seeing”) as Gilliom and Monahan explain, “was a prison conceived in the 1700s (by Jeremy Bentham but as he repeatedly explained, it was actually his brother Samuel) and made famous in the twentieth century work of the late French intellectual Michel Foucault. The panopticon is a cylindrical building surrounding a central guard tower, with individual cells built into its outer walls. Cells are backlit and completely observable so that the guards in the central tower could easily watch the inmates. Blinds on the tower windows prevented prisoners from viewing guards, meaning they could never really know when they were being watched. The idea of the panopticon was to use constant observation and a gentle system of regimented discipline to train inmates away from even the possibility of disobedience. They would, in Foucault’s words, become “docile bodies” so accustomed to constant observation that they internalized discipline and lost the capacity to resist. Foucault traced the idea of the panopticon out into other sites—like hospitals, schools and factories—to argue that panopticon had emerged as a defining mode of power in our time.” We have argued elsewhere that in online university courses, both instructor and students have this sense of feeling observed or potentially observed at all times [16]-[20].

Why do we feel violated when there is evidence that we have been watched? Why do we feel in need of some privacy and what, in fact is privacy? Is Zuckerberg correct when he states that the age of privacy is over [21] and do we really

believe that? As is common knowledge, even Zuckerberg's sister, Randi, inadvertently posted a private family photo online [22]. Even though it was subsequently deleted, why was Zuckerberg subsequently annoyed that someone kept the information on their twitter account. Why was he annoyed when he in fact proposes that we have no privacy? Why do we need and crave a sense of privacy? Why are there now a plethora of books offering specific strategies to ensure some modicum of privacy such as L. Andrews' *I know who you are and I saw what you did: social networks and the death of Privacy* [24]; J.J. Luna's *How to be invisible: protect your children, your assets, and your life* [25]; F. Lee's *Someone's watching you! Fifty steps to protect your privacy from microchips in your underwear to satellites monitoring your every move, Find out who's tracking you and what you can do about* [26]; Kezer's *Privacy* [27], Lever's *On privacy* [28], and Allen's *Unpopular privacy* [29]? Are these just anomalies? We do not think so. If, as such titles propose, we seem to value privacy, what exactly is it?

### III. WHAT IS PRIVACY?

Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis pronounced privacy, "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men." [30]. And the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 proposes that "no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation." [31] But not all agree: legal scholar Fred Cate declares that privacy is "an antisocial construct...[that] conflicts with other important values within the society, such as society's interest in facilitating free expression, preventing and punishing crime, protecting private property, and conducting government operations efficiently." [32] And still others contend that privacy can be socially detrimental. Law professor Richard Epstein argues that privacy is "a plea for the right to misrepresent one's self to the rest of the world." [33]

In his work on privacy, Solove [34] proposes that "privacy is a fundamental right, essential for freedom, democracy, psychological well-being, individuality and creativity". And yet, "countless commentators have declared that privacy is "under siege" and "attack"; that it is in "peril", "distress" or "danger"; that it is "eroding", "evaporating", "dying", "shrinking", "slipping away", "diminishing" or "vanishing"; and that it is "lost" or "dead". Legions of books and articles have warned of the "destruction", "death", or "end" of privacy [34].

He concludes, "privacy is proclaimed inviolable but decried as detrimental, antisocial, and even pathological. Some claim that privacy is nearing extinction; others argue that the threat to privacy is illusory. It seems as though everybody is talking about "privacy" but it is not clear exactly what they are talking about."

We will first turn to the Oxford English Dictionary to look at the definitions offered of this elusive concept. The Oxford English Dictionary defines privacy, which was first introduced in the English language in 1534 as: "the state or condition of being alone, undisturbed, or free from public attention, as a

matter of choice or right; seclusion; freedom from interference or intrusion." A second meaning offered is: "absence or avoidance of publicity or display; secrecy, concealment, discretion; protection from public knowledge or availability." Other definitions include "the keeping of a secret; reticence... a private or personal matter; a secret...intimacy; intimate relations"... and finally, "a private place; a place of concealment or retreat; a private apartment"[35].

Wikipedia [36] is also extremely useful with regard to the description and scope of privacy. The word derives, it is stated, "from the Latin: *privatus*," separated from the rest, deprived of something, esp. office, participation in the government", from *privo* "to deprive") is the ability of an individual or group to seclude themselves or information about themselves and thereby reveal themselves selectively. The boundaries and content of what is considered private differ among cultures and individuals, but share basic common themes. Privacy is sometimes related to anonymity, the wish to remain unnoticed or unidentified in the public realm. When something is private to a person, it usually means there is something within them that is considered inherently special or personally sensitive. The degree to which private information is exposed therefore depends on how the public will receive this information, which differs between places and over time. Privacy partially intersects security, including for instance the concepts of appropriate use, as well as protection of information. Privacy may also take the form of "bodily integrity" which Wikipedia defines as a concept that refers to the inviolability of the physical body. It emphasizes the importance of personal autonomy and the self-determination of human beings over their own bodies. It considers the violation of bodily integrity as an unethical infringement, intrusive and possibly criminal."

This term, privacy, is one of Martha Nussbaum's ten principle capabilities [37]. She defines bodily integrity as: "Being able to move freely from place to place; being able to be secure against violent assault, including sexual assault. . . ; having opportunities for sexual satisfaction and for choice in matters of reproduction".

Wikipedia [36] continues to explain that the concept of privacy, is not a universal concept and "remained virtually unknown in some cultures until recent times. However, "most cultures, recognize the ability—I would argue "right"-- of individuals to withhold certain parts of their personal information from wider society." Interestingly, the site points out that "the word 'privacy' is sometimes regarded as untranslatable by linguists. For example, Russians combine meaning of *уединение* - solitude, *секретность* - secrecy, and *частная жизнь* - private life) or borrow English "privacy" (as Indonesian *Privasi* or Italian *la privacy*)." Thus, the term "privacy" fluctuates depending on the context. Different people, cultures, and nations have a wide variety of expectations about how much privacy a person is entitled to or what constitutes an invasion of privacy.

### IV. VARIETIES OF PRIVACY

Wikipedia [36] proposes an array of different varieties of

privacy, which is both unique in the discussions of the term and also extremely useful, “beginning with the most immediate of physical privacy which refer to the prevention of “intrusions into one's physical space or solitude”, preventing unwelcome searching of one's body, personal possessions, home or vehicle. An example of the legal basis for the right to physical privacy is the US Fourth Amendment which guarantees “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures”. Most countries have laws regarding trespassing and property rights also determine the right of physical privacy.

Second, related to this, is “medical privacy”, or the “right to make fundamental medical decisions without governmental coercion or third party review, most widely applied to questions of contraception. Medical privacy allows a person to withhold their medical records and other information from others, perhaps because of fears that it might affect their insurance coverage or employment, or to avoid the embarrassment caused by revealing medical conditions or treatments. Medical information could also reveal other aspects of one's personal life, such as sexual preferences or proclivity. A right to sexual privacy enables individuals to acquire and use contraceptives without family, community or legal sanctions.”

Third in the expanding circles of understanding would be information privacy, according to Wikipedia, which “refers to the evolving relationship between technology and the legal right to, or public expectation of, privacy in the collection and sharing of data about one's self. Privacy concerns exist wherever uniquely identifiable data relating to a person or persons are collected and stored, in digital form or otherwise. In some cases these concerns refer to how data is collected, stored, and associated. In other cases the issue is who is given access to information. Other issues include whether an individual has any ownership rights to data about them, and/or the right to view, verify, and challenge that information.”

A fourth type of privacy related to information privacy is personal information regarding religion, sexual orientation or political affiliations.

Fifth would be financial privacy, in which information about a person's financial transactions is guarded, is important for the avoidance of fraud including identity theft. Information about a person's purchases, for instance, can reveal a great deal about their preferences, places they have visited, their contacts, products purchased, activities preferences and habits.

Embedded and included in many of the above privacies is internet privacy or the ability to determine what information one reveals or withholds about oneself over the Internet, who has access to such information, and for what purposes one's information may or may not be used. For example, web users may be concerned to discover that a great number of the web sites which they visit collect, store, and possibly share personally identifiable information about them. Similarly, people naively consider personal email messages to be private which of course is not the case unless one is using encryption tools.

Finally, according to Wikipedia, is political privacy, which has been a concern since voting systems emerged in ancient times. The secret ballot helps to ensure that voters cannot be coerced into voting in certain ways, since they can allocate their vote as they wish in the privacy and security of the voting booth while maintaining the anonymity of the vote. Secret ballots are nearly universal in modern democracies, and considered a basic right of citizenship”.

In addition to these personal privacy issues, Wikipedia suggests, is that of organizational privacy. “Governments agencies, corporations, groups/societies and other organizations may desire to keep their activities or secrets from being revealed to other organizations or individuals, adopting various security practices and controls in order to prevent this. Organizations may seek legal protection for their secrets. For example, a government administration may be able to invoke executive privilege or declare certain information to be classified, or a corporation might attempt to protect valuable proprietary information as trade secrets.

We think it is an understatement to say that the internet has brought new concerns about privacy in an age where computers can permanently store records of everything: “where every online photo, status update, Twitter post and blog entry by and about us can be stored forever,” writes law professor and author Jeffrey Rosen [38].

As well, this transparency affects employment searches. Microsoft reports that 75 percent of U.S. recruiters and human-resource professionals now do online research about candidates, often using information provided by search engines, social-networking sites, photo/video-sharing sites, personal web sites and blogs, and Twitter. They also report that 70 percent of U.S. recruiters have rejected candidates based on online information. This has created a need by many to closely monitor their online privacy settings. And many commonly used communication devices have the ability to record and store users locations in unencrypted files. In the words of Andrew Grove [39] more than a decade ago, “few would disagree that privacy is one of the biggest problems in this new electronic age. At the heart of the Internet culture is a force that wants to find out everything about you. And once it has found out everything about you and two hundred million others, that's a very valuable asset, and people will be tempted to trade and do commerce with that asset. This wasn't the information that people were thinking of when they called this the information age.” [39].

Let's examine the historical markers concerning privacy of the individual and its Janus face, surveillance, represented by the possible or actual guards in the tower of the panopticon metaphor of our contemporary lives.

## V.PRIVACY AND SURVEILLANCE

In Tudge's [40] overview of surveillance, he begins with a provocative thought. He states that a crucial aspect of many religions is surveillance or the feeling of being watched: “the first book of the Christian Bible (and the Jewish Torah) show how long-seated in the human psyche, and foremost in the mind of the storyteller, is the notion of surveillance.. At least

since the Bible was written, the perception of being watched over and the self-directing need to comply with the law has been evident in the human psyche...the Qur'n [41] puts it similarly, "Most surely your Lord is watching." Thus, "this idea that "an account is being kept somewhere of your every deed is widely entrenched." [40] Disregarding completely the fact that to many religious people, the gaze of the watcher is benign and loving rather than bellicose and suspicious, Tudge [40] reports that an earthly parallel was created in 1066 by William the Conqueror, who sent agents across his new fiefdom of England to determine exactly who owned what land, people and livestock and to ensure the state recouped the taxes owed him (which was eventually and rather ominously called)... "The Domesday Book".

In the Middle Ages, he goes on to say, this type of "centralized information collection" concerned no more than the "purposes of taxation, requisition and assessing of noble strengths". Certainly, however, Tudge describes the technology of migration surveillance as being strong in the Middle Ages. "Wax seals, stamps and water marks, long used by bureaucrats to authenticate documents, came into widespread use for travel documents, letters of safe conduct and missives borne by Europe's nobles, envoys and merchants as they roved the continent's city states, principalities and kingdoms in the 13<sup>th</sup> century." In 1642 with the "discovery" of the New World, and issues of slavery, documentation became increasing tools of surveillance. Only a few words and phrases will demonstrate how surveillance has been important in the course of human history: the Third Reich, the KGB, Edgar Hoover, CIA, Watergate, even the international use of credit cards, routine criminal record checks for employment, student grades, and library use of RFIDS, central pharmacy medication records, one's own medical records, even tracking numbers of packages sent—all have at their centre some sort of surveillance.

At the level of individual privacy, rather than surveillance, on the other hand, the earliest legislative development of privacy rights began under British common law, which protected "only the physical interference of life and property" [42]. Its development from then on became "one of the most significant chapters in the history of privacy law" [36]. Privacy rights gradually expanded to include a "recognition of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and his intellect." Eventually, the scope of those rights broadened even further to include a basic "right to be let alone," and the former definition of "property" would then comprise "every form of possession -- intangible, as well as tangible." By the late 19th century, interest in a "right to privacy" grew as a response to the growth of print media, especially newspapers [36].

The notion that individuals have a property right in information about themselves can be traced to John Locke, who asserted that individuals have property rights in their person and the fruits of their labor. According to Locke [43], property flows naturally from selfhood: "Every man has a property in his own person." From this principle, Locke deduced that property extends to the products of one's labor:

"Whatsoever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labor with, and joined it to something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property.

Locke's conception of property as the fruit of labor and as an extension of the self has formed the backbone of intellectual-property law, which as legal theorist James Boyle [44] has observed, has developed around the notion of the "romantic author", the individual who mixes her unique personality with ideas, who most displays originality and novelty in her creations. Unlike physical property, intellectual property protects the expression of idea. And copyright law provides control not over the underlying ideas and facts but over the particular manner in which they are expressed. The "romantic-author notion of intellectual property embodies Locke's idea that one gains a property right in something when it emanates from one's self".

## VI. PUBLICNESS VS PRIVACY

As legal scholar Anita Allen [45] observes, people are accountable to others even in their private lives—rarely do people's actions "concern only themselves." And Sam Lessin observes that "privacy was once free. Publicity was once ridiculously expensive . . . Now the opposite is true: you have to pay in a mix of cash, time, social capital, etc if you want privacy" [46]. And Google's Eric Schmidt says, "the data suggest that people are self-violating their privacy at a humungous rate. The number one cause of future privacy issues is going to be self-publishing of information. It's the sum of photos, blogs, Facebook, Myspace..." [47].

There are no easy answers and indeed it would seem that privacy is an issue of which we are generally unaware until and which we take completely for granted until it is violated, like the woman photographed praying only to find this private moment on the front page of a newspaper. Even though her names was not mentioned, even though she was not doing anything of which to be ashamed—she felt her privacy violated. Thus, accepting that we—in our multiple selves or parts-- are under surveillance by government and financial institutions, by our families and in our spiritual lives, that in fact, to some extent this has always been the case and technology, with CCTV surveillance cameras has only increased this reality, why do we value—indeed crave--privacy?

## VII. VALUE OF PRIVACY

According to the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "there is widespread belief that personal privacy is essential to our well-being—physically, psychologically, socially, and morally" [48]. Ruth Gavison in her article, "Privacy and the limits of law" 89 Yale Law Journal 421, 437 (1980), proposes that privacy enables people to "grow, maintain their mental health and autonomy, create and maintain human relations, and lead meaningful lives" [49]. And Julie Inness emphasizes intimacy as "the common denominator that internally organizes and externally links tort

and constitutional privacy law.” In short, she says, “privacy protects love, care, and liking. [50]”

However, we encounter challenges on a number of fronts as we seek to protect our personal privacy. Alan Lightman [51] proposes five obstacles to privacy: a) an obsession with speed and an accompanying impatience for all that does not move faster and faster”; b) “a sense of overload with information and other stimulation”; c) “a mounting obsession with consumption and material wealth”; d) accommodation to the virtual world”; and e) “loss of silence”. He says: “aside from the particular technologies, these fundamental qualities of the Wired World have not appeared suddenly...they are part of a trend of ever increasing speed and public access over the last couple of centuries and more. In recent decades, however, this trend has accelerated to a disturbing degree. If we have indeed lost in some measure the qualities of slowness, have lost a digestible rate of information, immediate experience with the real world, silence, and privacy, what exactly have we lost...when (we) never sever (ourselves) from the rush and the heave of the external world?”

Lightman continues, “I believe that I have lost something of my inner self. By inner self, I mean that part of me that imagines, that dreams, that explores, that is constantly questioning who I am and what is important to me. My inner self is my true freedom. My inner self roots me to me, and to the ground beneath me. The sunlight and soil that nourish my inner self are solitude and personal reflection. When I listen to my inner self, I hear the breathing of my spirit. Those breaths are so tiny and delicate, I need stillness to hear them, I need aloneness to hear them. I need vast, silent spaces in my mind. Without the breathing and the voice of my inner self, I am a prisoner of the world around me. Worse than a prisoner, because I do not know what has been taken away from me, I do not know who I am. The struggle to hear one’s inner self in the noise of the Wired World might be thought of in terms of private space versus public space. Public space—the space of people and clocks and commerce and deadlines and cellular phones and e-mail—is occupying more and more of our physical and psychic terrain. But the truly important spaces of one’s being cannot be measured in terms of square miles or cubic centimeters. Private space is not a physical space. It is a space of the mind.” It is—we would add in our vision of multiple selves in our various roles with our commitments and work and in our relationships with others—the inner self. It is “soul space” to use writer Margaret Wertheim’s words.” [51]

### VIII. CONCLUSION

Privacy is a nebulous concept, which becomes more clearly defined by infringement than specific attributes. Although surveillance seems certainly as old as consciousness itself, historically, as each new technology is introduced, there are renewed cries for the protection of what many nations regard as a basic human right. Although being public is an essential component of collaboration and sharing, it is to its opposite value, privacy and freedom from surveillance, to which we feel more attached and are more quick to defend. In truth,

privacy is our own space in the world, where our multiple selves or parts of us can have free voice, as orchestra instruments tune up before a concert. We need to be in touch with and listen carefully to our different parts, free from surveillance and hopefully, in silence. Privacy is our balance and our respite, our heart, and our soul. In the words of Lightman [51], “In a wired world where we are constantly connected, to lose that awareness, is to lose our deepest sense of self.”

### REFERENCES

- [1] C. Barzak. *The love we share without knowing*. New York, NY: Random House, 2008.
- [2] J.W. Goethe. *Faust, Part II, Act II*. Retrieved March 4, 2013 from: <http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/German/FaustIIActIIscenesItoIV.htm>
- [3] O. Wilde. "The Truth of Masks," in *Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*. London: Collins, 1948).
- [4] S. Rushdie. *The Satanic verses*. New York: Random House, 2008.
- [5] E.Aboujaoude. *Virtually you: the dangerous powers of the e-personality*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- [6] M.R.Leary. and R.M.Kowalski. Impression management: a literature review and two component model. *Psychological bulletin*, 107, 1, 34-47, 1990.
- [7] J. Lacan. The mirror stage as formative of the functioning of the I. In V.B. Leitch et al. Eds. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001.
- [8] G.Ward. *Postmodernism*. Chicago, IL: McGraw-Hill Companies, 2003) Retrieved March 7, 2013 from <http://www.allaboutworldview.org/postmodern-psychology-and-socially-constructed-selves-faq.htm#sthash.7dOEaVBI.dpuf>
- [9] W. T. Anderson *Reality Isn't What It Used To Be: Theatrical Politics, Ready-to-Wear Religion, Global Myths, Primitive Chic, and Other Wonders of the Postmodern World*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990.
- [10] K.J. Gergen, *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2000.
- [11] M. Stephens, “To Thine Own Selves be True,” *Los Angeles Times Magazine* (August 230 ),1992. Retrieved March 3, 2013 from: <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/stephens/Postmodern%20psych%20page.htm>
- [12] R. Schwartz. Our multiple selves: applying systems theory thinking to the inner family. *The family therapy networker*, March-April Edition, 1997. Retrieved March 6, 2013 from: <http://www.hakomiinstitute.com/Forum/Issue10/OurMultipleSelves.pdf>
- [13] E. Ornstein. *Multimind: a new way of looking at human behaviour*. Los Altos, Ca: Malor Books, 2003.
- [14] K. English. Public eye on private grief. *The Toronto Star*, March 2. 2013.
- [15] J. Gilliom and T. Monahan. *Supervision: an introduction to the Surveillance Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- [16] K. Armstrong and M. Manson. What is lost and what remains: an exploration of pedagogical benefits of online discussions in two online teacher education learning communities, one in an exclusively web-based environment and one supplemented with face to face contact. *Language and Literacy*, 12,2,18-29,2010. Available at: <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/langandlit/article/viewFile/9343/7420>
- [17] K. Armstrong. High wire act: the perils, pitfalls and possibilities of online discussions. *International Conference on Communication and Information Technologies*. Paris, France, October 27-29, 2010. Summary available at: [http://www.evolitera.co.id/themes/main/product\\_summarypopup\\_science.php?science\\_id=2080](http://www.evolitera.co.id/themes/main/product_summarypopup_science.php?science_id=2080)
- [18] K. Armstrong. Online discussions: developing insight through asynchronous and synchronous conversations. *Ubiquitous learning journal*, v 3, 2, pp. 1-8. 2011. Available at: <http://karenarmstrong1.cgipublisher.com/product/pub.186/prod.124>

- [19] K. Armstrong. The para-universe of a collaborative group: Strategies to ensure success. Paper published in the conference proceedings. *International Conference on Communication and Instructional Technology (ICCIT)* Bali, Indonesia, October 24-26, 2011. Available at: <https://www.waset.org/journals/waset/v58/v58-159.pdf>
- [20] K. Armstrong. Managing your online reputation: issues of ethics, trust and privacy in a wired, "no place to hide world". *World Academy of Science, engineering and Technology, Issue 64, April 2012*, Paris France, pp.848-853. Available at: <https://www.waset.org/journals/waset/v64/v64-162.pdf>
- [21] M. Kirkpatrick. Facebook's Zuckerberg says the age of privacy is over. Original post January 9, 2010. Retrieved March 10, 2013 from: [http://readwrite.com/2010/01/09/facebook\\_zuckerberg\\_says\\_the\\_age\\_of\\_privacy\\_is\\_ov](http://readwrite.com/2010/01/09/facebook_zuckerberg_says_the_age_of_privacy_is_ov)
- [22] M. Ingram. A valuable lesson from Randi Ingram: online privacy is complicated. Retrieved March 6, 2013 from: <http://gigaom.com/2012/12/26/a-valuable-lesson-from-randi-zuckerberg-online-privacy-is-complicated/>
- [23] L. Andrews. *I know who you are and I saw what you did: social networks and the death of Privacy*. New York: Free Press, 2012.
- [24] J.J. Luna. *How to be invisible: protect your children, your assets, and your life third Edition*. New York: St Martin's Press, 2012.
- [25] F. Lee. *Someone's watching you! Fifty steps to protect your privacy from microchips in your underwear to satellites monitoring your every move, Find out who's tracking you and what you can do about it*. Avon, Massachusetts: Adams Media, 2011.
- [26] A.P. Mintz. *Web of deceit: misinformation and the manipulation in the age of social media*. Medford, New Jersey: Information today, Inc, 2012.
- [27] G. Keizer. *Privacy*. New York: Picador, 2012.
- [28] A. Lever. *On Privacy*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- [29] A.L. Allen. *Unpopular privacy: what must we hide?* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [30] Brandeis, J. *Olmstead v United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (Brandeis, J dissenting) 1928.
- [31] United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, GA Res 217A (III) UN Doc A/Res/810, 1948.
- [32] F. H. Cate. *Privacy in the Information Age* 29. 1997H. Poor, *An Introduction to Signal Detection and Estimation*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1985, ch. 4.
- [33] R.A. Epstein. "The legal regulation of genetic discrimination: old responses to new technology," 74 *Boston University Law review*, 1, 12, 1994.
- [34] D. J. Solove. *Understanding privacy*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2008, p. 5.
- [35] Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1989. Retrieved September 27, 2012 from: <http://www.library.yorku.ca/eresolver/?id=247>
- [36] Wikipedia. *Privacy*. Retrieved, September 29, 2012 from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Privacy>
- [37] M.C. Nussbaum. *Sex and Social Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 41-42.
- [38] J. Rosen, Jeffrey. "The web means the end of forgetting" *New York Times*, July 19, 2010.
- [39] A. Grove. "What I've learned: Andy Grove", *Esquire Magazine*, May 1, 2000.
- [40] R.Tudge. *The no-nonsense guide to global surveillance*. Ottawa, ON: New Internationalist, 2011.
- [41] Qu'ran 89.14. Retrieved March 10, 2013 from: <http://www.mquran.org/content/view/6007/9/>
- [42] Warren and Brandeis, "The Right to privacy", 4 *Harvard Law Review* 193 (1890)
- [43] J. Locke, *Second treatise of government* 27 at 19 (1980) (1690).
- [44] J. Boyle. *Shamans, software, and spleens: law and the construction of the Information society* 54, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- [45] A.L. Allen. *Why privacy isn't everything: feminist reflections on personal accountability* 2, 2003, 29-30.
- [46] S. Lessin, speaking at the NY Tech meetup, August 2010 or Feb 2011. Retrieved September 30, 2012 from: [http://www.livestream.com/nytechmeetup/video?clipId=pla\\_dae43c2e-9cf4-4cea-8bd7-5f0f9ee32c52](http://www.livestream.com/nytechmeetup/video?clipId=pla_dae43c2e-9cf4-4cea-8bd7-5f0f9ee32c52)
- [47] J. Jarvis. *Public parts: how sharing in the digital age improves the way we work and live*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 2011, p. 116.
- [48] US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Record, Computers and the Rights of Citizens 33, 1973.
- [49] R. Gavison. Privacy and the limits of law. 89 *Yale Law Journal* 421, 437, 1980.
- [50] J.C. Inness. *Privacy, intimacy and isolation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- [51] A. Lightman. *The world is too much with me: finding private space in the wired world*. Toronto: The Hart House lecture, 2002.