

## IS THIS THE END OF DEMOCRACY AND WHY ARE PROTESTORS SO INCONSIDERATE, ANGRY AND HEARTLESS?

I am genuinely confounded by the anger expressed towards protestors who fear some of the public health orders and mandates. When a large assemblage of people in Australia's capital cities protest about mandatory lockdowns and a fear of mandatory vaccinations, the responses I have encountered too frequently range from ridicule to outright disdain. From what I can gather, some of the reasons for this disdain come from real differences of opinion, disinformation, or honest confusion. However, much of it is also due to certain media outlets and public officials deliberately misrepresenting the views of these protestors. I am not debating the science of Covid19 vaccines but addressing the most consequential of these distortions by the media.

This article is not intended to be an academic analysis. Instead, I seek to do two tasks. First, to ask what extent are we to forego our democratic freedoms in our quest to fight Covid19? Second, I wish to briefly introduce a concept known as "surveillance capitalism"<sup>1</sup>. I propose that this concept is manipulating the very foundations of free enterprise, technology, governments, and democracy itself. It is a new kind of totalitarian power. This new totalitarian power is difficult to define. Even in my personal life, when trying to explain concepts like "surveillance capitalism" and "instrumentarian power", I am confronted by listeners who usually assume the extent of the problem relates to an over-predictive smartphone, trying to sell products at every turn. Listeners usually respond with phrases like:

1. "If you want privacy, throw away your phone";
2. "If you're not doing anything wrong, what are you worried about";
3. "I already knew about companies using my data, I like the fact that I got recommended these new running shoes";
4. "I only use Facebook to read the news";
5. "This is inevitable, its just the way technology works";
6. "We already mandated flu vaccines in certain professions, how is this time any different";
7. "Are you trying to tell me that Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg, Sundar Pichai sat together with the CEOs of Pfizer and Johnson & Johnson to sell a vaccine to governments around the world in order to control it? – you're an idiot";
8. "I believe the internet was the worst creation ever invented, just my personal belief".

These responses firstly, misrepresent the issue. Secondly, they convey a fundamental misunderstanding of the mechanics of surveillance capitalism. I put it to readers of this article, that we cannot view the mandates and public health orders in Australia, in isolation from the concept of surveillance capitalism. Particularly when the lifeblood of these corporations, institutions, and the government, is dependent upon our being ignorant of its existence.

So, what is surveillance capitalism? Considerable academic articles and non-fiction books have been written about this concept, however, to summarise, it can be described as a novel market form and a specific logic of capitalist accumulation.<sup>2</sup> It is characterized as a radically different and extractive variant of information capitalism that commodifies reality. It "mines"

---

<sup>1</sup> This phrase was coined by Shoshana Zuboff in her book called *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*.

<sup>2</sup> Zuboff, Shoshana (September 15, 2014). "A Digital Declaration". *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. ISSN 0174-4909. Archived from the original on 2020-06-22. Retrieved 2020-05-18.

vast amounts of information and human data and transforms it into behavioural data for analysis and sales.<sup>3</sup>

It is the ability to operate covertly in a largely unregulated metaverse of information for “secret knowledge” that has allowed surveillance capitalism to flourish. This secret knowledge is collected about us, but it is not for us. It is not used for the betterment of humanity but harnessed for enormous profit, often to the diminishment of human dignity<sup>4</sup>. Sufficient laws have not yet been created to safeguard against the corporations that operate in this milieu. Legislators, much less the layperson, are largely unaccustomed to these processes and our existing legislative, regulatory, and judicial institutions are struggling to deal with this new threat<sup>5</sup> - because it does not look like a threat. The media, in part, is to blame for the difficulty in conveying the real risk of this threat to our democracy. If you turn on the news, it seems the media are intentionally running a defamation campaign against any person who questions the status quo.

A quick and general point about the mechanics of defamation. It is virtually impossible to effectively defend oneself against unethical critics. The law provides some recourse in the way of damages for a successful plaintiff, however, the ongoing reputational damage to a person, group, business - even an entire country, is often irreparable. In the instances where a plaintiff successfully sues for defamation, this often only provides financial compensation. It seems the law of entropy is on the side of the defamer because it will always be easier to make a mess than to clean it up. It is, for instance, easier to call a person “racist,” “misogynist,” “antivaxxer,” “criminal,” “un-Australian,” or “conspiracy theorist”, than it is for the defamed person to prove that he or she isn’t any of these things. In fact, the paradox is the very act of defending oneself against an accusation of the kinds I just mentioned only adds fuel to the fire. It is analogous to, and contrary to a fundamental principle of law – the presumption of innocence.

Let’s go back to the protestors. Why are they so “inconsiderate, angry, and heartless”? From what the Australian media publish on social and digital media platforms, the protestors can range anywhere from far-right conspiracy theorists, anti-vaxxers and anarchists, to religious fundamentalists, dole bludgers, immigrants, indigenous people, witch doctors, truckies, the list goes on. You need only search the word “protest” to see hundreds of media articles with pictures of signs that display “stand for freedom”, “my body my choice”, “big-brother”, and many others. Undeniably, it is not limited to the Australian media where protestors are portrayed in a specific light. CNN, MSNBC, Fox News, The BBC - and others, also paint protestors with a similar brush.

While I do not intend to regurgitate the same tired platitudes of communistic, dictatorial or antivaxx rhetoric from protestors in the media, I expect that some readers of this article will immediately default to an assumption that I too fall within the general basket of “antivaxxer” and “conspiracy theorist” merely for expressing a concern about the threat to our democratic way of life. It is, indeed, this precise assumption that stifles and suppresses the message I believe most protestors are trying to convey. It prevents any proper discussion and debate in the public discourse. The discussion and debate I am referring to is not whether Covid19 is

---

<sup>3</sup> Zuboff, Shoshana (September 15, 2014). "A Digital Declaration". Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. ISSN 0174-4909. Archived from the original on 2020-06-22. Retrieved 2020-05-18.

<sup>4</sup> Zuboff, Shoshana, The Age of Surveillance Capitalism – The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power.

<sup>5</sup> Dr Zac Rogers, Deleting Democracy: Australia and the surveillance juggernaut.

deadly, real, a hoax, or whether it was manufactured in a Chinese lab. It's not whether the vaccine will reach indigenous communities in the remote areas of Australia. The discussion and debate I am referring to is worth repeating here again: To what extent are we to forego our democratic freedoms in our quest to fight this disease. Who decides this important question? Surprisingly, it seems that no one does, because this question is not being asked or the voices asking this question are not being heard.

The branch of government to hear these voices – the judicial system, is constrained by the confines of its own doctrines and maxims. The doctrine of stare decisis, the principles of parliamentary supremacy, the constitutional rights (or the lack thereof), the absence of a constitutional bill of rights. All these legal precepts, *prima facie*, do little to offer an aggrieved protestor any recourse to the present pandemic conundrum. The law itself appears to be facing its own “horseless carriage” problem<sup>6</sup>. “Horseless carriage” refers to the unprecedented being unrecognizable. When we encounter something unprecedented, we automatically interpret it through the lenses of familiar categories, thereby rendering invisible precisely that which is unprecedented.<sup>7</sup> To be clear, this is not a criticism of the legal system, it is an attempt to highlight the belief that - other than protesting, it seems there is effectively, nothing else a person can do if he or she does not want to get vaccinated. The very recent decision from the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission (QIRC) (*Brasell-Dellow & Ors v State of Queensland (Queensland Police Service)*)<sup>8</sup> where the applicants’ objections to the Commissioner’s direction to get vaccinated were dismissed, only reinforces this proposition. The decision follows a trend of cases where employees have been dismissed for a refusal to vaccinate against Covid19. Granted, we are still in the early stages of litigating these types of cases, but the uphill battle for protestors appears steeper and steeper with each tribunal and judicial decision.

Let’s just digest the idea that if an employee refuses to get vaccinated, there appears to be no legal protection for this person whatsoever. At present, we are testing how far this idea can be stretched. Even the word “employee” is a little bit misleading if we are looking purely from the perspective of a person who does not want to get vaccinated. It misrepresents the lack of legal protection as though the mandate only affects an abstract “class” of persons that the ordinary citizen need not worry about, thereby sufficiently dismissing any reason to label what is happening as an act of despotic authoritarianism. Most of the people in this country are “employees” – in effect, is it really any different to say that most citizens are mandated by law to be vaccinated? Technically - it is different. But this is exactly why it is pernicious. It has the effect of allowing the government to mandate through a third party, and none of the accountability risks for the government. There are already discussions about the legality for businesses and retailers to refuse entry to the unvaccinated, highlighting the fact that an unvaccinated person would not be directly protected under discrimination laws at a Commonwealth, state, or territory level.<sup>9</sup> If you live in the state of Victoria, the unvaccinated are to be banned from venues including bookshops, pubs, and football matches until at least 2023<sup>10</sup>. If the recent “temporary” mandates are anything to go by, 2023 seems unlikely. As the adage goes, in life, the two certainties are death and taxes. They say diamonds are forever, it is

---

<sup>6</sup> The Age of Surveillance Capitalism by Shoshana Zuboff.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> [2021] QIRC 356.

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-10-06/morrison-businesses-refusing-unvaccinated-customers/100512488>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/oct/24/australia-covid-update-as-most-victoria-restrictions-lift-next-month-vaccinated-economy-to-stay-for-2022>.

fitting, perhaps, to coin an additional saying, being that nothing is more permanent than a temporary government policy.

I am often faced with the retort that “our elected officials are just following the science”. Even if we assume the government is attempting to follow the science, it seems unscientific (though not un-Australian) that the rugby league grand final would continue, albeit with reduced numbers (after identifying a cluster of Covid19) but a person eating a kebab in an open park is a threat to the safety of the community. A threat that warrants a substantial fine, and potentially imprisonment. If nothing else, this fact should be cause for a smidgen of consternation about some of the enforcement practices taking place.

At the time of writing, the World Health Organisation (WHO) reports an approximate 98% survival rate<sup>11</sup>. Indeed, a death rate of 2% of the 242,688,319 confirmed cases around the world is still a significant number. The below table illustrates the percentage of deaths based on the contracted cases in the top 11 counties:<sup>12</sup>

Country	No. of confirmed cases	Mortality rate (by %)
United States of America	44,940,696	(1.6%)
India	34,189,774	(1.3%)
Brazil	21,680,488	(2.8%)
The United Kingdom	8,641,225	(1.6%)
Russian Federation	8,168,305	(2.8%)
France	6,899,508	(1.7%)
Iran	5,851,670	(2.1%)
Argentina	5,275,984	(2.2%)
Spain	4,995,176	(1.7%)
Colombia	4,984,751	(2.5%)
Italy	4,737,462	(2.8%)

*\*Accurate as of 25 October 2021*

Depending on who you ask (no pun intended), the emotive interpretation of the above statistics can range anywhere between concerning, frightening, alarming, to encouraging, comforting, and even reassuring. Of the percentage of deaths, the CDC’s website states that “no studies comparing mortality rates within the general population of vaccinated and unvaccinated persons have been conducted”.<sup>13</sup> In other words, the above table does not tell us how many deaths occurred in people that were fully vaccinated. However, the narrative promulgated by the media, is that the number of deaths relate purely to the unvaccinated population. Moreover, there are a mixture of covid deaths caused by underlying medical conditions and comorbidities. The elderly, demographics, socio-economic circumstances are also variables that must be considered when analysing the above mortality rate. It is alarming that on the basis of questionable statistics, a person is stripped of their democratic right to bodily autonomy. Even if we assert Australia has never had a constitutional bill of rights and the “democratic right” to bodily autonomy is a myth in this country, this should not be treated as a kind of loophole and free pass for draconian mandates, rules, and regulations. It should be a wakeup call for the implementation of legal protections, and, if we are “following the

<sup>11</sup> <https://covid19.who.int/>.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> COVID-19 Vaccination and Non-COVID-19 Mortality Risk — Seven Integrated Health Care Organizations, United States, December 14, 2020–July 31, 2021 | MMWR (cdc.gov).

science”, which part of the scientific method involves blind trust and the inability to question the data?

As mentioned at the outset, I am not debating the scientific basis for vaccines. In fact, my intention is not even to reduce public anxiety. At the very least, this writeup encourages readers to consider JUST the possibility that there is a disproportionate level of control in response to the present threat. I am suggesting this is a fundamental breach of our human rights under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) – of which Australia is a signatory, and various states, including Queensland, have enacted supporting legislation. We are in uncharted territory, territory that requires significantly more transparency - not less, more institutional accountability, more legal protections, and a complete review of the checks and balances that are available against totalitarian power. If concepts and phrases like “totalitarian power”, “communism”, “big brother”, “threat to democracy” etc, make your ‘eyes roll’ in the present pandemic climate. I urge you to consider the possibility that if we continue to charter through this unprecedented territory with an opinionated, hubristic, and haughty sail, we render ourselves blind to the new and unrecognisable forces of “big brother” and “totalitarian power”. In other words, we too face a “horseless carriage problem”.

When people were faced with the unprecedented facts of the automobile, they could not comprehend the idea of a carriage with no horses<sup>14</sup>. It was considered a ridiculous idea fraught with impossibilities. As previously mentioned and worth repeating, the unprecedented is necessarily unrecognisable, we are apt to draw conclusions through the lenses of familiar categories, thereby blinding us to precisely that which is unprecedented.<sup>15</sup> Words like “totalitarianism”, and “communism” will generally conjure ideas of historical figures like Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Vladimir Putin, and the types of government administrations lead by those leaders. When protestors hold up signs with phrases like “resist communism”, phrases intended to stoke awareness of what is at risk, a media narrative that conflates news reporting with journalistic opinion, quickly and deliberately hijacks and misrepresents these protestors to immediately invoke an assumption of conspiracy theorist in the minds of its viewers.

If you recall my earlier paragraph on the mechanics of defamation, it is extremely difficult to extricate oneself from the defamatory publication once the damage is done. In the present news and media world, any protestor of Covid19 equates to conspiracy theorist. If you have concerns about some of the control measures adopted to reduce Covid19 also equates to conspiracy theorist. Even the word “conspiracy” has been tarnished to the point that the average person cannot distinguish between a “conspiracy” – which is the actual secret plan to do something unlawful or harmful, and a “conspiracy theory” – which is the belief that some covert, but influential organization is responsible for an unexplained event. In news and media world, any protest related to Covid19 is labelled a “conspiracy theory”.

If the new totalitarian power does not look like those historical figures in the previous paragraph, what does it look like? This question is best illustrated with an example. In 2016, black votership declined in the US by 7-percentage-points.<sup>16</sup> This was the largest decline on record for black Americans.<sup>17</sup> Donald Trump’s digital media director and political advisor - Brad Parscale - ran a campaign effort to deter a number of citizens from voting on election day.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Age of Surveillance Capitalism – Shoshana Zuboff.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/>.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

The vast data of voters, including personality traits, political attitudes, behavioural dispositions, and vulnerabilities, were all collected from Facebook's database to target individuals with the sole purpose of digitally engineering them. Pascal used those tools to identify citizens least likely to support Donald Trump. These citizens were labelled "deterrents". Among the "deterrents", 54% were people of colour, including 3.5 million black voters. Black citizens were bombarded with the standard range of algorithmic targeting mechanisms that are used in Facebook's advertising every day. Messages were engineered to produce negative views of Hillary Clinton, but also to persuade black citizens that the most affective expression of black protest was to withdraw entirely from the election process.<sup>18</sup>

It was the deliberate collection, computation, and manipulation of enormous scale knowledge through surveillance capitalism ABOUT these citizens, that produced massive scale behavioural change AMONG these citizens. Strategies like subliminal cues<sup>19</sup>, engineered social comparisons, and Cambridge Analytica's psychological microtargeting all assisted in manipulating and engineering the "deterrents".

Let this sink in for a moment, citizens of the world's longest-lived democracy<sup>20</sup> relinquished their most solemn democratic right – the right to vote, without anyone threatening them with violence, there were no guns to their heads, no one showed up in the middle of the night to threaten their families – there were no burning crosses. Instead, these citizens, surrendered the right to self-govern in response to nothing more than engineered digital communications and disinformation tailored to herd them into inaction without their knowledge. I am not trying to sell a totalitarian nightmare of an Orwellian universe, where "big brother" destroys the human soul. I am arguing this is an example of the "horseless carriage" conundrum in that we are not looking for totalitarianism in the right places, indeed, even when we begin to look for this "tyrannical power" we are not greeted with guns and violence, but with carefully engineered disinformation and a cup of hot chocolate from UberEats. The seeker is left with an artificial and superficial understanding of the problem. Zuboff calls this "instrumentarian power".

Instrumentarian power is the power of governments and corporations to use technology and infrastructure to manipulate people in subtle, but effective ways. This power turns ordinary people into the "instruments" that are used in predictable ways to achieve the governments and the corporations' goals. What does this all have to do with Covid19? I am hoping, by now, readers of this writeup are beginning to view the mandates, public health orders, and some of the policies in Australia and around the world through the lenses of both "surveillance capitalism" and "instrumentarian power". Even prior to Covid19, surveillance capitalism was a significant threat to democracy. Society itself was already living through an epistemic coup that most of us were unaware of,<sup>21</sup> one which is not intended to overthrow the government, but rather to overthrow the sovereignty of the individual.<sup>22</sup> Instrumentarian power annuls human dignity without the threat of violence, terror, or murder - no blood, no combat. It is seamless.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Subliminal cues are words, pictures or symbols which are undefinable in someone's conscious - Athletes perform better when exposed to subliminal visual cues -- ScienceDaily

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/08/countries-are-the-worlds-oldest-democracies>

<sup>21</sup> The coup enacted by tech corporations to claim ownership of knowledge in society.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/29/opinion/sunday/facebook-surveillance-society-technology.html>.

<sup>22</sup> Gray, John (February 6, 2019). "The new tech totalitarianism". New Statesman. Retrieved February 25, 2021.

“But there are medical experts in our country, and leaders in the government who care about us, how could they let something like this happen?” The echoes of this question still ring loud from a recent conversation. The usual problem I face in attempting to answer this question is partly due to the need to introduce concepts, ideas, and theories that may be novel to the average person and all of which require time to explain (some have been discussed in this paper). This is only half the difficulty, the other half relates to discussing this with a listener who has the time, and indeed the interest, to be willing to digest these concepts. Particularly if you are discussing this with a person who believes he or she knows what you are talking about already. In addition, we live in an era of distraction. We are sufficiently distracted with social media, TikTok, news, Netflix, Google, buying consumer products online, YouTube, PlayStation, Xbox, the list goes on. This does not even include the time spent with family, friends, and employment. Our distractions render our cognitive senses nugatory, unable to anticipate or foresee the threats of the new “communism” and “totalitarianism”.

On 26 August 2021, a statement released from the Queensland Government confirmed a “dedicated regional quarantine facility will be built at Wellcamp, Toowoomba, under a joint agreement between the Palaszczuk Government and the landowner, Wagner Corporation”. There was very little information released to the public, and from what I can gather, no public consultation.<sup>23</sup> It is deeply concerning when the revenue of a private corporation is dependent upon the ongoing push to vaccinate and quarantine members of the public. Even with the best of intentions, when profits are involved, the corporation – by design, is prone to forget its moral and ethical compass. It is naïve to assume corporations like Pfizer are an exception. A tragic example of corporate wrongdoing is illustrated by the Ford Pinto case where a cost benefit analysis concluded a price tag on human life was \$200,000. This price tag on human life was then used to compare Ford’s projected cost of settling burn-victim’s lawsuits versus Ford’s cost of spending \$11 per car to repair the defective fuel tank<sup>24</sup>. It was an example of corporate wrongdoing before the vast technological capacities of surveillance capitalism even existed. The conclusion in this case was that spending \$11 per car was not justified, even though conservative estimates showed that the un-modified design would cause at least five hundred, fire-related deaths over an eight-year period.<sup>25</sup>

It is not a conspiracy theory to say we are living in an era of surveillance capitalism. This is an established fact. In an era where democracy itself threatens surveillance revenue, and surveillance revenue is the lifeblood of most large corporations like Alphabet (Google’s holding company), Facebook, Netflix, Apple, and a few others, we must have laws that protect us against the lure of uncontrolled surveillance profits. It is no longer just the natural environment that is exploited by corporations, the surveillance capitalists exploit human experience and translate it into behavioural data. Our personal information is claimed as corporate property available for manufacture and sale. It is not too far a stretch that pharmaceutical companies may also be interested in our behavioural data. I believe this is the true fear of protestors in Australia and around the world. Artificial intelligence is developing at speeds outside of our awareness. “The same technologies that might make billions of people economically irrelevant might also make them easier to monitor and control”<sup>26</sup>. As Yuval Harari states, if we are not careful, concentrated artificial intelligence that is controlled by a

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> <https://pdhonline.com/courses/r152/Ethics-Alternative%20Account%20of%20Pinto%20.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/10/yuval-noah-harari-technology-tyranny/568330/>

small elite, could erase many practical advantages of democracy, eroding the ideals of liberty and equality.

Interestingly, all the writers I refer to in this paper warned of the threat of surveillance capitalism years before Covid19 even came into existence. It is a bizarre coincidence or a dystopian nightmare that the scale of data required (medical information being one type of data) to carry out the totalitarian data extraction appears to be taking place. Are protestors unreasonable for fearing “totalitarianism” considering this unprecedented new surveillance state that operates outside human awareness, robbing us of the right to know and the right to combat it? Surveillance capitalists sell the promise of certainty. It is sold to other corporations, and we have no way of knowing with certainty who these corporations are. Facebook’s artificial intelligence backbone ingests trillions of behavioural data points each day and produces 6 million behavioural predictions each second<sup>27</sup>. As previously mentioned, it is a mixture of these predictions, secret knowledge and secret power that ensures that neither citizens nor lawmakers can fully grasp the consequences of this new foundational institution and the economic incentives that drive it to the totalitarian data extraction. To elaborate on the extent of this data extraction is beyond the scope of this paper.

If nothing I have said in this paper stokes even the slightest concern, I fear that this detachment is potentially evidence of instrumentarian power at play. Early last year, the events that are presently unfolding would have been considered “ridiculous conspiracy theory”. When people spoke of “covid passports”, “green passes” and even “mandatory vaccinations”, they were dismissed as crazy conspiracy theorists. It appears we are sleep walking into an era that none of us can prepare for. It is precisely this reason that the law must provide adequate protection, not unintentionally dismantle democratic freedoms while simultaneously setting the perfect “nesting ground” for surveillance capitalism to prosper with impunity. The notion that all of this is inevitable is a narrative that has been deliberately sold by the surveillance capitalists to mislead people. Totalitarianism in this “new world order”, where we will “own nothing and be happy” does not imprison people in jails, it imprisons the human spirit in the comfort of their own homes. It automates human behaviour covertly through sophisticated algorithms, carefully designed hardware, and software. There has never been a time in human history where vast concentrations of power are vested in so few.

If when reading this paper, you assume I have an aversion to technology, science, vaccines, the government, or any specific political leader, you have misunderstood the message I am hoping to convey. We are slowly breaking down the pillars of our democracy by our inability to sight the new “tyrant”. It is not unreasonable nor conspiratorial to be concerned about the threat of pharmaceutical companies and governments deploying the same psychological engineering tactics that are used by companies like Google and Facebook. Indeed, “big pharma” and government are the potential clients of those very companies.

I will ask one more time, why are the protestors so inconsiderate, angry, and heartless? It is my firm belief that they are fighting to maintain the human spirit in a world that is quickly turning it into a digitised QR code. They are marching to protect our freedoms and are angry about the lack of debate around the erosion of these freedoms. They are marching for a world where they can continue to see the smiles of their children’s faces – unmasked, live free with loved ones unencumbered by surveillance check-in points. They wish to dispense with the psychologically engineered judgment and fear created by the government and promulgated by

---

<sup>27</sup> <https://engineering.fb.com/2016/05/09/core-data/introducing-fblearner-flow-facebook-s-ai-backbone/>



the media. If after reading this paper, you have more questions than answers, I consider this a success. I have poured as much as I can into this paper so that I can at least say - “I did my part”.

**Written by Inoke Faletau**

Copyright - Inoke Faletau