

Translated excerpt


Andreas Bernard
Komplizen des Erkennungsdienstes
Das Selbst in der digitalen Kultur

S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2017
ISBN 978-3-10-397301-3

pp. 7-27

Andreas Bernard
Persons of Interest
The Self in Digital Culture

Translated by Valentine A. Pakis



Contents

1. Profiles: The Development of a Format

A Conceptual History of the Profile in the Twentieth Century
The Triumph of the Self-Made Profile
Profiles and the Culture of Job Applications
Constants of External Control
Cyberspace and Profiles: From the Boundless to the Captive Self

2. Locations: GPS and the Aesthetics of Suspicion

The History of Satellite Navigation
On the Way to Locating Individuals
Paradoxes of Location
Electronic Ankle Bracelets
Location-Based Games

3. Cavity Searches: Bodily Measurements and the Quantified-Self Movement

Fitbit
Genealogies of Self-Tracking
Measuring, Classifying, Discriminating
Introspection and Data Generation
Lifting the Veil
Witnesses for the Prosecution

4. The Forgotten Fear of Registration

The Drama of the Census
The Police as a Catalyst of Electronic Registration
The Semantics of the Net
The Glamour of Datafication
1984 from Today's Perspective
Stigmatization and Self-Design

5. The Power of Internalization

Competitive Individuality
The Governability of the Self in Digital Culture

1. Profiles: The Development of a Format

An old political debate reopened when, within a few months in 2012, the United States was shocked by two mass shootings, one in a movie theater in Denver and the other at an elementary school in Connecticut. The question was whether there might be better ways to identify potential perpetrators in advance so as to prevent similar atrocities from happening in the future. To the familiar signs of suspicion – the introverted nature of the predominantly male offenders, their social isolation, and their history of psychiatric treatment – was now added an additional criterion: the reluctance of the killers to participate on social media. As reporters were quick to point out, neither James Eagan Holmes nor Adam Lanza had a profile on Facebook, Twitter, or LinkedIn. Like the Norwegian Anders Breivik, who had committed a similar crime the year before, Holmes and Lanza refused to join the internet’s omnipresent portals for communication and self-representation, and this refusal was being characterized as a warning sign. Hiring managers at large companies reminded the public that it was now a common practice to look at the online profiles of job applicants and that an applicant’s complete absence from social networks was highly peculiar. This opinion found support in a 2011 study conducted by the Canadian psychiatrist Richard Bélanger, who discovered a “u-shaped association” between the internet activity and mental health of adolescents: “Health care providers should thus be alerted both when caring for adolescents who do not use the Internet or use it rarely, as well as for those who are online several hours daily.”¹ In today’s digital culture, as this discussion makes clear, it is now a matter of irritation when people of a certain age have neglected to create a public double of themselves online in the form of profiles, status updates, comments, and so on. In the Western world, this abstinence has even become the first indication of psychiatric abnormality, perhaps of a mental illness or perhaps of a latent pathological impulse that might one day be discharged in a harrowing act of violence. Conversely, the regular use of social media is now regarded as evidence of good health and normality.

My reflections in this book about the status of the self in digital culture are concerned with the methods, services, and devices that have become self-evident and, in light of their daily use, have increasingly come to seem like a natural disposition. In the history of the representation of subjectivity, however, they are in fact an astonishingly recent development. Whoever attended school or university just a quarter century ago will remember how few options were available then for representing one’s own person, preferences, and convictions to the public – a patch on the back of a jacket, a few lines beneath one’s yearbook picture, or an expensive personal ad that would run for just one day in the local newspaper. This minimal radius of publicity for anyone without constant access to the mass media was still the invariable reality at the beginning of the 1990s, and yet those years now feel like a distant and unfamiliar epoch.

In no time at all – Facebook became open to everyone in the fall of 2006, and there have been smartphones since 2007 and app stores since 2008 – a comprehensive digital culture has emerged whose manifestations have been studied, celebrated, or demonized by journalists and academics on an ongoing basis. The origins of this culture in the history of knowledge, however,

¹ Richard Bélanger et al., “U-Shaped Association Between Intensity of Internet Use and Adolescent Health,” *Pediatrics* 127 (2011), 330–35, at 334. For further discussion related to this debate, see the anonymous article “The Mystery of Aurora Suspect’s Missing Facebook Account”, cnet.com/news/the-mystery-of-aurora-suspects-missing-facebook-account/; and Christoph David Piorkowski, “Spurlos im Netz: Wer sich Facebook verweigert, macht sich verdächtig,” *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (December 21, 2012), 13.

have seldom been discussed (and when they have been, it has been from the perspective of computer science). The aim of this book is to trace back just such a genealogy in order to demonstrate how digital media technologies have been embedded in the history of the human sciences. Ultimately, what is most striking about today's methods of self-representation and self-perception – the profiles of social media but also the various locational functions on smartphones or the bodily measurements of the “quantified-self movement” – is the fact that they all derive from methods of criminology, psychology, or psychiatry that were conceived at various points since the end of the nineteenth century. Certain techniques for collecting data, which were long used exclusively by police detectives or scientific authorities to identify suspicious groups of people, are now being applied to everyone who uses a smartphone or social media. Biographical descriptions, GPS transmitters, and measuring devices installed on bodies are no longer just instruments for tracking suspected criminals but are now being used for the sake of having fun, communicating, making money, or finding a romantic partner.

A Conceptual History of the Profile in the Twentieth Century

In this regard, the category of the profile is especially instructive. As is well known, this element plays an essential role in any exchange conducted on social media. The profile of members on LinkedIn, Instagram, or Facebook – the place where they describe themselves and where their personal information, texts, photos, and videos are gathered – is the nodal point of interaction. Thus even the earliest research devoted to social media placed the profile at the heart of its analysis. In her influential essays about Friendster, for instance, Danah Boyd repeatedly takes this element as her starting point. One of her pieces from 2006, co-written with Jeffrey Heer, begins as follows: “Profiles have become a common mechanism for presenting one’s identity online.”² To the creators of a profile, who are simultaneously its object, Boyd thus attributes a high degree of sovereignty. They enjoy complete autonomy in the public representation of their self, and the more original and comprehensive this representation is, the stronger the reaction it will entice from other users of the social network in question: “By paying the cost of carefully crafting an interesting profile,” as Boyd and Judith Donath concluded about Friendster in 2004, “one can make more connections.”³ In her essays, Boyd frequently describes the practice of self-formation as an “identity performance,” and she stresses that this creative and productive activity has “shifted the Profile from being a static representation of self to a communicative body in conversation with the other represented bodies.”⁴ This is thus the great promise of the format: It is a free and self-determined space in which its creators can set the scene with a desirable, more or less honest, and more or less polished public persona.

² Danah Boyd and Jeffrey Heer, “Profiles as Conversation: Networked Identity Performance on Friendster,” in *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (Los Alamitos: IEEE Computer Society, 2006), n.p. See also Danah Boyd, “Friendster and Publicly Articulated Social Networks,” in *CHI 2004 – Connect: Conference Proceedings* (New York: ACM Press, 2004), n.p.; and Danah Boyd and Judith Donath, “Public Displays of Connection,” *BT Technology Journal* 22 (2004), 71–82, at 72. These references to Boyd’s essays – as well as references to other works relating to the history of the profile – were brought to my attention by Andreas Weich, whose dissertation on the history of the profile is due to be published shortly. For an overview of some of his findings, see Andreas Weich, “Sich profilieren und profiliert werden: Über zwei Seiten einer Medaille,” in *Profile: Interdisziplinäre Beiträge*, ed. Martin Degeling et al. (Lüneburg: Meson Press, 2017), 37–57.

³ Boyd and Donath, “Friendster and Publicly Articulated Social Networks,” 74.

⁴ Boyd and Heer, “Profiles as Conversation,” n.p.

Yet despite all of this it should not be forgotten that, a mere twenty to twenty-five years ago, only serial killers and madmen were the objects of such profiles. Over the past quarter century, this form of knowledge – this pattern for describing human beings – has experienced a rapid and profound transformation. In light of its use today, it would thus be informative to engage with the historical semantics of the concept. In which contexts and at which point in time did the written profile emerge? Who was its author, who was its object, and why was it created? In the sense of a “short, vivid biography outlining the most outstanding characteristics of the subject,” as the 1968 edition of Webster’s dictionary defines it,⁵ the term has a relatively young history (German dictionaries and encyclopedias would not adopt this definition until later on). In the early modern era, the word “profile” was first used in architectural and geological contexts and denoted the contours of buildings or mountain ranges; in the eighteenth century, it also came to mean the side view of a face. It was apparently not until the early twentieth century that the profile was understood in the sense of a tabulated or schematic outline providing information about a person.

If my impression is correct, the word first appeared with this meaning as a technical term in the work of the Russian neurologist Grigory I. Rossolimo, who published an article in 1910 titled “Psychological Profiles” (*Psikhologicheskie profili*). In this study, which was translated into German after the war and adopted by a number of psychologists, Rossolimo designed a procedure for measuring certain aptitudes among children – their attention span, memory capacity, associative ability, and so on – on a scale of one to ten. At the end of this testing procedure, according to Rossolimo, all of the data points, which represented various levels of development, could be plotted on a diagram and connected to form a curve that would represent a “detailed psychological profile” of the subject in question.⁶ In Russia, these values were used above all to place children with behavioral problems into the appropriate types of schools. “The psychological profile,” as Karl Bartsch noted in his adaptation of the method, “enables us to analyze and clarify the functions of the juvenile mind, and it reveals avenues toward the proper therapeutic and pedagogical treatment of diagnosed disorders.”⁷

From the beginning, then, the epistemic interest of the profile consisted in providing evaluative information about the identity and behavior of deviant subjects. Bartsch, who refined the interpretation of Rossolimo’s procedures and referred to his young patients as “psychopaths,” asked the following about an indocile child with a long history of behavioral problems: “Who can understand him without knowing his psychological profile?” He even calculated a precise relationship between a child’s “profile curve” and how institutions should react to it: “All children from the age of seven who do not achieve a profile score of 4,” according to Bartsch’s recommendation, “should be sent to a school for special education (*Hilfsschule*).” What was always at stake whenever profiles were created – whenever, as the psychologist Fritz Giese

⁵ Webster Universal Dictionary: Unabridged International Edition, ed. Eric Partridge and Henry C. Wyld (New York: Harver, 1968), s.v. (p. 1163).

⁶ Rossolimo’s study was never translated into English. The quotation here is translated from the German edition: G. I. Rossolimo, *Das psychologische Profil und andere experimentell-psychologische, individuelle und kollektive Methoden zur Prüfung der Psychomechanik bei Erwachsenen und Kindern* (Halle an der Saale: C. Marhold, 1926), 8.

⁷ Karl Bartsch, *Das psychologische Profil und seine Auswertung für Heilpädagogik: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der psychischen Funktionen des normalen und abnormalen Kindes*, 2nd ed. (Halle an der Saale: C. Marhold, 1926), 3.

wrote in 1923, “a sort of psychological cross-section could be drawn through the human beings” – was the normality and healthiness of those being tested.⁸

Although the “psychological profile” in the sense outlined above went out of fashion around the year 1930, it soon reemerged in a new context of knowledge from which it would go on to gain widespread popularity in the late twentieth century. After the Second World War, concerted efforts were made in the United States to get to the bottom of unsolved crimes (especially those thought to have been committed by repeat offenders), and these efforts led to increased cooperation between criminologists and psychoanalysts. Just as conventional police work sought to analyze the material clues left at a crime scene in order to come closer to identifying the perpetrator by means of finger prints or bullet shells, the forensic-psychological perspective began to concentrate on immaterial and emotional clues – on the question, that is, of how such things as hatred, anger, rage, passion, or other eruptions of inner life might have left traces at the scene of a crime. Although this search for impressions left by the criminal personality – this practice of criminal-psychological ballistics – played a part in solving a number of spectacular serial crimes as early as the 1950s (for instance the case of New York’s “mad bomber,” George Metesky), the method was first described as psychiatric profiling in a 1962 essay by the psychoanalyst Louis Gold about notorious arsonists.⁹

One major difference distinguished the “psychiatric profile” of criminology from the earlier use of the term in applied psychology: It was now the case that *unknown* persons were meant to be identified by means of this knowledge format. The test was replaced by the manhunt, and a quantifiable scientific statement was replaced by a hypothesis. At this early stage, this new tracking technique depended on the charisma and nearly vatic intuition of individual forensic psychologists like James Brussel. It was not until the end of the 1970s that “criminal profiles,” as they are now known, were formulated in a systematic manner, and this development took place at a newly established division of the FBI called the “Behavioral Science Unit.” Here, psychologists and criminologists were tasked with testing new methods in response to the rising crime rate in the United States. Ever since the 1960s, according to the FBI, not only had the number of unsolved murders been growing; statistics showed that cases in which the offender was unknown to the victim had increased from ten to thirty percent. Richard Ault and James Reese, whose foundational essay on the new method appeared in the in-house journal *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, made the following observation: “As the crime rate grows in this country and the criminals become more sophisticated, the investigative tools of the police officer must also become more sophisticated. One such sophisticated tool [...] is the psychological assessment of crime – profiling.”¹⁰

According to Ault and Reese, profiling would enable detectives to decipher the behavioral patterns and motives of criminals on the basis of clues left behind at the scenes of unsolved violent crimes. One of the directors of the Behavioral Science Unit summarized this strategy concisely: “Knowing ‘why’ will often tell us ‘who’.”¹¹ From the state of the crime scene,

⁸ The quotations are from *ibid.*, 60, 73; and Fritz Giese, *Psychotechnisches Praktikum* (Halle an der Saale: Wendt & Klauwell, 1923), 40.

⁹ Louis Gold, “The Psychiatric Profile of the Firesetter,” *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 7 (1962), 404–17. On the “mad bomber” and the role that psychoanalysis played in solving the case, see James Brussel, *The Casebook of a Crime Psychiatrist* (New York: Grove Press, 1968).

¹⁰ Richard Ault and James Reese, “A Psychological Assessment of Crime: Profiling,” *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 49 (1980), 22–25, at 22.

¹¹ Russel Vorpagel, “Painting Psychological Profiles: Charlatanism, Coincidence, Charisma, Chance, or a New Science?” *The Police Chief* 3 (1982), 156–59, at 156.

detectives could tell whether the offender's methods were organized or unorganized, and on the basis of this simple difference they could begin to narrow down the possible identity of the unknown criminal: Did he live in the immediate vicinity of the victim? Would his apartment be messy or clean? Were they dealing with an eloquent or socially excluded perpetrator? White or black? Fat or skinny (forensic psychologists were convinced that certain mental illnesses manifested themselves in ascetic eating behavior)? At the beginning of their pioneering article, Ault and Reese claim that a series of seven rapes, each with the same recognizable modus operandi, could be solved within a week after the creation of a criminal profile. The latter might contain some of the following conjectured information: "1) The perpetrator's race, 2) Sex, 3) Age range, 4) Marital status, 5) General employment, 6) Reaction to questioning by police, 7) Degree of sexual maturing, 8) Whether the individual might strike again, 9) The possibility that he/she has committed a similar offense in the past, 10) Possible police record."¹²

In 1980, the FBI's *Law Enforcement Bulletin* was devoted entirely to this new form of tracking. Ault and Reese's article is followed by several others in which the concept of the criminal profile is applied specifically to cases of arson or sexual violence. Moreover, the staff of the Behavioral Science Unit began to conduct a long-term series of psychological interviews with convicted mass murderers. In all of this, the ambition to distill individual mental features from a series of crimes was inextricably tied to the presumed illness of the offender in question. As early as 1962, Louis Gold remarked: "It is generally accepted that a person who sets a fire intentionally is committing an abnormal act. His reasoning at this time is perverse, distorted. [...] The roots of such perverse and aberrant behavior are deep within the personality and have some relationship to sexual disturbance."¹³ Ault and Reese likewise underscored the following point: "It is most important that this investigative technique be confined chiefly to crimes against the person where the motive is lacking and where there is sufficient data to recognize the presence of psychopathology at the crime scenes."¹⁴ Profiles were thus created only when no apparent meaning could be derived from the crime itself; on the basis of chaotic crime scenes, they were meant bring to light the rationality and comparability that the wild rage of the perpetrator had initially obscured. "Psychological profiling," as Anthony Rider noted about arsonists in particular, "should be applied only to those cases in which the unknown subject demonstrates some form of mental, emotional, or behavioral disturbance in the crime. Unless there is perceptible psychopathology present in the crime, a profile cannot be rendered on an unknown subject."¹⁵

For the FBI, the condition of possibility for the criminal profile was thus the insanity of the offender. The number of cases in which this new method was applied in the United States grew rapidly (in 1979 there were only sixty-five, and in 1980 this number already surpassed two hundred), while in Germany the first criminal profile – commissioned, incidentally, by the FBI – was created in 1984.¹⁶ The method did not receive widespread public attention, however, until

¹² Ault and Reese, "A Psychological Assessment of Crime," 24. For a highly similar list, see Vorpagel, "Painting Psychological Profiles," 159.

¹³ Gold, "The Psychiatric Profile of the Firesetter," 404, 416.

¹⁴ Ault and Reese, "A Psychological Assessment of Crime," 25.

¹⁵ Anthony Rider, "The Firesetter: A Psychological Profile," *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 49 (July 1980), 7–17, at 7.

¹⁶ On the number of cases in the United States, see Vorpagel, "Painting Psychological Profiles," 159. Regarding the first criminal profile in Germany, see Cornelia Musolff, "Täterprofile und Fallanalyse: Eine Bestandaufnahme," in *Täterprofile bei Gewaltverbrechen: Mythos, Theorie und Praxis des Profilings*, ed. Cornelia Musolff and Jens Hoffmann (Heidelberg: Springer, 2006), 1–23, at 12.

the beginning of the 1990s, and this was largely due to the film *The Silence of the Lambs*, in which an FBI agent trained in psychology manages to convict a serial killer. In the wake of this movie, the work of the “ profiler ” became a phenomenon of popular culture. A few veterans from the Behavioral Science Unit, such as Robert Ressler and John Douglas, published successful memoirs, and their type of activity has since become a fundamental component of numerous crime shows on television, among them *Criminal Minds*, *Millennium*, *Cracker*, and *Profiler*.

What a brief conceptual history of the profile reveals at once is the fact that, for an entire century, this format has been used to describe individuals in situations involving tests or manhunts. In light of Foucault’s fundamental insight that, since the late eighteenth century, knowledge about human beings has been generated predominantly by marginal subjects – that the question of how to track down identities or measure bodies was driven above all by the psychiatric registration of the sick and by the police’s access to criminals – it can be said that this trend was consolidated in the knowledge format of the profile. Its object was someone under evaluation or being hunted, and its creators were representatives of state authority, police authority, or scientific authority. In the profiles of the twentieth century, the relations of institutional power were realized with particular clarity. To this extent, the success stories of psychiatry and criminology can be told alongside the genesis of their registration and recording techniques.¹⁷

Even in the term’s older semantic contexts, this constellation is already present. In its art-historical sense as a side view, the word “ profile ” had been used since the second half of the eighteenth century when attempts were made to systematize and classify certain categories of knowledge through representations of the human face. In the work of Johann Caspar Lavater, the silhouette in profile was transformed from a leisurely form of art into a cryptographic system whose proper interpretation could unlock the inner life of any man or woman. In his treatise *On Physiognomy*, which first appeared in 1772, Lavater left no doubt that portraits ought to depict the side of the face. As evidence for this thesis, he compared a physiognomically relevant profile drawing by Montesquieu with a less revealing portrait and declared that, in the latter, “ the view of the painter, and thus the action of the muscles [...] does not present to us the natural condition but rather something that is largely forced, stiff, or tense. ” This disadvantage of the frontal perspective is alleviated by profile representations because anyone who allows himself to be drawn in this manner does so, according to Lavater, “ in large part because the eye of the painter does not govern him but rather looks upon him more naturally and freely. ”¹⁸ Profile images thus enable greater objectivity are therefore better suited for physiognomic interpretation. A century later, a similar argument was made by the Parisian criminologist Alphonse Bertillon when he presented his new system for identifying recidivists. The latter system, which he referred to as

¹⁷ On the history of registering psychiatric patients and on the development of documentary practices in various hospitals during the nineteenth century, see Ali-Reza Ipektschi, *Ärztliche Aufzeichnungen über Patienten im Allgemeinen Krankenhaus in Hamburg in der Zeit von 1823–1888* (Doctoral Diss.: Universität Hamburg, 1983); Brigitte Bernet, “ Der Fall des psychiatrischen Formulars, ” in *Zum Fall machen, zum Fall werden: Wissensproduktion und Patientenerfahrung in Medizin und Psychiatrie des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Sibylle Brändli et al. (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2009), 62–91; Volker Hess, “ Formalisierte Beobachtung: Die Genese der modernen Krankenakte am Beispiel der Berliner und Pariser Medizin, ” *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 45 (2010), 293–340; and Sophie Ledebur, “ Schreiben und Beschreiben: Zur epistemischen Funktion von psychiatrischen Krankenakten, ihre Archivierung und deren Übersetzung in Fallgeschichten, ” *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 34 (2011), 102–24.

¹⁸ J. C. Lavater, *Von der Physiognomik* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1772), 63. This early work on physiognomy, which has not been translated into English, is distinct from Lavater’s more comprehensive treatment of the subject, which appeared in multiple English editions under the title *Essays on Physiognomy*.

“anthropometry,” involved a series of bodily measurements that were supplemented by profile photographs of delinquents. “It is the profile with precise lines,” according to Bertillon, “that best represents the particular individuality of any given face.”¹⁹ He believed that this was the case because of the highly identifiable nature of the ear, the form of which differs from person to person and cannot be obscured by any changes of expression while a photograph is being taken. Lavater’s and Bertillon’s observations make it clear that, as a side view, the profile provided types of knowledge about analyzed and classified subjects that are similar to the types produced later by the tabular and written format of the same name.²⁰

The Triumph of the Self-Made Profile

The establishment of digital culture over the past quarter century was accompanied by a massive redefinition and expansion of this format. Whereas Rossolimo’s intelligence tests and the FBI’s tracking methods were concerned with recording deviant behavior, the objective of today’s profiles is largely to underscore the particular attractiveness, competence, or social integration of the person represented. As the debate over the media behavior of the mass murderers from 2012 demonstrated, the format now represents the normal instead of the pathological. How did this shift come about? In which contexts did the coerced personal description transform into something voluntarily created?

In the middle of the 1990s, when networked and interactive computers spread beyond the confines of American military authorities and hackers to become the global form of communication known as the internet, the technological conditions for creating public spheres changed in a fundamental way. The rapid growth of the “world wide web” and of commercial browsers such as Netscape made it possible for every user to publicize his or her own persona without engaging with the mass media’s costly means of production. From the beginning, online “communication” meant not only the acceleration of exchanges between known people (i.e. the transition from letters or faxes to email) but also the ability to address previously unknown people via forums and platforms on the internet.

It was in this new and digital public sphere that the first traces of self-made profiles first appeared. For instance, the website Match.com, which today has more than thirty million registered users, began its operations as the first online-dating platform in the beginning of 1995. The earliest version of the site contained the following solicitation: “Become a member by registering and placing your profile.” In an advertisement from 1996, moreover, the company boasted: “Match.com features engaging member profiles.”²¹ In recent years, the sociologist Eva

¹⁹ Alphonse Bertillon, *La photographie judiciaire avec un appendice sur la classification et l’identification anthropométrique* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1890), 17.

²⁰ Here one could add yet a third level of meaning to concept, which concerns the grooved or “profile” bicycle tires first patented by Dunlop or Palmer in 1880. In the Sherlock Holmes story “The Adventure of the Priory School,” it is the interpretation of these peculiar treads near the crime scene that sets the detective on the right track toward finding the missing pupil. At one point in the investigation, Holmes remarks: “I am familiar with forty-two different impressions left by tyres.” Quoted from Arthur Conan Doyle, “The Adventure of the Priory School,” in *The Return of Sherlock Holmes* (New York: A. Wessels, 1907), 119–58, at 136.

²¹ For a screenshot of Match.com’s homepage from 1995, see Mia De Graaf, “‘I Was Trying to Find the Right Person to Marry’: Match.com Co-Founder Reveals the Inspiration of Online Dating Site as It Goes Public,” *The Daily Mail* (November 19, 2015), <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3324447/I-trying-right-person-marry-Match-com-founder-reveals-inspiration-online-dating-site-goes-public.html> (accessed September 5, 2017). The quotation of the 1996 advertisement was taken from a web page that is no longer active: kremen.com/wp-

Illouz has written extensively on the operating principles of online dating on Match.com and similar sites and has also focused on the profile as a format of self-representation. When registering, users have to answer dozens of questions about their physical appearance, interests, lifestyle, and values in order to provide other members with sufficient information about themselves and to furnish Match.com's psychologists with a sufficient amount of standardizable material. The hope of finding a "match" among the multitude of potential partners is synonymous with compatibility of two profiles. In her studies, Illouz is primarily interested in the ambivalence of the platforms between intimacy and marketability, between the exposure and commodification of individuals.²² Regarding the genealogy of the profile concept, Illouz's research, which extends back to the turn of the millennium, is significant if only because it demonstrates how early on this format had established itself as the central form of representing the self in online dating. Only a few years before, the profile was still exclusively known as an instrument for monitoring delinquent subjects, yet in the world of online dating it quickly revealed its greater productive potential as a venue for self-description.

Two years after Match.com's IPO in January of 1997, a lawyer named Andrew Weinreich introduced his idea for a website called SixDegrees.com. The goal of this site was not to bring together possible romantic partners but rather to build up a network of friends and acquaintances. Weinreich's presentation is preserved in a grainy YouTube video that, as of the spring of 2017, had attracted a mere thirty-one views. Such neglect is rather astounding because it is safe to say that this speech represents social media's moment of birth (at least as the term is understood today). Active from 1997 to 2001, SixDegrees was an online network that grew to 3.5 million users and 150 employees but, because of the slow and immobile internet connections of the late 1990s and the limitation of available data to texts, failed to generate lasting attention. This was quite unlike Friendster and Facebook – founded in 2002 and 2003, respectively – whose users had increasing access to broadband internet and digital cameras and which thus mark the first chapter of social media's global success story.

Weinreich began his speech with the following remarks: "Networking today is the same as it was ten years ago, as it was fifty years ago, as it was a hundred years ago. Today we hope to change that. Today we hope to make history and change how networking works."²³ This confident announcement is followed by a presentation of the SixDegrees website, which did in fact contain all of the basic elements of the subsequent, epoch-shaping social media platforms. At its heart was the profile of its users. Even though we now tend to associate this format with the billions of self-descriptions on Facebook, LinkedIn, or Instagram, it is certainly possible to identify a sort of prototype in the idea behind SixDegrees.²⁴ This prototype is described in minute detail in a patent with the title "Method and Apparatus for Constructing a Networking

content/uploads/files/019_WEBSIGHT_0996_MATCH_AD.PDF. For a report about using the site, see Leslie Crawford, "Geek Love," *San Francisco Focus* (October 1996), 20: "You simply post your profile on-line and wait for the on-line love letters."

²² See Eva Illouz, *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2007), 74–114; and eadem, *Why Love Hurts: A Sociological Explanation* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2012), 198–237.

²³ See [youtube.com/watch?v=MzE2cOqUFWM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MzE2cOqUFWM), at the 2:20 mark (accessed September 7, 2017).

²⁴ Older online communities such as WELL ("Whole Earth 'Lectronic Link"), which was founded in California in 1985, did not make use of the profile format. Members dialed in with a user name and password and could comb through various thematically arranged sites and post comments. See Howard Rheingold, *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), 1–24; and Fred Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 141–74.

Database and System,” which Weinreich and his collaborators submitted on the day that the SixDegrees website went live. The importance of the category of the profile to this system is apparent in the fact that the patented computer program required new users to register by “providing certain requested information.” Without such information, the network would not be able to function; new “friends” could not be added, and it would be impossible to search for people with certain characteristics. In a section of the patent titled “Editing Personal Profile,” it is stressed once more that, having registered, “the user may list various personal and professional information including e-mail address(es), last name, first name, aliases, occupation, geography, hobbies, skills or expertise, and the like.” The abundance of information about each user went hand in hand with SixDegrees’s stated business model, which was to offer “an e-mail service wherein a user is assigned an e-mail address in exchange for a profile describing themselves and their tastes.” The plan was for every user of SixDegrees to receive individually tailored advertisements on his or her personal page.²⁵

In this proto-program of social media from 1997, the profile was thus something from which the business hoped to turn a profit. The service could only be offered for free because its users would indirectly pay for it with a self-made biographical sketch that would provide potential advertisers with previously unknown information about their lives. From the beginning, then, profiles have had two sides in the history of social media: For members, they have provided a free and flexible format of self-representation, while for businesses they have served as a lucrative reservoir containing a wealth of information about real people – real consumers. Exactly how high the economic expectations were for this reservoir became clear when, in 1999, Weinreich and his business partners expressed that the patent would be put up for sale by the new owners of the Sixdegrees website. The auction, which took place in 2003, prompted a bidding war for the program among social media pioneers and entrepreneurs in related businesses. Having won the auction for a price of \$700,000, Reid Hoffmann, the co-owner of a recently founded network called LinkedIn, referred to his purchase as a “seminal social-networking patent” that could provide economic and technological guidelines for the development of his own enterprise.²⁶

It is worth dwelling on the fact that Weinreich had given his platform, which he thought would revolutionize the possibilities of social networking and could possibly contain “hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of individuals,”²⁷ the name “SixDegrees.” In 1997, this term had a familiar ring to it because it featured in a social-networking thought experiment that had recently gained popularity through the traditional media of theater and film. In 1990, a play titled *Six Degrees of Separation* debuted in a small theater on Broadway. The piece went on to become a big success in the United States and was made into an acclaimed movie in 1993. With the title of his website, Weinreich was thus referring to the popular hypothesis at the time that, through friends of friends, any two people could be linked in six steps or fewer.²⁸ In John Guare’s play and in the film, this experiment is carried out through the example of two married couples in

²⁵ Andrew Weinreich, “Method and Apparatus for Constructing a Networking Database and System,” United States Patent No. US6175831 (1997). The patent can be read online at <http://www.google.com/patents/US6175831> (accessed September 6, 2017).

²⁶ See Teresa Riordan, “Idea for Online Networking Brings Two Entrepreneurs Together,” *New York Times* (December 1, 2003), <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/01/technology/technology-media-patents-idea-for-online-networking-brings-two-entrepreneurs.html> (accessed September 7, 2017). Reid Hoffmann, who is still the president of LinkedIn, has remained the owner of this patent ever since.

²⁷ Weinreich, “Method and Apparatus for Constructing a Networking Database and System,” n.p.

²⁸ The idea first appeared in a short story titled “Chain-Links” by the Hungarian author Frigyes Karinthy.

New York, both of whom fall victim to a con-artist claiming to be Sydney Poitier's son and a close friend of their children at Harvard. The rest of the plot follows the couples as they attempt to figure out the identity of the unknown man and his mysterious relation with their sons and daughters, who claim never to have heard of him before. From today's perspective, the work mostly seems like a case study of how to generate knowledge under pre-digital conditions, for all of the questions that search engines and social media can now resolve with a few clicks – Does Sydney Poitier have a son? Who is part of our children's circle of friends? – have to be answered by the swindled families through protracted consultations with traditional media: by means of an autobiography of Poitier bought at a used bookstore, student yearbooks at Harvard, and ultimately the *New York Times*, in which a journalist known to one of the couples writes an article about the con-artist's methods.

Weinreich was thus quite precise in choosing the name "SixDegrees" for the first online network of friends. After all, the contingency and frustrating evasiveness of social relations that gave the play its title could now, thanks to new communication technology, be restrained and used productively to at least the second degree. The format for organizing this confounding web of relations was the profile: a simple personal description that quickly and conveniently made every member identifiable to his or her circle of acquaintances. In the age of social media, the notion of the profile implicitly suggests that a con-man pretending to be Sydney Poitier's son would be found out in a matter of seconds. Even in this era of affirmative self-description, that is, the profile can still be useful to the police. The six degrees of separation between any two people, which on the eve of the digitalization of social relations could still drive the plot of a dark tale of deception, are now becoming transparent and traceable.

Profiles and the Culture of Job Applications

Although the self-made profile first appeared during the second half of the 1990s on social networks and online dating sites, the format soon emerged in a context that was not truly related to the new medium of the internet. In the genre of job-application manuals, which have been flourishing on the book market in conjunction with the gradual standardization "job-application culture," the concept quickly gained enormous popularity. In Germany, the books by Christian Püttjer and Uwe Schnierda have occupied a dominant position in such literature for the past twenty-five years. By now, the duo has produced more than sixty guidebooks of this sort, with titles such as *Confidence in Interviews*, *Success in the Assessment Center*, or *The Definitive Job-Application Handbook* (their magnum opus).²⁹

These books and brochures began to attribute an important role to the concept of the profile by the end of the 1990s. In their 1999 handbook *Applications and Resumes for College Graduates*, for instance, the authors stressed that "lacking a profile" was the most detrimental factor for applicants, and in a section called "The Rules of Persuasion" they advised job-seekers especially to "create an individual profile."³⁰ In these early publications, however, the concept did not yet serve as the keyword and foundation of their entire approach to applying for jobs. This changed around the turn of the millennium, when Püttjer and Schnierda trademarked their

²⁹ These works have not been translated into English. Their original German titles are, respectively, *Souverän im Vorstellungsgespräch*, *Erfolgreich im Assessment-Center*, and *Das große Bewerbungshandbuch*.

³⁰ Christian Püttjer and Uwe Schnierda, *Anschreiben und Lebensläufe für Hochschulabsolventen* (Felde am Westensee: Sit-Up Verlag, 1999).