

How does the consolidation of algorithmic surveillance and data extraction by Big Tech platforms reconfigure the balance of power between corporate entities and democratic governance, and what are the long-term implications for individual agency and systemic accountability?

July 26, 2026 | SnugLab Research

Executive Summary

The consolidation of algorithmic surveillance and data extraction by Big Tech platforms fundamentally reconfigures the balance of power, establishing a quasi-sovereign private governance layer that increasingly supersedes democratic authority. This shift diminishes individual agency by algorithmically steering choices within curated environments and insulates systemic accountability due to the proprietary and opaque nature of these digital infrastructures. While regulatory efforts attempt to foster adaptive co-production, the structural dependency of democratic institutions on Big Tech's proprietary systems means that private terms increasingly dictate public life, eroding deliberative foundations and public trust.

Key Findings

Big Tech Establishes a Quasi-Sovereign Private Governance Layer

Big Tech firms have emerged as "data sovereigns" and "digital empires" that operate with significant independence from traditional political authority, primarily through their control over data and monopolization of technology [1]. These entities function as "private governors" that legislate through code, adjudicate through algorithms, and enforce rules via their technological infrastructure, embedding private norms that transcend territorial legal authority [5, 11]. This structural dependency means governments increasingly rely on Big Tech for state and societal management, which erodes public governance power [1]. The phenomenon of "surveillance federalism" further illustrates this, as centralized digital architectures lead to sub-national governments losing sovereignty to technologically mediated controls, redefining citizens as data subjects rather than political participants [10]. The opacity of these proprietary systems, often protected by trade

secret laws, limits legal oversight and prevents democratic institutions from auditing or understanding the algorithms that govern them [9, 11].

Conversely, democratic institutions are engaged in adaptive co-production through regulatory frameworks like the EU's Digital Markets Act (DMA) and Digital Services Act (DSA), which mandate data sharing and constrain platform power [9, 11]. These regulations have demonstrated efficacy in compelling tech firms to undertake structural redesigns rather than merely superficial adjustments, indicating that the "Brussels Effect" can lead to substantive compliance outcomes [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. Platforms can also act as political actors, enforcing democratic standards by suspending figures or removing disinformation [5]. Algorithmic data extraction can enhance democratic responsiveness through real-time policy calibration and targeted public service delivery [1, 3]. However, despite these adaptive efforts, the fundamental structural dependency on proprietary and opaque data infrastructure means democratic institutions remain largely subject to private terms. The ability of Big Tech to influence up to 20% of undecided voters by shifting search results and news feeds underscores how this quasi-sovereign layer can supersede traditional democratic authority [3, 5].

Algorithmic Curation Diminishes Individual Agency

Individual agency, defined as the constrained capacity for autonomous choice within data-curated environments, is systematically eroded by Big Tech's algorithmic consolidation. Platforms "herd" billions of users into artificially curated spaces where information exposure is steered by algorithmic interpretation rather than user intent [5]. These systems are designed to "pre-empt agency, spontaneity, and risk" by using granular behavioral data to orchestrate human situations and foreclose alternative actions [5]. This continuous direction of user interactions toward greater engagement and less friction diminishes the ability to make truly autonomous decisions [12]. The creation of detailed "data doubles" further limits agency by enabling social sorting, manipulation, and discrimination [12]. An idle Android phone, for example, transmits approximately 900 data points to Google in 24 hours, illustrating the pervasive nature of data extraction [5].

Transparency Mandates Fail to Ensure Systemic Accountability

Current transparency mandates largely create an appearance of oversight while leaving core algorithmic governance insulated from democratic review. Systemic accountability, framed as the ability to trace algorithmic decisions to democratic review, is fundamentally

challenged by the proprietary and opaque nature of algorithms, which are shielded by expanded trade secret laws and intellectual property rights [9, 11]. The technical complexity of machine learning models makes them difficult for even experts to audit, limiting the technical insight needed for meaningful public or regulatory review [9].

Traditional regulatory mechanisms, such as the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), do not extend to the private sector, and recent legal decisions have empowered agencies to withhold confidential information [9]. Even newer regulatory measures, like the EU's DMA and DSA, are often reactive attempts to constrain power after it has already crystallized, primarily accommodating corporate interests rather than fundamentally reasserting democratic control [11]. While these frameworks include provisions for mandatory data sharing with trusted researchers, they do not dismantle the asymmetric information control that allows Big Tech to function as quasi-sovereign entities [5, 9]. Specific proprietary algorithms, such as Facebook's DeepFace facial recognition software, its News Feed and "Trending Topics" recommendation systems, Amazon's recruitment algorithm, and Google's search and news feed algorithms, remain shielded by trade secrets [5, 9, 11].

Algorithmic Consolidation Erodes Democratic Deliberation and Public Trust

The consolidation of algorithmic power across major digital platforms weakens the deliberative foundations and public trust essential for democratic accountability. This leads to an "epistemic crisis" characterized by a breakdown in trust and legitimacy of knowledge institutions like science, journalism, universities, and courts [3]. Platforms often substitute human oversight with algorithmic curation, as seen with Facebook's 2016 "Trending Topics" system, which boosted unvetted Macedonian fake news sites ahead of the US election, outperforming mainstream media [3]. Algorithms are optimized for engagement and outrage rather than truth, favoring "quick reactions over reflection and verification" and "rewiring how people think" to prefer "moral outrage over truth" [3]. This "information pollution" and the rise of quasi-sovereign platforms fragment deliberative foundations, replacing deliberative politics with "computational rationality" and actively undermining the discourse required for democratic accountability [3, 10].

Municipal and Regional Governments Cede Governance Functions

The concept of "surveillance federalism" is evident in numerous instances where

municipal and regional governments have ceded core governance functions to private tech vendors through proprietary surveillance or data platforms. In the United States, Port Arthur, Texas, used automatic license plate readers (ALPRs) to target traffic tickets, and Denver, Colorado, relied on Flock Safety data, leading to a wrongful accusation [13, 17]. Over 60 police departments hold ALPR contracts with Motorola Solutions [15]. In Michigan, 26% of sheriffs and police chiefs use ALPRs, and 10% use facial recognition technology [14]. The NYPD and LAPD utilize Clearview AI's database and Palantir's Gotham system [15]. Internationally, India's Aadhaar biometric identity system and Singapore's Smart Nation program illustrate how centralized digital platforms can de-democratize local institutions and prioritize efficiency over democratic accountability [10, 16]. In West Africa, the French company Civipol has developed biometric identity systems for Senegal and Côte d'Ivoire [1, 7]. These adoptions shift data sovereignty from local democratic institutions to private markets, concentrating control in corporate hands and allowing surveillance tools to proliferate without public scrutiny [4, 6, 15, 16].

Implications

The long-term implications of Big Tech's consolidated algorithmic surveillance and data extraction are profound for individual agency and systemic accountability. For individual agency, the continuous algorithmic steering and creation of "data doubles" will further diminish the capacity for autonomous choice, leading to a future where personal decisions are increasingly pre-empted and manipulated by opaque systems [5, 12]. This could result in a society where individual behavior is largely orchestrated by private entities, reducing citizens to data subjects rather than autonomous actors.

For systemic accountability, the proprietary nature of algorithms, shielded by trade secrets and technical complexity, means that core algorithmic governance will remain largely insulated from democratic review [9, 11]. This perpetuates an asymmetric power dynamic where Big Tech operates as "data sovereigns" beyond effective public oversight [1]. Without a fundamental reconstruction of legal authority to subject digital infrastructure to democratic principles, or the implementation of robust citizen oversight mechanisms, the ability to trace algorithmic decisions to democratic review will remain superficial [2, 8, 11]. This could lead to a permanent "epistemic trap" where technical might dictates legal right, further eroding public trust and the deliberative foundations necessary for a functioning democracy [3].

Limitations and Caveats

The research provides a strong qualitative understanding of the power reconfiguration but has limitations regarding specific quantitative data. The available findings do not include exact market share percentages, revenue figures for the top five digital platforms in algorithmic advertising and data brokerage, or their specific lobbying expenditures in key democratic jurisdictions. Consequently, a direct correlation between market dominance, revenue, and lobbying activities could not be established. Additionally, the research does not detail specific legislative frameworks that have established binding timelines for the mandatory audit of high-risk algorithmic systems, nor does it provide specific compliance deadlines for the top five digital platforms. While some government programs have successfully used real-time algorithmic data extraction to enhance democratic responsiveness (e.g., fraud detection, economic analysis, public safety) [18, 19, 20, 21, 22], these instances represent specific applications rather than a systemic rebalancing of power against Big Tech's broader influence.

Sources

- [1] [peer-reviewed] Data, Big Tech, and the New Concept of Sovereignty - Authors: Hongfei Gu - Journal: Journal of Chinese Political Science - <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10155150/>
- [2] [edu] journals.uchicago.edu - <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/729938>
- [3] [edu] Power Truth How Big Tech Rewriting Reality And Weakening Dem - casi.stanford.edu - <https://casi.stanford.edu/news/power-truth-how-big-tech-rewriting-reality-and-weakening-democracy>
- [4] [edu] ProvostEuchnerInterview - people.stern.nyu.edu - <https://people.stern.nyu.edu/fprovost/Papers/ProvostEuchnerInterview.pdf>
- [5] [peer-reviewed] Algorithmic Governance and the International Politics of Big Tech - Authors: Swati Srivastava - Journal: Perspectives on Politics - <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/algorithmic-governance-and-the-international-politics-of-big-tech/3C04908735A5F2EE8A70AFED647741FB>
- [6] [peer-reviewed] Stable - jstor.org - AUTHORS UNAVAILABLE - <https://www.jstor.org/stable/jj.18323772.6?seq=1>
- [7] Towards Data Justice In Information Ecosystems Chapter 8 - observatory.informationdemocracy.org - <https://observatory.informationdemocracy.org/report/towards-data-justice-in-information-ecosystems-chapter-8/>
- [8] AYTBTAv7 - philarchive.org - <https://philarchive.org/archive/AYTBTAv7>
- [9] Data And Democracy An Introduction - knightcolumbia.org - <https://knightcolumbia.org/content/data-and-democracy-an-introduction>
- [10] [peer-reviewed] Algorithmic governance and surveillance federalism: transforming the digital state in India and ASEAN - Authors: Ganaie, Nasir Ahmad Ahmad; Mir, Tavseef Ahmad; Jaysingh, Monalisa Das; Rath, Durga Madhab - Journal: Frontiers in Political Science - <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2026.1757636/full>
- [11] ViewFile - journals.ezenwaohaetorc.org - <https://www.journals.ezenwaohaetorc.org/index.php/NAUJCPL/article/viewFile/3620/3744>
- [12] Algorithmic Governance - policyreview.info - <https://policyreview.info/concepts/algorithmic-governance>

- [13] [edu] Smart Cities Cannot Be Surveillance Cities - bridgingbarriers.utexas.edu - <https://bridgingbarriers.utexas.edu/news/smart-cities-cannot-be-surveillance-cities>
- [14] [edu] Mpps Michigan Local Leaders Report Increases Police Surveill - closup.umich.edu - <https://closup.umich.edu/michigan-public-policy-survey/131/mpps-michigan-local-leaders-report-increases-police-surveillance-technology-AI-uncertainty>
- [15] The Private Companies Quietly Building A Police State - campaignzero.org - <https://campaignzero.org/the-private-companies-quietly-building-a-police-state/>
- [16] [peer-reviewed] Pdf - frontiersin.org - AUTHORS UNAVAILABLE - <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2026.1757636/pdf>
- [17] Ai Surveillance Flock Contracts - futurism.com - <https://futurism.com/artificial-intelligence/ai-surveillance-flock-contracts>
- [18] [edu] Using Ai And Machine Learning To Reduce Government Fraud - brookings.edu - <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/using-ai-and-machine-learning-to-reduce-government-fraud/>
- [19] 568 Data And Evidence Policy Trends 10 Government Transforma - datafoundation.org - <https://datafoundation.org/news/blogs/568/568-Data-and-Evidence-Policy-Trends-10-Government-Transformations-for->
- [20] Ai Ready Open Data - bipartisanpolicy.org - <https://bipartisanpolicy.org/explainer/ai-ready-open-data/>
- [21] [blog] Governments Feedback Loops Need A - fermonge.substack.com - <https://fermonge.substack.com/p/governments-feedback-loops-need-a>
- [22] [gov] Html - ecb.europa.eu - https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2024/html/ecb.sp240704_1~e348c05894.en.html
- [23] [edu] Technology Firms and the Limits on Regulatory Arbitrage - <https://clsbluesky.law.columbia.edu/2019/07/08/technology-firms-and-the-limits-on-regulatory-arbitrage/>
- [24] [edu] Managing Regulatory Arbitrage: An Alternative to Harmonization - <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2378&context=facpub>
- [25] The Hidden Cost of AI Regulations: A Survey of EU, UK, and U.S. Companies - <https://actonline.org/the-hidden-cost-of-ai-regulations-a-survey-of-eu-uk-and-u-s-companies/>
- [26] Costs to U.S. Companies From EU Digital Regulation - https://ccianet.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CCIA_EU-Digital-Regulation-Factsheet_reportfinal.pdf
- [27] Platform lobbying: Policy influence strategies and the EU's - <https://ideas.repec.org/a/zbw/iprjir/300743.html>
- [28] [peer-reviewed] Digital communication strategies of lobbies in the European Union - Authors: Smolak Lozano, Emilia - Journal: Frontiers in Political Science - <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2025.1543123/full>