

PROBLEMS OF SURVEILLANCE IN THE REALM OF
21st CENTURY'S INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

SERGENÇ İNELER

AUGUST 2018

PROBLEMS OF SURVEILLANCE IN THE REALM OF
21st CENTURY'S INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

SERGENÇ İNELER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

AUGUST 2018

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name : SERGENÇ İNELER

Signature :

ABSTRACT

PROBLEMS OF SURVEILLANCE IN THE REALM OF 21st CENTURY'S INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

İNELER, Serenç

M.A., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. TURAN

Co-Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Oktar

August 2018, 76 pages

Jeremy Bentham's panoptic prison design and its underlying implications, with Michel Foucault's interpretation, turned into a new concept that refers to controlling power. Now, the panopticon is used as a synonym of surveillance. The analogy of the panopticon is often used to imply the problems of surveillance and its ethical implications in social media. This thesis aims to research how the panoptic prison has changed and transformed 21st century information technologies by analyzing people's behaviors and attitudes in social media channels and argues that computer ethics is an important subject matter to understand the unforeseen impact of Information Technologies on individuals and society.

Key Words: Panopticon, Bentham, Information Technologies, 21th Century, Ethics

ÖZ

21. YÜZYIL BİLGİ TEKNOLOJİLERİ ALANINDA GÖZETLEME PROBLEMLERİ

İNELER, Sergenç

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Felsefe Ana Bilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Sibel Oktar

Ağustos 2018, 76 sayfa

Jeremy Bentham'ın panoptik hapisane tasarımı ve onun altını çizdiği uygulamaları, Michel Foucault'nun açıklamaları ile, kontrol eden güç adında yeni bir referansa dönüşmüştür. Şimdilerde, Panoptikon gözetlemenin bir eşanlamlısı olarak kullanılmaktadır. Panoptikon anolojisi sıklıkla gözetimdeki ve sosyal medyanın etik uygulamalarındaki problemleri ifade etmek için kullanılır. Bu tez, insanların sosyal medya kanallarındaki davranışlarını analiz ederek panoptik hapishanenin 21. Yüzyıl bilgi teknolojilerinde nasıl değiştiğini ve dönüştüğünü araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Panoptikon, Bentham, Bilişim Teknolojileri, 21. Yüzyıl, Etik

To my precious wife and family...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to his supervisor Prof. Dr. Şeref Halil Turan and co-supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Oktar for their guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research. The author also expresses his deepest gratitude to one of his best friend Özge Şenyurt who has given great encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
THE BASIS OF BENTHAM’S ETHICS	3
2.1 THE CONCEPT OF UTILITY	3
2.2 THE PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY AS INDICATION AND FUNCTION	5
2.3 THE BASIS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY.....	8
BENTHAM’S PANOPTICON AND FOUCAULT’S CONCEPT OF POWER IN MORALITY.....	12
3.1 THE CONCEPT OF “PANOPTICON”	12
3.2 PANOPTICON AS CONTROLLING OTHERS	17
3.3 THE DISCIPLINARY POWER	19
3.4 DISCIPLINARY OPERATIONS	21
“SURVEILLANCE” AND BENTHAM’S PANOPTICON IN TERMS OF INFORMATION SOCIETY	25
4.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF SURVEILLANCE	25
4.2 HISTORY OF SURVEILLANCE	27
4.3 THE GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE IN MODERN SOCIETIES	30
4.4 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND NEW SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES	35
4.5 FROM PANOPTICON TO TELESCREEN	42
4.6 SURVEILLANCE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES	44
4.7 COMPUTER ETHICS IN TERMS OF PRIVACY AND SURVEILLANCE.....	46
4.8 THE AGE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES	48
4.9 IS BENTHAM’S PANOPTICON A PUNISHMENT?	51
4.10 BENTHAM’S PANOPTICON IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES	54

CONCLUSION	56
REFERENCES.....	65
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A:TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	73
APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	76

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Jeremy Bentham's panoptic prison design and its underlying implications, with Michel Foucault's interpretation, turned into a new concept that refers to controlling power. Now, the panopticon is used as a synonym of surveillance. The analogy of the panopticon is often used to imply the problems of surveillance and its ethical implications in social media. This thesis aims to research how the panoptic prison has changed and transformed 21st century information technologies by analyzing people's behaviors in social media channels and argues that computer ethics is an important subject matter to understand the unforeseen impact of Information Technologies on individuals and society.

In the 21st Century, information technologies have become a crucial and inevitable part of daily life because it makes any information accessible to anyone. Information technologies are connecting information and people. This accessibility and connection brings its own ethical issues and emphasizes the importance of computer ethics.

Nowadays, people are willingly sharing information about their daily life in social media. How can we be sure that this information is not stored and processed by others who sit in the tower of Bentham's panopticon prison? Bentham's 'Panopticon' and Foucault's 'Surveillance' are valid concepts of modern life. While people are storing and sharing the data, the panopticon watches and tracks details of this interaction.

This thesis discusses the panopticon and surveillance in terms of the modern world order from the perspective of utilitarianism. It also includes global examples such as Facebook to understand people's awareness of the "New Way of Prison" in the 21st century.

In that respect, this thesis mainly argues how the concept of the panopticon and surveillance are determined in the modern information technology society.

This thesis is divided into 6 main chapters; the first chapter is an introduction which discusses main arguments of the topic. The second chapter sets out the basis of Bentham's ethics. The thesis starts with Bentham's classical utilitarianism to pave the way to define how surveillance starts to be part of ethics in modern society. The third chapter discusses Bentham's panoptic prison design and its implications and Foucault's concept of power and prison in terms of controlling power. The main argument of this chapter is by defining Bentham's panopticon, it makes the relation with Foucault's disciplinary power. The fourth chapter is about surveillance in information technologies which connects the previous chapters with computer ethics. In other words; this chapter shows how Bentham's panopticon and Foucault's disciplinary power have transformed to an "Electronic Panopticon" in the modern world. The last chapter is the conclusion of the thesis which gives the general summary of what has been discussed in previous chapters with a conclusion statement.

CHAPTER 2

THE BASIS OF BENTHAM'S ETHICS

It is necessary to understand Jeremy Bentham's notion of ethics to grasp his idea of the panopticon. Thus, in this chapter Bentham's ethical theory, classical utilitarianism is discussed.

2.1 The Concept of Utility

The utilitarian sense of morality, derived from the Latin word *utilitas* meaning beneficial, is grounded on a hedonist understanding to the degree that it prescribes the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people. According to Jeremy Bentham utility is described as:

...a man may pretend to abjure their empire: but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The principle of utility recognizes this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and of law. Systems which attempt to question it, deal in sounds instead of sense, in caprice instead of reason, in darkness instead of light. (Bentham 1948: 1-2).

The theory of utilitarian morality formulizes the principle of utility as the principle of morality with this objective and purpose: An act is regarded to be morally correct if it is compatible with the principle of utility and it contributes to the happiness of those who are first affected by the act in the first place and then to the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people. The utilitarian theory, evaluating an act by the pleasure or pain is a discipline that deals with the consequence of the act rather than its motivation (Pieper 2000: 239, Cevizci 2010: 1110-1).

In this frame, an act is regarded to be a moral one if its consequences bring maximum pleasure and minimum pain.

Due to his strong belief in science, Bentham underlines that morality should be grounded on a scientific basis and it should make reforms in the field of morality under the guidance of science. In this frame, it will be quite convenient to use Bentham's own words to comprehend the duty he imposed on himself: "What Bacon was to the physical World, Helvetius was to the moral. The moral world has therefore had its Bacon, but its Newton is yet to come" (Letwin 1954: 16).¹

Bentham's interest in science is the characteristic of 18th century. Because of the advancements in positive sciences, the successful application of scientific principles and methods in every natural aspect drew the attraction of social sciences as well (Gökberk, 1990, p. 290). The success of empiricism that used observation and experiment as a ground to reach natural laws caused powerful and new movements to emerge. The aim of this movement was to establish a philosophy that has its concrete and empirical ground. Empiricism becomes prominent as a world perspective that regards superstitions, metaphysics and religions as a drawback for the progression of human in the guidance of science (Cevizci 2008: 225). Thus, it can be said that Bentham's belief in science and progression reflects the general mindset of the time back then for it includes the demand of standing against abstract and idealist thoughts, superstitions and religious ties, along with its demand for evaluating human acts and human nature on scientific grounds (Tebbit 2000: 16-17).

He firstly adopted the claim of being scientific in every aspect of methods. The result of this project will surely be making reforms in the field of morality with a critical approach and questioning the current principles and values (Baumgardt 1952: 64). To read it backwards, a morality that is has its scientific grounds should be based on criticizing the principles and values that are determined rationally and

¹ In the *Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, Elie Halévy says that Bentham refers to Newton's explaining all the natural phenomena with his universal law of gravitation when he declares himself as the Newton of morality field. Newton's principle that gathered all the natural sciences in one law inspired Bentham to find a similar principle which will serve for the establishment of a synthetic science that can gather all the phenomena of moral world in one place.

replacing them by creating principles and values that has factual roots and can be tested with experiments and observation.

Bentham's shaping moral judgements with pleasure and pain ultimately and his conception of pleasure and pain as phenomenon's that can be discovered scientifically suggest that a moral law or a judgement can be questioned with scientific or experimental methods. Therefore, Bentham predicts that a personal measurement of happiness for every individual can be done scientifically to prove what is right and what is wrong (Warburton 2009: 53-65, Cevizci 2008: 191-2). Therefore, he arrives at the conclusion suggesting that an individual should act upon assuring "the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people". In this frame, in Bentham's theory, a right act can be calculated by examining the consequences. Under these circumstances, the act that is most likely to achieve the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people is the right one amongst the kinds of acts (Warburton 2009: 53-65, Cevizci 2010: 191-2).

2.2 The Principle of Utility as Indication and Function

Bentham aims to clean ethics off theological judgements and to secularize it. The motive for this is to make radical reforms in the aspects of ethics, law and politics. This reformist, progressive and evolutionist attitude of Bentham made himself develop a concrete and practical point of view against humanity and life. He addresses humanity by the needs, acts, nature and social interactions. "What is the very best for humanity?" and "What is that thing that supports and improves it?" are the concepts that he questions (Davidson 1915: 11-12). For Bentham, the most suitable thing for human nature is utility and utility is the only principle that acknowledges nature (Bentham 1948: 1). On the other hand, Bentham gives great importance to experience and that is why he uses the results obtained out of experiences as the basis for this thought. Using experience, it can be learnt the objective of human that is regarded as a social being. For Bentham, this objective is "happiness" (Davidso 1915: 11-16).

As it was mentioned above, it is expressed by the former philosophers that the ultimate objective of human is happiness and therefore seeks pleasure and avoids pain. What distinguishes Bentham from this ground is his answer for “why do human beings act this way?” (Copleston 2003: 13). He relates human nature and aim of humanity to designation of nature rather than the presence of God. The most important aim of humanity in nature is to get happiness as much as possible. The reason of pursuit of happiness does not lie within God, it is hidden in nature. Bentham places nature in the place where God is for the former philosophers that held utility together with theological foundations (Baumgardt 1952: 167). The main criticism of Bentham is deriving an “ought” from an “is”, i.e., from what it is to what it ought to be. He attempts to propose ethical hedonism through psychological hedonism. Human acts should be explained within the scope of two main concepts as pain and pleasure, just like the way nature can be explained with the physics laws. He states that:

Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it (Bentham 1948: 1-2).

As can be seen, Bentham puts emphasis on how determinative pain and pleasure are while putting forward a reality related to human nature and psychology. He also claims this reality to be the ultimate rule that is constantly in control. Our every attempt to get rid of our dependence on pain and pleasure shall be in vain because every result it is ended up with will prove their authority. Every attempt to demolish their supremacy will be a so-called success, while their reign lives on. (Bentham 1948: 1-2).

Bentham’s main concern is not only to reveal a reality about human psychology but also to pinpoint an objective criterion for the morality of human acts (Copleston 2003: 14). Bentham focuses on establishing a normative theory that

confirms or rejects every kind of act and tells us “what is right or wrong” as well as “what we ought to do” rather than a descriptive theory that is approaching morality and human acts by means of explaining the existing situation.

According to Francisco Vergara, Bentham gives reference to these three principles while founding utilitarian theory of ethics:

- 1.The happiness of individual is promoted if the unit of pleasure is greater than the unit of pain.
- 2.The interests of the individuals in a society constitutes the general interest of the society, if the unit of pleasure is promoted with a ratio that is greater than the unit of pain, then the collective happiness of the individual goes up as well.
- 3.The principle of utility is the only criteria to refer to when determining whether acts accomplish the assumptions above or not. (Vergara 1998)

The first two principles specifically rank among Bentham’s expressions on utility and social concepts. The third one is what Bentham uses as a basis for the definition of the utility principle and the whole theory itself under the determinatively of his placing utility as a ground of morality. Thus, for something to be compatible with an individual’s benefit, it can promote the unit of pleasure and decrease the unit of pain (Bentham 1948: 3). The acts that promote the pleasure of individuals or society and the acts that keep them away from pain will promote their happiness and will be compatible with both their benefits and the principle of utility. Happiness and pleasure are the main things to that people pursue. The principle of utility is the only thing that acknowledges this psychological phenomenon which oversees human acts. That is why the principle of utility is the criteria for right and wrong (Hart 1996: xci). It is seen that Bentham uses two main ground arguments for the transition from this kind of specification to the principle of utility. Firstly, the reality behind the statement of “People seeks pleasure” is that human endeavors to get as much pleasure as possible (Copleston 2003: 14). Secondly, if it is pain and pleasure that determine our acts, there is no room left for us to make a moral decision, and therefore, no need to hold out a moral principle as well. Bentham tries to clarify this contradiction by if human being will not perform the tasks that lead to this purpose mandatorily (Copleston 2003: 14, Hampsher-Monk 1992: 319). At this point, the acts that tend to promote total of pleasure are the right

acts while the acts that tend to decrease this unit are considered as wrong acts. Hence, it should do the right things and it shouldn't do the wrong things. Bentham defines the principle of utility as follows:

The principle of utility is the foundation of the present work: it will be proper therefore at the outset to give an explicit and determinate account of what is meant by it. By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever per the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever, and therefore, not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government. (Bentham 1948: 1-3)

Therefore, it might be also concluded as firstly it recognizes the fundamental role of pain and pleasure in human life, secondly, it approves or disapproves of an action based on the amount of pain or pleasure, thirdly it equates good with pleasure and evil with pain and lastly, it asserts that pleasure and pain are capable of quantification. A person who applies for the principle of utility prefers the acts that are compatible with the principle. He uses the utility of the act as a criterion to choose. This criterion is used as a rational ground for the convenient acts. He explains utility as follows: By the utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered: if that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community: if an individual, then the happiness of that individual (Bentham 1948: 2).

2.3 The Basis of the Principle of Utility

One of the most important characteristics of the principle of utility which acknowledges all kinds of acts regarding their ability to provide benefit or happiness to the ones whose benefits are in question and states that right and wrong doesn't make any sense unless they are evaluated in relation to utility is that it is the ultimate and supreme principle for Bentham.

Therefore, Bentham considers the principle of utility as an axiom with an obvious accuracy (Twining 2000: 25).

Although it is impossible to prove the principle of utility, Bentham believes that it can be proven with a simple experiment or an observation that every rational individual takes this principle as a reference while doing something either explicitly or implicitly without and direct evidence at hand. For him, everyone embraces this principle in several aspects of life involuntarily due to human nature. Besides, he does this not only to organize and examine his/her own acts but also for the acts of others. There are quite a few people who are not familiar or on good terms with the principle, the reason for this is either they don't know how to use it or they are so prejudiced as not to use it. The concepts like obligation, right-wrong, good-bad etc. only have a meaning if they are read together with the principle of utility. Or else, they do not mean anything if they are evaluated with a point of view that disregards the consequences of the acts (Bentham 1948: 3-4, Baumgardt, 1952, p. 175).

Bentham keeps the same point of view when describing the concept of duty. For him, duties can be separated into three groups: Political duty, moral duty and religious duty. To touch briefly, each type of duty corresponds to the enforcements that are used for the force of validity. Political duty is formed by punishment that is the product of the ones that hold the power to punish –the political authorities- and religious duty is formed by the expected punishment from a special personality –the supreme existence-. Incentive is what forms moral duty. Bentham says that moral duty cannot be considered as punishment. Bentham uses the factor of punishment as the ground while speaking of political, moral and religious duties. Defending the principle of utility in a consistent way provides an opportunity for the parties that have a moral incompatibility to bring solution. On the other hand, the principle of utility warrants an objective process, as the principle itself is a quite clear one (Bentham 1948: 3-4). Moreover, there is a radical promise of equating people in calculating pain and pleasure related to an act. The principle of utility assumes that “every individual is equal” and guarantees in the calculation of the greatest happiness that “every person is counted as an individual and nobody is superior at all” (Bentham 1948: 11, Hall 1938: 377).

To sum up, Bentham thinks that the principle of utility is a very preferable moral principle due to the phenomenon about human nature that it exhibits. For him, the only way to cope with problems is to make the principle of utility dominant over all aspects (Twining 2000: 94-95, Harris 1997: 41-42).

For him, the feelings of pleasure and pain enable us to evaluate any kind of act and to observe happiness in human psychology in an empiric way. Now that the purpose of human acts is to achieve happiness, pleasure and pain are the concrete and observable sensations to bear in mind in the last instance. Bentham emphasizes that “pain and pleasure are real entities” (Hall 1938: 377). In other words, pleasure and pain are not fictional abstract entities for their lingual equivalences can be observed in fact as well. Bentham doesn’t make a distinction between pleasures and pain. For him, it is permissive to exclude some pleasures or to deny the existence of some pains. The concept of pleasure includes the pleasure of reading a book, drawing a picture and listening to music because it includes the pleasures of eating, drinking and as such (Copleston 2003: 15). Moreover, Bentham refuses to make a qualitative distinction between pleasures and to consider some of the pleasures to be superior than others. Accordingly, all the pleasures are of the same value in terms of their quality (Russell 1952: 114, Gürbüz 2012: 50). A distinction between pleasures can only be possible in terms of their quantity. Therefore, the measuring of pleasures in terms of their quantity is what matters most. With this measure, the pleasure whose quantity outweighs will be regarded as valuable.

Principle of utility is also applicable to government. Bentham states,

A measure of government may be said to be conformable to or dictated by the principle of utility (Bentham 1948: 2). Furthermore, he also mentions that When an action, or a measure of government, is supposed by a man to be conformable to the principle of utility, it may be convenient, for the purposes of discourse, to imagine a kind of law or dictate, called a law or dictate of utility: and to speak of the action in question (Bentham 1948: 3).

In the next chapter, Bentham’s panoptic prison design and Foucault’s idea of the panopticon will be discussed in detail. However, the question of whether it would be possible for a utilitarian to justify the morality of the idea of the panopticon will

be considered in section 4.9 after investigating what is the panopticon and what are its implications. Next chapter is mainly about Foucault's interpretation about Bentham's panopticon in terms of how knowledge has become power in the system. It is much important because it will give the arguments why Bentham's humanitarian prison idea has become an authoritarian governmental understanding in 20th century.

CHAPTER 3

BENTHAM'S PANOPTICON AND FOUCAULT'S CONCEPT OF POWER IN MORALITY

In this chapter, Bentham's Panopticon and Foucault's concept of power are compared with the discussion on ethics. It is started by providing a conceptual framework of surveillance.

3.1 The Concept of "Panopticon"

Jeremy Bentham proclaimed the birth of a new era in punishment, reform and administration, with his panoptic prison design that he published in 1791 in the *Panopticon*. The prisons of his time were dreadful: All kinds of prisoners would live together in horrible living conditions.

They were held in overcrowded dirty rooms, with little or no food, regardless of men or women, healthy or sick, child or elderly, murderer or smalltime thief. (King 2001: 41). Bentham's panoptic prison design was intended to introduce a radical change in the way prisons were managed. He describes his design as:

The building is circular. The apartments of the prisoners occupy the circumference. You may call them, if you please, the cells. These cells are divided from one another, and the prisoners by that means secluded from all communication with each other, by partitions in the form of radii issuing from the circumference towards the center, and extending as many feet as shall be thought necessary to form the largest dimension of the cell (Bentham 1995, 4 [Letter II]).

To compare with King's prison design and Bentham's prison design is one is single layout cell which are inspected by the panopticon tower which eliminates

every single privacy even the prisoners' daily lives. It is worth fully quoting his detailed description:

The apartment of the inspector occupies the center, you may call it if you please the inspector's lodge. It will be convenient in most, if not in all cases, to have a vacant space or area all round, between such center and such circumference. You may call it if you please the intermediate or annular area. About the width of a cell may be sufficient for a passage from the outside of the building to the lodge. Each cell has in the outward circumference, a window, large enough, not only to light the cell, but, through the cell, to afford light enough to the correspondent part of the lodge. The inner circumference of the cell is formed by an iron grating, so light as not to screen any part of the cell from the inspector's view. Of this grating, a part sufficiently large opens, in form of a door, to admit the prisoner at his first entrance, and to give admission at any time to the inspector or any of his attendants. To cut off from each prisoner the view of every other, the partitions are carried on a few feet beyond the grating into the intermediate area: such projecting parts I call the protracted partitions. It is conceived, that the light, coming in in this manner through the cells, and so across the intermediate area, will be sufficient for the inspector's lodge. But, for this purpose, both the windows in the cells, and those corresponding to them in the lodge, should be as large as the strength of the building, and what shall be deemed a necessary attention to economy, will permit. To the windows of the lodge there are blinds, as high up as the eyes of the prisoners in their cells can, by any means they can employ, be made to reach (Bentham 1995, 4-5 [Letter II]).

According to him, this would intelligently observe the needs of society. Safe supervision is prison, seclusion, forced labor, and discipline. These factors would be sufficient to punish the incorrigible, reform the criminals, detain the culprits, work the lazy, help the needy, treat the sick, provide training to those who wish in the industrial branch of their choosing, or regulate the increasing competition on education. The idea of the panopticon was not made of evil, grudge or hatred, it was not something that would intentionally persecute. What Bentham, a true reformer who eventually became inebriated by the magnificent vision of human progress and driven by the motivation of accelerating this progress, was concerned with and looking for was "the happiness of humankind." He believed that the surveillance would eliminate the uncertainty among the individuals, thereby bringing the individual to peace and happiness (Bauman 2014: 146).

Although Bentham's novel idea was not fully adopted in the plans for penal institutions built at that time, its radial plan was immediately influential, and its design clearly had an impact on later construction. For example, the Statesville Correctional Center, a prison near Joliet, Ill., U.S., incorporates essential features of the panopticon (Britannica, 2018).

Michel Foucault brings a different perspective to Jeremy Bentham's panoptic prison design. Foucault brings further the panopticon by putting knowledge as tool of power. According to David Wood, Foucault is a founding thinker in surveillance studies, and his work on the development of the modern man, the book *The Birth of Prison*, remains an intersection for this interdisciplinary, young and immature field. In his work, Foucault presents us with Jeremy Bentham's conception of the panopticon and its interpretation. According to Wood, Foucault sees the panopticon as a key in the modern project, a spatial figure, and a key spatial design for the image of modernity in the creation of the modern person, in other words, in the views of people and society. (Wood 2003) Foucault makes a new concrete interpretation of Bentham's concept of the panopticon in terms of the imprisoned because he thinks that knowledge brings power:

The cell principle is reversed, or rather, its three functions - confinement, depriving of light and hiding - and only the first one is preserved, while the other two are removed. Being under full light and the supervision of a watcher is more capturing than the darkness that is normally sheltering. Visibility is a trap. Those inside the cell do not see who does what in the next cell. The essence of surveillance here is to be visible but unable to see. Invisibility is the safety of order. In this way, wherever is under surveillance, there will be no acting out of the rules. For example, if detainees are convicted, there will be no conspiracy, collective escape attempt, new criminal schemes, no danger of mutual sinister interactions, if those in question are lunatics, there will be no danger of resorting to mutual violence, if the children are involved, there will be no danger of copying, noise, chattering, or daydreaming. If it is the workers who are in confinement, there will be no fighting, thefts, deals or any ridicule that delay work and impair its quality, or cause accidents. Ultimately, from the guardian's point of view, this crowd has been replaced by a countable and auditable pluralism, from the detainees' point of view, it has been replaced by solitude behind closed doors and under gazes (Foucault 1995: 295).

The purpose here was to prevent evil deeds and prevent the already evil ones from communicating their evil by inhibiting their interactions. Thus, discipline became a mechanism (Akay 2016: 105).

As Foucault, has stated, the panopticon's prominence does not lie in its construction through bricks and mortar. Its influence stems from the discipline mechanism it created. The panopticon, according to him, automates power and moves it away from individualism. This power principle becomes so automatic that it will not use force to regulate the system. Moreover, the functioning of this control mechanism is not based on the person, because it does not matter who watches in the tower. Knowing that there is a watcher there keeps the system going. What maintains the system is the internalization of the viewer's gaze. At the end of this, everyone reaches the point of self-monitoring. (Koops 2015: 43)

A vital question lies in the order provided to this ridiculous cost. Michelle Perrot, in an interview with Foucault, asks this question, the question, who did Bentham place on the tower. Foucault says that:

But God does not take much of a part in his text, religion plays a role only as much as its usefulness. Who is he, then? In fact, Bentham does not know very well with whom he will entrust the power and does not trust anyone because this is what the monarchy theory comprises of (Foucault 1995: 95-97).

This understanding of trust is also important in describing governmental transparency in the following topics. The panopticon, by its application, has many duties: alongside punishing prisoners, it also serves to treat patients, educate students, shelter lunatics, surveil workers, and employ beggars and drifters. Hierarchical organization, as a practice, is a way of regulating power centers and channels, and defining the means of power and its forms of intervention. This method can be put into practice in hospitals, workshops, schools or prisons. The panopticon schematic is a concentrator for any instrument of power. It is also a form of obtaining power and a new and great management tool: "Its perfection stems from the great power it is capable of grant to every institution it is applied to." (Foucault 1995: 303-304)

Although Bentham's design was not realized, the panopticon could take its place as a powerful analogy that allowed us to better understand the spread of surveillance in the capitalist states. According Edward Campbell and Matt Carlson, the panopticon should be perceived as more than a specific architectural project, as Foucault suggests, it must be perceived as a generalization model of function: a way of defining power relations per everyday life. According to them, the panopticon in the contemporary capitalist countries is the most impeccable model of productivity. The reason for this productivity is that the panopticon creates a system that disciplines everyone's movements. The panopticon model reveals the threat of pressure and the possibility of omnipresent surveillance as much as it reveals the “self-monitoring” issue. This kind of pressure is quite prominent in prison: If the prisoner attempts an unauthorized act, the prisoner will be confronted with the action and ultimately punished. A similar method can be applied in workplaces, hospitals and schools where condemnation, rejection, or discharge can be given due to the individuals' inability to surveil their own behavior. (Campbell and Carlson 2002: 64) Based on Foucault, Campbell and Carlson point out that if the individual is told the importance of self-surveillance, the pressure mechanisms can be removed altogether, but these mechanisms will remain place so long as the threat of pressure is present in the individual's mind (Campbell and Carlson 2002: 201).

Self-surveillance is an important element of the panopticon. Thus, with internal surveillance, the surveillance system will automatically improve. People in the system state that internal surveillance is the submission to the familiar, expected conformity. The emergence point of inner surveillance starts with trying to act in line with what the power expects from us. But this is because people are aware of the possibility of being watched. According to them, if it is given the chance to escape the eye of power, people can behave differently. However, its compliance will only be in appearance. Because this appearance is a mask that we will wear so long as it is thought that it is under the surveillance. In other words, we will embrace the eye of power but we will not know its values. According to Campbell and Carlson, internal surveillance is the surveillance of the internalized and the familiar.

3.2 Panopticon as Controlling Others

Foucault, in his book *The History of Madness*, talks extensively about the great organization of lepers in the Middle Ages. And in the *Birth of Prison*, he mentions of “a plague-stricken town” (Foucault 1995: 109) about the great plague that broke out towards the end of the classical era. It was ostracized and kept under confinement and control. Measures taken against the plague, however, were more peculiar. A more individualistic and effective strategy was introduced. Through surveillance of every single neighborhood, house, and individual, the plague was brought under control. But the plague was not the sole problem. There were crowds that needed to be supervised, and their surveillance needed more creative solutions.

The significance of this architectural model lies in the following: Disciplinary power needed very powerful, rigorous, permanent and economical apparatuses (the ability to monitor larger crowds with fewer supervisors) while placing the crowds into certain institutions and molding them into the desired form. Panopticon is the model that best responds to this need. Through the intrinsic influence of being under constant watch, the body of the criminal, which is subjected to a continuous surveillance from an invisible center, urges the criminal to be the supervisor of his own behavior. The panopticon's omnipresent eyes and non-corporal body exerts a physical pressure on the criminal's body (Foucault 1995: 325-6).

The subjection of criminals to such a personalized surveillance leads to a detailed registry, records and documents that lies in their behavior. The documentation of these personal attitudes about each criminal makes it possible to classify the body of the offender, while providing the technical information to penetrate and infiltrate his body. The disciplines of criminology and criminal sociology would construct the criminal in the depths of such an archive. Foucault states that once the panopticon had begun to be implemented, it showed a tendency to spread to many affiliates from prisons to many institutional organizations. It was fitted with a lot of functions (Foucault 1995: 328-9).

The panopticon model also allowed for the most economical exercise of control in the sense that each cell could be controlled from a single unit. By keeping the record of everyone, observing their actions and creating archives spread over

time into the practices of other institutions that adapted the model to their own structure and practiced it for their own procedures. Diseases and patients can be separated in hospitals, which lead to the possibility of classification. Each type of disease is subject to classification, and patients are admitted in accordance with this and are accompanied by a mass of archival/record information. Similar instrumentations are also in force in the workshops and military units. The individual distribution of the work and the architectural structures corresponding to these individual operations were also established under the panopticon.

While the panopticon is the most functional and strategic model of supervision and surveillance at the institutional level, in the wider society the police takes its place utilizing the same model. The police become the Panopticon model that is adapted to the society. But Foucault's words about the police should be considered within the context of the conditions of the classical period. In this period, the function laid on the police is quite comprehensive. It operates under a function that surveils and supervises all aspects of life. The police operate within both the individual and the social contexts, keeping the entire society under record through a large archive and biographical documentation. The panopticon sees all cells now present within every part of society to surveil and oversee it in its entirety. The police “had to be like a faceless gaze that transformed the whole social body into a field of perception: thousands of eyes posted everywhere, mobile attentions ever on the alert, a long, hierarchized network.” (Foucault 1995: 214) The network of this modern technology, is “...in appearance is merely the solution of a technical problem, but, through it, a whole type of society emerges” (Foucault 1995: 214).

Although Foucault's analysis of the prison system in general and the panopticon practices in particular are quite meticulous and consistent, as Mark Poster noted, Foucault “does not question how prisoners react to the disciplinary classifications of the panopticon system,” and regarding the parts of the *Birth of Prison* where Foucault talks about the failure of the prison system, Poster justifiably states that “When the prisoners' reaction to the prison system remains unexplained, the failure of the system sits in the text like an unwelcome guest.” (Poster 2008: 150)

3.3 The Disciplinary Power

For Foucault, disciplinary power has two distinctions, or rather two forms of power that converge and coalesce with one another and are of fundamental importance. These are the disciplinary-normalization power and bio-power. Before going into the details of the mentioned forms of power, another subject that holds fundamental importance in Foucault's power analyses need to be addressed.

Foucault suggests that a power modes functionality or power relations lie at the level of strategies and tactics. Power does not manifest itself in the form of ensuring obedience through coercion or violence. It operates through strategies and tactics. Throughout history, power has emerged in different modes. Transformations powers structures undergo specifically occur in strategic context. Foucault offers a radical approach towards the mechanism of power. According to him, what matters is the strategic and tactical changes corresponding to every arrangement (Foucault 1995: 27).

In the *Birth of the Prison*, Foucault reveals in a very detailed and striking analysis the disciplinary-normalization power, which is one of two fundamental modes of power for the analysis of the microphysics of power.

The 17th and 18th centuries (called the classical period) witnessed several inventions and occurrences in the exercise of power. The human body becomes a target of knowledge with a different context and a different understanding. Foucault calls it “The political technology of the body” (Foucault 1995: 27). There may be a 'knowledge' of the body that is not exactly the science of its functioning, and a mastery of its forces that is more than the ability to conquer them (Foucault 1995: 27). In the previous centuries, the strategy of power over body changed. As Bauman puts it:

... the bankruptcy, or at least the increasingly apparent inadequacy, of the extant (and thus far untheorized) means of social control, that this feeling of inadequacy of control, of social order under threat, arose among the powerful and the wealthy of the time out of the new experience of the presence of 'master less people' - a shifting, homeless, vagabond population, the rabble, riff-raff, mobile vulgus, les classes dangerousness (Bauman 1987: 74).

As a reaction to this crisis, the power mechanisms begin to evolve towards a new strategy. The body is now the object of a symbolic anatomy.

The power invests, penetrates, and manages the body through this knowledge. And “this political investment of the body” says Foucault,

... is bound up, in accordance with complex reciprocal relations, with its economic use, it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination, but, on the other hand, its constitution as labor power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection (Foucault 1995: 25-26).

Foucault underlies that, based on the axis of productivity-obedience, the basic goal of this new strategy of power is exceeding the body. According to him; “Beneficial body” is a productive body, and it can only be achieved through obedience. At this point, discipline gains significance. This dual process that is imposed on the body works simultaneously. On the one hand, the body is made obedient, on the other hand, it is made useful. Discipline constitutes power in the body by the obedience and virtue. The nature of this constitution process constitutes the most crucial part of Foucault's analysis. Therefore, it needs to be emphasized further. Foucault argues that in the 17th and 18th centuries, the body came to be the target and object of power in a different fashion than in the past. So much so that the disciplines in this period have become general formulas of domination. It is not a domination in the form of ownership of the body, the point is to be able to shape the body and guide its actions. Steven Best and Douglas Kellner state the following:

Disciplinary techniques include timetables for constant imposition and regulation of activity, surveillance measures to monitor performance, examinations such as written reports and files to reward conformity and penalize resistance, and ‘normalizing judgment’ to impose and enforce moral values such as the work ethics (Best and Kellner 1991: 50).

Foucault begins his analysis with the non-productive, marginal segments of society, the lunatics, deviants, criminals, and elements that are generally regarded as abnormal. He mentions that the methods practiced over these segments of society by the ruling powers of the past and the changes of strategy that took place in the

classical period. In the *Birth of the Prison*, Foucault analyzes how the public punishment rituals practiced on the criminals were replaced by new techniques that are practiced in seclusion and do not only involve punishment. Then the object of analysis becomes the whole societal body. In parallel, a knowledge of the body, a 'technical-political record' emerges. Oppression, ostracism and subjugation are replaced by this knowledge of the body and new strategies consisting of increasing the body's capabilities, making it adaptable and conditioning it on the level of obedience. Discipline represents the main apparatus of this program. In the *Birth of the Prison*, Foucault writes,

The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, nor at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful. The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it. A 'political anatomy', which was also a 'mechanics of power', was being born (Foucault 1995: 138).

Based on this political anatomy, discipline rebuilds the bodies for what is expected of them. The places where disciplinary power primarily operates are schools, hospitals, military organizations, workshops and factories. In this context, it is useful to elaborate on the political anatomy (anatomy-politics), which represents the new and the main dynamic, which essentially functions as a science of the body and constitutes the main axis of Foucault's disciplinary analysis.

3.4 Disciplinary Operations

Disciplinary operations are also seen in any institutions. Foucault defines discipline as follows:

'Discipline' may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus, it is a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets, it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology (Foucault 1995: 215).

The disciplinary power, rooted in certain institutions and spreading over the whole social body over time, initially sets off to “the distribution of action in the space.” (Foucault 1995: 224). Schools, hospitals, asylums, military organizations and factories are the first spatial models of this process. In these spaces, individuals are both separated for training, service or production operations towards a certain end, and harmonized into a coherent process. First, the spatial structure is designed for an ‘enclosure’ process. This partly corresponds to a practice of isolation. This is a process that is structured both externally and internally, it is about distinguishing statuses and ranks. Individuals, isolated from the society, are subject to a cellular architecture and functional placement. This is a classification practice based on capabilities, characters and levels.

The discipline put into practice in each of the above-mentioned institutions existed in the past as well. However, the process that the classical period had put into practice came with many innovations. Both the monastic educational system and the disciplinary practices in the military have always been present. However, the process put into practice in the classical era is based on more sophisticated, elaborate strategies that serve different purposes on a functional basis. Foucault states that:

The first of the great operations of discipline is, therefore, the constitution of *'tableaux vivants'* which transform the confused, useless or dangerous multitudes into ordered multiplicities. The drawing up of 'tables' was one of the great problems of the scientific, political and economic technology of the eighteenth century: how one was to arrange botanical and zoological gardens, and construct at the same time rational classifications of living beings, how one was to observe, supervise, regularize the circulation of commodities and money and thus build up an economic table that might serve as the principle of the increase of wealth, how one was to inspect men, observe their presence and absence and constitute a general and permanent register of the armed forces, how one was to distribute patients, separate them from one another, divide up the hospital space and make a systematic classification of diseases: these were all twin operations in which the two elements - distribution and analysis, supervision and intelligibility - are inextricably bound up. It was a question of organizing the multiple, of providing oneself with an instrument to cover it and to master it, it was a question of imposing upon it an order (Foucault 1995: 148).

It is seen that these 'surveillance houses', which surveils the multitude of mankind, receives little praise in scientific history, are gradually established throughout the classical era. Foucault notes that surveillance becomes a decisive economic factor as much as it is a specialized disciplinary power.

Beginning from the 17th century, the surveillance of bodies through discipline started to be practiced in the barracks, hospitals, schools and prisons. Foucault links the success of disciplinary power to the use of simple instruments, hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment and their combination in a procedure that is specific to the examination (Foucault 1995: 170).

Along with scattered workshops come along large manufactural areas that are both homogeneous and have definitive borders: these manufactures later became factories in the second half of the 18th century, this is a shift of scale, as well as a new form of control. The factory is clearly likened to a monastery, a castle, an enclosed city.

Foucault's analysis on discipline is, in a sense, about the rationalization process. But Foucault does not much dwell on this concept, instead he refers to various rationalities rather than a single holistic rationality. However, although he does put it this way, his analysis is regarded because of the spread of the 17th and 18th century rationalization in all spheres. The disciplinary power into society through certain institutions and structures is achieved via a series of processes. Both abstract and material process are applied on the body. The mobilized apparatuses are abstract yet functional in the manner of certain forms of information. Furthermore, an institutional or an architectural form can be found in segmental or/and cellular deployments as disciplinary power. This is the essence of the notion: At a certain point in history arose the need to "accommodate the human accumulation to capital accumulation" (Revel 2006: 130). For this, discipline comes into play. Discipline does not function as laws and rules. The body must be invested at multiple fronts. An action applied upon actions is only possible by structuring all the conditions of its entire field. It requires some external as well as internal apparatuses. The body needs to be made obedient and beneficial, and this is possible by a putting a set of elements, including institutions, architectural forms, forms of knowledge, and new

truth constructions, into play in a simultaneous or coordinated manner. This carries a mechanism into effect. Each element pushes each other into perfection just as they support and complete each other. Bodies, and thus individuals are rebuilt. A norm has emerged and bodies are being improved, reformed and managed around this norm. In other words, they are being normalized. Disciplinary power is a 'normalization power'. Foucault's theory of normalization depends on power and knowledge. Disciplinary techniques of observation, which create a sense of power, are transformed into supervision and norms. On the other hand, it must be a standard of norms to identify deviances from them, which can approve to identifying any abnormalities. This can then lead to the idea that 'norm' is more valued than what is not the 'norm'. Surveillance is a great power to normalize others.

Despite its meticulous tailoring, Foucault's analysis of disciplinary power includes a considerable neglect. The answer to the question what the basis of power such a major transformation is, such refined techniques and the coordinated the power that can function will inevitably be 'the state'. The conservatism that Foucault showed in avoiding establishing a center for the power (especially when this center is the state) led to the exclusion of many perspectives.

There are some structures and inventions that made possible the functions of Foucault's disciplinary power. Foucault puts an emphasis on the panopticon as the main apparatus of power. Disciplinary power is based on supervision and supervision requires surveillance. The classical period² needed the most impeccable surveillance and found this in the panopticon.

² Classical Period is defined as 1750s-1890s

CHAPTER 4

“SURVEILLANCE” AND BENTHAM’S PANOPTICON IN TERMS OF INFORMATION SOCIETY

In this chapter, the information technologies and the information society are explained. Besides that, conceptual framework of surveillance and history of surveillance are also discussed to underlie their effect on information society. Therefore, the concept of surveillance is covered by Bentham’s Panopticon in the modern society. The modern society can be described as an information society. Information exists everywhere, every time. By the help of information delivery devices such as smart phones, computers, panopticon has become primary subject in information society.

4.1 Conceptual Framework of Surveillance

The word surveillance generally has a negative connotation. Although the word “surveillance” rousing not so pleasant connotations, surveillance with the meaning monitoring others closely is not that negative. Careful watching means that watching children closely to avoid any injury or monitoring patients' health. Many people like someone to watch them while they are doing activities involving risk like swimming in the sea or climbing a high ladder. These are the examples of the good and positive meanings of ‘surveillance’. At this point, David Lyon also ties this feature of surveillance to the concept's being two-faced. Surveillance means both control and protection (Lyon 1994: 14). Recently, the issue of surveillance has brought up discussions on privacy and it has become one of the most discussed topics.

The concept of surveillance, in fact, emerged when people started living collectively. When people live together, they learn a lot about each other and this can be considered as a kind of surveillance. For example, through our encounters with our friends while walking on the street or in a restaurant, and guests who visit our home, others learn about what it does in certain time periods. In such events people, do not care much about the information others learn about them. In situations, such as meeting a friend, there is an agreement and a power equality. Therefore, this is not a type of surveillance. For an event to be called surveillance, there should be a great power distinction or lack of trust. Rule and Brantley have similarly described surveillance as the name of the relationship between an authority and a person whose behavior is to be controlled (Rule and Brantley 1992: 405-23, Botan and Vorvoreanu 2005: 125).

It is not clear whether the surveillance itself or the inequality of power causes the underlying problem of surveillance. The reason for this ambiguity is that they are interconnected and therefore cannot easily be distinguished from others. William Staples also accepts these power relations. According to him, it is intertwined with the vortex of power relations that are multidirectional, deliberate and determined. While a police officer observes suspects with a high-tech scanner, like those at airports and police stations, the police officer can also be monitored through a video camera placed on the patrol car. Similarly, when a teacher monitors students using a computer program, he or she can realize that his or her performance in the classroom may also be observed through this program (Staples 1998: 3). Of course, the topic of surveillance is not just a concept specific to this new world order.³ It has existed since the period when social relations started to establish. Therefore, to attain the distinctive meanings of surveillance possesses today, its history must first be examined.

³ “New World Order” is described as “The New World Order is a conspiracy theory which posits a new period of history bringing about a major change in the world with the balance of world power. This New World Order is theorized by some to involve a group or groups of elitist people bent on ruling the world through a single worldwide system of government. The appeal of this New World Order lies in its proposal to free the world of wars and political strife, and its promises to eradicate poverty, disease, and hunger. Its purpose is to meet the needs and hopes of all mankind through worldwide peace.” which is written in Available at: <https://www.gotquestions.org/new-world-order.html> [Accessed: 17.06.2018]).

4.2 History of Surveillance

After the development of literary texts, the next step in surveillance is the invention of the printing press. According to Anthony Giddens, the most important consequence of the invention of printing press in surveillance area is that the printing press consolidates the absoluteness of the state. Thus, the state can make progress in surveillance operations (Giddens 1985: 237). After the invention of the printing press, the state began to use surveillance in a way that it creates an element of oppression particularly on institutions. Traditional forms of behavior in the oral tradition are now handled and governed by the state. Thus, writing could be used directly to describe and monitor the activities of potentially disobedient segments of the population. With writing, keeping detailed “official statistics”, other highly detailed forms of documentation of individuals' collar records and everyday lives, has become the characteristic of modern states and organizations (Giddens 1985: 66-67).

In the 15th century, religious surveillance was a powerful and dominant method of surveillance. This included routine events such as the search for the infidels, the devil and the witches, or monitoring religious awareness, customs and rules (for example, adultery and marriage). Religious institutions also kept records of birth, marriage, baptism, and death. By the sixteenth century, with the emergence of nation-states, which had a developing capacity requiring new needs for collecting and using information, political surveillance became important in a similar fashion as religious surveillance. Over the next several centuries, the transition to the “police state”, in which state and economic actors controlled much wider social, geographical and temporal areas, took place (Marx 2005: 45).

Modern societies in the capitalist economic system, is brought along a strong surveillance concept. According to Karl Marx, the main objective and the urge of the direction of capitalist production is to produce as much added value as possible. Therefore, this leads to exploitation of the workforce to the greatest extent possible. As the number of cooperating workers increases, the resistance of the capital to the dominance increases, and at the same time for capital to overcome this resistance, the need for counter pressure increases as well. The surveillance that the capitalist

applies is not only a function derived from and intrinsic to the nature of the social work process but also a function of the exploitation of this social work process. The roots of this are found in the inevitable and uncompromising antagonism between the exploiter and the exploited living and working being and the raw material. Furthermore, these instruments are used as the need arises in proportion to the increase in the mass of the production tools which belong to the capitalist, not to the workers anymore. capitalist surveillance is both a social process that produces usage values and a process producing surplus value, because of its bilateral nature of the production process. This process is bilateral and formalistically tyrannous. Karl Marx thinks that industrial enterprises resemble armies. The army formed by industrial workers under the command of a capitalist is formed like a real army, with military officers (managers) and sergeants (foreman, chargehand.) During the work, they command this army on behalf of the capitalist. The task of inspecting and surveillance is their established and specific task (Marx, 2007, pp. 358-360). Control and surveillance become a task to ensure complete discipline within the factory. Thus, these surveillance efforts divide the employees into groups/sections as workers and supervisors or privates and sergeants of the industrial army (Marx 1992: 452). According to Marx, in the capitalist production system surveillance aims to produce surplus value by controlling whether workers are working or not. To ensure that workers can produce efficiently at the lowest possible cost in the most efficient way, the capitalist managers must continue to supervise the workers. Max Weber's view on the modern world of surveillance is significant. He saw this surveillance, keeping detailed records, collating information, limiting access to certain eligible persons, not only as evidence of 'progress,' but as deeply ambiguous (Weber 1958: 48-51).

Weber criticizes the limitation of surveillance based on class relations Marx stated. According to him, surveillance is limited to bureaucracy, and capitalist enterprises are a kind of bureaucracy. While modern organizations are characterized by their rationality above all else, this feature gives these organizations consistency and separates them from organizational forms (Lyon 1994: 43).

According to Lyon and Zureik, the first approach drawn from Marxist ideas is that the implementation and drive of surveillance are always combined with the

capitalist drive for higher profits. This can be expressed in many ways, from continuous renewal of technologies to provide higher efficiency and productivity, to the export of production management efforts or to initiatives aiming to manage more up-to-date consumption. According to them, Weber's analyses of surveillance focus on the process of rationalization characterizing the development of modern institutions. The capitalist firm and the government bureaucracy shed light on similar characteristics and, according to this point of view, the characteristics that capitalism cannot be reduced to its internal dynamics. Surveillance is a way to secure a continuous operation of an institution, and this may or may not mean that only capitalist goals are pursued. Furthermore, according to Weber, surveillance is a process that can never be explained in a single logic. Each situation must be studied in place on its own to reveal its nature and its consequences. According to David Lyon and Elia Zureik, the Weberian approach is sometimes -incorrectly- associated with motiveless importance on technical change. Technical developments that express the motif of rationalization are sometimes considered as the center for the understanding of surveillance. This point of view carries the danger of considering surveillance equal to “technological determinism” (Lyon and Zureik 1996: 5-6).

According to Douglas Kellner and Richard Kahn, Marxist theory focuses on how surveillance and technology are added to the power of the capital so that citizens can be controlled. In the Weberian approach, surveillance focuses on the rational process within modern organizations, on the methods and on the new technologies that increase the power of the organizations over the individuals (Kahn and Kellner 2003: 49).

These analyses of Marx and Weber are of crucial importance for surveillance studies. Because it is needed to make whole working system traceable and converted into performance system such as every single job is recorded to promote the works which are held by the workers in the system. In addition to this, with the diversity of instruments used in surveillance, the content and scope of surveillance leveraged by both the government and the organizations have expanded. Nevertheless, the expansion of this area did not deviate from the objective of using surveillance as a disciplinary tool by the state or institutions. (Jeffrey 2000: 33-34).

The state's surveillance was completed by using surveillance respectively in the business sector, on the market, in medicine, banking and insurance by the private sector. In other words, a new era has begun where the state's surveillance and private sector's surveillance feeds each other (Jeffrey 2000: 34).

4.3 The Global Surveillance in Modern Societies

1980s was a decade when surveillance computers started to be used. Surveillance became a decisive tool for the consumer world. Each of these is a result of long-term historical processes. Since the Industrial Revolution, with the objective of monitoring institutions and societies more effectively and today with the application of microelectronic technologies, the capacity of surveillance has now greatly expanded, and at the same time, the targets of surveillance have expanded. In addition, surveillance has become an increasingly global and integrated phenomenon with advances in technology and directed to a certain extent. Both commercial and state-linked data exceed national boundaries. At the same time, global marketing is very interested in analyzing the consumption in different parts of the world. Global marketing means that the international use of credit cards and barcode cards as well as the easy transmission of consumer information and personal information from one region to another (Stalder 2002: 118-9).

This global surveillance is spreading rapidly, especially because of the information society. Because of the activities we do in our everyday lives, it has become possible for personal data to be created and accumulated almost everywhere and anytime. Whenever we use a credit card in a store, our names, the things we buy, and the amounts we spend go into huge database lists.⁴ Apart from this, everything

⁴ While I am writing this thesis news about Facebook's "failure to compel Cambridge Analytica to delete all traces of data from its servers – including any "derivatives" – enabled the company to retain predictive models derived from millions of social media profiles throughout the US presidential election," the Guardian says. (Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/may/06/cambridge-analytica-kept-facebook-data-models-through-us-election> [Accessed: 17.06.2018].) While Facebook, Twitter and other big internet companies spent much of last year cataloging Russia-backed ad spending on their services, the Russian campaign to promote Trump also relied heavily on the use of "organic" services. That is: The Russians set up free, fake accounts and masqueraded as

from the electronic ticket we bought on the highway to our cell phone conversations can be recorded and after an analysis process, this data can be stored at the extreme, whenever we go to the doctor, accept the insurance policy, pay our bills, contact the authorities, or go online, the picture that can be obtained from our actions and our situation becomes clearer and more visible. Doing much more than just following us, this data body is leading us, guiding us, gets evaluated and classified before reaching anywhere. For this reason, when we go to private and public institutions, we are greeted in an appropriate manner that suits the profile that represents us (Stalder 2002: 120). This deduction by Felix Stalder indicates the point that the concept of surveillance has reached “for now”.

One of the things that brought surveillance to this point is the unbearable lightness of new surveillance technologies in people's everyday lives. Surveillance is no longer perceived only as a power tool for the continuation of the capitalist production process or the work of bureaucratic organizations. Surveillance is more common compared to the period when people were eavesdropping or the Cold War era. In addition, surveillance seems to be a cost to pay for having technological gadgets making our lives easier and providing protection rather than seeing it as a pressure element. It is grounded the thoughts of disciplinary techniques in Foucault that were discussed in the previous chapters. What are the changes in the contents and the tools of the surveillance? At this point, differences between traditional surveillance methods and new surveillance technologies will shed light on this change.

Today's world incredibly evolves through technology. Daily life dynamics also push societies to become involved in the 'information technology. For instance, one can ask “Have you heard the news at social media which is flash now news?” which also carries human being to follow and be followed by everyone called

regular users who supported Donald Trump or hated Hillary Clinton, The recode says. (Available at: <https://www.recode.net/2018/2/16/17021048/robert-mueller-russia-facebook-social-media-donald-trump-presidential-campaign-2016-hillary-clinton> [Accessed: 17.06.2018]). All this news directly connected to “big data” analysis. Relation database tables which include personal data named “big data” deliberately excluded in this thesis because of two main reasons: First, for the time being we have not observed the effects of the Facebook intervention. Second this thesis focuses mainly on privacy and the panopticon. “Big data” ethics deserves a study of its own.

“surveillance society” (Drehle 2013). The industrial revolution, the socio-economic change caused by the machines is like that of today - in the form of information technology and with the motto of knowledge is at your fingertips and new era had begun. Everything in everyday life now - economy, working life, social and administrative services, education, community, etc. people, while moving to the virtual life which means they are opening to a world where the internet begins (Tenner 1997: 54).

Panopticism enters a tight surveillance process within its social theory of the discussions which are held in modern world. Thus, the expected post-modern liberation era nowadays, all the actions start to slide from the surveillance society, not only literally but also physically. In public and private life in line with violations of freedom / privacy, - new powers based on technology stands out. This is antiutopian for the day when almost all people are recorded and every movement / communication is constantly being watched. There must be a single entity to control which must be invisible and always watching societies.⁵ Individuals in modern societies are recorded in a systematic manner at every stage of social life by the devices. Today information technology, mobile phones, smart cards economic transactions are controlled and the consumption/consumer profits storage in data banks, equipping cities or at least busy areas with cameras as well as monitoring web sites visited on the internet and reading electronic mail methods of social control and supervision of power (Brown and Duguid 2000: 22-52).

In this context, one of the main instruments of social control is 'systematic monitoring' (Bozkurt 2012: 16). The surveillance case, defined as the information, has experienced an incredible movement in parallel with the developments in technology and after the attacks of September 11 - behind the security perimeter - before the legal domain and then even if it caused violations of individual privacy (Shaw, 2016).

There are many other models and techniques to follow others. The key to this architectural model is that: Disciplinary power needed as very strong, rigorous,

⁵ This argument is valid all books of Yevgeni Zamyatin's *We*, George Orwell's *1984* and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*

permanent and economical devices (able to monitor larger crowds with less supervision) while putting the crowds into certain institution. Here's the panopticon, which is the best response model. According to Foucault, the relation established by the power from the classical period to the day-to-day is exercised and functioning in the panopticon generalized model. This design makes it possible to have an uninterrupted and individual oversight of every criminal in the prison, as far as every cell is visible. The body of the criminals, which is subject to an uninterrupted watch from an unseen public room, is being watched at any moment, encourages the guilt by its internal influence to become the controller of its own conduct. The panopticon at any moment is ready and watches at the cells and the body does not exist, the body of the criminal's physical pressure (Bentham 1995: 2-18).

The subjugation of criminals in this above way, in an individualized way, leads to a heap of detailed records, records and documents that rely on their conduct. The documentation of these personal attitudes about each criminal makes it possible to classify the body of the offender, to penetrate it, and to infiltrate the body. The disciplines of criminology and sociology of crime would build guilty in the depths of such an archive (Bentham 1995: 22-30).

Frequently expressed by official authorities after global terrorist attacks the views on how 'weak in the field of surveillance' are based on a totalitarian society it follows beyond justifying legitimate expressions. On the one hand, it is becoming increasingly widespread how effective it is to track and capture terrorists in the global terror while claims are coming forward, On the other hand, by taking the path from Bentham's Panopticon putting the metaphor into the social sciences, taking Foucault's view based on political power 'Authority, state, state apparatus' in the direction of the results are all ignored. Panopticism based a power relationship that allows people to suspend rights and deter life if we perceive it as a way of collecting a universal eye conception. Today it is also so easy to make sense of the possibilities provided by high technology it happens like that.

Nowadays people choose to get tracked to be safe by using smart phones, smart wearing techs etc. All these data are stored voluntary by the individuals for private use. Thus, we as individuals create the new system of traceability by not only

giving the data about our daily life, we also give all the single details of our body structure, finger prints, faces, heartbeats, skills, favorites and any kind of our lives.

Today, innovations in technology often denote a positive change in social life which probably lead to radical transformations. George Orwell and Michel Foucault, point out problems that could come with technological possibilities of telecommunication and satellite. As Orwell puts it: “Who will collect the information and process it and take the decision to give the punishment?” (Orwell 2002: 76-84). In the final stage, information technologies and 'new economy' the information that it is characterized will only offer a virtual freedom to humanity. Today, by producing and exporting these information technology devices, it also gives a lot of power to distribute “voluntary surveillance systems” based on technology. In line with this, information technologies with a 'guided' characteristic cannot complement both humanity and sophistication they have a purpose for the control of the countries. In this respect, many technological and economic facts are to keep all the functions of personal life under surveillance, or are aimed at transforming them into non-members (Johnson 2001: 55). Besides these technologies, which are also seen as a danger, at the beginning of these, personal bringing technologies such as computer-television-phone and fax together in one device which is called “Smart Phone” today. Functional 'integrated systems' makes it possible that all the operations can be done from home via a single tool by pressing a few keys. So, individuals can watch television on the computer and listen to the radio, phone calls and mail services on the net, banking transactions and all kinds of payments from home. In addition to being able to roam the whole world via the internet and access any information it is possible to shop from various stores around the world. Every day and compulsory requirements on the internet with a few keystrokes the opportunity to meet also opens the doors of a home-centered world. People are closed and the goal of keeping them under surveillance by imprisoning them into a specific space with their own for-all-time-was one of his main dreams. Information in this sense technologies, rather than expressing a simple conceptualization, they are becoming an 'ideology' in their direction. Surveillance activities based on this article are the second of the twentieth century an area that has begun to emerge.

Although the practices of surveillance are as old as human history, surveillance society, by the systems of telecommunication / computer / satellite and genetic technologies is new and much more effective to control larger societies. Thus, this brings the need to discuss more about Computer Ethics⁶.

4.4 Differences Between Traditional and New Surveillance Technologies

Gary T. Marx defines traditional surveillance as “close observation, especially of a suspected person” as defined by the dictionary. He gives listening to organized crime offenders' phones as an example to this definition (Marx 2005: 3).

According to Felix Staples, the most prominent feature of traditional surveillance is that these practices are faithfully repeated and applied routinely without being questioned. According to him, this surveillance is about “power.” Because in traditional surveillance, the aim is to discipline people to behave in ways that others regard as lawful or simply “normal.” Thus, unbalanced and unevenly distributed authority relationships can be maintained. Such authority relationships exist between communities (e.g. managers and employees, police officers and suspects, teachers and students, parents and children, etc.) and, to a broader extent, between individuals and the state. (Staples 1998: 22-24)

These forms of surveillance are in contradiction especially with surveillance that can be named as “new surveillance” and emerged at the end of the 20th century. Marx defines new surveillance as “scrutiny using technical means to extract or create personal or group data, whether from individuals or contexts.” (Marx 2005: 3).

Oscar H. Gandy's modern surveillance technology means a technical term that these technologies make up a combined system of hardware and software, including devices that can sense, measure, store, manipulate, and exchange information and intelligence data about the environment.

⁶ Here computer is replaced any kind of “smart” devices of 21th century

Although the definitions mentioned above cover some of the elements of the new surveillance methods, today's tactics are quite diverse. Marx gives the following methods as to what these tactics cover:

- a parent monitoring a baby on closed-circuit television during commercials or through a daycare center webcast,
- a database for employers containing the names of persons who have filed workman compensation claims,
- a video monitor in a department store scanning customers and matching their images to those of suspected shoplifters,
- a supervisor monitoring employee's e-mail and phone communication,
- a badge signaling where an employee is always,
- a hidden camera in an ATM machine,
- a computer program that monitors the number of keystrokes or looks for keywords
- a thermal imaging device aimed at the exterior of a house from across the street,
- a scanner that picks up cellular and cordless phone communication,
- a DNA sample,
- the polygraph or monitoring brain waves to determine truthfulness,
- Caller ID

(Marx 2005: 11-12).

As it can be understood from the methods Marx mentions, the new surveillance methods can now be found everywhere in the living space. The first difference between the new surveillance, which has become so widespread, and the traditional surveillance is that the change of the vehicle providing surveillance. The concept of surveillance can be found in means that look outward from the inside. Yet, the understanding that has dominated since the end of the Middle Ages is the opinion that makes the eye the master of the world and grants the representation of the world and the invisibility that lies behind this world.

However, the eye, which is the main means of the direct surveillance, is used in conjunction with the new surveillance and as mentioned by Oscar Gandy with the modern surveillance technologies or these new technologies (such as cameras, listening devices, computer systems) substitute the eye (Berger 2014: 26-32).

We can also find this new way of seeing in John Berger's phrases. According to him, physical appearances are now replaced by volatile appearances, and the eye evolved and developed where there was enough light for the visible forms of life to become more and more complex and varied. During this evolution, vision turned into the techniques that were repositioned on a separate level from the human eye (Berger 2016: 17).

Seeing, which has increasingly become technological, changed the means of vision for the traditional surveillance. Namely, the eye has now turned into a tool, which brings together multiple senses and is more technical.

In the new surveillance, along with the eye, face and body, which are the source of face-to-face communication, have also been mechanized. According to Lyon, with the development of new technologies, this line of change has begun with the search for substitutes for the face and body that has vanished. People have now turned to the tools that will compensate the visual and bodily clues and signs such as handshaking, eye contact, visual, bodily clues, which are considered traditional. These tools are provided not only by passports or national identity cards but also by electronic cards in the 20th century. Today, people's wallets and bags are filled with credit cards, phone cards, social security cards, driver's licenses, library cards, health cards and club cards. People use these cards when there is no one to interact with - such as using an ATM - or when the person who makes the change is a total stranger and requires approval. According to him, the relationship with the body is constantly decreasing with these cards.

Communication is now continuing through remote and electronic channels (Lyon, 2002). The effect of this on surveillance is that it is no longer just the body under surveillance but also the marks left by these electronic cards.

Another important difference between traditional surveillance and surveillance with new technologies is that there is cooperation in traditional surveillance and there is usually a clear distinction between the person who is exposed to surveillance and the observer. According to Marx, this distinction seemed reasonable in an age when the servants eavesdropped behind closed doors, telegraphs were sabotaged, and binoculars were abundantly used (Marx 2005: 35-38) However, with the technological improvements in recent years, the “self-control system” has emerged as a subject independent from surveillance in general.

The self-monitoring system is also supported by the homemade tests such as alcohol level detection, pregnancy, menopause and AIDS tests. The self-monitoring system removes the line between the observer and the observed. In other words, the distinction between the party who executes the surveillance and the party who is exposed to surveillance has thus vanished (Marx 2005: 10-11).

People may willingly participate in surveillance when they provide the desired data, for example for taking advantage of consumer deals (e.g. flyers or discounts) or for convenience (fast lanes where highway tolls are prepaid). In this case, as well, the distinction between the observer and the observed gets blurred. In addition, the new surveillance is largely automatic and people make it happen. For example, a person entering a parking lot, office, or a safe place using magnetic cards allows their entry and exit date and time information to be recorded. Logging in to the computer system starts the process of recording the opened files, the keys pressed, the errors made and the messages sent and received. The “message details, recording devices” in the office phone system can record the number, time and duration of calls made from all phones. Advanced audience analysis tools can record which television programs are watched and, at the very least, based on their scanned images, who are in the room. If the system is in doubt, the screen image can identify who enters and exits the room. Although not fully informed, individuals participate voluntarily in most today's surveillance (Gandy 1989: 63-64).

Staples terms this phenomenon as “constant visibility.” According to him, methodical, technological and anonymous surveillance becomes the main element of social control (Staples 1998: 4).

As Gandy states the analysis of data obtained with the new surveillance technologies has become automatic. The system that makes this possible is the crossmatch. This method is used through the computer networks. It has now become a routine to use this method in government-provided services. Inquiring compliance or “front-end” is used to compare the file of the applicant with the files of others, which may provide evidence for banks, employers, insurance companies, or unreported sources. Cross-matching can reveal the lack of spouses in expected places, just as it is in the claims about children in need of care that are not listed on any school's register. Furthermore, this practice may also be the result of a bureaucrat's “foresight” about where the evidence for corruption can be found. If corruption is suspected, all individuals are subject to this “investigation” without getting informed or their permission taken within the scope of a specific file. As soon as the existence of the new database is known, a potential expectation for gathering additional information about the person providing the data arises (Gandy 1989: 64-65).

Moreover, the new surveillance has relatively low visibility or is invisible compared to the traditional surveillance. Gandy considers this surveillance as “remote perception” that the observer will never be seen. The data is processed by experts who do not have knowledge about and are not interested in knowing who the person providing the data is. The advanced technology that the surveillance agency possesses provides intelligence about the individual, not even the individual knows about themselves. For instance, laboratories that test blood for employees who are applying for a job may identify symptoms of a dangerous illness that the person is unaware of. If these tests were done without the consent of the person—such as the AIDS tests, which are prohibited by the law as a condition for employment—the laboratories may not reveal the results to the person at all. Surveillance can also be done discreetly through a video camera hidden inside a teddy bear or a watch. In addition, data collection can become routine and precise as it becomes one of the daily activities (for instance, the use of a credit card for shopping automatically conveys information about consumption, time and place.) The new surveillance focuses on preventing or avoiding any loss or damage rather than just observation of

a criminal. Individuals are no longer subject to surveillance solely to determine whether they have committed a crime or not. Bureaucratic surveillance rather tries to see if the individual has the “the potential to commit a crime.” (Gandy 1989: 64-65). Staples explains this with the following example: Careful gazes of a shopkeeper in the traditional surveillance could be deterrent to a possible thief. His surveillance was personal, not systematic, and his memory was, of course, misleading. It was more likely that he knew his customers (and his customers knew him) and a stranger was to be “observed more carefully.” This type of “personal social control” was formerly popular in small communities or in communities where people closely followed each other and the fear of contempt or fear of exclusion maintained order or in communities where people were socially close. However, today in large corporate bookstores, part-time employees are less interested in observing thieves, and their massive customer mass seems to be a crowd without an identity. Therefore, the bookstore administrators rely on hidden, invisible and always-ready security cameras. As a distinctive feature of the postmodern society, the video camera watches every corner of the bookshop day and night with a careful “eye” and it observes not just “the suspects” but “all customers”. Cameras are also used for the surveillance of both “working” employees and employees as “potential thieves”. Thus, surveillance and discipline are attained a strange democratic role, everyone is watched and no one is trusted. Thus, the first characteristic of the postmodern social control is that it has a systematic, methodical and automatic process. “The observer” is anonymous and rarely seen, often it's a computer system, a video camera, a drug control set, or an electronic scanner.

Data collected by such devices can turn into a permanent record such as video cassette, a computer file, etc. (Staples 1998: 3-4).

In this kind of surveillance, where the observer is rarely seen, the surveillance is targeting the more privileged people as opposed to the poor and homeless, aside from being under surveillance in public. For example, we can think that “the privileged person's” telephone, fax, computer, bank transactions, occupation, health, and travels are monitored in the electronic environment. In fact, we can see the common goals of the observer and the observed by looking at the traditional

corporate context. For example, customers want a secure shopping environment and they do not want to see the increase in the price resulting from the theft rate. For this reason, the cameras in the shopping malls offer social services such as identifying the safety hazards, finding missing children, or reaching out to customers when they need help. If we have done everything perfectly, young people under the age of 30 who are accustomed to constantly watching themselves through their personal cameras and playing video games, may even perceive security cameras as self-approval (Marx 2005: 371). This state of approval does not change the fact that everyone can turn into a potential criminal. While the prediction capacity arising from the matching methods that can be created from the data, especially, on a computer provides the ability to control, this system now blurs the line between the real and the potential criminals. Thus, apparently predictive and preventive supervision makes the citizens, the workers, or the consumers the target of the bureaucratic control. When each unit of the collected data is considered, such comprehensive surveillance and the new surveillance methods can be defined as cheap. It is utterly easy to combine visual, audio, textual and numerical data compared to the traditional methods. It is also easy to organize, store, edit, decipher, send and receive the data. Data is in real time and data collection can be continuous. It is also possible not only to collect the present data but also past and future data. These probability calculations create motion patterns for those who collect these data. New surveillance is more comprehensive, intensive and versatile. This versatility and probabilistic forecasting of the new surveillance makes the individuals less informed about themselves compared to what the surveillance organization knows about them (Marx, 2005: 13).

G. Marx also states that traditional surveillance methods have not yet disappeared with the introduction of these new surveillance methods. On the contrary, it increases in number with new varieties. Today's social life is too complicated to make this sharp distinction. There are some transitions between values. (For example, while the informants, a traditional type of surveillance, have little visibility, drug tests, a new kind, are applied at intervals.) Despite everything, such classifications will be useful to analyze the great differences. Based on Marx's

thoughts, the differences between the traditional surveillance and the new surveillance can be summarized as follows: The new surveillance is often more comprehensive than traditional surveillance, involving multiple measures. It is more intense and more common. Even though when objective more is known, the rate of what a person knows about themselves is lower than that of a person who did surveillance in the past. It is much more likely that the object of surveillance is an indistinct individual, a cluster or a community, compared to the past. This emphasis has expanded past the individual beyond the system and the networks. The data often turns from direct representation to imitation, from verbal and numeral forms to copying video and audio recordings. Expert inspections are often accompanied by self-inspection methods (or leave their place to these inspection methods). It is easy to combine, send and receive visual, audible, verbal and numerical data. It is much easier to edit, load, bring back and analyze data. In the traditional surveillance, the opposite of what's mentioned above applies (Marx 2005 14-15).

The traditional surveillance methods have not yet disappeared completely with the new surveillance. The traditional surveillance methods are still in use. In addition, with the use of new information technologies, surveillance has become more comprehensive, more intensive, more intrusive and more common. The scope of surveillance has expanded to the fields from economy to medicine to intelligence.

Thus, it has become a more effective power tool. These technologies continue to change the structure of surveillance shockingly. Furthermore, if we are to look for alternatives to this, we need to focus on both George Orwell's Big Brother model in 1984 and Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon prison model.

4.5 From Panopticon to Telescreen

In studies on surveillance, we can see that George Orwell's Big Brother review and Bentham's panopticon prison plan are highlighted. Especially in the studies on the new surveillance, the first analogy stems from the Big Brother figure in George Orwell's 1984.

With these new surveillance tools, mechanical eyes, reminiscent of “Big Brother Is Watching You” line from Orwell's novel, are on individuals.

In his novel, Orwell refers to a dystopian society, in which the state controls everything, does not allow the slightest conflict and individuality, and the official ideology fictionalizes the entire history and language. In the novel, there is a central power called “Big Brother” who keeps people under constant surveillance and control. This power uses a technology called “telescreen” to provide continuous supervision. Winston Smith, the hero of the novel, writes “Down with The Big Brother” in his diary and it is remarkably written in all capital letters. However, it is dangerous to stay away from the telescreen, write such phrases, and keep a diary. In fact, it does not matter whether he keeps a diary or not because the Thought Police will take hold of it sooner or later. Even if he did not write a single word, it would still be a crime involving all the crimes. It is considered as a thoughtcrime. Thoughtcrime is not a crime that can be hidden forever. You can hide it for a while, but you cannot prevent them catching you in the end even after many years (Orwell 2002: 22-23).

The party not only monitored via telescreens, but also monitored the party members via sensors that remotely sense heartbeats. These sensors are placed in transceiver (two-way) television screens in all houses, government buildings and public open spaces. By focusing these sensors on individuals and measuring their heart rate, it can be told whether the individuals watched by Big Brother intend to participate in any unusual activity. An important point is that in Orwell's 1984, everyone owns a television. But no one can turn them off. No one is aware of how television can be used as a recording medium (Orwell 2002: 202).

The party conducts audits at every level of your life. At this point, the greatest mainstay of the party is that human nature will not rebel against it. Because according to them, the human nature is submissive (Orwell 2002: 218). We see at the end of Orwell's novel that this submission prevails. Smith renounces the resistance movement. Resisting Big Brother is futile. Eventually the Big Brother will take over the whole world. Humankind will stop fighting itself and learn to love him (Orwell 2002: 238-239).

This reminds us of the relationship we have with new surveillance tools. The lack of resistance to new surveillance tools is since those who use them, like in Orwell's novel, are aware of people's lack of resistance and their compliance. The resulting system is based on the compliance of human nature and the fact that it will voluntarily accept to be a part of the emerging telescreen. But with one difference, this will not be by force or pressure, but by learning to love "Big Brothers". Orwell's Big Brother analogy is still valid for now, albeit partially, despite the specific part about how to work technically with the telegraph being lacking. It is Bentham's panopticon that explains the functioning of surveillance several centuries ago by establishing a system as effective as Orwell's Big Brother. Bentham's panopticon prison plan has been brought to our day, especially through the work of Foucault. The compatibility of this plan with electronic panopticon has also become a field of study.

4.6 Surveillance in Information Technologies

Today, innovations in the field of technology often express a positive change the social space also leads to some radical transformations. Information society concepts always carry some optimism; however, it includes the control of power and the dominant sectors over society which are becoming inspectors of the surveillance society together with their applications.

Disciplinary societies based on surveillance thinkers such as Orwell and Foucault, state that humans are trailing with the technological possibilities of telecommunication. At the same time, this is the situation for the surveillance society projections. In the final stage, information technologies and 'new economy' the information that is characterized will only offer a virtual freedom to humanity, capitalism opinions are becoming increasingly widespread (Johnson 1997: 43). Today, the power to produce information technologies in developed countries, on the one hand by exporting these technologies in large economies on the one hand, through surveillance systems based on these technologies they play a global leadership.

In line with this, information technologies with a 'guided' characteristic cannot complement both humanity and sophistication they have a purpose for the control of the countries.

Foucault set out from a corporate place, prisons, where the bodies of the government watched and supervised to tell the surveillance. It was mentioned a bit about how punishment differed between king and modern society. Although this form of punishment seems to be legitimized by jails and laws, in fact, it is different for Foucault. In modern society, the accusations are not just the king, but the whole assembly has rebelled. In addition to rebellion, they have opposed the normal and effective use of the 'normality' body, which the government seeks to create. Thus, the punishment of the accused has become a revenge of the sovereign, and the society has become a state of defending itself. The goal of the disciplinary power is to apply a positive, continuous and profound enforcement. The aim here is to create a light and rapid surveillance system that permeates the social world, which enables everyone to apply the effort to achieve effective performance for power as a natural result. In conclusion, a paradoxical structure emerges and power cannot be identified with any institution. Because, it can be produced in all institutions (Bernauer and Rasmussen 1987: 28).

In this respect, many technological and economic in fact, to keep all the functions of personal life under surveillance, or are aimed at transforming them into non-members. Besides these technologies, which are also seen as a danger, Globally, the history of the ruling societies secret weapons that allow them to control them in unprecedented ways. All new technologies such as computer-television-phone and fax combined in one device: Smart phone. (And any other tracking devices connect to that) So, individuals can watch television on the computer and listen to the radio, phone calls and mail services on the net, banking transactions and all kinds of payments from home they can do, in addition to being able to roam the whole world via the internet, every access to sorts of information or to shop from various stores around the world there. Every day and compulsory requirements on the internet with a few keystrokes the opportunity to meet also opens the doors of a home-centered world. People are closed and the goal of keeping them under surveillance by

imprisoning them into a specific space with their own for-all-time-was one of his main dreams. Information in this sense technologies, rather than expressing a simple conceptualization, they are becoming an 'ideology' in their direction (Prince 1980: 50).

Surveillance activities by technological devices increased in the second half of the twentieth century. Although the practices of surveillance are as old as the history of mankind, by this increase it is also transformed into data storing by the computers.

4.7 Computer Ethics in Terms of Privacy and Surveillance

Computer science and computer technology was born in a 1950s and has grown and developed over time. Computer ethics is a matter of ethical use of computers. Although legal rules try to make wrong and correct discrimination by putting definite rules, they cannot reveal rules that will show the correctness or wrongness of each situation. Although this is theoretically possible, it is practically never possible. In this case, it is very important for people to think ethically about the relevant issues (Brey 1999: 5-14).

Deborah Johnson (2001:12) states that: "Social context shapes the very character and direction of technological development". Today, the use of computers in homes, schools, offices, factories, and stores has become commonplace. Large amounts of information can be stored and restored on computers for a variety of purposes. Major developments in computer technology have also led to ethical problems with computers. About computer ethics, there are problems in the context of confidentiality, ownership, accuracy and access, which are the four ethical issues of information age. Some of these problems are not legal and ethical, and some of them are not ethical if they are legal. However, solving ethical problems related to computers is difficult and complicated (Mason 1986: 84).

All these difficulties are expressed by Kallman and Grillo as:

The use of information and communication technologies in communication has changed the relationship between individuals. Decrease in personal proximity and speed in communication do not leave enough time for the user to consider the ethical dimension of actions. Electronic information is more fragile than information on paper. Because electronic information is much easier to change and is more vulnerable to unauthorized access. Intellectual property rights, art theft, privacy and confidentiality issues have become contemporary issues. Challenges to the benefits of information sharing conflict with efforts to protect information integrity, information reliability and information accessibility (Kallman and Grillo 1993: 17-34).

Because of the difficult and complex problems encountered, people need to be informed about computer ethics. People who interact with or are likely to interact with the computer must behave in a determined global dimension.

Besides all, it can also be described as privacy is declined into private life however, by computers every single data is stored and private life which constitutes privacy disappeared. A world is described with computer and any kind of information technologies as human's actions. Computer works with interpreting the data which has been stored by the past actions (Johnson 2001: 20). All the data is the data which are effected by the human actions. Computer technology creates a new instrumentation for human action both individual action and institutional arrangements. Furthermore, the physical world's characters follow to be existed in the virtual computerized world. In addition, all real world ethical understanding keep to be valid in the virtual world too because the society in the virtual social life is combined by the real ones.

Privacy is the key issue in respect to how individual is separated from the society. This is also important in the context of transaction generated information which includes any kind of actions which were described above such as credit card, telephone calls, tracking wearing technologies, any kind of automat machines.

All these actions come from these events are stored in the place and this idea gives human a sense of fear. This fear is well described in 1984 (Orwell 2002: 20-45).

Johnson states that:

Information about individuals would not exist if organizations did not have any interest in using it. Information is created, collected and exchanged because organizations can use it to further their interests and activities. Information about individuals is used to make decisions about those individuals, and often the decisions profoundly affect the lives of those individuals whom the information is about. Information about you, stored in a database, may be used to decide whether you will be hired by a computer, whether who will be given a loan, whether you will be called by the police for interrogation, arrest or prosecution (Johnson 2001: 118).

Privacy is used as referring all the properties of one individual (Johnson 2001: 120). On the other hand, Charles Friedt argues that privacy is the relationship with intimacy and trust (Fried, 1968). No matter. privacy is necessary for the democracy. People need to control any kind of information about themselves to maintain a diversity of relationships not only in real world but also in the virtual ones. (Rachels 1975: 323-3)

4.8 The Age of Information Technologies

Historians argues that two industrial revolutions have taken place during the last centuries. The first one was at 18th century that started in the third quarter, the steam engine was effective. The second one is 100 years later, when the electricity, internal combustion engine, chemicals, efficient steel casting, the spread of communication technologies with the invention of the phone. After 1850s, the technological development was settled and the scientific knowledge played a decisive role. (Castells 2010: 43)

The transition from industrial society to information society had been much faster the reason because of pace of development of new technologies and due to the high level of flexibility. Information systems and technology have been the tools of the information society that is being shaped based on the divergent, transforming and

emerging as a new society style. (Erkan 2002: 206)

In the process of socio-economic development, especially human factor and information of the extension to the industrial society, which requires structural change in all fields the information society that emerged as “information economy” and “post-industrial society”, “science society” and “information age”. (Aktan and Tunç 1998: 118) In the transition period to information society Toffler states that industrial society and all these changes are defined as waves. The fluctuations are,

-First wave agricultural society,

-Second wave industrial society,

-Third wave is information society. (Toffler 1995: 88)

The diversity of all kind of information societies has brought the need to organize for the circumstances in daily life. According to that need, technological development at the computer, communication and electronic devices provide valuable information as the output of the information to human being. All information sector and workplace tools, measurement and control tools, press, all unpublished publications, electronic communications, advertising, education, communication development research, librarianship firms have positioned to help human being to communicate and to exchange of this information. These new developments have led to new forms of behavior and the society goes beyond standardization and centralization. In the new society, it carries the new perception of time, space by the specific criteria for evaluating the logic and causal relationship among them. On the way to the information society, the most crucial need became to produce and share information. Furthermore, the information that is produced and shared is used by human being to provide different information and discoveries. The information that is known to have been used for centuries in the east and west and even the source of capitalism and the industrial revolution has made a huge leap upwards with the discovery of writing in the early times and the second major leap with the finding of the printing press in the 15th century. However, it made his great surge in the 1950s, after the Second World War, with computers at everyday use. Information as its own nature develops if it is shared, so it is very depended to the

platforms to share it. Moreover, the information devices are the most important elements of information. Using computers in almost all areas, the debate about the transition from modern society to information society has begun to accelerate and change its own area. In all areas of life, from health to consultancy, from production to construction, information devices are helping to construct the new way of features of the information society which are the development of information gathering, editing and publishing processes. The term internet is started to be used in the daily life in the 90s. Internet is the final step where the communication system has reached. According to different sources, internet has different meanings:

According to Microsoft Computer Dictionary, internet is “the system where computer webs intersect by TCP/IP protocols”⁷. According to the Oxford Dictionary of English, the internet is “A global computer network providing a variety of information and communication facilities, consisting of interconnected networks using standardized communication protocols.”⁸

The term of internet is the abbreviation of “internetwork”. So, all these explanations express that internet is basically international web which connects people by the help of some protocols.

Social media tools are the interfaces where all people can share the products. In other words, ‘individuals’ own data which were shared by themselves to get interacted by the connected others in web services (Boyd and Ellison 2007). These interfaces can be differed in terms of sharing data that for instances people mainly share the visuals by Instagram, the news by Facebook, the places by Foursquare, status by Twitter. Lon Safko states that “social media is the media for us to be social” (Lon Safko 2009: 3) On the other hand, social media is not the medium to make people more social but they all are existed to be the channels to realize their social activities.

⁷ Microsoft Computer Dictionary’s definition

⁸ Oxford Living Dictionary of English’s definition

Facebook Inc. is founded by Mark Zuckerberg in 4th February 2004. It was first used for the university social network than spread out US and all over the world. Users at Facebook update their own page and it is appeared to others in its network. Nowadays, there almost 2 billion of users in Facebook network (Constine, 2017). Therefore, Facebook has the power of collecting all information and process which directly comes from these 2 billion of users. It is a great power as mentioned above it is a great the panopticon to follow others' lives. Facebook sometimes use the data to sell advertisement, sometimes for setting up the campaigns which are looking for the supporters. The basic question of Facebook is "To who which information must be shown, and how?" Facebook gathers all the necessary information and process it accordingly for this main purpose.

4.9 Is Bentham's Panopticon a Punishment?

It is commonly discussed the understanding of Bentham's panoptic prison is good or bad for people. The two general arguments have been arisen afterwards: one is Bentham supports an authoritarian government control, second is he is suggesting a humanitarian prison. Having researched all the sources about it, this thesis mainly supports of the latter argument that Bentham tried to set up a humanitarian prison. However after the development of technologies. as Foucault points out, it is converted into authoritarian government control tool.

According to Jeremy Bentham,

.... all punishment is mischief: all punishment in itself is evil. Upon the principle of utility, if it ought at all to be admitted, it ought only to be admitted in as far as it promises to exclude some greater evil (Bentham 1948: 171).

By putting the tower at the center of prison, Bentham tries to peremptory area for all other cells which contain prisoners. Thus, he maximizes the area to get watched and followed. Unlike panopticon prison, prisoners might have their own private lives, and emotions in the ordinary prisons because they can hide themselves and/or they can own their own privacies. However, prisoners have no privacy in the

prison. (Bozovic 1995: 9)

What is privacy? Privacy is the intangible property right which includes:

- The right to be let alone
- The right to be anonymous
- The right to control who, when, where, and how information about us is shared
- A recently recognized human right

Privacy is also tangible property right which includes:

- Ownership of property physical and intellectual
- Control of physical space protected by the 4th Amendment

(Coney, 2007)

Visibility is the key issue in Bentham's panopticon in respect to punishment. Everything is visible in/by Bentham's panopticon, which also bring prisoners carried to be unpropertied. Prisoners have no properties which also include monologues, dialogues, interact with others, privacies with others. The inspector is always present during even the prisons' daily activities (Bozovic 1995: 9).

In the eyes of the prisoners, the inspector is also endowed with other divine attributes: apart from being omnipresent, he is also all seeing, omniscient and omnipotent (Bozovic 1995: 10).

Here, Bentham describes inspectors as if they are God of this architectural properties. The tower gazes upon prisoners and always in control.

On the other hand, it is also important to eliminate the idea of tower (controller, follower) in the prisoners' minds. This is the most difficult part to eliminate that constant and continuous part of surveillance. According to Bentham, the actuality of inspectors in tower is not meaningful if you create the idea of surveillance in the prisoners' mind. All cells are monitored by the tower. There is an interaction between the cells and the tower all the time. On the one side, there are prisoners on the other side there are inspectors. This interaction realizes the "compact microcosm" in the area. (Bozovic 1995: 18)

If the tower is silent it does not mean that it stops the interactions with others. Furthermore, it makes much scarier to prisoners.

Bentham's panopticon is not only an architectural design. It is the constant invisible control of others to arrive happiness of individual members of the society.

Bentham's panopticon describes a circular prison with illuminated cells using a central tower that gives the impression of constant watchful eyes by the inspectors. The goal is for the prisoners to internalize the gaze which also have become conscious of being watch to conform themselves. This new power dynamic of the watcher over the watched creates the perfect gage for the mind and body. It is the creature of the new perspective of authoritarian way of being watched everything. According to Foucault, knowledge is power. Technology which is generated by knowledge is a further power to control others. In the past, controlling the body was important however, today it is crucial to control the human mind. Modern "disciplinary power" involves hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and the examination. Thus, Bentham's panopticon is the representation of total surveillance extended to all aspects of society.

Panopticon is basically defining, collecting and processing the personal data. In Bentham's panoptic prison, both prisoners and inspectors are affected. By calibrating the light, prisoners' appearances are maximized by the help of architecture form. All prisoners are isolated in their cells. As it was previously discussed, there is no privacy in whole system. Moreover, the discipline is provided and both the prisoners and the guardians are happy because prisoners have no torture and guardians have less work to do. Bentham's understanding of panopticon is not an example of an authoritarian government control. But it came to be a means of authoritarian control in the 20th and 21st centuries. Governments are always keen to surveil the society to force them to follow the rules. After the 20th century it was also discovered that it is much more important to surveil society member's attitudes by means of technological devices. According to Debroah G. Johnson,

We are forced to clarify what makes an action right or wrong. We are forced to come to grips with our moral intuitions and extend these two entities with unique characteristics (Johnson 2001: 167).

Although there are some other arguments about Bentham's panopticon, this thesis mainly discusses that Bentham created new way of modern humanitarian prison by eliminating mainly having the property and privacy. In Bentham's prison, it was the panopticon tower, nowadays it might be any kind of technological device which collects data. Thus, panopticon prison is a conceptual framework to prove society is much important than individuals in respect of happiness.

According to Bentham, quantity is more important than quality. In respect of pain and pleasure, both prisoners and guardians are happier than other prisons because prisoners are not exposed to torture or bad (evil) attitudes in Bentham's prison. They are only fully inspected by the panopticon. Guardians have also less work to do that as quantity vice, whole happiness is greatest important. Bentham's prison cannot be excluded from any other alternative prisons in his times. So, it may also be concluded that unlike others, Bentham's design of prison is much more humanitarian by having no physical slavery, torture, bad attitudes and fights.

4.10 Bentham's Panopticon in Information Technologies

The panopticon was aiming to make a radical change in the way the prisons managed. According to Bentham, this new order was intelligently observing the needs of society. According to Vaz and Bruno, if today's modern practices of surveillance are the extension and concentration of the panopticon principles, we will bear the risk of living in a totalitarian age. They discuss how self-surveillance transforms individuals into submissive bodies due to their fear of punishment through the constant authority it ensures. But at this point, for them, the authority of power that matters are our consciences (Vaz and Bruno, 2003).

Internalization of surveillance, is one of the most significant qualities of the surveillance society. Beyond the internalization of surveillance via only one authority channel, there may be a more mystical element that is being transformed into submissive bodies under the influence of the inner voice. So, the submissive bodies are not only disciplined by the gaze of the authority but also by the inner voice. (Vaz and Bruno, 2003)

Besides, the surveillance principle of the panopticon is still very much alive. Security cameras, magnetic tapes of credit cards, data in cyber space, advertisements, are only a few examples. It is also equally important that the panopticon can be transferred to other similar mediums. Although the panopticon initially came into prominence as a design for prisons, it is not just an architectural design created with punishment in mind. It should be remembered that it was designed not only to be used in prison but to be applied in many environments.

In that respect this thesis also asks whether smart phones and the like, especially social media tools such as Facebook, Twitter and other softwares could be the modern way of the panopticon that people carry them in their pocket voluntarily?

I believe that people are not so much aware that every single of information are gathered and processed accordingly. They mainly would like learn more about the world. However, people pay a cost to learn about it. They must share the information about themselves. As it was previously mentioned, the social media channel Facebook is always looking after selling more, it continuously stores more data to sell. Nowadays it seems to sell advertisements, however, my concerns are if Facebook or any other social media channels start to influence new trends, new ideas, etc. Then it may also be implement a new world order.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Surveillance, which is one of the most important tools of power, can be traced back middle ages. However, surveillance systems advanced and spread across the globe especially with the improvement of nation states and large-scale bureaucratic organizations. Surveillance has become much more influential not only in observing others but also in controlling all of them.

Jeremy Bentham creates the concept of the panopticon as a design of a humanitarian prison, which enables a constant surveillance of all prisoners. As it is described before, it is one of the basic analogical tools for large scale bureaucratic organizations or new world order's states. The panopticon is the basic element to surveil others. Every act of prisoners is inspected in Bentham's design of the panopticon from the tower that is located at the center of the prison. As Foucault, has stated, the panopticon's prominence does not lie in its construction through bricks and mortar. It is more than an architectural design. Foucault is always questioning about "who will stand at the tower?" in connection of his understanding of "self-monitoring". However, Foucault advanced one step further in his analysis that disciplinary power is the key to control others. When individuals are clearly "visible", they could lose their privacy and this could be a kind of oppression. The panopticon makes individuals visible to others. Thus, the panopticon can be used as a controlling power. Therefore, surveillance is the key to watch and control others in society.

Surveillance, in addition to Bentham and Foucault, also took various philosopher's attention. One of them is Karl Marx. Marx's view of surveillance is an outcome of the conflict between labor and capital. According to Marx, in parallel with abolition of slavery and capitalism's expansion, employing labor in the

traditional way became impossible. In order to employ workers with the lowest price and highest efficiency, capitalist managers felt the need of controlling the workers. For this reason, management for the surveillance has been created in order to observe/control the workers and discipline them. The idea of assembling workers in factories and workshops is seen most of the times a way to increase efficiency and reach production at the maximum level. According to Marx, the usage of factory, disciplining labor by controlling the worker. Even though Marx's views are one sided, they have importance in terms of understanding the modern surveillance concept.

Max Weber who developed his thoughts which, grounded in Marx, stated that one of the specialty of bureaucratic managements, which he sees as rational organization models, is extensive recording and filing. This system, which Weber claims maximizes the efficiency, is a form of maximized social control. According to Weber, the panopticon can be described as diminishing the level of desire of everything that is also so important that you can even control people's wills by the help of the panopticon. It can be argued that Bentham's "benevolent" plan, with the objectifying methodology of utilitarianism, which considers ethical subjects as bearers of pleasure and pain, prepared the groundwork for turning ethical subjects into objects upon whose pleasures and pains calculations can be made. The rationalization process, which Weber describes perfected this operation. (Weber, 2005: 209)

There are other works beside scientific research that draw attention to modern surveillance's growing influence and danger in parallel with new development of technologies. Most important of them is without a doubt George Orwell's 1984 novel, his writing of which is considered to be inspired by the oppressive Russian regime. Written with a great far-sightedness by Orwell himself, the popular novel boldly expresses a society where a giant bureaucratic organization named Big Brother is keeping the country's citizens under close surveillance. Big brother is the symbol of the panopticon in the modern Orwell's society that controls everything. Big Brother even changes the past to control the future.

As Bentham creates the panoptic prison design as a more humanitarian design of prison, it might be also said that surveillance system is not only for prisoners but for everyone. This system, through surveillance mechanisms, became more effective on human behavior and creates a better controlling influence on them. All the advancements of the power have increased information, and all the places where the power takes place are known to them.

The power will face any kind of extraordinary threat, invent new mechanisms and make itself present everywhere. It divides, neutralizes and frames. Also, the surveillance gets the help from non-stop recording system. There is no danger from power increase caused by the panopticon. The discipline will inspect the mechanism democratically. According to Foucault, the age of enlightenment, which found freedom, also discovered discipline and the modern society was transformed into a society where the concepts of “surveillance” and “discipline” became dominant.

The surveillance concept, which in Foucault’s very impressive words; “The systematic examination and observation of one or more people’s communication or actions” (Foucault, 1995: 62) lately got a special importance with the development process of information technologies such as internet which connects directly with this thesis.

Through these technologies the amount of collected personal information steadily increased. Information technologies made controllers invincible or unknown to potentially a massive population, which in turn made them monitorable. Foucault did not only view surveillance in an organizational context, but also as a wide discipline in society. After Foucault’s studies, surveillance got a central importance in social theory. Modern society to him is a disciplinary society. In this society disciplinary techniques and strategies were always existent. Even though these were initially developed in certain establishments such as armies, prisons and factories, they deeply influenced social life.

According to Foucault, visibility is a trap. In the panopticon, the prisoner can be seen but s/he can not see the observer. S/he’s an information’s object but never the subject and because of this, the panopticon’s major impact comes from this situation; creating a mental state of conscious and non-stop visibility in prisoners that

causes the power function automatically. The panopticon is a great machine that stems from very different desires. It creates homogeneous power effects and a subjection state for the prisoners. This state stems from the imaginary relationship of both parties-though it is more mechanic. It is such a powerful state that makes prisoners behave, calms the insane, encourages the worker to labor, makes schoolers to be attentive and the ill to follow the treatment without any kind of force. There is no need of rusty jails and giant locks anymore.

Furthermore, information technologies, unlike older technologies, are able to accumulate information. New technologies became a potential tool of Bentham's Panopticon vision.

Information leaks are a massive problem in our days. The line between public and private life has weakened. Considering these facts, Foucault suggested a surveillance society concept. According to him, the surveillance society is a place where all obstacles are eliminated with the help of computer technology. New technologies are constantly enhancing the surveillance potential.

Indeed, both national and international treaties covered the right of privacy. For example, according to UN Human Rights Notice privacy is a fundamental right. Laws provide lots of regulations for the protection of private life. Official authorities included, everybody must respect people's right of privacy and private life.⁹ The only exception could be the breach of laws, which is regulated by laws. Privacy surely has had other definitions. Privacy is the right of protection of your private information. Privacy again, is people, groups or institutions determination process when, how much, and information are able to interact with the other. However, in virtual platforms it is quite hard to determine which information is public or private. Thus, the advancements of new technologies have been a constant reduction of private space. If the technological advancements continue like this, the worries about privacy's disappearance will continue to grow. All international laws attempt to protect people's privacy, which also includes the virtual world in the new modern world.

⁹ The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 12.

In the modern information technologies age, the panopticon appears everywhere. Privacy and the panopticon are the key concepts of information technologies. Thus, disciplinary power has transformed into disciplinary technologies. The panopticon is designed to eliminate privacy. Although the panopticon was initially designed as a prison and correction center, the concept is still alive in the new world order. People increasingly use smart devices such as smart phones, computers, and watches. People share every single detail such as political views, choices, steps, everyday routines etc. through software programmes.

Threats to privacy come from various sources in the internet. A good example would be modern day social media. The data about people in commercial and public authority data banks have exploded with the new advancements on computer technology. The biggest computerized society USA is the leader of this movement. But other countries are not very behind of this movement too. It is not coincidence that biggest social media programmes such as Twitter, Facebook, WhatsApp, Foursquare, LinkedIn start their business in USA. Nowadays, USA is the biggest data collector which process all of them and use them as the crucial tool to advertise its products.

The advancements in computers have a dual effect: The computers do not only ease access to information gain but also have the ability to analyze them. Thanks to the shopping done with credit cards, telephone calls, supermarket shopping records and other financial processes, all information of a regular citizens' daily life are stored in computers data base. To this day there are two main approaches towards internet. The first one is the "progressivist" approach, which further enhances the internet freeing effect. According to this approach, internet, as in the slogan "information is at your fingertips", carries information from one place to another at an immense speed. In modern times where information is power, this technology provides broad possibilities to most researchers.

Alongside the broad possibilities, internet's "anarchist" character at the second one, uncontrollable nature, independent state of time and place, all have a lot of limiting effects for authoritarian managements. In centerless Cyberspace where there are no authoritarian managements, expressing demands became easier. With

this technology, especially the opposing groups in authoritarian regimes found themselves having an easier time getting external support for breach of international norms. Therefore; every day we left our footprints in the internet which gives a lot of data about our personal privacies.

Thus, the internet/information age societies will now comprise of freer and more democratic societies. This “technological determinist” approach overlaps with the progressive tradition in the modern social theory. However, another approach, which disputes the tradition of technological determinism and asserts that technology, too, is a social construct, asserts that information technologies such as the internet cannot solely prove an agent of change, on the contrary, they will only have a reinforcing effect on the established order.

The internet, which is said to lay the technological groundwork for freedom on the one hand, led to the disclosure of personal information of people at an unimaginable level. It has now become far easier for the official authorities in charge of monitoring the world to monitor millions of people on the web. It is now also easier to identify the potential dissenters in certain countries. Furthermore, we deliberately update about our lives in the social media channels, which gives the authority every single detail about us. Therefore; we have become the guardian and the prisoner in Bentham’s Panopticon in the new world order era’s social media channels.

Today, this information, which particularly contains many details about the common people's private lives, manifests in the form of an ever-increasing restriction of the personal space as opposed to the public one. And this comes hand in hand with the concerns towards the highly frequent violation of the rule of the secrecy of the private life. The line between the terms of private space / public space has certainly remained blurred to date. It has been constantly reshaped by the ideologies and cultures that comprise these notions.

From the common citizen to huge organizations, online privacy has today become a problem for everyone. One of the factors that has made internet so attractive to this day is its anonymous characteristic. But, Intel's project, declared in January 1999, that aims to produce a microchip that will label personal computers on

a regular basis will spell the end of the anonymous characteristic of the internet as well as further violation of privacy. It will also mean a new era in electronic surveillance. Your personal qualities and habits will now become easier to monitor over the internet.

If the scenarios for the next 10 years come true, those who manage to overcome the current firewall will be able to gain access to the smallest details about common people's private lives such as what food they eat, what books they read, which coffee they drink, what they buy, and if we are to go a little bit further, what they talk about with their significant others, what health issues or hobbies they have.

Personalizing the hardware with Intel, and software with social media channels, nowadays, we are not free as we think in the virtual world.

Today, the digital citizens who make heavy use of information technologies are under greater surveillance than the others. For example, purchases made via credit cards, commercial transactions carried out on the web sites visited over the internet, security cameras in various shops and streets keep common people under constant surveillance, and somewhere they keep on recording. All the items are also stored by the authorities to advertise more in the next steps.

What is more is that this surveillance, as it is with Foucault's panopticon metaphor, is carried out unbeknownst to the surveilled.

To sum up, in the internet era, privacy remains as one of the major issues. Making a distinction between the public and private space has become far more difficult, while the private space has kept becoming more and more restricted.

In modern times, ordinary citizens are faced with the danger of being kept under far stricter surveillance than Orwell's Big Brother and Foucault's panopticon metaphors. However, it has become obvious that the form of government Orwell pictured by drawing inspiration from the Stalin government will never come true. There is no need for resorting to using such physical force on people as it used to be. With the continuing spread of new technologies, the need in this regard has begun to follow a downward trend. Those who believe that they are under constant surveillance become much more "docile" creatures.

Therefore, the internet age society can be defined as the society of neither greater democracy, individuality and freedom, nor that of an Orwellian one where privacy has been utterly annihilated. In the long view, the contradiction between freedom and surveillance will most likely form new syntheses by mutually feeding one another in a dialectic process.

Nowadays, people do not hide their identity in the virtually connected world, i.e., internet. People willingly share their lives in virtual life while sharing their choices, pictures, videos, links etc. In social media, Facebook is one of the most popular applications to share information about people's private life. The panopticon was transformed into a new understanding of "following" others. Although people feel uncomfortable by being followed by the authorities and share their personal data with the 3rd parties, usage of such social media channels is increasing. People also like to have more followers in social media. The panopticon has metamorphosed from the tower to telescreen. Also, all information shared and updated through social media becomes part of the "*big data*". Computer ethics is now dealing with the issues of the panopticon. Bentham's 200 years old panoptic prison design now appears as social media channels. People are aware that the authorities collect the data, but they do not like to be followed by the authorities for such purposes as advertising, trade etc. The panopticon and its ethical implications are still valid in the new world order; it has transformed to social media channels, which is still discussed under the concept of computer ethics.

Having more information brings more power. The concept of prison has changed. In the past, prison was for punishing the prisoners' body and controlling their physical activities, but nowadays it is for controlling the mind. This will always carry the risk of normalizing people as Foucault describes.

The panopticon was designed to decrease the level of pain in prison. But now it is identical with Foucault's disciplinary power. The relations among the individual members of society have also changed. Having developed the information technologies and their tools of communication, the "Electronic Panopticon" has become the primary power to control others.

Today social media is the Big Brother of the modern world which observe and control everything. People share “good” pictures, “good” wishes, “good” places in Facebook. We are all pressured to share “good” things in social media.

Electronic Panopticon makes us much more docile at least in the virtual world. According to me, big data will enable to data collectors to also control the real world in the very near future.

REFERENCES

1. Akay, A., (2016). *Michel Foucault'da İktidar ve Diren İstanbul: Doğu Batı Yayınları*.
2. Aktan, C. and Tunç, M., (1998). *Bilgi Toplumu ve Eğitim. Yeni Türkiye Dergisi*, Issue 21, 118-133.
3. Bauman, Z., (1987). *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
4. ———(1995). *Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
5. Baumgardt, D., (1952). *Bentham and the Ethics of Today*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press .
6. Bentham, J., (1948). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Newyork: Hafner Publishing Co..
7. Bentham, J., (1995). *The Panopticon Writings*. London-New York : Verso.
8. Bentham, J., (1932). *Theory of Legislation*. London: Werthheimer, Lea and Co.
9. Berger, J., (1997). *Steps Toward A Small Theory of the Visible*. London
10. Berger, J., (1972). *Ways of Seeing*. İstanbul: Penguin Modern Classics.
11. Bernauer, J. and Rasmussen, D., (1987). *The Final Foucault*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

12. Best, S. and Kellner, D., (1991). *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. New York: Guilford Publications.
13. Botan, C. and Vorvoreanu, M., (2005). *What Do Employees Think about Electronic Surveillance at Work?*. Hershey: IGI Global.
14. Boyd, M. and Ellison, N. B., (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* , 13(1), 210-230.
15. Bozkurt, V., (2012). *Değişen Dünyada Sosyoloji*. Bursa: Ekin Yayınevi.
16. Bozovic, M., (1995). “An Utterly Dark Spot: The Fiction Of God in Bentham's Panopticon”, *Qui Parle*, 8(2), 83-108.
17. Brey, P., (1999). “The ethics of representation and action in virtual reality”, *Ethics and Information Technology*, 1(1), 5-14.
18. Britannica, T. E. o. E., (2018). Panopticon, Chicago: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Inc.
19. Brown, J. S. and Duguid, P., (2000). *The Social Life of Information*. New York: New Directions Publishing Corp and James MacGibbon.
20. Campbell, J. E. and Carlson, M., (2002). “Online Surveillance and the Commodification of Privacy”, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 46(4), 586-606.
21. Castells, M., (2010). *The Power of Identity: The Information Age - Economy, Society, and Culture: 2*. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing.
22. Cevizci, A., (2008). *Etiğe Giriş*. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.

23. Cevizci, A., (2010). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
24. Coney, L., (2007). *The Right to Privacy a New Common Law Right*. Available at: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=22&ved=0ahUKEwjb5pSziZTbAhWO_KQKHbrjBfo4FBAWCC8wAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fepic.org%2Fepic%2Fstaff%2FSMU%2520presentation.ppt&usg=AOvVaw2wYhrHWJv8z6TsT0um70BD [Accessed 19.05. 2018].
25. Constine, J., (2017). “Facebook now has 2 billion monthly users... and responsibility.” Available at: <https://techcrunch.com/2017/06/27/facebook-2-billion-users/> [Accessed 01.05.2018].
26. Copleston, F. C., (2003). *History of Philosophy Volume 8: Utilitarianism to Early Analytic Philosophy Vol 8*. London: Continuum.
27. Davidson, W., (1915). *Political thought in England: the Utilitarians from Bentham to J.S. Mill*. London: Thornton Butterworth.
28. Drehle, D. V., (2013). *The Surveillance Society*. Available at: <http://nation.time.com/2013/08/01/the-surveillance-society/> [Accessed: 01.05.2018].
29. Erkan, H., (2002). *Bilgi Toplumu ve Ekonomik Gelişme*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
30. Foucault, M., (2000). *Power (The Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, Vol. 3)*. New York: New Press.
31. Foucault, M., (1995). *The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
32. Fried, C., (1968). Privacy. *The Yale Law Journal*, 77(3), 475-493.

33. Gandy, O. H. J., (1989). The Surveillance Society: Information Technology and Bureaucratic Social Control. *Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 61-76.
34. Giddens, A., (1985). *The Nation-state and Violence*. California: University of California Press.
35. Gökberk, M., (1990). *Felsefe Tarihi*. Ankara: Remzi Kitapevi.
36. Gürbüz, A., (2012). *Hukuk Felsefesi Açısından Yaratıcılık Teorisinin Eleştirisi*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın.
37. Halévy, É., (1960). *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
38. Hall, J., (1938). *Readings in Jurisprudence*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
39. Hampsher-Monk, I., (1992). *A History of Modern Political Thought*. Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell.
40. Harris, J., (1997). *Legal Philosophies*. London: Butterworths.
41. Hart, H., (1996). *Bentham's Principle of Utility and Theory of Penal Law*. Oxford: Claderon Press.
42. Jeffrey, G. R., (2000). *Surveillance Society: The Rise of Antichrist*. Colorado : Waterbrook Press.
43. Johnson, D. G., (2001). *Computer Ethics*. New Jersey: Perarson Education International.
44. Johnson, D. G., (1997). Is the global information infrastructure a democratic technology?. *ACM SIGCAS Computers and Society*, 27(3) 20-26.

45. Kahn, R. and Kellner, D., (2003). *Internet subcultures and oppositional politics*. London: Muggleton.
46. Kallman, E. A. and Grillo, J. P., (1993). *Ethical decision making and information technology: an introduction with cases*. New York: Mitchell McGraw-Hill.
47. King, L., (2001). Information, Society and the Panopticon. *The Western Journal of Graduate Research*, 10(1), 40-50.
48. Koops, M. G. and T. T. and B.-J., (2015). *Bentham, Deleuze and Beyond: An Overview*. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2817813 [Accessed: 03.06.2018].
49. Letwin, W., (1954). *Twinning, Globalization and Legal Theory*. London: Routledge.
50. Lon Safko, D. K. B., (2009). *The Social Media Bible: Tactics, Tools, and Strategies for Business Success*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
51. Lyon, D. and Zureik, E., (1996). *Computers, Surveillance, and Privacy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
52. Lyon, D., (1994). *Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society*. Minnesota: U of Minnesota Press.
53. Lyon, D., (2002). Everyday Surveillance: Personal data and social classifications. *Journal Information, Communication & Society* , 5(2) 242-257.
54. Marx, G. T., (2005). Seeing Hazily (But Not Darkly) Through the Lens: Some Recent Empirical Studies of Surveillance Technologies. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 30(2), 339-399.

55. Marx, G. T., (2005). *Surveillance and Society*. The Encyclopedia of Social Theory.
56. Marx, K., (1992). *Capital*. Cambridge: Penguin Classics.
57. Mason, R. O., (1986). Four ethical issues of the information age. *Journal MIS Quarterly*, 10(1) 5-12.
58. Orwell, G., (2002). *1984*. New York: Spark Pub.
59. Pieper, A., (2000). *Etiğe Giriş*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
60. Poster, M., (1984). *Foucault, Marxism, and History*. Polity Press.
61. Prince, J., (1980). Negligence: Liability for Defective Software. *Oklahoma Law Review*, 848-855.
62. Rachels, J., (1975). Why Privacy is Important. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 01 June, 323-333.
63. Revel, J., (2006). *Michel Foucault Güncelliğin Bir Ontolojisi*. İstanbul: Otonom Yayıncılık.
64. Roth, M. P., (1953). *Prisons and Prison Systems*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.
65. Rule, J. and Brantley, P., (1992). Computerized surveillance in the workplace: Forms and distributions. *Sociological Forum*, 7(3) 405-423.
66. Russell, B., (1952). *Freedom and Organization*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd..

67. Shaw, C. M., (2016). 9/11: *The Rise of the Surveillance State*. Available at: <https://www.thenewamerican.com/culture/item/24048-9-11-the-rise-of-the-surveillance-state> [Accessed: 01.05.2018].
68. Sheridan, C., (2016). *Foucault, Power and the Modern Panopticon*. Dublin: Senior Theses, Trinity College.
69. Stalder, F., (2002). Privacy Is Not The Antidote To The Antidote Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(1) 120-124.
70. Staples, W. G., (1998). *The Culture of Surveillance: Discipline and Social Control in the United States*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
71. Tebbit, M., (2000). *Philosophy of Law: An Introduction*. London: Psychology Press.
72. Tenner, E., (1997). *Why Things Bite Back: Technology and the Revenge of Unintended Consequences*. New York: Random House Inc.
73. Toffler, A. a. H., (1995). *Creating a New Civilization: The Politics of the Third Wave*. Nashville: Turner Publishing.
74. Twining, W., (2000). *Globalization and Legal Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
75. Vaz, P. and Bruno, F., (2003). Types of Self-Surveillance: from abnormality to individuals 'at risk'. *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 272-291.
76. Vergara, F., (1998). A Critique of Elie Halévy. Available at: <https://www.utilitarianism.com/vergara/halevy.htm> [Accessed: 03.06.2018].
77. Warburton, N., (2009). *Philosophy: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

78. Weber, M., (1958). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University.
79. Weber, M, (2005). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Routledge
80. Wood, D., (2003). *Foucault and Panopticism Revisited*. Available at: <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/3338/3300> [Accessed: 03.06.2018].

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Jeremy Bentham'ın panoptik hapisane tasarımı ve onun altını çizdiği uygulamaları, Michel Foucault'nun açıklamaları ile, kontrol eden güç adında yeni bir referansa dönüşmüştür. Bu dönüşme içerisinde bulunan insan ögesi de haliyle bir otorite gerekliliğini ortaya koymuştur. Söz konusu otorite mevcut hali ile daima izleyen, izledikçe güçlenen güçlendikçe de daha da fazla izleme araçlarını şekillendiren bir hale kavuşmaktadır.

Günümüzde hapisane kavramları değişmiştir. Sadece suçluyu değil; potansiyel suçluları da izleyen sistemler, bu sistemlerin bir parçası olan DNA'mızdan, parmak izimize, nelerden hoşlanıp nelerden hoşlanmadığımıza dair her türlü veriyi işleyen sistemlere ve o sistemleri birbiri arasında ilişkilerin düzenlenmesine kadar birçok kurguyu ve eylemi içerir.

Şimdilerde, Panoptikon gözetlemenin bir eşanlamlısı olarak kullanılmaktadır. Çünkü gözetleme otoritesi belli olmayan, içerisinde kendi doğasında olan eski anlamıyla mahkumlardan çok salt bir otoriteyi barındıran en önemli unsurdur. Bu unsur; insanı her an her yerde izlemektedir. İzlenildiğinin farkındalığı ile insan; daha fazla evcilleşmekte; normlaşmakta ve tek düzeye indirgenmektedir. İnsan kendi olmaktan böylelikle daha çok uzaklaşarak, arzuya duyduğu istek tek tipleştirilmektedir. Bu tek tipleştirme, insanı özellikle somut ve beşeri dünyasında geçmişini anlama ile kendini var ederken; geleceğine de yön vermektedir.

İnsan doğasında izlenme ve gözetlenme toplu olarak yaşamaya başladığı ilk andan itibaren var olan; bu varoluşla beraber de toplumların evrilmesi ile her toplumda kendini başka şekillerde gösteren bir stil olarak da varlığını sürdürmüştür. Gözetlenme, daima sosyolojik bir kavram olarak insanı baskı altında tutan; bu hissiyat ile birlikte de kişiyi hep daha iyiye ve etik olana yönelttiği düşünülen bir

araçtır. Bu aracı sosyal düzendeki sistemler; insanı ehilleştirmek için kullanmaktadır.

Panoptikon günümüz bilgi teknolojileri içerisinde kendiliğinden gerçek dünyanın bir tezahürü olarak ortaya çıkmış olup bu tezahürü de sanal dünyanın içerisinde her alanda görmektedir. Mevcuttaki sosyal medya kanallarının gerçek isim ve cisimlerle çalışması ile beraberinde yeni bir etik problem de beraberinde getirmektedir. Acaba gerçek dünya ile sanal dünyadaki etik kurallar birbirinden farklı mıdır? Gerçeği söylemek gerekirse bu tez bu ikisinin herhangi bir ayırdımına varmadan; insanların kendi öz dünyaları açısından bilişime ve özellikle de bilişimle alakalı sosyal medya dünyasındaki yaklaşımlara bakarak bir çıkarım yapmaktadır. O da; şu hali ile mevcut etik problem özellikle insanların kendilerini özellikle daha da fazla özgür hissettiklerini söyledikleri sosyal medyanın gün geçtikçe bir hapishaneye dönüşümünü gözler önüne sermektedir.

Bu tez, bu ikisi arasındaki ayırdımdan çok teorik olarak sanal dünyadaki farkındalığın otorite ile eş tutulması üzerinden bir tasarımla hareket etmektedir. Söz konusu otorite tüm bu gerçek dünyadaki verileri toplayarak işlemekte ve işlenen bu veriler ışığında size bir dizi öneri pazarlamalar getirmektedir. Bu pazarlama faaliyeti de mevcut dünya kapital düzeni içerisinde panoptikonun yerine geçmektedir.

Bu anlamıyla Bentham'ın acı ve hazzı Foucault'da otoriteyle eş değer tutularak Panoptikon analogisi sıklıkla gözetimdeki ve günümüz modern dünyasında sosyal medyanın etik uygulamalarındaki problemleri ifade etmek için kullanılır. Bu anlamıyla mevcut dünya düzeni içerisinde; sosyal medya büyük bir panoptikon analogisi içerisinde bir otorite olarak göze çarpmaktadır. Bu tez, insanların sosyal medya kanallarındaki davranışlarının bir panoptik hapishanenin 21. yüzyıl bilgi teknolojilerinde nasıl değiştiğini ve dönüştüğünü araştırmayı, bu anlamda bir literatür taraması ile Bentham'dan başlayarak 21. yüzyıla gelene kadar aşama aşama ne tür değişimler geçirdiğini anlatmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Bentham Foucault arasındaki bağı kuran bu tez; özellikle 21. yüzyıl bilişim etiği dünyasında önem arz eden sosyal medyada insanın kendini nasıl ehileştirdiği problemi üzerinde dururken özellikle bu problem ekseninde insanın sanal dünyada

nasıl kendini prangalara vurduğunu, diđer insanlar ve gözetleyenler açısından nasıl olur da bunu farkına varmadan her an kendisi ve diđerleri için bir hapisane tasarımı yaptığını gözler önüne sermektedir.

APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : İNELER

Adı : SERGENÇ

Bölümü : FELSEFE

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : PROBLEMS OF SURVEILLANCE IN THE
REALM OF 21st CENTURY'S INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

Yazarın imzası

Tarih 24.07.2018