THE CHANGING TYPES OF SOCIAL SURVEILLANCE THROUGH GLOBALIZATION

Fatma Altınbaş Sarıgül
School of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Altınbaş University, Istanbul, Turkey
fatos.altinbas@gmail.com

Abstract

Each individual takes part in social surveillance both as the watcher and the watched. The degree of watching and being watched, however, shows a substantial change as the world becomes more globalized. There are three main types of social surveillance, based on whether the space that is being watched is somewhere local, global or a cyberspace. The first type of surveillance is considered a Panopticon emerged with modernism, where a small group of people watches over a larger group of people. The second one is the Synopticon where the many watch over the few. Emerged especially with the growth of the mass media, the Synopticon is the product of a more globalized world when compared to the concept of Panopticon. The third type of surveillance is the Omnipticon, where both Panopticon and Synopticon are applied simultaneously. While the globalization has stripped a minority of the privilege of watching and conferred it on the whole of society, surveillance has gradually begun to evolve from a mean of psychological pressure into an alluring psychological desire. As the world becomes more globalized, the grip of social control becomes firmer and stronger than thought even though the physical local pressures on the individual seem to have been diminished. While it might seem liberating at first sight, the globalization also leads to an anti-emancipatory world.

Keywords

Globalization, Surveillance, Panopticon, Synopticon, Omniopticon

1. Introduction

The history of surveillance, which is one of the most important means of social control used by ruling powers, dates back to ancient times. The real pressure of surveillance on social life, however, began to manifest itself in modern times.

Restriction of individual freedom and privacy for the sake of social security rules and rules of social life/order has first surfaced, especially with the emergence of modernism, when the State stopped being a feudal lord in the eyes of the individual and became a structure trying to control all aspects of individuals' lives, subdue them with education system, propaganda, and various ideologies like nationalism, and make them bow before an intangible moral and spiritual fiction of state sovereignty. Surveillance has become more prominent and effective, especially with the birth of nation-states and large-scale bureaucratic organizations.

Surveillance functioning together with the nation-state, which ought to be considered a certain stage of globalization when compared to agricultural societies, would help the State fix its eye permanently on the individual using the advantages of modernism. That is to say, the world of surveillance descending domineeringly over people has been among the first phases of globalization.

Through mass media, which is the second phase of globalization, reaching far beyond the geographic borders, the world of surveillance has taken a new turn, replacing its heavy hand with people's willfully opting into surveillance thus transforming into a new strategy where majority watches over minority in order to establish social models.

In cyber-universe, the current phase of globalization, where both 'the watcher' and 'the watched' are taken into a simulative dimension, the surveillance has turned into a reciprocal action.

2. The Changing Types of Social Surveillance through Globalization

Social surveillance plays an important role in shaping the development of different types of individual behavior in public life. Each individual takes part in social surveillance both as the watcher and the watched. The degree of watching and being watched, however, shows a substantial change as the world becomes more globalized. There are three main types of social surveillance, based on whether the space that is being watched is somewhere local, global or a cyberspace. The first type of surveillance is considered a Panopticon emerged with modernism, where a small group of people watches over a larger group of people. Panopticon reflects the

direct domination of a minority over the majority and has a disturbing effect on the dominated. The second one is the Synopticon where the many watch over the few. Emerged especially with the growth of the mass media, the Synopticon is the product of a more globalized world when compared to the concept of Panopticon. This type of surveillance is being carried out where the masses watch/purchase/consume a number of products, i.e. books, radio programs, TV shows, movies, music; by a few certain writers, journalists, radio broadcasters, television and film producers, musicians. With the introduction of the internet to the public, the act of watching and being watched started to occur simultaneously in the cyberspace, which manifests itself as the next stage of globalization, thus allowing the emergence of Omnipticon, the third type of surveillance, where both Panopticon and Synopticon are applied simultaneously.

While the globalization has stripped a minority of the privilege of watching and conferred it on the whole of society, surveillance has gradually begun to evolve from a mean of psychological pressure into an alluring psychological desire. Being no longer hegemony of a small minority over the masses, social control exercised through surveillance is slowly turning into a structure where all citizens voluntarily watch each other. As the world becomes more globalized, the grip of social control becomes firmer and stronger than thought even though the physical local pressures on the individual seem to have been diminished. While it might seem liberating at first sight, the globalization also leads to an anti-emancipatory world.

2.1 Pantopticon

With technological advances in manufacturing industry, rural dwellers started to flock to urban areas during the eighteen century, causing a huge amount of population pile up on cities and making it difficult for urban authorities to control. The controlling and authoritarian approach of modernism sought ways to control large numbers of people, eventually, the Panopticon, an institutional building designed by the Bentham brothers, naval architect Sir Samuel Bentham and philosopher Jeremy Bentham, has emerged as a symbol of modern surveillance societies. With his 1975 book, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison,* Michel Foucault was the first person who draw attention to Bentham Brothers' works in modern times. (Foucault, 2000)

The panopticon building, designed as a prison and also a hospital, consists of a central watchtower/inspection house sitting at the heart of the circular structure surrounded by individuals in their cells. (Senett, 2005) The essential purpose of the design is that custodians should be able to monitor the individuals (inmates, patients or workers, depending on the use of

the building) at all times, but the individuals should be unable to see through their cells thus ensuring that they would never know whether or not they are being watched. The emergence of the Panopticon represents a transformation where the few watch over the many in lieu of the many watch over the few. (Mathiensen, 1997) That is to say, the display of power has been replaced with surveillance.

Accordingly, the name of the building, "Panopticon", has been created to express the primary purpose of this system of control. The word is derived from ancient Greek "opticon" for "observe" and "pan" for "all". It is a design allowing the minority keep an eye on the majority, thus establishing absolute authority over the latter. It has also been envisaged as a model of surveillance and authority for governments to use in schools and other public institutions over the forthcoming periods.

There is no private space in the ideal Panopticon, in which even the smallest spaces are observed. Each individual, in his place, is securely confined to a cell from which he is seen from the front by the supervisor. He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication. If the inmates are convicts, there is no danger of a plot, an attempt at collective escape, the planning of new crimes for the future, bad reciprocal influences; if they are patients, there is no danger of contagion; if they are madmen there is no risk of their committing violence upon one another; if they are schoolchildren, there is no copying, no noise, no chatter, no waste of time; if they are workers, there are no disorders, no theft, no coalitions, none of those distractions that slow down the rate of work, make it less perfect or cause accidents. From the point of view of the guardian, it is replaced by a multiplicity that can be numbered and supervised. (Bentham, 2010)

Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the in a stale of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary. (Foucault, 2000) For that reason, the panoptic environment is considerably unsafe for the watched, whereas it is quite safe for 'the watcher'. 'The watched' (occupants/inmates) never know when they are being watched. Therefore, they behave as though they were being watched all the time, feeling compelled to control their own behavior, yet knowing that they are not entirely free to do what they want. (Johnson, 2001) The fact that the individuals in the panopticon have right neither to

private space nor to privacy makes them permanently feel like they are living under the control of a watchman.

Panopticon automatizes and disindividualizes power. Individuals do not act honestly and transparently towards each other out of the fear of being watched at all times. They develop a certain form of behavior that complies with the generally accepted ideology set forth by those in power instead of expressing their true opinions and feelings. So, rather than being just themselves, they slowly begin to adopt a certain personality compatible with the others and the environment, eventually becoming a part of the social order designed through hegemonic desire. When enough time has passed, individuals in the panopticon naturally start acting alike. Such pressures hold importance in terms of individual and social transformations.

A real subjection is born mechanically from a fictitious relation. So it is not necessary to use force to constrain the convict to good behavior, the madman to calm, the worker to work, the schoolboy to application, the patient to the observation of the regulations. There were no more bars, no more chains, no more heavy locks; all that was needed was that the separations should be dear and the openings well arranged.

Whenever one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a particular form of behavior must be imposed the panoptic schema may be used. It is - necessary modifications apart - applicable 'to all establishments whatsoever, in which, within a space not too large to be covered or commanded by buildings, a number of persons are meant to be kept under inspection. (Bentham, 2010) In each of its applications, it makes it possible to perfect the exercise of power.

The panoptic schema, without disappearing as such or losing any of its properties, was destined to spread throughout the social body; its vocation was to become a generalized function. (Foucault, 2000) Panopticon is the general principle of a new 'political anatomy' whose object and end are not the relations of sovereignty but the relations of discipline.

The above-described situation is exactly what utopia architects and social engineers desire: to manipulate society into performing "regular", "rational" and "predictable" actions through architecture. After a while, however, it would be understood that the said practices are often not implementable for governments due to an ever increasing population.

As a system of control where the few watch over the many, the Panopticon has a certain natural boundary. (Garland, 2008) This is because when the number of those who are being watched increases above the biological capacity of the few entrusted with the watching duty, 'the

watched' would start to grow away from the feeling of being watched all the time. Accordingly, the Panopticon has no other choice but to remain as a local practice with limited geographic reach and a limited number of individuals to be kept under watch. With expanding globalization, the *synopticon* would be added to the Panopticon.

2.2 Synopticon

The purpose and major effect of the Panopticon was to immobilize individuals/subjects, thus preventing escape or at least any autonomous, unexpected and unsystematic action. Introduced by Mathiesen as a counterpart to the Panopticon, the concept of Synopticon does not require an authoritative control on individuals. On the contrary, the Synopticon is a soft power aiming to seduce people into watching. The term Synopticon is a combination of the Greek prefix "syn" (synchronous, at the same time) and "opticon" (observe). In Mathiesen's Synopticon, the many watch over the few. (Mathiensen, 1997) According to Mathiesen, with the rise of mass media, especially the television, the masses started to watch over the few, the like of which has never been seen before.

Panopticon, by its very nature, is a local control mechanism. Synopticon, however, is global. The act of watching disengage the watchers from their localness. (Bauman, 2017) With the emergence of the phase prepared by mass media towards the path to globalization, those who are watching are pulled away from their own localness; it's because various means of communication as national radio or television stations, national newspapers, and national publishers are the products of a more globalized approach compared to the previous phase. Localness, which was used to be limited to villages, counties, districts, started to address larger scale areas with rise of nationalism. For this reason, nationalism stands out as a significant step taken towards the globalization, in comparison to localization. It provides individuals with information and knowledge on larger parts of the country they live in, ensure them feel concerned, worried or curious, and make them build emotional connections. Although the large numbers of people watching the minority physically remain in their place, at least, they are spiritually taken to a universe where the distance is no longer a problem.

In the Synopticon, the subjects who were being watched in the Panopticon turn into spectators. While, in the Panopticon, select local elites were watching other locals (whereas ordinary locals were watching select few locals prior to the Panopticon), in the Synopticon, however, locals watch the globals. While the Panopticon makes the masses subject to constant surveillance by constraining them within specified physical boundaries, the Synopticon invites

the same masses to engage in a fun act of watching without neither imposing any physical boundary nor exercising power over them or stipulating any apparent condition. Those who are being watched consist of a few celebrities involved in politics, sports, science, and show business, having the opportunity to reach large audiences through mass media.

On the other hand, the authority of the globals remains safe and secure, away from those who are engaged in watching. (Bauman, 2017) The Globals are literally "out of this world", casting their shadows over the local worlds. Living separated and isolated from each other on the Earth, locals meet with the globals via mass media like books, magazines, newspapers, radio and television.

Through their actions or statements, subjects who are being watched demonstrate to the watchers that they are leading a general lifestyle; they generate envy. As the act of watching is extremely gratifying itself, there's no need to exercise control and pressure over people; because, they would not know that they are actually being kept under control as they get consistent pleasure and have so much fun while watching others. Such entertainment becomes the main ideology for ruling the World. People find a chance to escape from real world problems by losing themselves into television. At this point, fun becomes the real ideology. The concept of synopticon begins to dominate the disciplinary society, notably in the 1950s where mass media, especially television, starts playing a prominent role in society, allowing Government to regenerate itself through an entertainment experience.

Modern mass media creates a synoptic environment. Radio shows, TV shows and printed works are produced by a minority, and then offered to the majority. In the said synoptic environment, the watcher and the watched does not interact with each other. The medium through which content/information is transmitted results in a unilateral communication, thus leaving the many with no other option but to watch the few.

As being readers, listeners or viewers of modern mass media, people not only connect with news, events, stories, shows and characters broadcasted via various mass media, but also connect with other fellow readers, listeners and viewers holding the same position as they do. Such connection, however, is not real. It is an imagined communication. People connect with each other in imagined settings. This connection leads to the establishment of discipline among the masses and encourage them to internalize the discipline. From now on, government would not need to monitor the subjects consistently. Control is implemented through the symbols that

are released into circulation by the minority. With the relationship established with the symbols, majority watches over the minority world.

2.3 Omniopticon

Since the last fifteen years of the 21st century, a fractionation has occurred in the methods of surveillance with the increasing use of internet in public spaces. Surveillance instruments of the Synopticon phase, like radio and television, are parts of a unilateral broadcasting model. On the other hand, surveillance through computers, which have turned into mass media as well with the emergence of internet, has become more globalized compared to the synopticon phase. The capacity of surveillance has significantly increased worldwide.

While, in local worlds, the few have watched over the many through the panoptic mechanism and the many have watched over the few in relatively globalized environments through the Synopticon; together with the rise of globalization, the elimination of the obstructive effects of borders by allowing public use of internet and cyberspace, which connects real people to each other, has led to a brand new phase where everyone watches everyone. Born of the combination of panoptic and synoptic practices, the Omniopticon is characterized by both watching and being watched taking place simultaneously.

The term Omniopticon is a combination of the Latin prefix "Omni", for "in all places, everything, whole" and "opticon", which stands for "observe". In this way, the concept signified by the term "omniopticon", has been enabled to mean "*observing everywhere and everything*". (Rosen, 2004)

Images transferred to computers, tablets or mobile phones by cameras located in places required to be monitored through new communication technologies, allow the watchers to spectate anywhere they want, just by clicking a button, thus giving them freedom access all these images from any corner of the world with an available internet connection. Accordingly, such technology enables the Governments to keep and store record images of streets worldwide while allowing a business person, for instance, to monitor his/her office or premises when going abroad, or working parents to view their children they left at home with a babysitter. Everyone lives as under the watchful eye of authority.

In the Omniopticon, however, there is a climate where not only the authority but also the non-authorities can watch each other. Such climate is mainly provided by the advances in technological infrastructure and its affordability to the extent that it becomes a part of users' daily lives as well as the willingness of individuals for being subjects to surveillance. Social

media networking sites such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter that are built on internet-based infrastructure have replaced the restricted content offered by mass media before the rise of the internet, allowing everyone contribute content to mass communication. Any type or form of content generated by users of a system/service is being made available to the public so that everyone can watch and monitor everyone else. And everyone desires to attain the status of most watched.

In such practices allowing individuals to share every detail of their personal lives, people knowingly and willfully reveal photos of their daily routines, their opinions regarding social facts/events, their political views and any other feelings or thoughts they wish to divulge to the world. Digital identities are declarative, active, and calculated. The declarative element is made of all data voluntarily introduced by the user, notably during the process of inscription to the service— on Facebook, for instance, information about "Work and Education," "Contact and Basic Info" (birthdate, gender, religious view, etc.), "Family and Relationships," etc. The active element consists of all the messages about the user's social activities. (Romele, Gallino, Emmenegger, & Gorgone, 2017) Any personal information shared on digital platforms is designed in a way that the owners of such information are already aware that what they share will be put under monitoring of others.

Globalization thus creates a new universe where we are deliberately trying to disclose personal or intimate information and life events that, in our local worlds, we do not really want to reveal, that we actually intend to keep it to ourselves. In lieu of an absolute transparency, however, this disclosure includes a perspective, which can only be built by the one who divulges it. In other words, those who are being watched do not disclose themselves at large like they do in the Panopticon under the command of watchers; instead, they generate their own shots and frames using camera angles, filters; dividing, trimming and cutting out the pictures, videos where they expose themselves in different states and they create fake images claiming to represent the "truth". In this type of surveillance, the watcher obtains the privilege to monitor others without reservation. While everyone is being watched by everyone else, the watcher is also kept under constant monitoring of others.

The fact that masses keep each other under observation ceases to be a one-way action and turns into a multidirectional structure. In terms of structure, the act of watching over each other is not merely exerted in a vertical command way like government's control over the society; it also refers to a horizontal dimension of surveillance where users watch other users.

Consequently, each and every member of cyber society turns into a cog in the wheel known as surveillance society.

There is a new actor in the Omniopticon, watching over individuals: the eye of the market. The fact that individuals technically cannot run away from being monitored, allows market actors too to fix their eyes on them along with governments and ordinary people. Through computers enabling advanced data mining and data analysis, as well as surveillance methods allowing taking close pulse of market economy and consumers, the watchers have set new goals for themselves, like obtaining new information, in order to drive consumers into new consumption areas.

Global marketing shows a great deal of interest in the analysis of consumption in different parts of the world. Consumer spending behavior can be predicted based on information obtained from consumers' technological handprints left on global scale such as credit card transactions, barcoded cards, interbank money transfers; in this sense, surveillance makes it possible to release products into markets, leaving no doubt in producers' minds that their products will most definitely be sold. (Lyon, 2003) Clicks on the "like" button and consumer opinions on goods provide important data on product popularity, bringing serious advantages to companies in shaping their marketing policy. As a result, we see advertisements for commercial products we were searching on search engines every time we go on the internet. (Turow, 2006) This shows how closely internet users and their online behaviour are monitored. (Marwick, 2012)

Such close monitoring of individuals is carried out through perceiving them as attitudes, behaviors, habits and patterns that are measured by using existing algorithms, instead of perceiving them as human beings. (Pimenta, 2011) Individuals are no longer monitored as living, breathing human beings, but as objects transformed/ reduced into a ball of numbers and statistics, in other words, *informatic bodies*. (Çam, 2015) In an era where bodies get sucked into databases, networks and information corridors, there is nowhere left to hide.

3. Conclusion

Today, cameras positioned everywhere, mobile phones and credit cards we carry in our pockets, internet access at our homes, offices and via our cell phones   we have access from our homes, show us that the panopticon model of surveillance is no longer in effect alone. However,

no model entirely disappears. Panopticon continues to survive along with Synopticon and Omniopticon models.

Office cameras to monitor employees, transparent acoustic barriers between offices maintaining visibility come out as different forms of panoptic mechanism. Although it seems like the panoptic form has changed, the concepts still remains. In this sense, the Synopticon and the Omniopticon are more noticeable in terms of effectiveness.

In the new cyber world, there is no one left still tied to local roots. Everyone becomes a part of this global universe. In the first phase, the many remaining under the constant pressure of the few feel compelled to control their own behavior; in the second phase, the many is encouraged and seduced by the few to change their behavior to match that of the minority; and in the third phase, everyone is a role model for everyone else, yet all of the models are designed to be the most favorite among other surveilled models. The status of "being watched", the least preferred position at the local phase, has become a desired status at the relative globalization phase, with having individuals convinced that "being watched" is a privilege granted to celebrities. As for the cyberspace phase, being watched has become a competition for attaining and maintaining the status of most watched. Used to be shackle during the local phase, being watched has evolved into an object of desire.

In the 21st century, being voluntarily watched is now accompanied by mandatory monitoring for security purposes. With September 11 attacks in the Twin Towers in New York, the ideal of *highly secure society* has been declared as a legitimizer for surveillance/monitoring all around the world, most notable in the United States of America. Governments, throughout the history, placed great importance in controlling individuals. In today's world, however, the said control is exercised not only over persons who are deemed to be dangerous to the rest of society. Almost everyone with possible risk factor is closely monitored. (Tutal, 2015) The 21st Century where the State, society and market systematically watch individuals under the pretexts and justifications such as control, tracking individuals' likings, driving them into things that bring satisfaction, and economic reasons, leads us to see the non-emancipatory face of globalization. Globalization, presented as an absolute emancipation, causes anti-emancipation in this process towards an absolute surveillance society.

References

Bauman, Z. (2017). Küreselleşme. İstanbul: Ayrıntı .

Bentham, J. (2010). Panopticon: Or The Inspection House. Kessinger Publishing, LLC.

Çam, A. (2015). Al Gözüm Seyreyle Dünyayı. Varlık (1295), 12-16.

Foucault, M. (2000). Hapishanenin Doğuşu . Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Garland, D. (2008). Panopticon Days. Criminal Justice Matters , 20 (1), 3.
https://doi.org/10.1080/09627259508552708

Johnson, D. G. (2001). Computer Ethics. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
https://doi.org/10.1086/233589

Lyon, D. (2003). Fear, Surveillance, and Consumption. The Hedgehog Review, Critical Reflections on Contemporary Culture , 5 (3), 81-95.

Marwick, A. E. (2012). The Public Domain: Social Surveillance in Everyday Life . Surveillance & Society , 9 (4), 378-393.

Mathiensen, T. (1997). The Viwer Society: Micheal Foucault's "Panopticon" Revisited. Theroical Criminology , 1 (2), 215-234. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003

Pimenta, E. D. (2011). Low Power Society. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Romele, A., Gallino, F., Emmenegger, C., & Gorgone, D. (2017). Panopticism is not Enough: Social Media as Technologies of Voluntary Servitude . Surveillance & Society , 15 (2), 204-221.

Rosen, J. (2004). The Naked Crow, Reclaiming Security and Freedom in an Anxious Age. New York: Random House.

Senett, R. (2005). Otorite. İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Turow, J. (2006). Niche Envy: Marketing Discrimination in the Digital Age . Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Tutal, N. (2015). İktidarın Bakışını Cezbetmek. Varlık (1295).