AJIT-e Academic Journal of Information Technology
10.5824/ajite.2023.03.003.x

2023 . Summer – Yaz . Volume – Cilt: 14 . Issue – Sayı: 54

The Limitations of Social Movements and the Increasing Impact of Digital Surveillance in the Age of Big Data

Özgür YILMAZ, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Gazetecilik Doktora Programı Öğrencisi, ozguryilmaz955@gmail.com, 0000-0003-3020-8550

ABSTACT *Surveillance is one of the areas where digitalization is discussed intensely today. The phenomenon that can be called digital surveillance is generally discussed in the context of privacy, display, and access to personal information and around concepts such as synopticon, banopticon, and omnipticon. The relationship of digital surveillance with political economy and social movements is often neglected. When examined within the framework of the big data concept, it is seen that the individuals subjected to digital surveillance are categorized. Especially with the pandemic and the focusing of the states on surveillance technologies, the organizational opportunities of social movements are getting harder. The credit system in China is one of the most extreme examples of surveillance technologies. Investments in the metaverse universe add a dystopian fiction to the difficulties mentioned about social movements. In the study, it is thought that the effect of digital surveillance on social movements has structural consequences. In this context, three hypotheses are put forward in the study. The first of these is that digital surveillance changes the space of social movements: Social movements are moving into digital space. Another hypothesis related to the first is that the social movements that took place in the digital medium faded and created an illusion in people. The new repertoire of protests such as hacktivism and slacktivism are thought to strengthen this argument. A third hypothesis is the phenomenon of (digital) populism, which has been on the rise due to the transformation of social movements, and the changes brought about by (digital) populism regarding the form of politics. The aim of the study is to reveal the effects of big data on social movements. Literature review will be used as a method in the study. The research finds that big data and artificial intelligence applications have a restrictive effect on social movements.*

Keywords **:** Digital Surveillance, Pandemic, Social movements, Populism, Metaverse

Toplumsal Hareketlerin Sınırlılıkları ve Büyük Veri Çağında Dijital Gözetimin Artan Etkisi

ÖZ *Bugün dijitalleşmenin yoğun olarak tartışıldığı alanlardan biri de gözetimdir. Dijital gözetim olarak adlandırılabilecek bu olgu genellikle gizlilik, gösteri ve kişisel bilgilere erişim bağlamında ve sinoptikon, banoptikon ve omnipikon gibi kavramlar etrafında tartışılmaktadır. Dijital gözetimin politik ekonomi ve sosyal hareketlerle*

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article
Date Received: 8.03.2023
Publishing Date: 30.08.2023

ilişkisi genellikle göz ardı edilmektedir. Büyük veri kavramı çerçevesinde incelendiğinde, dijital gözetim altındaki bireylerin kategorilendirildiği görülmektedir. Özellikle pandemi ile devletlerin gözetim teknolojilerine odaklanması, sosyal hareketlerin örgütlenme olanaklarını zorlaştırmaktadır. Çin'deki kredi sistemi, gözetim teknolojilerinin en aşırı örneklerinden biridir. Metaverse evrenine yapılan yatırımlar, sosyal hareketlerle ilgili zorluklara distopik bir kurgu eklemektedir. Çalışmada, dijital gözetimin sosyal hareketler üzerinde yapısal sonuçları olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, çalışmada üç hipotez öne sürülmektedir. Bunlardan ilki, dijital gözetimin sosyal hareketlerin alanını değiştirdiğidir: Sosyal hareketler dijital alana taşınmaktadır. Diğer bir hipotez, dijital ortamda gerçekleşen sosyal hareketlerin solgunlaştığı ve insanlarda bir illüzyon yarattığıdır. Hacktivizm ve slacktivizm gibi yeni protesto repertuarlarının bu argümanı güçlendirdiği düşünülmektedir. Üçüncü bir hipotez, sosyal hareketlerin dönüşümü nedeniyle yükselen (dijital) populizm olgusudur ve (dijital) populizmin politika biçimi hakkında getirdiği değişikliklerdir. Çalışmanın amacı, büyük verinin sosyal hareketler üzerindeki etkilerini ortaya koymaktır. Çalışmada literatür taraması yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Araştırma, büyük veri ve yapay zekâ uygulamalarının sosyal hareketler üzerinde kısıtlayıcı bir etkisi olduğunu ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler : Dijital Gözetim, Pandemi, Toplumsal Hareketler, Popülizm, Metaevren

INTRODUCTION

Digitalization is becoming an important influence on life, especially on the economy, politics, and culture. Mainstream thought generally focuses on the positive effects of digitalization on the economy. The negative effects of digitalization on society are generally concentrated in the field of culture. The relationship between digitalization and politics is progressing in the shadow of these two debates. However, the effects of digitalization on politics are too important to be left in the background. The Covid-19 pandemic has made the importance of this relationship visible through a discussion: Digital surveillance. With the pandemic, the access of mobile health applications to personal data and the measures implemented by the states have caused reactions.

The concept of digital surveillance is discussed in the context of privacy, display, and protection of personal information and is analyzed around the concepts of panopticon and derivatives (such as synopticon and banopticon). The effects of digital surveillance on politics are thus reduced to a personal level and no attention is paid to interaction with political economy/social movements. In this study, the effects of digital surveillance on social movements are investigated, thus the current position of the collective political subject is examined. In this research process, it is thought that the most important element of the concept set that shapes the era we live in is "big data". The questions sought to be answered in the study can be listed as follows: What does the collective political subject say about digital

10.5824/ajite.2023.03.002.x

surveillance practices? What is the projection of political subjects regarding digital surveillance?

Three hypotheses about the relationship between digital surveillance and social movements are put forward in the study. The first is that digital surveillance has changed the space of social movements. The second hypothesis is about whether social movements taking place in digital space create an illusion in people. The last hypothesis is whether the digitalization trend of social movements can be examined with the phenomenon of digital populism. Critical to this latter hypothesis is the assumption that digital populism is a strategy. If, as claimed in the study, the relationship between social movements and digitalization creates significant transformations, these transformations can also be seen in digital populism itself. Therefore, another questioning topic regarding the third hypothesis is whether digital populism is a strategy or a new "ideology". Before starting the field research in the study, a literature review will be carried out regarding the mentioned concepts.

1. DIGITAL SURVEILLANCE-BIG DATA RELATIONSHIP

Big data is the name given to data sets that cannot be detected, obtained, managed, and processed in a reasonable time with traditional information technologies, software, and hardware tools. The concept of big data is used in the context of the increase in global data and to describe large data sets. Compared to traditional datasets, big data often contains unstructured data that needs more real-time analysis. As the amount of large data sets increases, it brings many problems to be solved. First, recent developments in information technologies make data generation easier. For example, an average of 500 hours of video is uploaded to YouTube every minute (Wise, 2023). Therefore, we are faced with the big task of collecting and extracting data from highly dispersed data sources. Second, the data collected is constantly increasing, which raises the question of how to store and manage heterogeneous datasets in software and hardware. The rapid development of cloud computing and the internet of things has further driven the sharp growth in data. Cloud computing provides channels for security, site access, and datasets. The internet of things collects and transforms data to be stored and processed in the cloud by sensors all over the world. Today, the production of data has increased so much that the data produced in two days in 2011 is more than all the data created and accumulated from the beginning of civilization until 2003 (Chen et al, 2014: v-3).

Big data is a broad term for raw data generated by the user or machine. Data generations have evolved from processed data to the first interacted data. Weblogs are the first phase of this evolution. These technologies, consisting of diaries, were instrumental in the first development of data. Social media has taken data production to further dimensions with human interaction. Surveillance and wearable technologies have made the next stage possible

(Ramesh, 2015: 29). Therefore, it can be said that digital surveillance is a sub-branch of big data.

Digital surveillance is the state of surveillance that takes place in digital media. Surveillance studies are based on two premises: Jeremy Bentham's book "Panopticon" published in 1791 and Michel Foucault's take on the panopticon in The Birth of the Prison published in 1975 [1992] (Mattelart, 2012: 14). The panopticon is "a surveillance system in which the entire area of the building, partitioned like a honeycomb, can be fully viewed from a central tower, and those under surveillance, who are separated from each other in these individual cells, can be seen without seeing anything" (Mattelart & Mattelart, 2020: 78). In the panoptic order, the authorities do not need to be on duty all the time, it is the possibility of the authorities to be there that restrains the criminals (Ritzer, 2000: 122). The panopticon and its derivatives are at the foundation of Foucault's disciplinary society (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2016: 196).

Foucault (1992: 222) associated surveillance with disciplinary power: "Hierarchical, continuous and functional surveillance is certainly not one of the great technical inventions of the 18th century, but it owes its insidious spread to the new power mechanisms it carries with it." According to Foucault, disciplinary power becomes a system connected to the economy and the aims of the order in which it is exercised (Foucault, 1992: 222). Foucault describes Bentham's Panopticon as "a ring building on the periphery, a tower in the center; this tower has large windows facing the inner side of the ring; The surrounding building is divided into cells, each of which spans the full thickness of the building, each with two windows, one facing inside and opposing those of the tower, and the other facing outside, allowing light to enter the cell. In this case, it is sufficient to lock a single supervisor in the central tower and a single insane person, a patient, a prisoner, a worker or a schoolboy in each cell" (Foucault, 1992: 251). Thus, Bentham poses the problem of "(visibility), but by considering visibility organized entirely around a dominating and surveillance gaze. It gives function to a project of universal visibility acting in the name of a rigid and meticulous power" (Foucault, 2012: 92). Foucault's reading of Bentham emphasizes the panopticon, a situation in which individual individuals are constantly observed but cannot see this eye (Neocleous, 1996: 61).

Foucault's contribution to surveillance studies is evident in his attention to the development of rational tools for modern societies to disarm traditional methods of ordering society. "Rather than relying on external controls and constraints, modern social institutions employ a set of disciplinary practices that ensure that life continues on a regulated and determined path" (Lyon, 1997: 20). The surveillance society debates can be traced from the concept of the panopticon to the need for coordination and control of modernity (Lyon, 2006: 98). Surveillance is not just coercive and controlling, it is an act of influencing, persuading, and seducing. The power of surveillance ranges from oppressive control to mild temptation, from a necessity to influence (Lyon, 2006: 113). Surveillance, a fundamental feature of modernity,

10.5824/ajite.2023.03.002.x

has greatly intensified and systematized the immature practices of traditional and feudal societies: everyday life has become largely transparent, while the oversight capacity of organizations has steadily increased. The development of electronic technologies, on the other hand, infiltrates surveillance even more deeply (Lyon, 1997: 59-61).

Academics working in the field of surveillance studies and information society studies have emphasized the effects of computerization on surveillance for the last 20 years. There is an important link between surveillance and computerization: The new concepts of surveillance, data surveillance, electronic (super) panopticon, electronic surveillance or digital surveillance are products of this link. Digital surveillance has different features from traditional surveillance studies. In this new type of surveillance, the use of technical tools to create or exploit personal data is at the forefront. While it is more difficult to transfer data in traditional surveillance, it is easier in new surveillance. Whereas in traditional surveillance the object probably knows what the observer knows, in the new surveillance the supervisor knows everything, but the object is usually unaware. Computerized surveillance is an important form of new surveillance (Fuchs et al, 2012: 1).

Another difference between digital surveillance and traditional surveillance is that traditional surveillance separates citizens from each other for disciplining, while digital surveillance interacts with each other intensively: Thus, voluntary cooperation is made with the digital panopticon (Han, 2020: 18). In other words, external surveillance, which is hated because it keeps people's individual lives under constant control, has become a kind of addictive and enjoyed (Kar & Güven, 2016: 305). Thus, the digital surveillance society creates a context where pornographic exhibitionism and panoptic control overlap (Han, 2021: 39). Computers reshape, routinize, set boundaries, and deepen the nature of surveillance. An important form of digital surveillance is data surveillance. This form of surveillance is the systematic monitoring of people's actions or communications through communication technology tools (Fuchs et al., 2012: 1). In this way, data is designed, used, and analyzed and conclusions are drawn about these data by those who seize it (Kitchin, 2014: 30).

The Internet offers new options for user surveillance and new risks for consumers. Technologies such as cookies, data mining, collaborative filtering, eavesdropping, click analysis, spyware, search robots, log file analysis, etc., allow the expansion and spread of consumer surveillance with the help of the internet (Fuchs et al., 2012: 8). For example, cookies are the name given to a small file that a server writes to the hard disk via the internet. In the next visit to a site that leaves a cookie on the computer, the site can remember details about the user and offer special options (Bell et al, 2004: 26).

Targeted advertising, spam emails, the collection and marketing of email addresses and personal information for commercial purposes, detailed consumer profiling, privacy

policies, terms of use, solicited and unsolicited solutions, and fair information practices are some of the key topics of surveillance and big data discussion. (Fuchs et al, 2012: 8). The Internet widens the panoptic eye of power, but it also gives those who are the object of surveillance the opportunity to reverse surveillance. A potential Internet counter-surveillance can be mentioned in this context. There are ways to spy on the watchers (Fuchs et al, 2012: 13).

With digitalization, some new additions have been brought to the panopticon debate. For example, synopticon means that the majority watches the minority (Fuchs, 2012: 53). Omnipticon means that the multitude watches the multitude, that is, everyone is always and everywhere under surveillance. Individuals are under surveillance of more resources (Sprague, 2007: 2-3). Banopticon, on the other hand, is based on exceptional practices, profiling activities of foreigners, and the prescriptive mandate of mobility (such as free movement in the EU). The banopticon, which is based on the control and surveillance of certain minority groups, provides an understanding of how transnational forms of mistrust work and establish a heterogeneous network (Bigo, 2008: 6, 34). As seen in the concept of banopticon, big data analytics is subject to criticism because it increases discrimination practices (Brayne, 2017: 983).

Big data analytics used in surveillance practices are also used by police and legal bodies. Surveillance applications used for this purpose have the potential to increase both efficiency and calculability, just like other corporate organizations. At the same time, it can serve the order by predicting and predicting behaviors (Brayne, 2017: 979, 983). "The police state implies a state engaged in comprehensive internal administration, welfare and surveillance" (Neocleous, 2000: 9). This understanding, which does not wait for the criminals to act, performs its preventive policing task with the classification process before any event (Lyon, 1997: 105).

When the concept of surveillance is considered in the context of political economy, it can be said that capitalist companies predict human behavior and shape it to comply with the control of capital as a profit generating tool (Bloom, 2019: 8). Commercial enterprises target new customers with targeted advertising, and data obtained through big data mining is used in this targeted advertising process (Rosenzweig, 2016: 46). For example, "Google's terms of service and privacy policy legally allow it to collect a large amount of user data and use it for a targeted advertising strategy. This allows for self-defined Google rules, and economic surveillance, which does not give the user a say and is a structural feature of its own privacy control" (Fuchs, 2021: 78).

Surveillance is quick to adapt to new technologies. For example, virtual reality sets can enable more data collection, giving companies and governments more opportunities for profiling and advertising (Hunter, 2022). The metaverse, which exists as a multidimensional environment that allows individuals to enter and use as an augmented form of the real world, has become one of the places where surveillance is experienced (Clemens, 2022: 8, 18). Similarly, the metaverse has started to become an area where users produce more data and

10.5824/ajite.2023.03.002.x

where more sensitive and important data theft can occur. Data will be generated to the extent that users customize their avatars. Metaverse is becoming a place where the traceability of digital footprints becomes easier, where it can be said that the data produced becomes denser as more intense experiences are experienced (Rahman, 2022).

The use of digital technologies for surveillance is not a new phenomenon. Examples of this situation are "mechanisms such as passport, driver's license, identity card, as well as more insidious information gathering tools such as wiretapping, listening to bugs and opening letters" that states use and manage the population (Neocleous, 2015: 91). However, after the Covid-19 pandemic, it started to be used more intensively on the grounds of combating the epidemic. For example, in China, where the pandemic started, telecom operators tracking people's movements have created a health code system that assigns one of three color codes to people according to the carriers of the virus, where they can report people, they suspect may be sick. At the same time, the use of surveillance applications in daily life has advanced by using facial recognition technologies that can detect those who have a fever and those who do not wear masks in the crowd, phone applications that store citizens' personal health information, and their proximity to the infected, and QR codes that are scanned and registered so that people can enter their homes or workplaces (Aydın, 2021: 89).

It can easily be said that surveillance will increase in a world surrounded by media (Güngör, 2020: 14). This concentration of surveillance raises the possibility of a new phase of totalitarianism (Stevenson, 2015: 329). Today's practice of political power is subject to global surveillance that has never existed before, and it can be assumed that totalitarianism will have global effects (Thompson, 2008: 225). Therefore, examining the relationship between surveillance and social movements is a very important task for contemporary surveillance studies (Fuchs et al., 2012: 12).

2. MONITORED SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND POLITICAL PARTIES

Social movements are organizations made up of wide-ranging interest groups. It includes different segments and strata of society. These different interest groups usually come together around a single problem (Tilly, 2008: 13). Social movements combine three kinds of claims: program, identity, and stance. The program "contains the declaration of support or opposition to the actual or anticipated actions of the objects of the movement." Identity claims, on the other hand, include convictions that "we form a unified force that must be reckoned with", while stance claims "emphasize ties and similarities with other political actors, such as marginalized minorities, regularly formed civic groups, or official supporters of the regime" (Tilly, 2008: 30). Social movements as created institutions can disappear or turn into another form (Tilly, 2008: 236).

A political party, on the other hand, can be defined as a group of people organized to take power through elections or other means. Parties are often confused with social movements. However, there are important differences: 1) Parties aim to take power; 2) parties have official members; 3) parties typically adopt a broad focus that addresses each of the key issues of governance policy; 4) parties are integrated with shared political preferences and an ideological identity (Heywood, 2018: 271). Recently, social movements and political parties have entered an important dialogue. One of the products of this dialogue is the "movement parties" that emerged from the social movements and aimed to provide the social movements with an organizational structure and strategic practices in the electoral lane (Hutter et al., 2018: 322). Populist parties that evolved from social movements that emerged especially after the 2008 crisis can be cited as an example of "movement parties" (de Nadal, 2021: 36). Therefore, when examining both social movements and political parties, it is necessary to assume that there is an interaction between them.

These subjects, who emerged after the 2008 crisis, have their own characteristics. Geographically insignificant for potential participants, documenting behavior (by accessing simultaneous accounts), archiving micro-blogs, and use of social media sites are some of these new phenomena. Social media has effects on this new policy understanding (Tucker et al, 2016: 199-200). These effects are more fundamental and profound than relatively simple: The use of digital media – especially social media – is transforming the language used and the style of policymaking. Virtual space has become the natural habitat where an increasing number of people around the world discuss, work, shop, do their banking, hang out, relax, vote, find a partner, and organize their daily activities (Gounari, 2018: 212). Therefore, this transformation has ontological effects.

It is necessary to explain this ontological transformation. It has been said that social movements are based on three claims. These three claims—aiming at social change, identity-based networking, and stance—as well as the means of protest have begun to move into the digital space. Especially after the 2008 crisis, social movements have tended to diversity, decentralization, informality, and grassroots democracy rather than unity, centrality, formality, and strong leadership. These desires, demands, and needs are compatible with the opportunities provided by information and communication technologies (van de Donk et al., 2004: 3). With the developments in digital technology, social movement actors have started to use the media as tools to discuss their problems, distribute information and create collective demands. These new forms of communication are changing organizational functioning, collective behavior now requires less professional leadership and expertise, allowing grassroots organization and improvisation. Compared to past forms of technology, the flow of information is no longer multipoint, under government or corporate control, but bottom-up. With technology, ordinary citizens can organize and make political moves that can affect social change both in cyberspace and in their local communities. Many contemporary social movements avoid identifying a leader or spokesperson, and some avoid voicing their specific

demands. In addition, the participants of social movements are more flexible than the activists who participated in previous forms of movement, they tend to present their demands and tactics as protest activities (Carty, 2018: 5, 12).

Whether in the areas of control or struggle, technologies are not neutral, they are embedded in collective action (Melgaço & Monaghan, 2018: 5). Web 2.0 and other techno-social systems are systems of contrasts, they do not have one-sided effects, they have complex effects (Fuchs et al, 2012: 5). The digital repertoire of struggle is used by social movements and political parties as well as by the police and secret services (Melgaço & Monaghan, 2018: 7). Therefore, one should neither be optimistic nor pessimistic when examining the relationship between social movements and digital surveillance. Because the Internet can be used to strengthen the control and hegemony of power groups, as well as to resist exploitation (Fuchs et al., 2012: 6). For this purpose, methods can be developed in the context of domination, asymmetric power relations, control, and exploitation by developing a critical approach to the relationship between social movements and digital surveillance (Allmer, 2012: 135).

3. HAS POLITICS MOVED TO DIGITAL?

In modern society, digitalization is experienced in every field. The Internet and social media platforms have changed how we acquire knowledge, experience entertainment, socialize, shop, and present ourselves. Applications and smart devices are used to automatically understand data and control it in accordance with industrial process processes. Algorithms, autonomous devices, and humanoid robots are examples of this development. All these processes and practices are related to digital security, democracy, and politics (Musik & Bogner, 2019: 1). The process of digitization of social interaction through mobile devices has supported the globalization of personal and political life activities. This process of transformation can be seen in political campaigns, elections, or riots. Social media platforms simultaneously collect and produce social information from all over the world. Especially social media platforms have become places where personal, social, political, and informational commitment is experienced. People from all over the world participate in local and global online discussions and interact with each other (Hanschitz, 2017: 3).

The digitalization of politics and the big data-politics relationship continued to increase especially after the Covid-19 pandemic (Nowotny, 2021: 107). The digitalization of politics through social media platforms has a great impact on political communication and marketing, political content, and the speed of the spread of fake news (Böcskei, 2017: 257). At the same time, the digitization of politics is a global trend (Wijermars, 2021: 16). One of the prominent topics in the relationship between digitalization and politics is big data. Data does not only affect those who are connected to the Internet because it also reconstructs the form of the relationship between the state and citizens (Ruppert et al, 2017: 1).

Big data analysis allows governments, companies, and organizations to make clearer decisions and determine their policies, as well as the central government's control over citizens' data, as does the Chinese state - the Social Credit System. Thus, mass surveillance and data accumulation are legitimized (Mathew, 2020: 116). With the presence of surveillance in the big data-politics relationship, factors such as blurring the public/private distinction of the produced data and shaping the world through self-representation and self-presentation come to the fore (Mendonca & Bustamente, 2020: 638). In other words, it can be said that states and companies violate the private space of individuals by spying on the data and that the users of social media platforms reproduce this surveillance practice -through their data. For example, a state may penalize a citizen before taking any action through "behavioral profiling". More importantly, states can have foresight about what citizens can do in the future (Posters, 2020).

Information and communication technologies (ICT) are creating some changes in the collective action repertoire. The first change is that street-based activities take place over ICTs. Another change is the implementation of existing tactics through ICTs. Electronic civil disobedience and hacktivism can be read as examples of this tactical transformation. However, this technologydetermined repertoire may limit activists. Participation of participants in online action through automated means can be an obstacle to collective action (Kelly Garrett, 2006: 210-212). Another obstacle is, of course, being kept under constant surveillance by the state. Surveillance through spyware (Harkin et al, 2020) and web crawling (Ang et al, 2021) that collect data without the user's consent are examples of this form of surveillance.

Therefore, although the ever-increasing development in ICTs provides some contributions to collective action (such as the potential to increase participation, and rapid and multi-point to multi-point communication), the topic of big data and surveillance is a point that needs to be considered – apparently not considered. It is thought that there has been a transformation regarding the structure of politics in the digitalization-politics relationship embodied by big data and surveillance. Today, politics has started to become a phenomenon experienced in the digital field, beyond meeting instrumental needs. So, while digitalization is causing such important changes, why are big data and surveillance topics, which are its most important aspects, ignored the answer to this question will be sought in the concept of digital populism.

4. DIGITAL POPULISM: FROM STRATEGY TO IDEOLOGY (?)

Digital populism, called "populism 2.0" by Paolo Gerbaudo, is defined as an ideological orientation that shapes an ideology or sees social media as a means of addressing the public. Traditional populism used the mass media -first the press, then radio and television broadcasts-to reach the public (Gerbaudo, 2014: 67). Contemporary activists use interactive social networking sites for similar purposes. However, what differs from traditional populism here is the use of social networking sites for the construction of a new mass politics after the

2008 crisis (Gerbaudo, 2014: 68). What should be noted here is the definition of digital populism as a strategy by Gerbaudo.

In the study, strategy is understood as the possibilities used to achieve the goal (Tezkan, 2000: 11). A political strategy refers to the methods and tools used to obtain and exercise power (Weyland, 2001: 12). For left socialist subjects, the discussion of strategy "does not include questions about general issues that transcend a particular country and a certain time, such as the general laws of capitalism", instead it "concerns with questions about the methods and possibilities of a real break with capitalism" (Saraçoğlu, 2016). The political strategy stands out with its practical-political dimension rather than its theoretical content (Şener, 2008: 121). For example, some of the strategies used by digital populists can be summarized as "caps, hacking, blogging, digital rights advocacy, setting up pirate parties" (Postill, 2016).

Since carrying out a broad discussion on the concept of ideology would exceed the dimensions of the study more than necessary, a reading was made regarding the position to be focused on. There are many different approaches to ideology, and there are many different definitions developed by each approach. Terry Eagleton (1996: 18) describes some of these approaches and definitions as

> *"(a) The production process of meaning, sign and values in social life; (b) a set of ideas belonging to a particular social group or class; (c) Ideas that serve to legitimize a sovereign political power; (d) False ideas that serve to legitimize a sovereign political power; (e) systematically distorted communication; (f) That which presents a particular position to the subject; (g) Ways of thinking motivated by social interests; (h) the idea of identity; (i) Socially necessary illusion; (j) Discourse and power conjuncture; (k) The environment in which conscious social actors give meaning to their world; (l) the set of action-oriented beliefs; (m) Mixing linguistic and factual reality; (n) Semantic [semiotic] inclusions; (o) The inevitable environment in which individuals live their relationship with the social structure; (p) The process by which social life is transformed into natural reality."*

Especially the approaches of Karl Marx and Marxist thinkers Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser are decisive for the definition of ideology used in the study. While Marx attributed a pejorative meaning to ideology, Gramsci was the first thinker in the Marxist tradition to attribute a positive meaning to ideology (Barrett, 2004: 76). Althusser, on the other hand, in his ideology approach that he developed based on Gramsci, sees ideology as a system in the sense that it has its own logic and rigidity, and by using the term representations, he leaves open the possibility of discussing myths, ideas and concepts depending on the situation. He believes that ideology is an organic part of every society and special in the historical life of

societies" (Barrett, 2004: 121). As can be seen, ideology, unlike strategy, is a more systematic phenomenon and is related to the theoretical field rather than the practical one.

When the concepts of strategy and ideology are examined, it is seen that the concept of digital populism is closer to strategy. That is, digital populism appears to be a methodological style rather than a theoretical position. However, when the results of the relationship between digitalization, big data, surveillance, and politics as revealed in the study especially the result that the structure of politics has changed- are recalled, it can be said that the digital populist discourse, which is the most visible form of the digitalization-politics relationship, goes beyond being a practical strategy/instrumental device. For example, today it is mentioned that surveillance devices restrict the moves of left-socialist political subjects (from individual individuals to organizations as a whole). It can be deduced that it is difficult for left socialist political subjects to develop alternative/radical thoughts while living in a society of big data and surveillance, especially when the next step of individuals is dominated by algorithms. This difficulty can also be called "mainstreaming". As the study puts it, "Why do left-socialist subjects use digital tools quite heavily, while not addressing concepts such as big data and digital surveillance?" The answer to the question can also be found here. Populism is short-term projects based on coming together around a single demand/problem (Yılmaz, 2021: 52, 54).

The nature of the forms of activism and strategies such as digital populism carried out in the digital space is another important topic. Evgeny Morozov considers the effect of big data on politics as creating an "illusion". First, Morozov states that a "good old technocratic political utopia without politics" is presented with algorithmic arrangements. In this utopia, "conflict and conflict are seen as unfortunate by-products of the analogue age—to be resolved through data collection—but not as inevitable consequences of economic or ideological conflicts" (Morozov, 2020: 45). However, the impact of big data on politics is not limited to these. Algorithmic regulations "aim to reprogram the state and make it feedback-friendly, pushing out other ways of policy making" (Morozov, 2020: 46). Morozov draws attention to the voluntary cooperation with digital surveillance applications in this process (Morozov, 2020: 46). The most important point that Morozov mentions in the big data-politics relationship is that the use of personal data by institutions such as "especially insurance companies and banks" (other state institutions can be added to these) leads to the idea that people will shape the rest of their lives (Morozov, 2021: 31) . The idea is that "as we begin to adjust our behavior, assuming that what we do will affect everything, the only result will be more social indifference" (Morozov, 2021: 31). This "calculation of everything" and the state of indifference caused by it also applies to political actions. Morozov calls "one-click" actions such as joining a Facebook group that "make us feel more useful and important but have no social impact" online as "slacktivism" (Morozov, 2009). Morozov states that this situation creates an illusion of social media and other forms of digital activism, especially in authoritarian states (Morozov, 2011: 274). It can be said that digital populism is a form of slacktivism.

Today, left-socialist parties can be described as digital populists because while they use digital media very effectively for daily problems, they do not develop solutions for the most fundamental problems in digital space. Just like the mainstream populist parties, they do not propose long-term projects. They do not consider the possibility of an essential problem that the medium they use as a tool becomes the only area where they are visible. At the same time, they cannot catch up with the transforming structure of politics and the transformation of the digital populist strategy they use. While these subjects benefit from the instrumental benefits of the digitalization of politics, they ignore the two issues behind these benefits: big data and digital surveillance. Therefore, the claim of "being the most advanced subject" in society remains only in discourse. It would be appropriate to call this state of refusal and indifference as "cynical" (Bora, 2011: 24).

CONCLUSION

This review process was focused on the perspective of "Critical Data Studies (CDS)". CDS sees data as a form of power and is "a neat attempt to name the types of research that question all forms of potentially depoliticized data science and track how data is produced, organized, and how it permeates and powers all forms of life" (Illiadis & Russo, 2020: 1, 4).

Three hypotheses have been proposed in the study. The first hypothesis is that digital surveillance practices change the space of social movements. The second hypothesis is whether the collective action taking place in the digital space creates an illusion in people. Digital activism creates the illusion that it "transforms something in real life" with the number of likes, shares, and views on social media. Hacktivism and slacktivism are the embodiment of this fallacy. The third hypothesis is whether digital populism, which assumes of a strategy, carries some ideological motives. In the study, it has been seen that the phenomenon of digital populism has begun to carry some qualities that go beyond strategy as a method, and it has some orientations regarding the ideological and theoretical perspectives of the subjects. In other words, short-term strategies, and solutions (sharing of the political subject on the agenda) are preferred instead of long-term strategies and solutions (big data/digital surveillance in relation to the subject of the study).

The concept set used in the article is in the form of big data, digital surveillance, panopticon, synopticon, and banopticon concepts, social movements and political parties, ideology, and strategy in relation to digital surveillance. Big data has been shown to facilitate and legitimize digital surveillance practices. Data surveillance is the systematic viewing of data that people produce through communication technology. Digital surveillance applications, unlike traditional surveillance, put citizens in intense communication. In this context, it can be said that citizens have entered into a voluntary cooperation with digital surveillance applications. On the other hand, the inequalities created by the banopticon, especially on marginalized groups—leftsocialist subjects can be thought of in particular—can be recalled. Surveillance through big data increases both efficiency and calculability. For this purpose, the most important strategy used by states stands out as "profiling". With profiling, citizens' data is collected, making their next possible moves predictable. At this point, another

issue that needs to be mentioned regarding surveillance practices through big data is that it has been used intensively by states during the Covid-19 pandemic, on the grounds of combating the epidemic.

The determinant concept in the study of the relationship between big data and digital surveillance applications with politics has been digital populism. In this transformation, while social movements and political parties were considered as two separate organizational forms, a hybrid form emerged in the form of "movement parties", especially after the 2008 economic crisis. It can be said that the social movements and political parties that emerged after the 2008 crisis affect each other. An example of this hybrid form is the emergence of social movements (for example, Podemos from Spain), or the coming together of political parties to create a social movement (for example, Syriza from Greece). This new hybrid form makes effective use of digital media and introduces the concept of "populism 2.0" or digital populism, as Gerbaudo calls it. It should be noted that (digital) populists often organize around a single demand and engage in short-term agendas. Therefore, today's political subjects - preferably or forcedly - tend to digital populism. The instant nature of social media platforms is also related to this situation.

The study thinks that digitalization creates a transformation process regarding the structure of politics. This ontological transformation emphasizes the change in the aims of change, identitybased structures, stances, action repertoires, and protest tools of social movements. The structure of digital communication tools that allow horizontality has been effective in this transformation. However, these benefits of digital tools and digital space lead to ignoring the existence of digital surveillance applications through big data. These channels are used not only by the opposition and alternative subjects but also by secret services and states. Digital tools have become a necessary condition of existence for the subjects who claim to create an alternative to the existing order.

REFERENCES

Allmer, T. (2012). Critical Internet Surveillance Studies and Economic Surveillance. (Ed. Christian Fuchs, Kees Boersma, Anders Albrechtslund & Marisol Sandoval) *Internet and Surveillance the Challenges of Web 2.0 and Social Media.* Routledge.

Ang, P. S., Teo, D. C. H., Dorajoo, S. R., Prem Kumar, M., Chan, Y. H., Choong, C. T., ... & Poh, J. W. W. (2021). Augmenting product defect surveillance through web crawling and machine learning in singapore. *Drug safety*, 44(9), 939-948.

Aydın, B. (2021). Pandemi, Neoliberalizm ve Biyoiktidar: Bir Büyük Kapatılma ve Güvencesizlik Hikayesi. (Eds. Yasemin İnceoğlu & Savaş Çoban) Pandemi Neoliberalizm Medya. *Ayrıntı Yayınları.*

Barrett, M. (2004). *Marx'tan Foucault'ya İdeoloji*. Trans. Ahmet Fethi. Doruk Yayımcılık.

Bell, D., Loader, B. D., Pleace, N. & Schuler, D. (2004). Cyberculture The Key Concepts. Routledge.

Bigo, D. (2008). Globalized (in) security: the field and the ban-opticon. In *Terror, insecurity and liberty* (pp. 20-58). Routledge.

Bloom, P. (2019). *Monitored Business and Surveillance in a Time of Big Data*. Pluto Press.

Bora, T. (2011). *Sol, Sinizm, Pragmatizm.* 2nd Print. Birikim Yayınları.

Böcskei, B. (2017). "Post-truth politics" as the normal state of politics. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organisation Inquiry*, 15(3/4), 257-260.

Brayne, S. (2017). Big data surveillance: The case of policing. American sociological review, 82(5), 977-1008.

Cadwalladr, C., & Graham-Harrison, E. (2018). *Revealed: 50 million Facebook profiles harvested for Cambridge Analytica in major data breach*. The guardian, 17, 22.

Carty, V. (2018). *Social Movements and New Technology*. Routledge..

Chen, M., Mao, S., Zhang, Y & Leung, V. C. M. (2014). *Big Data Related Technologies, Challenges and Future Prospects*. Springer.

Clemens, A. (2022). *Metaverse For Beginners A Guide to Help You Learn About Metaverse, Virtual Reality and Investing in NFTs*. Independently published.

Çomu, T. & Halaiqa, İ. (2018). Web İçeriklerinin Metin Temelli Çözümlemesi. (Ed. Mutlu Binark) *Yeni Medya Çalışmalarında Araştırma Yöntem ve Teknikleri*. 3rd Print. Ayrıntı.

Nadal, L. (2021). On populism and social movements: from the Indignados to Podemos. *Social Movement* Studies, 20(1), 36-56.

Eagleton, T. (1996). *İdeoloji Giriş*. Trans. Muttalip Özcan. Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Foucault, M. (1992). *Hapishanenin Doğuşu*. Trans. Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay. İmge Kitabevi.

Foucault, M. (2012). *İktidarın Gözü*. 3Rd Print. Trans. Işık Ergüden. Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Fuchs, C. (2012). Critique of the Political Economy of Web 2.0 Surveillance. (Ed. Christian Fuchs, Kees Boersma, Anders Albrechtslund & Marisol Sandoval) *Internet and Surveillance the Challenges of Web 2.0 and Social Media*. Routledge:.

Fuchs, C. (2021). Google Kapitalizmi. (Trans. Çağla Çavuşoğlu) (Ed. Filiz Aydoğan) *Yeni Medya Kuramcılarından Yeni Medya Kuramları* I. Der Yayınları.

Fuhcs, C., Boersma, K., Albrechtslund, A. & Sandoval, M. (2012). Introduction: Internet and Surveillance. (Ed. Christian Fuchs, Kees Boersma, Anders Albrechtslund & Marisol Sandoval) *Internet and Surveillance the Challenges of Web 2.0 and Social Media*. Routledge.

Gerbaudo, P. (2014). *Populism 2.0. Social media, politics and the state: Protests, revolutions, riots, crime and policing in the age of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube*, 16, 67.

Gounari, P. (2018). Authoritarianism, Discourse and Social Media: Trump as the 'American Agitator'. (Ed. Jeremiah Morelock) *Critical Theory and Authoritarian Populism*. University of Westminster Press.

Güngör, N. (2020). *İletişim Kuramlar Yaklaşımlar*. 5Th Print. Siyasal Kitabevi.

Han, B. (2020). *Psikopolitika Neoliberalizm ve Yeni İktidar Teknikleri*. Trans. Haluk Barışçan. Metis.

Han, B. (2021). *Kapitalizm ve Ölüm Dürtüsü Denemeler ve Söyleşiler*. (Trans. Çağlar Tanrıyeri). İnka.

Harkin, D., Molnar, A., & Vowles, E. (2020). The commodification of mobile phone surveillance: An analysis of the consumer spyware industry. *Crime, media, culture*, 16(1), 33-60.

Heywood, A. (2018). *Siyasetin ve Uluslararası İlişkilerin Temel Kavramları*. 4Th Print. Trans. Fahri Bakırcı. BB101 Yayınları.

Hunter, T. (2022*). Surveillance will follow us into 'the metaverse,' and our bodies could be its new data source*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/01/13/privacy-vr-metaverse

Hutter, S., Kriesi, H., & Lorenzini, J. (2018). Social movements in interaction with political parties. *The Wiley Blackwell companion to social movements*, 322-337.

Illiadis, A. & Russo, F. (2020) Eleştirel Veri Çalışmaları (EVÇ): Giriş. (Trans. Filiz Aydoğan) (Ed. Filiz Aydoğan) *Yeni Medya Kuramları II*. Der Yayınları.

Kar, A. & Güven, S. (2016). Medya, Teknoloji, Şiddet ve Haz Sarmalı. (Eds. Yasemin G. İnceoğlu & Nebahat A. Çomak) *Metin Çözümlemeleri*. 2. Print. Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Kelly Garrett, R. (2006). Protest in an information society: A review of literature on social movements and new ICTs. *Information, communication & society*, 9(02), 202-224.

Kitchin, R. (2014). *The Data Revolution Big Data, Open Data, Data Infrastructures and Their Consequences*. Sage.

Lyon, D. (1997). *Elektronik Göz Gözetim Toplumunun Yükselişi*. Trans. Dilek Hattatoğlu. Sarmal Yayınevi.

Lyon, D. (2006). *Günlük Hayatı Kontrol Etmek Gözetlenen Toplum*. Trans. Gözde Soykan. Kalkedon Yayıncılık.

Mathew, B. B. (2022). Surveillance and Panopticon: A Study on the Social Credit System in China. *Journal of Polity and Society*, 12(2), 115-122.

Mattelart, A. (2012). *Gözetimin Küreselleşmesi Güvenlileştirme Düzeninin Kökeni*. Trans. Onur Gayretli & Su Elif Karacan. Kalkedon Yayınları.

Mattelart, A. & Mattelart, M. (2020). *İletişim Kuramları Tarihi*. (Trans . Merih Zıllıoğlu). 10Th Print. İletişim Yayınları.

Mendonca, R. F., & Bustamante, M. (2020). Back to the future: changing repertoire in contemporary protests. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 39(5), 629-643.

Morozov, E. (2009). *The brave new world of slacktivism*. https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/05/19/the-brave-new-world-of-slacktivism

Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: How not to liberate the world*. Public Affairs.

Morozov, E. (2020) Verinin Yükselişi ve Siyasetin Ölümü. (Trans . Aysel Ay) (Ed. Filiz Aydoğan) *Yeni Medya Kuramları II*. Der Yayınları.

Morozov, E. (2021). Silikon Vadisi "Dijital Sosyalizm" Vaad Ediyor Ama Aslında Bir Masal Satıyor. (Trans . Yenal Göksun) (Ed. Filiz Aydoğan) *Yeni Medya Kuramcılarından Yeni Medya Kuramları I*. Der Yayınları.

Musik, C., & Bogner, A. (2019). Book title: Digitalization & society. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 44(1), 1-14.

Neocleous, M. (1996). *Administering Civil Society Towards a Theory of State Power*. MacMillan Press.

Neocleous, M. (2000). *The Fabrication of Social Order a Critical Theory of Police Power*. Pluto Press.

Neocleous, M. (2015). *Devleti Tahayyül Etmek*. Trans. Akın Sarı, 2nd Print. NotaBene.

Nowotny, H. (2021). In AI We Trust: How the COVID-19 Pandemic Pushes us Deeper into Digitalization. (Ed. Gerard Delanty) *Pandemics, Politics, and Society*, 107-122. Walter de Gruyter GmbH.

Podemos. (n.d.). *Programa de Podemos para una Europa con más democracia, derechos, justicia y futuro*. https://podemos.info/en/medida-europa/una-nueva-economia-basada-en-la-idi/

Posters, B. (2020). Hacking the corporation. https://www.tni.org/en/article/hacking-thecorporation

Postill, J. (2016). *Freedom technologists and the future of global justice*. State of Power 2016. https://www.tni.org/en/publication/freedom-technologists-and-the-future-of-global-justice

Rahman, M. (2022). *The Metaverse – What Does It Mean for Data Privacy and Information Security?*. https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-metaverse-what-does-it-mean-for-2751284/

Ramesh, B. (2015). Big Data Architecture. (Ed. Mohanty, H., Bhuyan, P. & Chenthati, D.) *Big Data A Primer*. Springer India.

Ritzer, G. (2000). *Büyüsü Bozulmuş Dünyayı Büyülemek Tüketim Araçlarının Devrimcileştirilmesi*. (Trans. Şen Süer Kaya). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Ritzer, G. & Stepnisky, J. (2013). *Çağdaş Sosyoloji Kuramları ve Klasik Kökleri*. (Trans. Irmak Ertuna Howison). Deki.

Rosenzweig, P. (2016). *The Surveillance State Big Data, Freedom, and You*. The Great Courses.

Ruppert, E., Isin, E., & Bigo, D. (2017). Data politics. *Big data & society*, 4(2).

Sak, R., Şahin Sak, İ. T., Öneren Şendil, Ç. & Nas, E. (2021). Bir araştırma yöntemi olarak doküman analizi. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi*, 4(1), 227-256.

Saraçoğlu, C. (2016). An'ın, mekanın ve stratejinin kaybı: *2013'ten 2016'ya Türkiye solu*. Birgün Fikir. https://www.birgun.net/haber/an-in-mekanin-ve-stratejinin-kaybi-2013-ten-2016-yaturkiye-solu-99574

Sprague, R. (2007). From Taylorism to the Omnipticon: Expanding employee surveillance beyond the workplace. J. *Marshall J. Computer & Info*. L., 25, 1.

Stevenson, N. (2015). *Medya Kültürleri Sosyal Teori ve Kitle İletişimi*. (Trans. Göze Orhon ve Barış Engin Aksoy). 2Nd Print. Ütopya Yayınları.

Şeker, Ş. E. (2008). *Web Emeklemesi (Web Crawling).* https://bilgisayarkavramlari.com/2008/12/09/web-emeklemesi-web-crawling/

Şener, M. (2008). Marksizmde Siyasal Strateji Sorunu: Marx'tan Komintern'e. *Praksis*, 18.

Tezkan, Y. (2000). *Siyaset, Strateji ve Milli Güvenlik*. Ülke Kitapları.

Thompson, J. (2008). *Medya ve Modernite*. (Trans. Serdar Öztürk). Kırmızı Yayınları.

Tilly, C. (2008). *Toplumsal Hareketler 1768-2004*. Trans. Orhan Düz. Babil Yayınları.

Nagler, J., MacDuffee, M., Metzger, P. B., Penfold-Brown, D., & Bonneau, R. (2016). Big data, social media, and protest. *Computational social science,* 199.

van de Donk, W., Loader, B. D., Nixon, P. G. & Rucht, D. (2004). *Introduction Social Movements and* ICTs. (Ed. Wim van de Donk, Brian D. Loader, Paul G. Nixon & Dieter Rucht).

Cyberprotest *New Media, Citizens and Social Movements*. Routledge.

Wise, J. (2023). *How Many Hours of Video Are Uploaded to YouTube Every Minitue in 2023?*. https://earthweb.com/how-many-hours-of-video-are-uploaded-to-youtube-every-minute/

Yılmaz, Ö. (2021). Sağ Popülizm ve Faşizm: Bir Karşılaştırma Denemesi. *İstanbul Kent Üniversitesi İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri* Dergisi, 2 (2), 51-68.

Yurtsever, H. (1995). *Marksist Bakış Açısından Program Yöntemi*. Sorun Yayınları.

Yurtsever, H. (2008). *Yeni Bir Sol Atılım için*. Kalkedon Yayıncılık.

Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the study of Latin American politics. *Comparative politics*, 1-22.

Wijermars, M. (2021). The digitalization of Russian politics and political participation. *In The Palgrave Handbook of Digital Russia Studies*, 15-32. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.