



İğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi

e-ISSN: 2147-6152

Yıl 10, Sayı 28, Ekim 2021

Makale Adı /Article Name


The Evolution of Panoptic
Surveillance and Its Impact on
Political Discrimination

Panoptik Gözetlemenin Evrimi ve
Siyasi Ayrımcılık Üzerindeki Etkisi

Yazar/Author

Ahmet ATEŞ

Öğr. Gör. Dr., İğdır Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve
Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, ahmet.ates@igdir.edu.tr

 ORCID: 0000-0001-5184-7701

Yayın Bilgisi/Article Information

Yayın Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Gönderim Tarihi: 02.08.2021

Kabul Tarihi: 04.10.2021

Yayın Tarihi: 30.10.2021

Sayfa Aralığı: 202-216

Kaynak Gösterme/Citation: Ateş, Ahmet (2021). "The Evolution of Panoptic Surveillance and Its Impact on Political Discrimination", *İğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, S. 28, s. 202-216

(Bu makale, yazar beyanına göre, TR DİZİN tarafından öngörülen "ETİK KURUL ONAYI" gerektirmemektedir.)

ABSTRACT

This article aims to explore how the expansion of social media and information technologies changed the nature of surveillance and expanded the political discrimination against women and people of color by utilizing the concept of the Panopticon. First, it surveys and documents the evolution of the Panopticon from an architecture plan to participatory omnipticon. More precisely, starting from Jeremy Bentham's blueprints of the Panopticon, this article analyzes how the expansion of CCTVs and social media led to the evolution of the Panopticon and surveillance. Then, this article discusses how increasing political discrimination against women and people of color can be analyzed by Feminist International Relations Theory and post-colonialism. Last, it offers a road map to counter political discrimination due to the expansion of surveillance. This article argues that there is a two-step road map to encounter increasing political discrimination against women and people of color. The first step is raising awareness. To understand and then encounter these challenges, feminist and postcolonial scholars should actively engage race and gender issues by problematizing and deconstructing the virtual world's nature and the effects of the omnipticon that promotes these challenges. After raising the awareness, the second step is resisting. Unlike in the previous versions of the Panopticon, now a regular citizen can stand for fighting the challenges of the women and the people of color and can monitor masculinity or racism and can actively promote equality by using social media platforms.

Keywords: Panopticon, Surveillance, Discrimination, Social Media

ÖZ

Bu makale, panoptikon kavramını kullanarak, sosyal medyanın ve bilgi teknolojilerinin yaygınlaşmasının, gözetimin doğasını nasıl değiştirdiğini ve kadınlara ve beyaz olmayan insanlara yönelik siyasi ayrımcılığı nasıl genişlettiğini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Makalede ilk olarak, panoptikon kavramının mimari bir plan olarak başlayıp katılımcı omniptikon kavramına kadar olan evrimi araştırılmış ve belgelenmiştir. Daha açık olmak gerekirse, Jeremy Bentham'ın panoptikon çizimlerinden başlayarak kapalı devre kamera sistemleri ve sosyal medyanın yaygınlaşmasının panoptikon kavramı ve gözetlemenin evrimine nasıl etki ettiği analiz edilmektedir. Ardından, bu ayrımcılığın Feminist Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorisi ve post-kolonializm tarafından nasıl analiz edilebileceğini tartışılmaktadır. Son olarak, gözetimin genişlemesi nedeniyle artan siyasi ayrımcılığa karşı bir yol haritası önerilmektedir. Bu makale, kadınlara ve beyaz olmayanlara yönelik artan siyasi ayrımcılıkla yüzleşmek için iki aşamalı bir yol haritası olduğunu savunmaktadır. Bu adımların ilki farkındalık yaratmaktır. Bu bağlamda, Feminist ve postkolonyal araştırmacılar sanal ortamların siyasi ayrımcılığı teşvik eden doğasını sorunsallaştırarak ve yapıbozumuna uğratarak tekrar yorumlamalıdır. Farkındalığı arttırdıktan sonra ikinci adım ise direniş göstermektir. Panoptikon'un önceki versiyonlarından farklı olarak, artık sıradan bir vatandaş, kadınların ve beyaz olmayan insanların zorluklarıyla mücadele edebilmekte, sanal ortamdaki siyasi ayrımcılığı etkin bir şekilde denetleyebilmekte ve sosyal medya platformlarını kullanarak eşitliği teşvik edebilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Panoptikon, Gözetleme, Ayrımcılık, Sosyal Medya

Introduction

The concept of the Panopticon has been used as a fundamental concept by surveillance studies for at least three decades. However, the conceptualization of the Panopticon has changed at least four times. Therefore, it is vital to clarify the concept at the beginning of the article. Panopticon as an idea refers to a surveillance system that aims to discipline that includes asymmetric power relations. Due to Foucault's interpretation of the Panopticon, the concept of Panopticon, on the other hand, refers to a phenomenon that explains power relations and discipline within society. Besides, it is important to stress that the concept of the Panopticon has been revisited

and reconceptualized by scholars in each technological breakthrough that enhances surveillance capacity to apply it to the new technologies.

Put differently, panoptic surveillance literature has been mainly focused on adapting the concept of the Panopticon to new technologic developments. There are four themes in the literature tracking the evolution of panoptic surveillance. The first theme is the blueprints and the Panopticon's foundation by English philosopher Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century. The second theme is Foucault's interpretation of the Panopticon and the expansion of panopticism from prison to society in the 1970s. The third theme is applying the panopticon concept into modern surveillance systems due to the developments in information technologies and CCTV systems which can be called "Panopticon 1.0". The last theme is the implementation of panoptic surveillance to Web 2.0 technologies and social media.

The literature stresses the evolution and various versions of the Panopticon such as synopticon, omnipticon, and participatory Panopticon. Current debates mainly focus on the concept of the participatory Panopticon as a result of the expansion of social media. This debate is essential because the current version of panoptic surveillance, namely "the participatory omnipticon," is considerably different from previous Panopticon versions. However, the literature on the participatory omnipticon that focuses on the structure is more developed than the literature on its potential threats to privacy and negative consequences such as political discrimination.

To analyze the Panopticon's impact on political discrimination and the current spectrum, I engage the foundation of the Panopticon and Foucault's interpretation of the concept first. Second, I examine the changing nature of the Panopticon in the light of technological developments, namely, developments in information technologies and Web 2.0 technologies. Third, I discuss how to analyze increasing political discrimination against women and people of color by combining panopticon and surveillance studies and Feminist IR theory and postcolonial theory. Last, I discuss the negative consequences of the current panoptic surveillance regarding political discrimination and what critical theory can do about it.

The Idea of Panopticon

Jeremy Bentham designed the Panopticon in the late eighteenth century as an architectural plan. The design's main aim was to provide constant discipline to inmates (Farinosi, 2011: 63; Foucault, 2006; Campbell and Carlson, 2002; Elmer, 2003; Jespersen et al., 2007; Caluya, 2010; Clarke, 2013; Deagon, 2015). In other words, it was a design of prison with a unique structure that allow one to observe prisoners unbeknownst to them (Jespersen et al., 2007: 110). Its unique structure is described below.

"The proposed Panopticon was composed of an annular building circling a tower. The peripheral building is divided into cells for the inmates, which has a window facing out of the building and another facing the tower such that the backlighting effect would allow anyone within the tower to see all inmates. On the other hand, the tower was designed in such a way that one could not tell whether it was occupied." (Caluya, 2010: 622).

As shown in the description above, a single guard in the centralized tower can observe all prisoners anytime (Jespersen et al., 2007: 11; Deagon, 2015: 15). In other words, a single guard authority to all inmates due to the structure of the prison (Campbell and Carlson, 2002: 589). It is also important to note that because of the structure, prisoners do not have the ability to know if they are being observed or if a guard is on duty (Farinosi, 2011: 63). Therefore, Panopticon provides prisoners' constant discipline even if no one is watching them from the central tower (Clarke, 2013: 175). Simply put, prisoners have to presume that they are always being observed and must behave accordingly since they cannot know whether they are being watched or not (Jespersen et al., 2007: 111; Deagon, 2015: 7-8; Campbell and Carlson, 2002: 589). As Jespersen et al. (2007: 110) and Elmer (2003: 232-233) assert, the Panopticon's design maximizes the efficiency of surveillance while it minimizes the required human resource.

The aim of the Panopticon is to punish by systematic confinement rather than physical torture (Jespersen et al., 2007: 110). Therefore, it was considered a way of organizing institutions to create an orderly society with disciplined and rational citizens (Campbell and Carlson, 2002: 589).

Even though it was never built, Bentham's blueprints of a panopticon prison have dramatically changed the concepts of discipline and surveillance. It is considered as a starting point of surveillance studies for two reasons. First, the panopticon design enhances surveillance capacity while it reduces the cost of surveillance. A single guard in the tower can observe all prisoners because of the Panopticon's structure. Second and more important, it forces the surveilled to be self-disciplined. Since prisoners do not know if they are being watched or not, they presume that they are being watched, and therefore they behave accordingly to avoid punishment. Over time, they discipline themselves and regulate their behaviors which is the desired outcome in the surveillance. Consequently, the Panopticon, basically a fixed surveillance system that contains asymmetric power relations, became a starting point for surveillance studies. Another major shift in the surveillance literature took place after Foucault benefitted the concept of the Panopticon as a metaphor and explained the power relations within the society and the ways of discipline it.

Foucault's Interpretation of Panopticon

As Farinosi (2011: 63) presents, Foucault's analysis of Bentham's architecture has become a central reference in the surveillances studies literature in the last four

decades. Foucault introduced Bentham's blueprints as an example of the shift in mechanisms of social control (Caluya, 2010: 622). As Deagon (2015: 6) and Campbell and Carlson (2002: 589) show, Foucault conceptualized Panopticon and argued that there are disciplinary mechanisms that states use to regulate their citizens through universal surveillance in modern institutions (Deagon, 2015: 6; Campbell and Carlson, 2002: 589). Per Foucault, Panopticon as a metaphor represents the achievement of regulating and disciplining citizens, from physical punishments on the body to producing disciplined subjects through discourse (Campbell and Carlson, 2002: 589). A summary of this shift is provided below.

"Foucault described Panopticism as a new political anatomy, in which discipline replaces the earlier sovereign power (e.g., the king) that was manifested in pomp and circumstance. The sovereign was replaced by a more subtle and hidden authority. This new kind of authority exercised its power by objectifying the subjects which it desired to control, and by creating knowledge about them. Therefore, Panopticism implies a disciplinary power that aims to train and manipulate the body." (Jespersen et al., 2007: 112)

There are several differences between Bentham's Panopticon and Foucault's interpretation of the concept. For instance, Foucault's interpretation of the Panopticon is a machine of power and a way of defining power relations in daily life while there is no communication with the prisoners in Bentham's version (Foucault, 2006: 141-146; Caluya, 2010: 625).

As Farinosi (2011: 63) and Caluya (2010: 625) stress, there are two main effects of Foucault's Panopticon as a disciplinary model: the internalization of discipline in the mind of surveilled and the voluntary subordination of the individual to the observer's potential gaze. As in Bentham's Panopticon, one does not know when s/he is being observed or not and therefore behave accordingly (Foucault, 2006: 156; Kandias et al., 2003: 98). Foucault's version's main difference is that a physical restriction (i.e., bars or locks) is not required anymore (Hasselberg, 2014: 475). While in Bentham's Panopticon, prisoners discipline themselves because they do not know when the guard is watching, individuals discipline themselves as a result of universal surveillance in the school and the hospital and so on, to be "rational" in Foucault's interpretation of Panopticon (Foucault, 2006: 174).

Thanks to Foucault's contribution, panopticism had transformed into a phenomenon. First and most importantly, it is started to be considered an ideal type of exercising power, rather than only the blueprints of Bentham. Second, the nature and the importance of surveillance have changed and boosted surveillance studies. Third, the focus of surveillance expanded. Not only inmates but also individuals became the subject of surveillance. Last, surveillance space expanded. Not only prisons but also almost everywhere became an area that surveillance can be conducted. After a relative institutionalization of the field, the following studies adopted the Panopticon to the new technologies such as CCTV and social media.

Panopticon and Information Technologies "The New Panopticon" or "Panopticon 1.0"

David Lyon introduced a new concept, "Electronic Panopticon," that focuses on the role that information technologies have played in the routine operation of surveillance in 1994 (Farinosi, 2011: 63; Humphreys, 2011: 576). As Farinosi (2011: 63) puts it, it is seen as an instrument to monitor people, order and categorize certain segments of society and marginalize and exclude some groups from the system of information exchange. In that context, the most crucial tool of surveillance became CCTV technologies.

CCTV is often portrayed as the current version of panoptic surveillance (Lippert, 2009: 511). They are designed to prevent crime before it happens since it increases the possibility of being observed and punished if one involves criminal activity (Deagon, 2015: 9). However, the role of CCTV systems in surveillance is beyond preventing crime. CCTV operators gather any required information to categorize society, including personal information such as gender and age, and they can spot any patterns of society in daily routine (Lippert, 2009: 511).

CCTV systems have significant similarities with Bentham's Panopticon. As in Bentham's Panopticon, CCTV schemes are visible and unverifiable (Fyfe and Bannister, 1996: 39). As prisoners do not know if they are being observed and therefore behave well in Bentham's Panopticon, citizens do not know if CCTV operators observe them, so they need to behave accordingly (Fyfe and Bannister, 1996: 39). As Foucault (2006: 156) argues, CCTV systems led to the automatic functioning of power.

However, CCTV systems and Bentham's Panopticon differ on at least one point: CCTV signage. There are two main features of CCTV signage in terms of the Panopticon. First, these signs display legal authority, but not to threaten punishment in relation to specific forms of conduct (Lippert, 2009: 511), whereas punishment is a crucial feature of Bentham's Panopticon. Second, signage clarifies that one is in a surveillance zone (Lippert, 2009: 520), so individuals are free to choose to be surveilled or not, whereas it is not optional in Bentham's Panopticon.

The expansion of surveillance, on the other hand, goes well beyond CCTV. Kuehn (2008: 81) argues that one of the vital parts of contemporary surveillance is linking data. Utilizing Elmer (2003:237) 's research, Kuehn (2008: 81) and Jespersen et al. (2007: 116) argue that linking data from multiple sources such as the Internet, mobile phones, and GPS systems and creating a system to process these data from the multiple sources is the "new panopticon" or "panopticon 1.0."

Due to the developments in information technologies, the new Panopticon has enabled the expansion of the scope of panoptic surveillance. The main differences between the new Panopticon and the previous versions are multiple-featured

surveillance and categorizing. In the new Panopticon, the observer can conduct surveillance in multiple areas such as CCTV and financial records and observe the subject in a multilevel way. Since the scope and sources of surveillance expanded with the technological developments in information technologies, the observer can reach more data than before and therefore categorize society.

Panopticon and Social Media or “Panopticon 2.0”

Web 2.0 technologies and particularly social media have changed the nature of panoptic surveillance substantially. In this context, the distinction between observer and observed diminished, and everyone can do both at the same time on online platforms (Farinosi, 2011: 65). Besides, the observed is not a passive subject as in Bentham's Panopticon anymore; the observed participate in the surveillance process, mostly voluntarily, in what is called "the participatory panopticon." In other words, current surveillance is a participatory omniopticon that subjects voluntarily shared information, participate in the surveillance process, and the observer is not a single authority anymore; the current condition is "many observe many." (Kandias et al., 2013: 98). While the surveillance was unilateral in Bentham's Panopticon, it is multilateral in the latest version (Kandias et al., 2013: 98).

It is essential to ask what has led to the participatory omniopticon? The first is the nature of social media. Before social media applications, the average user was a passive reader. However, in social media, average users became content contributors (Kandias et al., 2013: 99). For instance, American citizens were passive readers who watched or read the news in the Iraqi Invasion decision in 2003. In contrast, now they are content contributors that share the news and their opinions on social media in terms of US actions against the Islamic State of Iraq and Sham (ISIS).

Related to the first, the second is the relative equality of observation. Since users share information and produce content in social media now, any individual can monitor another individual as well (Mitrou et al., 2014: 2; Humphreys, 2011: 577; Kandias et al., 2013: 99). In other words, as Mitrou et al. (2014: 12) asserts, every social media user can be equally observer and observed, controller, and controlled in this environment.

On the one hand, people are "subjects of communication" because their data is available to others; on the other hand, they are "objects of communication and surveillance" for the same reason (Kandias et al., 2013: 99; Mitrou et al., 2014: 12). For instance, on the one hand, a user on Twitter can observe what other users' think about President Joe Biden by looking/searching. On the other hand, and other users can observe what this particular user thinks about President Biden. Therefore, s/he is both subject of communication and the object of surveillance.

The latest version of panoptic surveillance, the participatory omniopticon, differs from previous versions in some ways. Even though internet technology may

conceal what and who is monitored, people willingly participate in monitoring their behavior, such as enrolling in shopping websites with their personal information (Mitrou et al., 2014: 2; Humphreys, 2011: 577; Elmer, 2003: 232).

In opposition to Bentham's Panopticon in which one observes many, in social media, many observe many (Elmer, 2003: 232; Krueger, 2005: 442). Further, while it is much harder to control data flow in the latest version of Panopticon, monitoring behavior is relatively easy (Dupont, 2008: 264). Moreover, while there was a lack of communication among prisoners in Bentham's version, individuals can easily communicate on social media (Krueger, 2005: 442-443). Also, the level of collection of personal information in social media is beyond comparing the previous versions of the Panopticon. These data are used to categorize and assess individuals and enhance surveillance (Humphreys, 2011: 575; Campbell and Carlson, 2002: 595).

In Bentham's Panopticon, information about prisoners is not necessarily needed. The observer does not intend to categorize inmates but to discipline them. In the electronic Panopticon, the observers' ability to categorize is relatively limited. However, in the participatory omnipticon, the observer can reach information since the observed participate in the surveillance voluntarily and can use it to enhance the surveillance or his/her own agenda after the assessment of the information.

There are three central debates in the literature regarding the tremendous change in nature and the structure of panoptic surveillance. The first and the second are related to the structure (or theoretical), and the last is related to morality.

Some scholars argue that the traditional panoptic principle of observation has been transformed. It is not an effective metaphor anymore to explain surveillance since social media dynamics are beyond the traditional paradigm (Farinosi, 2011: 62). Other scholars, on the other hand, argue the latest version of the Panopticon is a form of democratization of surveillance (Dupont, 2008: 259). Dupont (2008: 260) and Ben-David and Fernandez (2016: 1170) argue that thanks to the democratization of surveillance, anyone can observe anyone at any level they want on a scale from family to presidents or celebrities.

The last debate is the morality of the participatory omnipticon. Mitrou et al. (2014: 10) argue that social media give rise to traditional surveillance since it helps governments "connect the dots" and identify patterns. However, they also argue that these profiling activities may have severe consequences for human rights (Mitrou et al., 2014: 9; Jespersen et al., 2007: 119). Proving people of color are more likely to be surveilled than whites on social media (Privacy International, 2008 quoted in Kuehn, 2008: 82), scholars argue that these technological surveillance capacity racial and religious bias (Kuehn, 2008: 82).

Put differently, it is possible to claim that including social media in surveillance boosts political discrimination. I argue that political discrimination

happens in three ways: at the individual level, the organizational level, and the state level.

At the individual level, political discrimination occurs between persons. Let us take a professor, for example. When a professor receives an email from a person for collaboration on a project, the first thing s/he does is usually checking the person's social media accounts. If there is any discrepancy in the person's affiliation or any information s/he provided, the professor kindly refuses to work with the person. This may be considered political discrimination, and the professor can do that because of social media. It is important to note that give same discrimination can easily happen to the professor as well. In other words, the professor is both subject and object of panoptic surveillance in participatory omniopicon, which was not possible in the previous versions of Panopticon.

At the organizational level, political discrimination occurs between individuals and organizations. For instance, a Carnegie Mellon Research in 2013 revealed that candidates whose public Facebook profiles indicated they were Muslim were less likely to be called for interviews than Christian applicants (Valentino-Devries, 2013). Per the same research, Christian applicants got callbacks 17%, whereas Muslim applicants got callbacks about 2% in traditionally conservative cities (Valentino-Devries, 2013). As shown in the examples, organizations discriminate against individuals by conducting surveillance on social media.

At the state level, political discrimination occurs between individuals and the state. For instance, defamatory social media posts against Nitish Kumar, Chief Minister of Bihar, India, became a cybercrime in India in 2021, and owners of such posts are facing jail now (theweek.in, January 22, 2021). As shown in the examples, states conduct surveillance in social media and usually connect the dots. Hence, individuals are subject to discrimination by states for political reasons.

As shown above, social media has boosted political discrimination. In other words, considering Facebook has 2.8 billion active users (Statista, 2021a), and Twitter has 330 million active users (Statista, 2021b) in 2020, participatory omniopicon expands the scope of surveillance that severely affects individuals. Foucault argues that we live in a prison-like society (Jespersen et al., 2007: 113). In the latest version of the Panopticon, namely the participatory omniopicon, we live in a prison-like virtual world. Web 2.0 technologies and social media become a tool of political discrimination against individuals. There is a moral dilemma in terms of political discrimination in the Panopticon. On the one hand, individuals became surveillance subjects to observe others that were not possible in the previous versions of the Panopticon. On the other hand, they are more likely to be discriminated against than previous versions of the Panopticon because of the expansion of surveillance in the private sphere. The concept that should be problematized is participation. While

individuals enhance their surveillance capacity by participating in the surveillance process, they are also being discriminated more.

The Panopticon and Critical Theory

Given the evolution of the Panopticon, it is possible to argue that there is a serious discrimination problem in the current political spectrum. Some argue the expansion of surveillance increases security. However, it also increases discrimination. I argue that discrimination in social media and Web 2.0 technologies is particularly against women and people of color. That problem deserves more attention, and scholars of political science, particularly the critical theory, should engage political discrimination due to the participatory omnipticon. There are, however, different schools of critical theory such as post-structuralism, post-colonialism, the English School, and feminist IR. Since my emphasis in this piece is discrimination against women and people of color, I focus on Feminist IR and postcolonial theory.

Social media is a virtual environment that has effects on the world we live in. According to Schwartz et al. (2015: 934-942), the written language accumulating in social media can be used in personality assessments. Further, even though social media users willingly provide valuable information about themselves, they do not have control over how their information is processed and disseminated and networking information (Tang and Liu, 2011: 475; van Dijck and Nieborg, 2009: 865 quoted in Werbin, 2011: 1258).

It is noteworthy that social media presence/information affects recruitment (Pate, 2012: 133). A recent report indicates that most human resources managers are utilizing social media in the recruitment processes (Clark, 2006 and Grasz, 2009 quoted in Brown and Vaughn, 2011: 219). Per Brown and Vaughn (2011: 221), these actions may result in discrimination in the hiring process.

Social media, as the world we live in, is gendered and promotes masculinity. According to Buni and Chemaly (2014: 2-5), just as televisions normalized brutality, social media platforms and the Internet play a key role in promoting violence against women. Even though social media companies are neutral platforms where users generate content and report content as equals, some users are more equal than others as in the physical world. Across websites and social media platforms, women are significantly more likely to be targeted because of their gender, and men are overwhelmingly those doing the harassing. For instance, after the presidential campaign, John Edwards hired them in 2007 to run his presidential blog, Amanda Marcotte and Melissa McEwan received threats and sexual harassment from anonymous emailers and bloggers (Filipovic, 2007: 298-299). Likewise, technology blogger Kathy Sierra stopped blogging after she received a series of threats of hanging, suffocation, and rape (Filipovic, 2007: 301).

As shown above, social media is gendered as the world we live in. There is an inequality between men and women. Women are suffering the most and usually are the victims in social media as in the real world. The privacy of the women is violated as it is in, for instance, the Bosnian War. Social media promotes masculinity, and it is highly related to Panopticon. With the expansion of Web 2.0 technologies and social media and therefore omnipticon, now many can observe many. It may seem an opportunity for women to raise their voice, to reach a larger audience to draw attention to inequality issues. However, it has been a challenge rather than an opportunity for women so far. Women are discriminated against in their private life more as a result of the omnipticon. They are discriminated more in the work-life, both in the application process and working conditions.

Put differently, because of the Panopticon and the expansion of surveillance in the private sphere, women have not only challenges in the actual world we live in but also in the virtual world. Realizing the double burden of women, feminist scholars (both the first and the second generations – Halliday, Tickner, True, Enloe and so on) should pay more attention to examine, problematize, and challenge social media and its gendered structure. In doing so, they can help to reduce the severe effects of discrimination because of the omnipticon and can build a gender-equal social media that does not promote masculinity but equity.

Given the discrimination against women due to the participatory omnipticon, it is crucial for us to realize and challenge this discrimination. However, women are not the only part of the society that is being discriminated against because of the omnipticon. As women, people of color are also discriminated against more in social media as a result of the omnipticon.

Social media, as the world we live in, is racist and contains racial bias. Online forms of racial discrimination occur on social media platforms and Internet (Tynes et al., 2016). Tynes, Rose, and Markoe (2013: 102) conduct an online survey of a sample of 217 African American and European American college students and explore that African Americans experienced more online racial discrimination and online stress and had a significantly more negative view of campus racial climate. According to Tynes, Rose, and Markoe (2013: 104),

"There are three primary types: micro-insults (rudeness and insensitivity, demeaning a person's heritage), micro-assaults (explicit racial derogation and discriminatory behavior), and microinvalidation (excluding or negating experiences) and online racial discrimination involve denigrating or excluding an individual or group on the basis of race through the use of symbols, voice, video, images, text, and graphic representations."

Another study, Tynes et al. (2008: 565), shows that 29% of African Americans and 42% of multiracial people experienced online discrimination.

As a result of the expansion of surveillance, omniopticon, people of color have not only challenges in the actual world (racism and discrimination) we live in but also in the virtual world. Realizing the double burden of people of color, postcolonial scholars should pay more attention to examine, problematize, and challenge social media and its racist structure. In doing so, they can help to reduce the severe effects of discrimination because of the omniopticon and can build an equal social media that does not promote racism but equity.

Given the challenges of women and people of color due to the omniopticon, I argue that there is a two-step road map to encounter these challenges. The first step is raising awareness. The challenges of women, gender inequality, and masculinity had existed before feminist scholars drew attention to these problems and problematized them as racism had existed before postcolonial scholars problematized. Now, the same issues, namely masculinity, and racism, exist in the virtual world we live in. To understand and then encounter these challenges, feminist and postcolonial scholars should actively engage these issues by problematizing and deconstructing the virtual world's nature and the effects of the omniopticon that promotes these challenges.

After raising the awareness, the second step is resisting. Omniopticon is both a challenge and an opportunity. Now, a regular citizen has the ability to surveil others that gives a space/power for resisting these challenges of women and people of color. Unlike in the previous versions of the Panopticon, now a regular citizen can stand for fighting the challenges of the women and the people of color. He or she can monitor masculinity or racism and can actively promote equality by using social media platforms.

Conclusion

Panopticon is a crucial concept in surveillance studies. Starting with Bentham's blueprints, panopticism has changed in parallel to theoretical and technologic developments. Panopticism transformed into a phenomenon after Foucault's contribution. In each technological breakthrough that enhances surveillance capacity, scholars have revisited panopticism to apply it to the new technologies. The current version of the Panopticon is "participatory omniopticon," which refers to a surveillance process that individuals voluntarily involve in the surveillance process, and there are many observers and observed. While individuals enjoy being subjects of surveillance, they also become objects of surveillance by sharing their information voluntarily. As a result of the current structure of the Panopticon, individuals are politically discriminated against by other individuals, organizations, and states. Women and people of color are the part of the society that is affected the most. That is a moral problem that should be analyzed in detail. Hence, feminist IR and post-colonialism should deeply engage in surveillance studies for further research. As the problematization of the mainstream IR and the Western

dominance, scholars from feminist and postcolonial schools should problematize, examine, challenge, and re-formulate the virtual world we live in to enhance equality between women and men and between races.

References

- Ben-David, Anat; Fernández, Ariadna. Matamoros (2016). “Hate Speech and Covert Discrimination on Social Media: Monitoring the Facebook Pages of Extreme-Right Political Parties in Spain”, *International Journal of Communication*, Vol. 10, 1167-1193.
- Brown, Victoria. R.; Vaughn, E. Daly (2011). “The writing on the (Facebook) wall: The use of social networking sites in hiring decisions”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 26, No 2, 219-225.
- Buni, Catherine; Chemaly, Soraya (2014). “The unsafety net: How social media turned against women”, *The Atlantic*, 9.
- Caluya, Gilbert (2010). “The post-panoptic society? Reassessing Foucault in surveillance studies”, *Social Identities*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 621-633.
- Campbell, John Edward; Carlson, Matt (2002). “Panopticon. com: Online surveillance and the commodification of privacy”, *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, Vol. 46, No. 4, 586-606.
- Clarke, Stephen (2013). “The Panopticon of the Public Protest: Technology and Surveillance”, *Res Cogitans*, Vol. 4, No.1, 173-180.
- Deagon, Alex (2015). “Sovereignty, surveillance and speeding: Considering the Panopticon as a method of policing”, *Justice and Social Democracy Conference*.
- Dupont, Benoit (2008). “Hacking the Panopticon: Distributed online surveillance and resistance”, *Sociology of Crime Law and Deviance*, Vol.10, 259-280.
- Elmer, Greg (2003). “A diagram of panoptic surveillance”, *New Media & Society*, Vol.5, No. 2, 231-247.
- Farinosi, Manuela (2011). “Deconstructing Bentham's Panopticon: The New Metaphors of Surveillance in the Web 2.0 Environment. tripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique”, *Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 62-76.
- Filipovic, Jill (2007). “Blogging while female: How internet misogyny parallels real-world harassment”, *Yale JL & Feminism*, Vol. 19, 295-304.
- Foucault, M. (2006). *Hapishanenin doğuşu*. MA Kılıçbay (Çev.). Ankara: İmge. (Translated Turkish from Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*. Gallimard.

- Fyfe, Nicholas R; Bannister, John. (1996). "City watching: closed circuit television surveillance in public spaces", *Area*, 37-46.
- Grasz, Jennifer (2009). "Forty-five percent of employers use social networking sites to research job candidates, CareerBuilder survey finds", *CareerBuilder Press Releases*.
http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleasesdetail.aspx?id=pr519&sd=8%2f19%2f2009&ed=12%2f31%2f2009&siteid=cbpr&sc_cmp1=cb_pr519 (Access: 22.03.2021)
- Hasselberg, Ines (2014). "Coerced to Leave: Punishment and the Surveillance of Foreign-National Offenders in the UK", *Surveillance & Society*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 471-484.
- Jespersen, Julie Leth; Albrechtslund, Anders; Øhrstrøm, Peter; Hasle, Per; Albretsen, Jorgen. (2007). "Surveillance, persuasion, and Panopticon", *International Conference on Persuasive Technology*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 109-120.
- Kandias, Miltiadis; Mitrou, Lilian; Stavrou, Vasilis; Gritzalis, Dimitris (2013, July). "Which side are you on? A new Panopticon vs. privacy", *2013 International Conference on Security and Cryptography (SECRYPT)*, 1-13.
- Krueger, Brian S. (2005). "Government surveillance and political participation on the Internet", *Social Science Computer Review*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 439-452.
- Kuehn, Larry (2008). "Surveillance 2.0: the "information panopticon" and education", *Our Schools, Our Selves*, Summer, 81-91.
- Lippert, Randy (2009). "Signs of the surveillant assemblage: Privacy regulation, urban CCTV, and governmentality", *Social & Legal Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 505-522.
- Mitrou, Lilian; Kandias, Miltiadis; Stavrou, Vasilis; Gritzalis, Dimitris (2014). "Social media profiling: A Panopticon or Omnipticon tool?", *Proc. of the 6th Conference of the Surveillance Studies Network*.
- Pate, Richard L. (2012). "Invisible discrimination: employers, social media sites and passwords in the US", *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 133-146.
- Statista, (2021a). *Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 4th quarter of 2020*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/#:~:text=How%20many%20users%20does%20Facebook,network%20ever%20to%20do%20so>. (Access: 22.03.2021)
- Statista. (2021b). *Number of monthly active Twitter users worldwide from 1st quarter 2010 to 1st quarter 2019*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/282087/number-of-monthly-active-twitter-users/> (Access: 22.03.2021)

- Tang, Lei; Liu, Huan (2011). "Leveraging social media networks for classification", *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 447-478.
- The Week. *Defamatory social media posts against Nitish Kumar govt now a cyber crime in Bihar*. <https://www.theweek.in/news/india/2021/01/22/defamatory-social-media-posts-against-nitish-kumar-govt-now-a-cyber-crime-in-bihar.html> (Access: 22.03.2021)
- Tynes, Brendesha M.; Giang, Michael T.; Williams, David R.; Thompson, Geneene. N. (2008). "Online racial discrimination and psychological adjustment among adolescents", *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 43, No. 6, 565-569.
- Tynes, Brendesha M.; Rose, Chad A.; Markoe, Suzanne L. (2013). "Extending campus life to the Internet: Social media, discrimination, and perceptions of racial climate", *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 102-114.
- Tynes, Brendesha M.; Rose, Chad A.; Hiss, Sophia; Umaña-Taylor, Adriana J.; Mitchell, Kimberly; Williams, David (2016). "Virtual environments, online racial discrimination, and adjustment among a diverse, school-based sample of adolescents", *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1-16.
- Valentino-Devries Jennifer. (2013). "Bosses May Use Social Media to Discriminate Against Job Seekers", *The Wall Street Journal*. November 20, 2013. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702303755504579208304255139392> Ac(Access: 22.03.2021)
- Van Dijck, Jose; Nieborg, David (2009). "Wikinomics and its discontents: a critical analysis of Web 2.0 business manifestos", *New media & society*, Vol. 11, No. 5, 855-874.
- Werbin, Kenneth C. (2011). "Spookipedia: intelligence, social media and biopolitics", *Media, Culture & Society*, Vol. 33, No. 8, 1254-1265.

Çatışma Beyanı/Declaration of Conflict

The author of the article declares that he is not related to any person or financial institution that may be a party to this study, therefore there is no conflict of interest.

Destek ve teşekkür/ Support and Thanks

No support was received from any institution or organization in the study.