

# Algorithm Domination As A New Surveillance System\*

## Yeni Bir Gözetim Sistemi Olarak Algoritma Tahakkümü

Muhittin EVREN  • Ahmet Ayhan KOYUNCU 

Derleme Makale Research Article

Başvuru Received: 05.08.2024 ■ Kabul Accepted: 08.10.2024

### ABSTRACT

This study emphasizes that surveillance differs in digital process. The study draws attention to how surveillance systems work in the new process. With the development of digital technologies, surveillance and control, which spread over a wide area, greatly affect people's lives. People's information is recorded, analyzed, and used to direct people. The study draws attention to the fact that this structure works through algorithms. Algorithms form a surveillance and control mechanism with their processing way. Algorithms constitute a domination form because they threaten people's freedoms and security. Algorithm domination is seen as a form of control and discipline in today's world. The study analyzes the domination forms created by algorithms that influence and are debated in today's world. It profiles people thanks to the information obtained with big data. In this way, people can be easily manipulated and directed by algorithms. Literature review was used as a method in the study. The study aims to reveal how algorithm domination occurs and how it works from a theoretical perspective.

**Keywords:** Surveillance, Panopticon, Digitalization, Algorithm, Power.

### ÖZ

Bu çalışma gözetimin dijital süreçte farklılaştığı üzerinde durmaktadır. Çalışmada gözetim sistemlerinin yeni süreçte nasıl işlediğine dikkat çekmektedir. Dijital teknolojilerin gelişmesi ile birlikte geniş alana yayılan gözetim ve denetim insanların yaşamlarını büyük ölçüde etkilemektedir. İnsanların bilgileri kaydedilmekte, analiz edilmekte ve insanları yönlendirmek için kullanılmaktadır. Çalışma oluşan bu yapının algoritmalar aracılığıyla işlediğine dikkat çekmektedir. Algoritmalar işleme biçimiyle bir gözetim ve denetim mekanizması oluşturmaktadır. Algoritmalar, insanların özgürlükleri ve güvenliklerini tehdit ettiği için bir tahakküm biçimi oluşturmaktadır. Algoritma tahakkümü, günümüz dünyasının denetim ve disiplin biçimi olarak görülmektedir. Çalışmada günümüz yaşam dünyasını etkileyen ve tartışılan algoritmaların oluşturduğu tahakküm biçimi analiz edilmiştir. Büyük veri ile elde edilen bilgiler sayesinde insanlara profiller çıkarmaktadır. Bu sayede insanlar algoritmalarla kolay şekilde manipüle edilmekte ve yönlendirebilmektedir. Çalışmada yöntem olarak literatür taraması kullanılmıştır. Çalışma algoritma tahakkümünün nasıl oluştuğunu ve nasıl işlediğini teorik bir perspektifle ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Gözetim, Panoptikon, Dijitalleşme, Algoritma, İktidar.

\*This study was carried out by Assoc. Prof. Dr. in the PhD Program of Afyon Kocatepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology. It has been prepared from the thesis titled "Dominance of Algorithm in the Context of Freedom and Security", which is under the supervision of Ahmet Ayhan Koyuncu

## Introduction

Surveillance is among the important concepts of human history. Power systems, people and institutions use surveillance to gain knowledge of and control over others. Surveillance has gained importance again with technological developments and the process in which people are observed in every field has started (Dolgun, 2005:4). Surveillance tools need to be addressed with their functionality and societal control relationships in an institutional context. Social surveillance has emerged mostly with capitalist processes and information technologies. Drawing attention to this, Giddens (2008:24-25) emphasizes that there are two social surveillance aspects. The first is the data-driven surveillance dimension. This dimension consists of the knowledge gained from the materials collected and stored by the social institution or community. This information is used to guide their social actions. The second dimension is the supervision feature of surveillance. This feature means that the social actions of some individuals in society are controlled and monitored by the authority.

Surveillance has increased the dominant group's ability to monitor and supervise the social actions that are concentrated and congested within the designated spaces. Surveillance, as a tool supporting the power of the ruling authority, contains two basic elements. The first is the regulation of information to supervise the population's behavior subject to the state. The second is the direct supervision of this behavior (Dolgun 2015:37). Surveillance in the traditional sense has been redefined and debated concept in today's digital world. Therefore, it is necessary to understand what the concept of surveillance is and how it is reflected and understood in society. With this effort, first of all, evaluation is made on behalf of the surveillance society through its known features and systems. In this context, it is possible to say that Jeremy Bentham, the surveillance society, came to the fore in the design of the Panopticon. Surveillance has gained a philosophical and sociological dimension with Foucault's studies. He brought the process of discipline to the

forefront by addressing surveillance practices in relation to authority. Surveillance techniques have changed with the effect of mass communication technologies. Surveillance forms such as synopticon, banopticon, omipticon and superpanopticon have emerged. The development of today's digital technologies has led to the emergence of a surveillance and audit based on algorithms. Using big data obtained by algorithms, people's behaviors are controlled and people are manipulated.

This study first focuses on what surveillance is and its changing forms today. New surveillance dimensions have been mentioned in the digital process that has emerged with the effects of technological developments. The study aims to reveal how the algorithms create domination. For this aims, literature review method was used. In particular, a new form of surveillance/audit, which affects today's life world and is created by the discussed algorithms, has been analyzed. The idea that algorithms create domination emerges in the digital era dominated by algorithms. Algorithm domination is seen as a form of control and discipline in today's world. It is emphasized that algorithms create domination because they threaten people's freedom and security. In the study, it is theoretically examined how this new form of domination is formed and how it works.

## Surveillance Society

Surveillance is the process of collecting, analyzing, processing, evaluating and using data in order to control the behavior of other people or groups (Çakır, 2015:10). Lyon points out that surveillance is derived from the French verb *surveiller*, which means "to be by looking". Surveillance is defined as "systematic and regular attention focused on personal information for purposes such as influencing, managing, protecting and directing" (Lyon, 2013:30-31). This interest is the desire to know everything. When this desire is satisfied, it means that we allow everything to know about us (Niedzviecki,2010:15). The ruling powers need certain rules to ensure social order. This idea of order has revealed a surveillance mechanism

that ensures compliance with social norms and rules (Dolgun, 2005:9). According to Giddens, surveillance started with the writing that emerged for the purpose of recording the data. He sees writing as a system that expands the scope of authority's control over products and individuals (Giddens, 2008:66). Another approach is based on the fact that surveillance emerges when those who own property supervise their slaves when settled life is started (Çakır, 2015:184-185; Solmaz, 2023:169).

Transformations in the social order have brought about the use of surveillance in different areas (Dolgun, 2015:46). Surveillance was used in medieval Europe to train workers and apprentices in vocational schools and to carry out production under supervision. In addition, surveillance was carried out in prisons to condition prisoners to comply with the rules or discipline them (Lyon, 2006:81). On the other hand, the bourgeoisie exercised surveillance to control the working class. Guard workers, who cooperate with the authority against opposing views within the supervision, are the eyes of the government. The development of technology has revealed the structure that controls the entire working process of the working class (Çoban, 2019:115).

The first emergence in the name of surveillance is Bentham's panopticon. The concept of Panopticon is based on the Argus Panoptes character in Greek mythology, who sees everything and is not seen (Pimenta, 2010:267-268). "Pan" in the panopticon emerges with the combination of Greek words related to "all" or "whole" and "opticon", that is, "visual vision" (Mathiesen, 1997:217-219). This structure is a design that can be applied to all kinds of institutions where there are people to be kept under supervision (Çakır, 2015:248). The Panopticon is an architectural structure with a central observation tower. This tower was arranged with a circle shape and provided the prison guard with the capacity to monitor the building (Mattelart, 2012:13). While designing the panopticon, Bentham based his work on the architectural structure prepared by Samuel Bentham for the military

school (Bentham, 2019:68).

Bentham claims that the penal system and morality that existed before him needed reform. For this, he aimed to design the panopticon (Lyon, 2013:89; Acemoğlu & Johnson, 2023:12). In Bentham's words, the panopticon is "the design of a new building principle that can be applied to all kinds of institutions where there are all kinds of people to be kept under surveillance; correctional facilities, prisons, commercial houses, mental hospitals and schools" (Bentham, 2019:9; Pease-Watkin, 2019:77-78). Since this design is circular, the central location of the observer provides significant advantages. These advantages are the decrease in the number of observers and the convenience in internal audit. According to him, "the prisoner who thinks he is under surveillance will not even dream of escaping" (Bentham, 2019:23-28). Because they know that they are being monitored, they produce a compulsory/voluntary obedience by self-control (Çağan, 2018:43). The use of Bentham's panopticon as a metaphor in the reuse and distribution of supervisory powers with modern transformations was successfully evaluated by Foucault (Bauman, 2021:63).

The most important philosopher of the works on the surveillance society is undoubtedly Michel Foucault. He points out that the relationship between persons always contains an authority. In general, authority has existed as a monarchical structure on society in the historical process. In the modern process, authority is seen as directed towards individuals, not society. Foucault mentions this type of authority and addresses relationships as authority. Discipline is actually the authority mechanism that allows to control the smallest elements in society and to reach individuals. Here includes how to monitor someone, control their behavior and attitude, reinforce their performance, increase their abilities and place them in the most useful place (Foucault, 2021:145-148).

It is argued that surveillance was not taken seriously on its own until Foucault dealt with surveillance and discipline (Canpolat, 2005:131). The

concept of the eye of authority is used to indicate that authority is everywhere with supervision, surveillance and regulation. This aspect manifests itself in institutions where people are confined, such as hospitals, mental hospitals, or prisons (Foucault, 2019: 42; 2019a: 42-43). In this process, the general supervision of different elements of society such as the people, workers and peasants was continued with the new forms of political authorities. In this case, the “panopticon” is the most important structure discovered (Urhan, 2013:267). At the end of the 18th century, society evolved into a form of authority that included a system not excluding people, where everyone’s role or position was defined, and where there was surveillance both day and night. This power consists of three modes of control. These are surveillance, normalization, and test modes. Foucault exemplifies Bentham’s panopticon design for surveillance mode (Canpolat, 2005:132).

In the 19th century, authority ceased to be an entity embodied solely in individuals who possessed or wielded it from birth and transformed into machines with unknown owners (Foucault, 2019:99-100). When Foucault examined the architecture of hospitals, he became one of the guiding principles for the bodies to be fully visible from the central point of view of individuals. He thinks that the same situation is addressed with the same theme in projects when examining criminal proceedings and when prisons are reorganized. The structure mentioned here is Bentham’s panopticon (Foucault, 2019:87-88). The classic closure system aims to include everyone who is not working as a result of disability or economic conditions. Since the 19th century, hospitalization (improvement, rehabilitation, etc.) has served another function. For this reason, on the one hand, those who have been confined to detention houses will be released. On the other hand, people who are thought to be temporarily unable to work are placed in the labor market in an improvement system to rehabilitate them (Foucault, 2019:232).

Detention houses have begun to turn into mental hospitals, juvenile detention centers and prisons.

While elderly, disabled, unemployed, mentally ill, etc. were confined to the same place in the 17th century, at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century, the mentally ill were locked up in asylum, young people in juvenile detention centers, and criminals in prisons (Foucault, 2020:104). These institutions have been tied to the surveillance apparatus by being forced to obey certain vital rules that surround the entire lives of individuals. These institutions have become one of the conditions for the functioning of capitalist society with their disciplines (Foucault, 2020:122-123). Foucault states that the domination of authority over the individual increases not only physically but also psychologically. The defeat of the subject, who is in a difficult struggle with authority, brings the end of the individual, and the non-free individual is condemned to perish. The thoughts Foucault has put forward has been a turning point in terms of surveillance.

### **New Surveillance Forms**

The digital society created by technological developments constitutes the new dimension of the surveillance society put forward by Bentham and Foucault. Therefore, panoptic thinking differs today (Çağan, 2018:39; Aust & Amman, 2019:10; Brusseau, 2020:16). The Panoptic is thought to shape synoptic effects (Rizanaj, 2020:96). Unlike Panopticon, Synopticon is defined as “the many” monitoring “the few” (Öztürk, 2013:140; Demir, 2017:60). The main media of the Synopticon are tools such as “radio and television”. According to Bauman, synopticon is the movement of surveillance to more than one place (Bauman & Lyon, 2020:83). Emphasizing the rise of mass media, Mathiesen introduced a new power mechanism, which he called the synopticon. Mathiesen points out that Foucault never mentions mass media. According to him, the development of mass media should be taken into account (Mathiesen, 1997:218-219). Mathiesen’s contribution is that he draws attention to the importance of the interaction between surveillance and mass media rather than the role of the media in control (Doyle, 2011: 283).

Another form of surveillance, Banopticon, is the

effort to prevent the crimes that an individual can commit in advance according to his/her potential behavior and risk category by creating a risk profile according to certain groups and tendencies (Lyon, 2012:90-91). New methods are used to manage the borders where tourists, businessmen and immigrants constantly cross (Bigo, 2008:32-33). In this context, it is a surveillance process that focuses on undocumented people such as potential terrorists and immigrants while normalizing consumer capitalism (Lyon, 2013: 99-100). Didier Bigo calls the concept of subjecting profiling technologies to certain forms of surveillance as "Banopticon". Banopticon uses databases to direct data flow (Bauman & Lyon, 2020:75-76). Bigo states that "disposition operates through states and companies that tend to strengthen informatics and biometric surveillance styles that focus on individuals' border movements" (Bigo, 2008:10-11).

In another way where surveillance is differentiated, everything, everywhere, has begun to be controlled through a powerful omnioptic reality (Pimenta, 2010:301). With the innovations brought by the new media, surveillance is being rebuilt (Rizanaj, 2020:98). The transformation of the internet and its intertwining with other mass media have made the synopticon controversial, where the majority monitors the minority through mass media. In this context, the idea of the many watching the few, which Mathiesen puts at the center of social control, is re-evaluated (Doyle, 2011:293-295). Omniptikon is based on the regular processing of not only the panoptic and synoptic effects of monitoring, but also the control of everyone by everyone (Pimenta, 2010:272-273). In addition to normalizing surveillance in the structure of social consciousness, authority enables society to become increasingly exhibitionistic and enjoy surveillance. This is an indication of surrender without the need for authority (Çoban, 2019:122). People's privacy space has the power to decide who they are. Omniptikon, together with developing technologies, causes the loss of privacy, which is considered as a private area, and makes it easier to access the data (Lokke, 2020:47).

In the new form of surveillance, with the "Superpanopticon", the minority watches the majority, the majority watches the majority and the minority. In this context, "economic power", which means "less", monitors, defines, categorizes and evaluates the behavior of the shopper (Öztürk, 2013:140;Solmaz, 2023:171-172). Face-to-face relationships in traditional societies have been lost in the new technological order. Letter symbols such as smiling faces replace the invisible face and bodies disappear (Lyon, 2006:33-35). Modern surveillance has already crossed the threshold of the house through non-commercial channels. The administrative structures of the state are concerned with who lives with whom, where and at what economic level (Lyon, 1997:198). This surveillance is global surveillance, starting with individuals watching each other, where the government watches its subjects, and capital and technology owners watch their consumers. Customers leave electronic fingerprints every time they make a sale (Lyon, 2006:87). By following these traces, large companies can make guidances using technological infrastructures (Huberman, 2023:232). From this point on, "we all now participate as disciplined consumers and citizens, constantly obeying the rule by submissively filling out forms, producing driver's licenses and credit cards" (Lyon, 1997:265). The super-panopticon is complementary to the panopticon. However, it is not the shackles that fix people, but a tool that provides mobility and spreads to large areas (Bauman, 2021:61).

While the modern surveillance phenomenon aims to establish control with pressure, by hiding the function of control in the digital surveillance phenomenon, individuals accept to be observed with their own consent in the unlimited universe of information technologies that develops every day. Surveillance continues uninterruptedly with information technologies and turns into local global audit. While technological or digital power builds this global control on entertainment and pleasure, it hides itself by adding the unknowability to its invisibility (Okmeydan, 2017:47). This facilitates data collection. The

obtained data is divided, fragmented and cut into pieces and falls into the hands of data brokers who do not pay any attention to the accuracy and security of the information (Goodman, 2020:506). The use of digital technologies makes this situation widespread. It is emphasized that there is supervision and surveillance within the dynamics of the capitalist structure in the publicity formed in digital areas. For this reason, digital communication technologies are not guaranteed to liberate individuals (Evren, 2023:48-49).

### **Surveillance and Audit in Digital Technology**

Digital technology has created a wide revolution in many areas such as communication, data processing, industrial automation. The development of the internet has affected global communication and information sharing (Miandji,2024:27). There is a relationship between social, political or cultural changes and technology. Rapid development in information and communication technologies has been classified as “digital revolution”. Digital technologies have advanced the speed of information and communication and spread all over the world. The domination of technology in society has become evident due to its central position and the emergence of new technical interventions. Technical intervention is interpreted over surveillance/inspection. “As technology advances, the vulnerability of all kinds of computing platforms will increase and security risks will emerge” (Lee & Qiufan,2023:97). The digital society approach of the dominant authorities holding the technology is the desire to maintain control over society. In the economic system established with digital technologies, authorities have created a surveillance system with technology dominance (Dolgun, 2004:56). Technology society consists of people whose “bodies and souls are affected, whether it is called entertainment, show or attention” (Niedzviecki,2010:27-28). In order to understand surveillance in organizational and informational contexts, it is inevitable to analyze the relationship between both the viewer and the monitored and between them together.

This is interpreted as a break with the spirit of ‘surveillance work’, which emphasizes the power of the panoptic authority that establishes and positions the subject in its own slavery (Lyon, 2013:137). Freedom, which is the most important claim of modernity that uses the panopticon to provide control, is restricted by oppressive tools (Koyuncu & Günerigök, 2019:98).

After the industrial revolution, political powers experienced difficulties in adapting to technological advances. Internet and network society has risen to a central position in life. In this context, political problems such as dominance, privacy, and security have also changed (Harari, 2016:390). The internet also constitutes a society of transparency that is indistinguishable from the surveillance and supervision society. Digital objects that completely surround us keep us under constant supervision and surveillance (Han, 2021:38). The numerous security-enhancing opportunities offered by new technologies in the internet world cannot be ignored. But you should also consider the risks. In this case, does digital technology “reinforce control and surveillance mechanisms?” question comes to mind (Morozov, 2019:211). Dominant powers that possess digital technologies easily carry out surveillance by placing it in all areas of society (Solmaz, 2023:171). Developments in digital technology have brought the socio-economic situation under control and surrounded individuals in all aspects. Control systems borrowed from ancient societies have come to the fore again (Deleuze, 1992:7).

The issue of “transparency and confidentiality” is also discussed in the digital society. While all kinds of ideas and actions of individuals turn into data and become increasingly transparent, the powers that manage technologies become increasingly hidden. Individuals are data objects that live in an integrated way with the internet and receive and transfer data (Solmaz, 2023:186-187). Digital technologies have changed and transformed today’s surveillance society, causing it to be redefined both in terms of quantity and quality (Acemoğlu & Johnson, 2023: 376). The

spread of technology does not mean that it will automatically lead to totalitarianism. However, in reality, dictatorships have existed at all levels of technological development (Dickson, 1992: 50). While we dream of a beautiful world with technological advances, we live in an age where wars do not stop. For this reason, it can be said that there is a transformation towards dystopias rather than utopias. In his novel *1984*, Orwell (2019) constructs a dystopian surveillance society. “Big Brother”, who watches everyone and everything at any time, has concentrated on society and life, which has imprisoned everyone in a totalitarian surveillance society. In Aldous Huxley’s (2013) “*Brave New World*”, the advanced version of Orwell’s dystopia, “soma”, which was distributed as a “happiness pill”, has been replaced by digital technologies that provide this pleasure today. These technologies, like soma, give the pleasure of virtual happiness and take place voluntarily. While people were controlled by fear and oppression in *1984*, they are controlled by unlimited happiness and pleasure in the *Brave New World* (Dickson, 1992:35; Okmeydan, 2017:56).

Neil Postman (1990:7-8), who gives an assessment of the book *Brave New World* and *1984*, thinks that Huxley is right, based on the characteristics of the two dystopias and the world of today. However, when we think about digital technologies, we go through the process where we see the reflections of the concerns that the two of them have raised. In the new period, surveillance is carried out by the ruling forces with a controlled supervision. Big Data has replaced Orwell’s Big Brother in the new supervision form created by digital technologies. While Big Brother ensures that prisoners are only observed from the outside in the panopticon known as Classic, people’s thoughts are also observed through algorithms in digital surveillance (Han, 2021:39; 2024:84). It is now stated that the person under 24/7 supervision will go far beyond the claim that he will turn into a slave (Akilli, 2022: 118). Therefore, users whose data is collected do not need to be online or on digital platforms. Because the smart technologies used in the real world in which they live provide this easily. Thus,

people have turned into products like objects designed in terms of commercial purposes and social behaviors.

Digital technology breaks everything down into small pieces, makes them invisible and transfers them by evaporating. Parts scattered everywhere are collected by receiving devices. In the new process, the data transferred to the digital universe can become the tool of politics or trade by many focused groups. Now, beyond a science fiction story, society and the individual can be fictionalized in the form of political fiction. In this fiction, biological bodies will turn into data that can be defined and processed as consciousness in the next digital leap (Virilio, 2003:32). In the process of turning into data, predictions about technological violations have increased. The system that predetermines what we will do in every field is inevitable. Harari considers this situation as dataism (O’Gieblyn, 2023:231). It is stated that the internet and computer technology carry the surveillance out in a confidential manner. However, today, people’s relationship with digital technologies has eliminated the boundary between the real world and the virtual world. In the surveillance society, economic and political powers see people as data and can be easily manipulated (Dolgun, 2004:74). In the following processes, it is discussed that this will turn into a digital dictatorship and re-establish totalitarian administrations (Aust & Ammann, 2019:147-149).

In the 21st century, the effort to gather all the information that prevents authoritarian regimes in one place can turn into a decisive advantage (Fioriglio, 2015:409). As algorithms get to know us, they will emerge authoritarian regimes. This regime will not only know how you feel, but it will also make you feel what you want. In this sense, democracy will be completely reshaped or people will start to live under a “digital dictatorship” (Rizanaj, 2020:101). The human, who is fictionalized through digital channels and easily manipulated by algorithms at any time, is used as a ready-made tool. Deleuze says that “the liberating qualities of technologies are also their enslaving qualities

and we need new weapons to defend ourselves, not to hope or despair” (Deleuze, 1992:4). There is a process that we accept without any objection to the freedom offered to us with digital systems that have technology. The new universe created by digital technologies almost contains a new reality (Virilio, 2003:29). Digital tools damage decision-making autonomy by unwittingly guiding us in certain ways. Manipulations in the internet and digital world threaten freedom. In this context, it can be stated that freedom is endangered in the digital process.

Many contemporary theoretical approaches to the concept of authority do not find it consistent to exclude technology from the agenda. The close relationship of new communication technologies and biotechnological developments with concepts such as “biopolitics”, “bioauthority” and “managerialism” related to authority is obvious. On the other hand, even such current concepts gain new meaning in terms of technologies in continuous development (Han, 2020). Authority provides a fast flow of communication in a certain direction, only as a means of communication. It is stated that authority does not need to be oppressive in order to be realized communicatively (Han, 2022: 15). In the new process, which is considered as a digital process, a new form of authority/managerialism or domination has emerged through algorithms. Therefore, it is necessary to consider this newly emerging form of domination in detail.

## Algorithm Domination

### **Algorithm**

The concept of algorithm covers the meanings of calculation, problem solving, set of rules and systematic creation. At the same time, the algorithms include instructions that can be applied to computers to solve the computable dataset. Basically, algorithms were created to find solutions to the problem and to facilitate the solution (Fioriglio, 2015:398;Toker, 2021:211). It is used to process data, recognize patterns, learn or achieve results. For example, the classification algorithm can divide the data into certain

categories by analyzing them (Miandji,2024:129). The concept of algorithm was first used to make calculations in al-Khwarizmi 's work titled “Hisab-ül Jabir vel Mukabale”. The calculation he developed is a calculation method made with Indo-Arabic numerals. The study forms the basis of algorithm calculations and algebra mathematics. Algorithm computation first took its place in Western civilization with the work translated by the British philosopher Adelard of Bath in the 12th century and was defined by the word “algorismus” in Bath's work (Ausiello, 2013:12). Algorithms have a significant impact in the period we live in. This does not only apply to mathematical operation. Regarding the subject, Goodman (2020:457-458) states that we have the following algorithms today;

- ▶ Trading algorithms on Wall Street (robots trade shares),
- ▶ Criminal algorithms (traffic lights and radar cameras, crime violations are detected),
- ▶ Border control algorithms (an AI can invite you and your luggage to inspect),
- ▶ Credit score algorithms (your FICO score determines your credibility),
- ▶ Surveillance algorithms (closed-circuit cameras can detect unusual activities with computer vision analysis and voice recognition systems can scan your searches due to problematic word choices),
- ▶ Health algorithms (seeing a specialist or deciding whether to approve your insurance claim)
- ▶ Combat algorithms (drones and other robots are technically capable of finding and killing targets without any intervention)
- ▶ Love algorithms (eHarmony and other services promise you can find your perfect soul mate using math)

In connection with its technological function, “the algorithm is the way in which the solution



of a problem or how to achieve the specified goal is explained. As can be understood from this statement, the algorithm is not a result, but the path that leads to the result" (Aytekin et al., 2018:151). Therefore, the algorithm is one of the elements that shape the knowledge of individuals (Musiani, 2013:1). Algorithms are linked to machine learning. Machine learning is "the general name of computer algorithms that model a problem according to the data of that problem" (Atalay & Çelik, 2017:161). In such a case, a world dominated by algorithms can be mentioned (Musiani, 2013:5). Algorithms see data left in the digital world as raw materials. The data that algorithms use as food for living expand their capacity by feeding the digital economy (Sarı, 2022:91).

Considering the characteristics of digital systems, algorithms can also be seen as part of cybernetics. Because it is thought that the behaviors of important systems such as bureaucratic, mechanical and organizational etc. can be regulated (Ünver, 2018:3). In connection with this issue, Wiener (1964:69) also draws attention to the aspects of algorithms that threaten the working order and the freedom of individual and social life. He questions whether these algorithms are related to human freedom of choice and will. He emphasizes that algorithms help us, but only when we compromise our honesty and intelligence. Wiener expressed this discourse when computers started to play games against human creativity. It is said that he sees signs of what machines can turn into through artificial intelligence (O'Gieblyn, 2023:207). Thanks to the advanced levels, capabilities and algorithms of technologies, individuals are monitored, recorded and audited in all aspects. Algorithm domination is provided by the power of big data about the individual and society.

Algorithms make everything visible. Of course, it is possible for everything to be visible thanks to information and communication. It has been hoped that freedom of information and communication will improve democracy and human rights in the age we live in. However, there is a problem of control, audit and trust. Therefore, information has made

information security, freedom of communication and protection of personal data mandatory (Alper, 2022:327). It is stated that personal data is seen as the oil of digital capitalism in the period we live in. In addition to the raw material fossil fuel and body power exploited in the digital age, there are also symbols of the world of minds and culture. Data are not consumed like physical resources, but reproduced as they are copied (Şan, 2022:111).

Those who advocate this system in studies of digital capitalism think that digital infrastructures actually give people the freedom to be the leaders of their industry. However, it is stated that digital capitalism treats people as a means, not a goal, by revealing a world of great insecurity and inequality. In such an evaluation, it is concluded that this order creates domination, not liberation (Huberman, 2023:26-27). Algorithms that provide data to digital capitalism increasingly play a role in regulating and controlling our lives (Brusseau, 2020:16). Surveillance algorithms have become an important phenomenon in digital societies. The digital surveillance system created by algorithms directs people or society towards certain purposes by analyzing the data it obtains. This situation raises concerns as it plays an inclusive role on the individual and society. Because there is an effort to regulate the actions and thoughts of individuals with technological possibilities. In addition to controlling the bodies, the process of designing in their thoughts with algorithms has been started (Masco, 2020:181-182).

With the widespread use of surveillance technologies, the perfection of facial recognition systems, the transfer of social relations to the digital space, the involvement of artificial intelligence and algorithms in all areas of life from companies to bureaucracy, from education to consumption, various problems arise with the radical transformation of social life. The hegemony of algorithms leads to echo chambers, limited coverage and the fragmentation of online communities, deepening state/company surveillance over citizens and consumers, and deepening inequalities and discrimination in society (Şener, 2021:81). The culture created by

algorithms and reproducing itself has sometimes reinforced and sometimes changed the individual-society, subject-object relationship through new social channels after industrialization. In this respect, it is possible to say that algorithms define the age we live in (Toker, 2021:212).

### **Algorithmic Managerialism**

Managerialism is expressed as a form of power that shapes human behavior and does this by subjectivizing it without applying pressure. Foucault explains the concept of managerialism as a new model of power. The neoliberal system imposes emotions, behaviors, and ways of thinking on people to ensure their integration into the economic order (Foucault, 2019b;2021:145-147). This managerialism is provided by algorithms today. Algorithmic managerialism operates differently from the old forms of authority. Instead of subjectivizing people as in the surveillance society, managerialism tries to determine their potential behavior. Thus, it manipulates people's mental relationships and directs them to think and act according to certain profiles. It can be used in examples such as consumption habits and political preferences. The possibilities that the neoliberal subject can realize, the opportunities he/she can capture or the risks he/she can take are among the priorities of the algorithm (Şan, 2022:115). Surveillance and control software developed to manage consumption can have many functions. With these software, managers know the sales rates, which product is sold for how much, and which salesman sells how many products (Lyon, 2006:86). For this reason, it is important to draw attention to the importance that structures such as Google, Amazon and Apple will know better as time passes where we go, which friends we have, and which types of films we prefer (Aust & Ammann, 2019:22).

It is stated that surveillance systems have emerged to compensate for the fact that many social relations are not embodied (Lyon, 2006: 57). Predicting and trying to change human behavior is done through the analysis of various companies. In doing so, data is being used (O'Gieblyn, 2023: 230). This is where the importance of big data

emerges, whether for governments or private companies. Because it helps manage uncertainty. Instead of managing what is, this uncertainty is managing what is unknown. Big data leads to a society where opportunities and risks are sharply individualized and their behaviors are modeled (Wiggins & Jones,2024:240). In this sense, algorithmic managerialism is a management based on the profiles that emerge with the data that accumulates digital footprints. Algorithms that collect and track footprints left on digital data produce information about people's thoughts, desires, and tastes (Sarı, 2022:96;Şan, 2022:115). Digital traces left on the internet are exposed to personalized advertisements and messages by many companies by extracting their algorithms (Gültekin, 2023:122). Algorithmic managerialism focuses on relationships rather than individuals or issues. Individuals' physical and digital behaviors are constantly analyzed and reduced to profiles. These profiles are automated, making them computable and predictable. Therefore, it primarily manifests itself as a regime of power over the future imaginations of individuals. Algorithmic managerialism thus suppresses the plurality and heterogeneity of existence regimes by compressing digitized reality onto itself. Therefore, the main purpose is to prevent individualization by paradoxically transforming relationships into matter (Şan, 2022:115).

Rouvroy and Berns explain algorithmic managerialism in three stages. The first of these stages is the collection of data and the formation of data warehouses. At this stage, it is the stage of collecting and automatically storing large amounts of unsorted data, which we can call data surveillance, which constitutes big data. Governments collect data for companies, marketing and advertising in the name of security, and scientists for the purpose of obtaining and improving information. Individuals voluntarily share their "own" data on social networks, blogs and "mailing lists" (Rouvroy & Berns, 2013:168). The second stage is data mining itself, that is, the automatic processing of this large amount of data in such a way as to reveal subtle correlations between them. What is mentioned here and what

is fundamental is the fact that we are faced with a knowledge production from such unordered and therefore completely heterogeneous knowledge. The essence of what we call machine learning is ultimately to make it possible to generate hypotheses directly from data. In this way we find ourselves once again confronted with the idea of knowledge whose objectivity may seem absolute. Norms seem to emerge directly from reality itself. However, these norms or “information” consist of “only” correlations and this is not a problem (Rouvroy & Berns, 2013:170).

The final stage is the algorithmic reproduction of the processed data, contrary to the information obtained as a result of individual production, the application of individual perception to individuals without concept. In order to fully understand what algorithmic profiling we are talking about here consists of, on the one hand, it can be observed at the individual level, often by the person to whom it is related. Or we need to perceive the important difference between perceptible information. On the other hand, it is about the information produced at the level of profiling, which is often not accessible by individuals or perceived by them, but applied to them in a way that gives them information or predictions. It is used to predict individual behaviors related to profiles defined based on correlations discovered by data mining. This time, the application of the norm to individual behavior is the most obvious example of this (Rouvroy & Berns, 2013: 171). In these three stages, the data contained in the big data classifies individuals and guides their behavior through a collective category based on statistics.

### **Algorithmic Surveillance**

As a Chinese proverb goes, “The eye sees what is, the brain sees what will be.” (Akıllı, 2022:26). In fact, algorithms that try to determine behaviors here are trying to influence/manipulate the brain. Algorithms create profiles and prepare content by taking into account the behaviors of people. At the same time, algorithms guide people on what to do. In the words of Han (2022:12), “this is how we surrender ourselves to the ever-increasing

power of the algorithmic black box”. This situation manifests itself in social media channels (Aytekin et al., 2018:157-158). The most important part of ubiquitous surveillance is the transformation of large data sets into usable information by algorithmic analysis. It is formed by the interconnection of data sets and the mathematical evaluation of the relationships in that field of knowledge (Masco, 2020:192). While individuals in the society judge the ‘Market’ or ‘invisible hand’ to govern themselves, they now judge the algorithms to govern themselves (Edwards & Veale, 2017:19).

The more communication is established in the digital information society, the more surveillance increases. In this information regime, it is emphasized that people feel that they are free, not that they are being watched, but that freedom is being exploited (Han, 2022:10). Han also states that people experience the illusion of freedom in digital surveillance. They voluntarily disclose themselves and provide information to digital surveillance (Han, 2024:84). In connection with the subject, Edwards states that freedom will not be unlimited, but at the same time he accepts that privacy cannot be an untouchable absolute. However, even the individual part of individuality is in danger of being destroyed with the invasion of privacy and private in the digital process (Edwards, 2020:248).

The understanding of authoritarianism is a form of domination that has a decisive effect on social, economic and political processes using algorithms and artificial intelligence. Here, it is not the bodies that are exploited, but the data (Han, 2022:7). The technology industry exploits people’s desire for approval. It takes place especially through social media. Platforms that collect information and spread pressure also enable the reproduction of data about tastes, values, weak points, and desires that break identity profiles, crash algorithms, and lose control (Brusseau, 2020:21). Deleuze states that the limited means of discipline and supervision that Foucault mentions in modern societies have been replaced by new means of surveillance and supervision that are no longer limited to specific

areas. Algorithm systems are one of the new tools (Erwin, 2015:42). Surveillance is becoming an intensive data collection and analysis center. In this sense, algorithms are understood by analyzing the data and using them to direct thoughts for certain purposes. Certain patterns and trends are revealed by the data collected.

Big data and algorithms have spread the surveillance mentality to wide areas (Erwin, 2015:34). Big data consists of data on every subject related to the digital field. Therefore, it collects and analyzes data in a broad framework. In particular, the people, pages or advertisements we encounter on social media channels are related to the place and likes we live in. All personalized advertisements and referrals are created through algorithms (Ünver, 2018: 2). According to Han, the bombardment of information has reached an inconceivable level. Today's election campaigns are carried out with algorithms. Voter referrals are made through similar algorithms. Algorithms make it possible to make assumptions about voter behavior and optimize the way they appeal to voters (Han, 2020:70). Algorithms are not limited to the functioning of digital technologies. It also has a structure that affects the socio-political and economic aspects of social life. In this context, political forces that demographically hold the population benefit significantly from algorithms. Algorithms are used to influence, shape and manipulate the behavior of voters (Tüfekci, 2014:27).

In today's world, where algorithm systems are dominant, their frequent use brings various conveniences but also brings dangers. The fact that individuals' data are recorded, directed, and controlled causes controversy about issues such as freedom. On this subject, Julian Assange said; "The internet, which is our perfect means of liberation, has become a dangerous element that paves the way for totalitarianism. The internet, which reached large masses with the mass surveillance of the state, has been the threat of human civilization. This leads to a postmodern surveillance nightmare that no one can escape except the very cunning ones". Similarly, William Binney emphasizes that there is a fine line between surveillance and

pressure. According to him, we are not far from a totalitarian state (Amman & Aust, 2019:14-15). Morozov states that supporting internet freedom in a quixotic way is perhaps an attempt that is doomed to disappear from the very beginning (Morozov, 2019:271). While the digital process promises freedom, contradictions arise. Similarly, smartphones that promise freedom present a coercion. Here, freedom turns into coercion. Social networks strengthen communication coercion. More communication means more capital/information (Huberman, 2023:225; Han, 2024:45).

After the American and British surveillance system's confidential information was uncovered by former NSA employee Edward Snowden, there have been major changes in the world. At the beginning of 2014, it was revealed that billions of mobile phone data and about two hundred million text messages were stored by the NSA. This means that it is certain that the surveillance process concerns every person (Aust & Ammann, 2019:11; Lokke, 2020:32; Edwards, 2020:236-237; Masco, 2020:196). The NSA is not merely agents of the secret services of the "British Government Communications Headquarters" (GCHQ) or the "German Federal Bureau of Intelligence" (BND). All the movements we make on the search engine Google and the social network Facebook, where the data is regularly recorded, are constantly recorded (Fioriglio, 2015:398; Aust & Ammann, 2019:9; Dolgun, 2015:151-153). Even if these channels seem to be democratic, they have a centralized structure and their users largely renounce their freedom in the digital world (Aust & Ammann, 2019:167). Julian Assange (2012:23), in his book *Cypherpunks*, says that mass surveillance by Americans, British and Russians, as well as a few states such as Switzerland and France, has become more evident today. With the commercialization of mass surveillance, all states can implement it. Because all kinds of communication that used to take place in the personal sphere are now subject to mass surveillance.

Although the first things that come to people's mind about surveillance are issues such as privacy, confidentiality and anonymity, the connection

of surveillance with justice, impartiality, human rights and fundamental freedoms should not be forgotten (Bauman & Lyon, 2020:24-25). "Network-based authoritarianism", which takes networks at its center, leads to changes with digitalization. In places where surveillance techniques are applied, although those with internet connection or mobile access think that they are free, there is no guarantee of freedoms (Ceyhan, 2020:111). Freedom is not suppressed here, but it is extensively exploited. The digital process is becoming a new domination. This form of intelligent domination asks us to express our opinions, preferences, likes, and lives. Smart domination is extremely effective because it doesn't have to be visible. Because it hides behind the illusion of freedom and communication (Han, 2024a:20-21). The most important danger posed by technologies is their efforts to produce in order to secure a lifestyle that seems to be freedom. This structure makes individuals dependent on it by making them feel free, observing them unseen, and producing so-called needs.

Actions that make us feel free also facilitate interference with our freedom. For example, new communication technologies that facilitate freedom of communication increase tracking and surveillance. While providing ease of communication and freedom of communication here, it also raises the concern of being followed, controlled and monitored (Gültekin, 2023:122). The sense of freedom that paradoxically secures sovereignty with information technologies is this illusion. At the moment when freedom and surveillance merge, domination becomes perfect. Today, surveillance does not take the form of an attack on freedom. People voluntarily surrender themselves to the digital panopticon. The prisoner in the digital panopticon is both the victim and the perpetrator. Here, freedom turns into control (Han, 2020:72; 2024a:34). This situation reveals a new understanding of authority. Regarding authority, Harari (2021: 59) stated that "for thousands of years people believed that authority came from divine sources and therefore should be sanctified by the word of God, not human freedom. The source of authority was transferred from god to man a few centuries ago. Nowadays, authority can shift from

human to digital algorithms".

In the form of domination dominated by algorithms, the concept of security is important as well as the concept of freedom. The concept of freedom has been discussed in connection with many concepts. One of the most important of these is security. For example, "the concept of freedom and security in political philosophy is seen as two ends of a scale". According to thinkers, approaching one of these concepts means moving away from the other (Koyuncu, 2019: 22;2023:113). Today, when freedoms are used to the fullest, security problems arise. Because there is surveillance from all sides. Even the idea that our home is the only place that is not monitored is an optimistic approach. Surveillance and inspection are carried out without objection for security reasons. Recording all behaviors in the social field has become the norm today (Gültekin, 2023:123).

In today's digital societies, the concepts of freedom and security are frequently discussed. In addition, the concepts of freedom and security are considered as co-existing concepts. Bauman (2017:44) sees two concepts as dilemmas through fluidity. Security is the main objective of surveillance by states. In this sense, security offers an offer that will not be rejected for surveillance (Gültekin, 2018:127). Although it is revealed that social security is aimed to be maximized discursively, governments can make it their goal to consolidate their hegemony with the security procedures they implement. The surveillance practices implemented by states for security reasons not only protect society against crimes but also establish oversight and control over individuals (Özarslan, 2019:142). Possession of information has been a guarantee of power and security throughout history. Although the governments have collected information against uprisings, epidemics, wars and crises in the historical process, today more information has been collected for the continuation of the governments by keeping the people under control. The clarification of the electronic relationship between discipline and security turns into a future-oriented project. This will make "surveillance and supervision thanks

to digital techniques and statistical reasoning” operational in the future. This surveillance requires monitoring everything that acts as a product, information, capital and individual (Bauman & Lyon, 2020:16).

*In the Transparency Society*, Han states that “trust is unnecessary if you know everything in advance”. Transparency is a situation where all kinds of ignorance are eliminated. Transparency does not create trust, on the contrary, it eliminates trust. Therefore, transparency society is a society of insecurity and suspicion that attaches importance to control due to decreased trust (Han, 2020a:70). Security is a powerful reason for surveillance. Security does not need to be rational because it is fed by a sense of fear (Gültekin, 2018:117). Especially after 9/11, this situation became clear and expressed as global fears. Insecurity has spread rapidly with new applications such as body scanners and fingerprint readers (Bauman & Lyon, 2020:115-116). Even though the tools that discover and analyze the human brain are changing; today, just as in the past, the security/insecurity dialectic continues as a risk. The danger lies in transforming the citizen subject into a measured, calculated, and obedient individual (Mattelart, 2012:298). One of the most important factors in the increase of these risks is big data, as in the concept of freedom. Big data is the most important factor underlying the developments that have occurred with the rise of big data, security and privacy are intertwined. This situation is facilitated by algorithms. Our data collected in digital environments reveal the state of insecurity (Burt, 2020:168). In summary, algorithm domination as a new control/surveillance system has created a society where freedom and security are discussed.

## Result

Surveillance is a phenomenon used in the sense of collecting, analyzing and using information. In this sense, it appears in different forms in the historical process. It is stated that it goes back to the first use of writing. However, it is possible to say that the concept has experienced differences in the historical process. The first known design

for surveillance is Bentham’s Panopticon. This design specifically mentions the way to discipline by providing supervision and control over the prison system. Foucault, on the other hand, handled surveillance through authority relations. The concept of the eye of authority is used to indicate that surveillance and authority are everywhere. In particular, it deals with institutions such as hospitals, mental hospitals and prisons through surveillance. With the development of mass communication technologies, the issue of surveillance has reached to a different dimension. The extent to which surveillance in closed environments can now be carried out in any area and by everyone has emerged.

With the development of the internet and the different dimensions of digital technologies, supervision in every field becomes easier. Because people voluntarily share information. This allows data to be collected. Large data sets, on the other hand, make it possible to direct behaviors and manipulate them by analyzing them. It has been revealed that this analysis is provided especially by algorithms. Similarly, the effect of algorithms on social media has altered the panopticon. Algorithms have created a digital control and discipline structure. This situation is directly related to the freedom and security of the individual. Within the new structure created by algorithms, there are discussions about these two concepts. Individuals who think they are free in the digital age are actually under control and pressure. At the same time, it makes one feel safe, but on the other hand, insecurity is built up through the practices carried out. Algorithms constitute a form of domination because they threaten people’s freedoms and security.

In summary, digital systems are thought to form a structure that controls and supervises the human body, mind and social life in today’s societies. This structure emerges as algorithm domination. It can be said that algorithm domination has a structure above other forms of surveillance and control. It carries the features of all of them and operates systematically. However, considering the effects,

it can be said that it has a multidimensional structure compared to others. It is thought that the effects of algorithms will increase even more in the coming years. In this article, it is aimed to reveal that algorithms, which are a new subject, constitute a domination. There is a need for larger-scale studies for the problems and opportunities of algorithms, which have begun to gain an important place in today's life world.

## References

Acemođlu, D. & Johnson, S.(2023). *İktidar ve teknoloji*, (C. Duran, Çev.). Dođan Kitap.

Akıllı, M.M.(2022). *Büyük birader gözetiminde, teknolojik yenedünya düzeni*, Karina Yayınevi.

Alper, H.(2022). Psikopolitika ve özgürlüğün krizi. *Trt Akademi*, 7(14), 324-339. <https://doi.org/10.37679/trta.1064049>.

Assange, J.(2012).*Şifrepunk-Özgürlük ve İnternetin Geleceđi Üzerine Bir Tartışma*, (A. D.Temiz, Çev.).Metis Yayınları.

Atalay, M.& Çelik, E.(2017). Büyük veri analizinde yapay zekâ öğrenmesi ve makine öğrenmesi uygulamaları. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9(22),55-172. <https://doi.org/10.20875/makusobed.309727>.

Ausiello, G.(2013). Algorithms, an historical perspective. The power of algorithms: inspiration and examples in everyday life. Berlin, *Heidelberg: Springer*.

Aust, S. & Amman, T.(2019) *Kitlesel gözetim verilerin kötüye kullanımı siber savaş, dijital diktatörlük*, (E.Yücel, H. Yılmaz, Çev.). Hece Yayınları.

Aytekin, A., Çakır, F. S., Yücel, Y. B. & Kulaözü, İ.(2018). Algoritmaların hayatımızdakiyeri ve önemi. *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ASEAD)*, 5(7),51-162. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/asead/issue/41013/495619>

Bauman, Z.(2015). *Özgürlük*. (K. Eren, Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Bauman, Z.(2017). *Akışkan modernite*. (S. O. Çavuş, Çev.). Can Yayınları.

Bauman, Z.(2021), *Küreselleşme*, (A. E. Pilgir, Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Bauman, Z.& Lyon, D.(2020). *Akışkan gözetim* (E.Yılmaz, Çev.).Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Bentham, J.(2019). Panoptikon yâda gözetim-evi (Z.Özarslan Çev.). içinde B. Çoban ve Z. Özarslan (Haz.), *Panoptikon: Gözün İktidarı*. (s.s.9-76). Su Yayınları.

Bigo, D.(2008). Globalized (In) security: The field and the ban-opticon.terror, insecurity and liberty. *Illeberal Practices Of Liberal Regimes After 9/11*.

Burt, A.(2020). Kişisel gizlilik ve siber güvenlik iç içe geçiyor. (Ü. Şensoy, Çev.), içinde *Dijital Dönüşüm, Siber Güvenlik*, (ss.167-173). Optimum Basım.

Brusseau, J.(2020).Deleuze's postscript on the societies of control: updated for big data and predictive analytics. *Theoria*, 67(164),1-25. <https://doi:10.3167/th.2020.6716401>.

Canpolat, N.(2005). Michel Foucault. İçinde, N. Rigel, G. Batu, G. Yücedođan & B. Çoban (Editörler), *Kadife Karanlık: 21. Yüzyıl İletişim Çađını Aydınlatan Kuramcılar* (ss.75-138). Su Yayınları.

Ceyhan, E.G.(2020). Demokrasi ve medya ilişkisinin bir eleştirisi "dijital çağda özgürlük yanılıđı. *İzmir Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2 (2),110-120.

Çađan, K.(2018). Postmodern toplumda mahremiyetin dönüşümü, *Sosyoloji Divanı Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 6(11),27-57

Çakır, M.(2015). *İnternette gösteri ve gözetim, eleştirel bir okuma*, Ütopya Yayınları.

Çoban, B.(2019). Gözün iktidarı üzerine. İçinde B. Çoban ve Z. Özarslan (Haz.), *Panoptikon: Gözün İktidarı*, (ss.111-138). Su Yayınları.

Deleuze, G.(1992). Postscript on the societies of control. October. No. 59. Winter 1992. *Cambridge, MA:the MIT Journals Press*: 3-7. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/778828>

Demir, A.(2017). Panopticon ve synopticon geriliminde özgürlük paradoksu. *Kaygı*, 28(28), 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.20981/kaygi.307940>

Dickson, D.(1992). Alternatif teknoloji, teknik değişimin politik boyutları, (N. ErdoğanÇev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Dolgun, U.(2004). Gözetim toplumunun yükselişi: enformasyon toplumundan gözetim toplumuna. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 55-74. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/comuybd/issue/4120/54196>

Dolgun, U.(2005).*Enformasyon toplumundan gözetim toplumuna; 21. yüzyılda gözetim toplumsal denetim ve iktidar ilişkileri*. Ekin Kitabevi.

Dolgun, U.(2015).*Şeffaf hapishane yahut gözetim toplumu: Küreselleşen dünyada gözetim,toplumsal denetim ve iktidar ilişkileri*. Ötüken Yayınları.

Doyle, A. (2011). Revisiting the synopticon: reconsidering mathiesen's the viewer society'in the age of web 2.0. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(3), 283-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480610396645>

Edwards, L.& Veale, M. (2017). Slave to the algorithm? Why a'right to an explanation'is probably not the remedy you are looking for. *Duke L. & Tech. Rev.*, 16, 18.16 *Duke Law & Technology Review* 18 (2017). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2972855>

Edwards, V. A.(2020). *Dijital her şeyi yok ediyor*, (M. Yener, Çev.). Siyah Kitap.

Erwin, S.(2015). Living by algorithm: smart surveillance and the society of control. *Humanities and Technology Review*, 34, s.28-69. <https://philpapers.org/citations/ERWLBA>

Evren, M. (2023).Siyasetin kamusal alandan dijital medyaya taşınmasının kuşaklar açısından değerlendirilmesi, içinde Osman Metin (Editör.). *Kuşak ve Siyaset*, (ss.47-71). Eğitim Yayınevi.

Fioriglio, G.(2015). Freedom, authorityand knowledge on line: the dictatorship of the

algorithm. *Revista Internacional de PensamientoPolítico-I Época*, 10,95-410. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2728842>

Foucault, M.(2019).*İktidarın gözü seçme Yazılar-4*,(I. Ergüden, O. Akınhay Çev.) Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Foucault, M.(2019a). *Hapishane'nin doğuşu* (M. A. Kılıçbay, Çev.). İmge Kitabevi.

Foucault, M.(2019b).*Güvenlik, toprak, nüfus, collège de france dersleri* (1977-1978). (F. Taylan, Çev.).İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. .

Foucault, M.(2020).*Büyük kapatılma* (I. Ergüden ve F. Keskin, Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Foucault, M.(2021).*Özne ve iktidar* (I. Ergüden ve O. Akınhay, Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Han, B. C.(2020). *Psikopolitika, neoliberalizm ve yeni iktidar teknikleri*, (H. Barışcan, Çev.). Metis Yayınları.

Han, B. C.(2020a).*Şeffaflık toplumu*, (H. Barışcan, Çev.).Metis Yayınları.

Han, B. C.(2021).*Kapitalizm ve ölüm dürtüsü*, (Ç. Tanyeri Çev.). İnka Yayınları.

Han, B. C.(2022).*Enforaksi, dijitalleşme ve demokrasi krizi*, (M. Özdemir, Çev.). Ketebe Yayınları.



- Han, B C.(2022a). *İktidar nedir?* (M. Özdemir, Çev.). İnsan Yayınları.
- Han, B. C.(2024). *Sürünün içinde dijital dünyaya bakışlar*, (Z. Sarıkartal, Çev.). İnka Yayınları.
- Han, B. C.(2024a). *Anlatının krizi*, (M. Erşen, Çev.). Ketebe Yayınları.
- Harari, Y. N.(2016). *Homo deus yarının kısa bir tarihi*. (P. N. Taneli, Çev.). Kolektif Kitap.
- Harari, N. Y.(2021). *21.yüzyıl için 21 ders*, (S. Sıral, Çev.), Kolektif Kitap.
- Huxley, A. (2013). *Cesur yenedünya*. (Ü. Tosun, Çev.).İthaki Yayınları.
- Huberman, J.( 2023). *Dijital kapitalizmin ruhu*, (M. Pekdemir, Çev.). Fol Kitap.
- Giddens, A.(2008). *Ulus devlet ve şiddet*, (Cumhur Atay, Çev.). Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Goodman, M.(2020). *Geleceğin suçları, dijital dünyanın karanlık yüzü*, Timaş Yayınları.
- Gültekin, M.(2018). Teşhirin ve gözetlemenin biyo-psiko-politiği. *Sosyoloji Divanı*, 6(11,17-131.
- Gültekin, M.(2023). *Algı yönetimi ve manipülasyon; kanmanın ve kaldırmanın psikoloji*, Pınar Yayınları.
- Koyuncu, A.A. & Gönerigök, M.(2019), *Bauman ve postmodernite*, Çizgi Yayınları.
- Koyuncu, A.A.(2019). Özgürlüğün bir imkânı olarak belirsizlik: Bauman bağlamında eleştirel bir değerlendirme. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi*, (Icoae), 21-38.
- Koyuncu, A.A.(2023). *Vasat sosyolojisi*, Pınar Yayınları.
- Lee, K-F.& Qiufan, C.(2023). *Yapay zeka 2041, geleceğimiz için on vizyon*, (İ. Büyükdevrim Özçelik, Çev.).Obtimist Bilim.
- Lokke, E.(2020).Mahremiyet, dijital toplumda özel hayat, (D. Başa, Çev.), Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları
- Lyon, D.(1997). *Elektronik göz: gözetim toplumunun yükselişi* (D. Hattatoğlu, Çev.). Sarmal Yayınevi.
- Lyon, D.(2013). *Gözetim çalışmaları*,(A. Toprak, Çev.), Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Lyon, D.(2006). *Gözetlenen toplum: günlük hayatı kontrol etmek* (G. Soykan, Çev.).Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Masco, J.(2020). Heryerde gözetim, içinde Catherina Besteman & Hugh Gusterson (Eds) *Algoritmalarla yaşamak*, (B. Akmeriç, Çev.). (ss.177-205). The Kitap.
- Mathiesen, T.(1997). The viewer society: michel foucault's panopticon revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2), 215-234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003>
- Mattelart, A. (2012). *Gözetimin küreselleşmesi: güvenileştirme düzeninin kökeni* (O. Gayretli & S. E. Karacan, Çev.). Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Miandji, A. (2024). *Yapay zekâ kitabı*, Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Morozov, E. (2019). *Twitter'dan sonra, bir tarih kaldı mı?*, (M. Tekin, Çev.). Açılım Kitap.
- Musiani, F.(2013). Governance by algorithms. *Internet Policy Review*, 2(3),1-8. <https://doi.org/10.14763/2013.3.188>.
- Niedzwiecki, H. (2010). *Dikizleme günlüğü*, (G. Gündüç, Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- O'Gieblyn, M. (2023). *Teknoloji, metafor ve anlam arayışı; tanrı insan hayvan makine*, (F. Sarılioğlu, Çev.).Altın Kitaplar.
- Orwell G.(2019). *1984* (C. Üster Çev.).Can Yayınları.
- Okmeydan, S. B. (2017). Postmodern kültürde gözetim toplumunun dönüşümü: 'panoptikon'dan 'sinoptikon' ve 'omniptikon'a. *AJIT-e: Academic Journal of Information*

- Technology*, 8(30),45-69. <https://doi.org/10.5824/1309-1581.2017.5.003.x>
- Özarslan, Z. (2019). Gözün İktidarı: Elektronik Gözetim Sistemler. B. Çoban ve Z. Özarslan (Haz.).*Panoptikon: Gözün İktidarı* içinde (ss.139-153). İstanbul: Su Yayınevi.
- Öztürk S. (2013). Filmlerle görünürlüğü dönüştürümü: panoptikon, süperpanoptikon, sinoptikon, *Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 36, 132-151. <https://doi:10.5281/zenodo.7513015>
- Pease-Watkin, C.(2019). Bentham'ın 'panoptikon'u ve dumont'un 'panoptique'i. içinde B.Çoban & Z.Özarslan (Haz.), *Panoptikon: Gözün iktidarı* (B. Çoban, Çev.). (ss.77-85).Su Yayınları.
- Pimenta, E. D. M. (2010). The city of sun: Panopticon, synopticon and omnipticon- big brother and the giant with thousand eyes. In E. D. M. Pimenta (Ed.), *Lo Power Society - Continuous Hyperconsumption and the End of the Medium Class in a Hyperurban Planet* (pp.260-303). Lisbon: Asa Art and Technolog.
- Postman, N.(1990).*Televizyon öldüren eğlence; gösteri çağında kamusal söylem*, (O. Akınhay Çev.).Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Rizanaj, H. F.(2020), *Yeni medyada gözetim ve mahremiyetin dönüşümü*, Gece Kitaplığı.
- Rouvroy, A.& Berns, T.(2013). Gouvernamentalité algorithmique et perspectives d'émancipation: le disparate comme condition d'individuation par la relation? *Réseaux*, 177,163-196. <https://doi.org/10.3917/-res.177.0163>
- Sarı, Ş. A.(2022). Öznelliğin bozumu: aydınlanmanın yükseldiği öznelliğin yerini alan algoritmik bilgi üretimi, içinde, Necmi Emel Dilmen & Cemile Tokgöz Şahoğlu (Editörler.). *Sosyal Medya ve Algoritmalar*. (ss.91-126). Kriter Yayınları
- Solmaz, M. (2023). *Koronavirüs salgını ve toplumsal değişme*, Çizgi Kitapevi.
- Şan, E.(2022). Bernard Stiegler'in teknoloji felsefesi problemleri: algoritmik yönetsellik ve bilişsel proleterleşme. *ViraVerita E-Dergi*, (15). 105-135. <https://doi.org/10.47124/viraverita.1103061>.
- Şener, G. (2021). Algoritmalara karşı aktivist taktikler, içinde, Oğuz Kuş (Der.). *Algoritmaların Gölgesinde Toplum ve İletişim*, (ss.81-98). Alternatif Bilişim.
- Toker, A.(2021). Büyük veri ışığında algoritmaların dönüştürücü gücü: kültür makineleri. *Yeni Medya Elektronik Dergisi*, 5(3), 204-218. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ejnm/issue/64591/951749>.
- Tüfekci, Z. (2014). Engineering the public: big-data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday*, 19(7),1-39. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v19i7.4901>
- Urhan, V.(2013).*Michel foucault ve düşünce sistemleri tarihi; Arkeoloji, soykötüğü, etik*. Say Yayınları.
- Ünver, H. A. (2018).Artificial intelligence, authoritarianism and the future of political systems. *EDAM Research Reports*, 2018/9. <https://doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.19598.00329>
- Wiener, N.(1964).*God and Golem Inc.:A comment on certain points where cybernetics impinges on religion*. Cambridge: The M.I.T Press.
- Wiggins, C.& Jones, M.L.(2024).*Veri nasıl oluştu, akıl çağından algoritma çağına uzanan bir tarih*, (M.Ü. Salman, Çev.).Serenad Yayınları
- Virilio, P.(2003). *Enformasyon bombası*.(K. Şahin, Çev.). Metis Yayınları.
- Algorithm Domination As A New Surveillance System
- Yeni Bir Gözetim Sistemi Olarak Algoritma Tahakkümü

## Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu çalışma gözetimin dijital süreçte farklılaştığı üzerinde durmaktadır. Çalışmada gözetim sistemlerinin yeni süreçte nasıl işlediğine dikkat çekmektedir. Gözetim, insanlık tarihinin önemli kavramları arasında yer alır. İktidar sistemleri, insanlar ve kurumlar gözetimi, diğerleri hakkında bilgi sahibi olmak ve onları kontrol etmek için kullanır. Gözetim, teknolojik gelişmelerle birlikte yeniden önem kazanmış ve insanların her alanda gözetildiği süreç başlamıştır (Dolgun, 2005:4). Gözetim araçları, işlevselliği ve kurumsal bağlamda toplumsal denetim ilişkileriyle ele alınması gerekir. Toplumsal gözetim, daha çok kapitalist süreç ve enformasyon teknolojileriyle ortaya çıkmıştır. Buna dikkat çeken Giddens (2008:24-25), toplumsal gözetimin iki görünümü olduğunu vurgular. Bunlardan ilki, gözetimin veriye dayanan boyutudur. Bu boyut, sosyal kurum veya topluluk tarafından toplanan ve saklanan materyallerden elde edilen bilgi birikimlerinden oluşmaktadır. Bu bilgiler ise sosyal eylemlerini yönlendirmek için kullanılır. İkinci boyutu, gözetimin denetim özelliğidir. Bu özellik, toplumda bazı bireylerin sosyal eylemlerinin otorite tarafından kontrol edilmesi ve izlenmesi anlamına gelir.

Gözetim, belirlenmiş mekânlar içerisinde yoğunlaşan ve sıkışan sosyal eylemlerin hâkim kesim tarafından izlenebilmesini ve denetlenebilmesini artırmıştır. Geleneksel anlamdaki gözetim, günümüz dijital dünyasında yeniden tanımlanan ve tartışılan bir kavram olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Dolayısıyla gözetim kavramının ne olduğunu topluma nasıl yansıdığını ve anlaşıldığını anlamak gerekir. Bu çabayla ilk olarak gözetim toplumu adına bilinen özellikleri ve sistemleri üzerinden değerlendirme yapılmıştır. Bu bağlamda gözetim toplumu Jeremy Bentham'ın Panoptikon tasarımında ön plana çıktığını söylemek mümkündür. Gözetim, Foucault'un çalışmalarıyla felsefi ve sosyolojik boyut kazanmıştır. Gözetim pratiklerini iktidar ile ilişkili şekilde ele alarak disiplin etme sürecini ön plana çıkarmıştır. Gözetim ve iktidarın her yerde olduğunu belirtmek için, iktidarın gözü kavramı kullanılmaktadır. Özellikle hastane, akıl hastanesi,

hapishane gibi kurumları gözetim üzerinden ele alır. Kitle iletişim teknolojilerinin gelişmesi ile birlikte ise gözetim meselesi farklı boyuta ulaşmıştır. Kapalı ortamlarda yapılan gözetimin artık her alanda ve herkes tarafından yapılabileceği boyutları ortaya çıkmıştır. Sinoptikon, banoptikon, omiptikon ve süper-panoptikon gibi gözetim formları ortaya çıkmıştır. Günümüz dijital teknolojilerin gelişmesi algoritmalara dayalı bir gözetim ve denetimin ortaya çıkmasına neden olmuştur. Algoritmalar ile elde edilen büyük veri/big data kullanılarak insanların davranışlarını kontrol edilmekte ve insanlar manipüle edilmektedir.

Dijital sistemlerin özellikleri düşünüldüğünde algoritmalar siberneğin parçası olarak da görülebilir. Çünkü bürokratik, mekanik ve organizasyonel vb. önemli sistemlerin davranışları düzenlenebileceği düşünülmektedir (Ünver, 2018: 3). Algoritmaların çalışma düzeni ile bireysel ve sosyal hayatın özgürlüğünü tehdit ettiği taraflarına da dikkat çeker. O, bu algoritmaların insanın seçim yapma özgürlüğüyle ve iradesiyle ilişkisi olup olmadığını sorgular. Algoritmaların bize yardımcı olduğunu, fakat bu yardımın dürüstlüğümden ve zekâmızdan ödün verdiğimizde gerçekleştiğini vurgular (Wiener, 1964: 69). Bu söylemi Wiener, bilgisayarların insan yaratıcılığına karşı oyun oynayabilmeye başladığı dönemde ifade etmiştir. Yapay zekâ üzerinden makinelerin neye dönüşebileceği konusunda işaretleri gördüğü söylenir (O'Gieblyn,2023:207). Teknolojilerin gelişmiş seviyeleri, yetenekleri ve algoritmaları sayesinde bireyler her yönüyle gözetlenmekte ve kaydedilip denetlenmektedir. Algoritma tahakkümü, birey ve toplum ile ilgili büyük verinin getirdiği güç ile sağlanmaktadır.

Dijital teknolojilerin gelişmesi ile birlikte geniş alana yayılan gözetim ve denetim insanların yaşamlarını büyük ölçüde etkilemektedir. İnsanların bilgileri kaydedilmekte, analiz edilmekte ve insanları yönlendirmek için kullanılmaktadır. Çalışma oluşan bu yapının algoritmalar aracılığıyla işlediğine dikkat çekmektedir. Algoritmalar işleme biçimiyle bir gözetim ve denetim mekanizması oluşturmaktadır. Algoritmalar, insanların

özgürlükleri ve güvenliklerini tehdit ettiği için bir tahakküm biçimi oluşturmaktadır. Algoritma tahakkümü, günümüz dünyasının denetim ve disiplin biçimi olarak görülmektedir. Çalışmada günümüz yaşam dünyasını etkileyen ve tartışılan algoritmaların oluşturduğu tahakküm biçimi analiz edilmiştir. Büyük veri ile elde edilen bilgiler sayesinde insanlara profiller çıkarmaktadır. Bu sayede insanlar algoritmalarla kolay şekilde manipüle edilmekte ve yönlendirebilmektedir. Çalışma algoritma tahakkümünün nasıl oluştuğunu ve nasıl işlediğini teorik bir perspektifle ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Özellikle günümüz yaşam dünyasını etkileyen ve tartışılan algoritmaların oluşturduğu yeni bir gözetim/denetim biçimi analiz edilmiştir. Algoritmaların hâkim olduğu dijital dönemde bir tahakküm oluşturduğu fikri ortaya çıkmaktadır. Algoritma tahakkümü, günümüz dünyasının denetim ve disiplin biçimi olarak görülmektedir. Algoritmalar, insanların özgürlükleri ve güvenliklerini tehdit ettiği için tahakküm oluşturduğuna vurgu yapılmaktadır. Çalışmada bu oluşan yeni tahakküm biçiminin nasıl oluştuğu ve nasıl işlediği literatür taraması yapılarak teorik olarak incelenmiştir.

İnternetin gelişmesi ve dijital teknolojilerin farklı boyutlar kazanması her alanda denetim kolaylaşmaktadır. Çünkü insanlar gönüllü olarak bilgileri paylaşmaktadır. Bu durum verilerin toplanmasına olanak sağlar. Büyük veri setleri ise analiz edilerek davranışları yönlendirme manipüle edilmeyi mümkün hale getirir. Bu analiz ise özellikle algoritmalar ile sağlandığı ortaya konulmuştur. Benzer şekilde sosyal mecralarda algoritmaların etkisi panoptikon'u farklılaştırmıştır. Algoritmalar, dijital bir denetim ve disiplin yapısı oluşturmuştur. Bu durum ise bireyin özgürlüğü ve güvenliği ile doğrudan bağlantılıdır. Algoritmaların oluşturduğu yeni yapı içerisinde bu iki kavram ile ilgili tartışmalar yaşanmaktadır. Dijital dönemde özgür olduğunu düşünen bireyler aslında denetim ve baskı altına alınmaktadır. Aynı zamanda güvende olduğunu hissettirmekte ama diğer taraftan yapılan uygulamalarla güvensizlik inşa edilmektedir. Algoritmalar, insanların özgürlükleri ve güvenliklerini tehdit ettiği için bir tahakküm biçimi oluşturmaktadır.

Sonuç olarak dijital sistemlerin günümüz toplumlarında insan bedenini, zihnini ve toplumsal yaşamını kontrol altına alan ve denetim kuran bir yapı oluşturduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu yapı algoritma tahakkümü olarak açığa çıkmaktadır. Algoritma tahakkümü diğer gözetim ve denetim biçimlerinin üstünde bir yapıya sahip olduğu söylenebilir. Hepsinin özelliklerini içerisinde taşır ve sistemli olarak işler. Ancak etkileri düşündüğünde diğerlerine göre çok boyutlu bir yapıya sahip olduğu söylenebilir. Algoritmaların önümüzdeki yıllarda etkilerinin daha da artacağı düşünülmektedir. Bu makalede henüz yeni bir konu olan algoritmaların bir tahakküm oluşturduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Günümüz yaşam dünyasına önemli bir yer edinmeye başlayan algoritmaların, sorun ve fırsatları için daha geniş ölçekli çalışmalar yapılmasına ihtiyaç vardır.

#### Yazar Bilgileri

##### Author details

1- (Sorumlu Yazar **Corresponding Author**) Öğr. Gör.

Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi Savur Meslek Yüksekokulu,  
muhittinevren@artuklu.edu.tr.

2- Doç. Dr., Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi,  
ahmetkoyuncu@hotmail.com.

#### Destekleyen Kurum/Kuruluşlar

##### Supporting-Sponsor Institutions or Organizations:

Herhangi bir kurum/kuruluştan destek alınmamıştır. None

#### Katkı Oranı

##### Author Contribution Percentage

Birinci yazar % First Author %	60
İkinci yazar % Second Author %	40

#### Çıkar Çatışması

##### Conflict of Interest

Herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır. None

#### Kaynak Göstermek İçin

##### To Cite This Article

Evren, M. & Koyuncu, A. A. (2024). Algorithm domination as a new surveillance system. *Yeni Medya*, (16), 325-344, <https://doi.org/10.55609/yenimedya.1528528>.