

Cybernetics of Technology, Education and Politics in Technological Societies

Hüseyin TOLU¹

Abstract

Understanding any regime requires an appreciation of the abstract political and philosophical conflicts and disputes that underpin the national constitution, history and characteristic way of life. In this sense, social cybernetics is the concept of manipulation and control, and it has been reincarnated and awakened into new shapes within technological society. This study thereby focuses on the mobility of the governance of social cybernetics upon technology, education, and politics in the global political economy. This paper addresses the fundamental social cybernetics concerns through the political and philosophical history of technological development to argue whether or not the democratic principles have been globally and inappropriately rejected for the purpose of manipulation and control of the public. This paper inquires into the background and reasoning behind the use of these new techniques, which have been orchestrated for the persistence of establishing a form of plutocratic technocratic governance existing under the guise of democratic international relations

Keywords: Social Cybernetics, Sociology of Technology, Governance of Education, International relations

Teknoloji Toplumlarında Teknoloji, Eğitim ve Politika Sibernetiđi

Öz

Herhangi bir rejimi anlamak, ulusal anayasayı, tarihi ve karakteristik yaşam biçimini destekleyen soyut politik ve felsefi çatışmaların ve ihtilafların değerlendirilmesini gerektirir. Bu manada sosyal sibernetik, güdümlenme ve kontrol kavramıdır ve teknolojik toplum içinde yeniden doğdu ve yeni şekillere uyandırıldı. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma, sosyal sibernetik yönetişiminin küresel politik ekonomideki teknoloji, eğitim ve politikaya yönelik hareketliliğine odaklanmaktadır. Bu makale, temel sosyal sibernetik ile ilgili olarak teknolojik gelişmenin politik ve felsefi tarihi yoluyla, demokratik ilkelerin halkın güdümlenme ve kontrolü amacıyla küresel ve uygunsuz bir şekilde reddedilip reddedilmediđini tartışmaktadır. Bu makale, demokratik uluslararası ilişkiler kisvesi altında var olan bir tür çođulcu teknokratik yönetim kurulmasının devam etmesi için düzenlenen bu yeni tekniklerin kullanımının arkasındaki gerekçelerini arařtırmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Sosyal Sibernetik, Teknoloji Sosyolojisi, Eğitim Yönetişimi, Uluslararası İlişkiler

Atıf İçin / Please Cite As:

Tolu, H. (2020). Cybernetics of technology, education and politics in technological societies. *Manas Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, 9(1), 562-572.

Geliş Tarihi / Received Date: 07.03.2019

Kabul Tarihi / Accepted Date: 17.06.2019

¹ Dr. - Recep Tayyip Erdogan University Education Department, huseyinalitolu@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-0769-6779

Introduction

Understanding any regime requires an appreciation of the abstract political and philosophical conflicts and disputes that underpin the national constitution, history and characteristic way of life. Nevertheless, any regime more than simply an index of political philosophical doctrines and abstract schemes, as the forms in which they manifest within a particular country are informed by particular ethical, legitimate and civil constitutional practises that guide social, political and cultural colours distinctive from other nations. Appropriate understanding of a particular regime entails taking into account the evolution of its political history, both in and of itself and also with reference to the philosophies and histories of neighbouring and associated foreign states. Political philosophical history assumes the criticality of political mobility as reflective of how the constitution in any society is shaped by its own civic bodies and the outcomes of conflicts and disputes, as such struggles between individuals and communities over ruling power, in particular the disobedience versus obedience for freedom, justice and equality in the national and international norm and principles.

The cybernetics literature covers interdisciplinary approach in which the thoughts that advanced throughout the cybernetics assemblies would have undoubtedly not arisen and turns into widespread had the dialogue engaged in a particular discipline (Heims, 1991). In particular, social cybernetics aims to maintain “the ideal of a stable society, expressed by objectively controllable social mechanisms” (Tiqun, 2010, p. 9), as fundamentally to utilise the interaction between ideas and society as to design of social movement; the concept of manipulation and control, and it has been reincarnated and awakened within new shapes of technological moments (Kline, 2015). At the global level, there have been many controversial political initiatives pursued by democratic and undemocratic governments to alter the fundamental functioning techniques of cybernetics. This paper will utilise hypothetical consideration and interpretation of cybernetics’ history without taking any particular states, thereby, concerns about the mobility of the governance of technology, in the sense of stipulation and order of cybernetics’ nature and reality (Mead, 1968). This study focuses on the mobility of governance upon the social cybernetics concerns of technology, education and politics in the democratic principles through technoethics. Bunge initiated the formation of an innovative form of ethical theories which focus on the singular complications impersonated by science and technology and stated that “the technologist must be held not only technically but also morally responsible for whatever he designs or executes: not only should his artefacts be optimally efficient but, far from being harmful, they should be beneficial, and not only in the short run but also in the long term” (1977, p.99). This study shaped as a review research paper through the philosophical proposition of technology to argue the democratic principles have been globally and inappropriately rejected, not actually ignored, for the purpose of manipulation and controlling the public under the guise of democratic international relations.

Cybernetics of Technology

When the majority of academics consider the issues arising from the interaction of new technology and society, they devote their attention to many different areas with different assumptions and come to dissimilar conclusions, such as advocates of techno-progressives or democratic transhumanism (Medina, 2011). However, what links these considerations together, as well as what distinguishes the lines of dispute between technology enthusiasts and sceptics, are the way academics recognize the challenges online democracy places on the values and ethical and moral standards of offline democracy. Many states analyse political events using the logic of offline political events without considering how politics on the internet does not mirror politics as known in offline society. Therefore, the observations of these states are naturally limited to traditional political organizations, such as parties, administrations and governments; to traditional political players, such as elected and/or nominated governments, supporter or opponent groups; and to traditional self-governing accomplishments, such as the outcomes of obvious political disputes, and the contribution of complaints or consultations. The union of state and corporate giants is then not an impartial fact. For many it is not unforeseen and means nothing but an enlargement of national state power. They enquire whether; after all, it is not a superior thing that the nation expands the scope of its existence and becomes better able to do so efficiently. We undeniably recognize that a nation which has only an ineffective police force would be helpless to control crime and unable to evaluate the legality or illegality of actions. It is a superior thing for technological improvement in this subject to assemble all available technological apparatuses, thus facilitating the nation to achieve its function of controlling crime and maintaining social order and stratification. There is, as a result, nothing of a

sociological nature existing to bring under control corporate giants, because everything in the social order is its attendant. Corporate giants and states would be fundamentally self-governing. For instance, in the 2017 ranking of digital rights, it was revealed that “Russia threatens Facebook over data localization, Spain orders companies to censor Catalan referendum content, U.S. and EU complete first annual Privacy Shield review” (Digitalright, 2017). In this sense, burgeoning technology has already proved capable of penetrating the intimate recesses of human life. The technology learns not only to shape new human settings, but also to adjust the particular essence of humanity with the relations of states. The milieu in which we are alive is no longer ours. We have to familiarize ourselves, as though humanity was fresh, to a world for which we were not created (Luppardini, 2010). Therefore, instead of being us under the rule of law, we may be forced to obey and conform to the clockwork of new technology and its partners under the rule by law (Bingham, 2010), seen in all types of democratic or authoritarian governments.

Whatever the locale of national interest, struggles are increased by technological mobility offering technological solutions of such scale that they are not able to be achieved by corporate giants and states alone; for instance, in conflict stemming from privacy concerns and legal/illegal surveillance in many developed and developing states. These observable facts, which would be achieved such scales that they put pressure on the many parts of human life, are of dominant technological derivation. Only precise and demanding methods of a general controlling process would be able to answer these struggles if they are to be answered. That is to say, there are increasing demands for technological structures and systems on a global scale which would be essentially undemocratic or authoritarian in practice. These struggles have already exceeded the powers of the corporate giants and government agenda. Technological mobility, once established to a certain point, poses further challenges that only a particular nation is able to resolve, both from the point of view of public investments and from that of initiative power. The fundamental interaction of the affiliation of states and corporate giants is the alteration of the responsibility and the accountability (its role) of the nation. Corporate giants and states would be seeking to increase their power to further their own governmental agendas progressively. They would be regarding themselves not as subject to national power but as mentors of the nation in themselves, such as Iran or China. Admittedly, every nation has its own ethics which symbolize a principle of norms to represent and to be represented as the normal. When these technoethics amend their nature a disorder of equilibrium proceeds for those humans who have not yet complied with the amendment. It is undeniable that the ethics of our societies have been altered for motivations which are not human. Indirect pressures have come to bear on the ethics of modern civilization, and these ethics have been malformed without human deliberation in what has occurred. In a democratic nation there is no sanction and/or an official permission or approval for an action against civilisations, whether successful or unsuccessful in their demands or actions, except the repression of financial support. On the other hand, any state and nation goes very much further to stifle the performance of civilisations.

“Day by day, however, the machines are gaining ground upon us; day by day we are becoming more subservient to them; more men are daily bound down as slaves to tend them, more men are daily devoting the energies of their whole lives to the development of mechanical life. The upshot is simply page a question of time, but that the time will come when the machines will hold the real supremacy over the world and its inhabitants is what no person of a truly philosophic mind can for a moment question” (Samuel Butler, cited in Cannan, 1970, p. 30-31).

Humans have become acquainted with listening and talking to technology, even old technology, as for instance radio. There are less real meetings, less conversations, but rather a continuous monologue by which humans run away from the torment of silence and the hassle of neighbours. Technology, due to its unlimited power of charm and its capability of access, is perhaps the technological device which is on the whole critical to character development and human relationships (Heidegger, 1954). What we take is clearly a dominant diversion, a general obliviousness of ourselves and our issues, and the synchronized synthesis of our consciousness with an all-pervading technological amusement. These new corporations with the ruling power of governments have attempted to conclude their movements of encirclement and to put the drying touch to the modern human, in accordance with their flexible process of re-constructing what is into what should be and the reduction of separate groupings into a single undeniable and unforced line, such as in the matter of propaganda and privacy in Facebook or Twitter. In this sense, the question is then why corporations under the democratic jurisdictions of California in the USA have collaborated harmoniously with both democratic and undemocratic nations (Twitter or Facebook Transparency Annual Reports since 2012). Control is then no longer an impulsive movement; it is an intensive achievement to

nature the modern human by necessity (Morozov, 2011). To be in this technological equilibrium, the modern human is not able to live without the techno-governmental reality, and it would assume that it is so difficult to be from the techno-social part of things which the corporate giants and states have designed for us. The more our needs are all present and accounted for, the more we are integrated into their indices. For instance, corporate giants with governments aspired to make their particular education compulsory and free (being free of charge and/or pirated) by way of a new particular pedagogy which must be directly addressed to not only all children but also others (e.g. the elderly, the disabled, etc.) (Oppenheimer, 2004), as argued further.

Cybernetics of Education

Many scholars argue that the civic education of teaching political philosophy or history has become a kind of a game theory in which many governments study techno-mathematical models about how to cover their political and philosophical historical conflicts and disputes within asserted their own decision-making processes (Svolik, 2009). The game theory models use economics, biology or psychology as their fundamental rationale, but when the matter is political science, it may also lead to either rational or irrational conclusions or both (Smith, & Mesquita, 2012), as in politics it is meant to be cybernetics marketing in which individual and community preferences are shaped and the values of technoethical preferences are exploited (Green, 2016). Instead of teaching a civic education to make the public to think of themselves as citizens of that nation, in the modern political social cybernetics (e.g. dictate) the public is viewed as a form of irrational and/or rational actor who is assumed to behave from inclinations in which the issue is what the inclinations are for, are these kinds of asserted preferences about how a rational/irrational choice has been exercised. That seems to reduce all politics to selections and all selections to asserted preferences in which all preferences are pre-reshaped and re-permitted, even extreme values of corporations or governments.

For educational system, the main concerns then ought to be the same as those raised by Plato, Aristotle, Karl Popper, Karl Marx, etc. who considered the issue as who would educate to educators and how and in which manner, and so why the ruler must be a philosopher in an democratic society. "Democracy must be born anew in every generation, and education is its midwife" (Dewey, 1980, p. 139). Public can learn a lot from books, the media or the Internet to rekindle democracy with an infusion of new blood of the young generations, to promote freedom and justice within total legitimate equality, as Dewey's thought. Therefore, any type of democratic government ought to make sure the public have a really good (appropriate) education to induce them to gain critical knowledge and detect any positive or negative implications. According to Bernays, "the normal school should provide for the training of the educator to make him realize that his is a twofold job: education as a teacher and education as a propagandist" (1928, p. 122). The youth is present to be directed and facilitated; but if the guide, the assistant may be chaotic or rationalist, then unsurprisingly youths would become what the assistant is, and the system of education has turned out to be merely a foundation of further confusion and contention. If we perceive the actuality of this phenomenon, we will comprehend how vital it is that we activate to edify ourselves accurately. To be apprehensive with our own future education is more essential than to be concerned about the future conformity and safety of the youth. To permit the youths to nurturing with freedom from prejudgment, one has to principally pause all prejudice within oneself, and so in one's surroundings - which aims to demolish the assembly of this thoughtless civilisation which we have shaped. Thus "the problem is not the child, but the parent and teacher; the problem is to educate the educator" (Osho, 2009, p. 71). Nevertheless, the current educator is the technology or the orchestration of technological giants and governments.

"Each new generation is reared by its predecessor; the latter must therefore improve in order to improve its successor. The movement is circular." (Durkheim, 1897/2005, p. 340) To educate the youths rationally and logically, to assist them to be sensitive so that s/he understands through these unwise prejudgments, we ought to be in clear connection with them. We ought to repeat things again and again to let them hear intellectual discussion; we ought to inspire the soul of inquiry and restlessness which they possess inherently, thus aiding them to determine for themselves what is factual and what is fabricated. It is continuous review, factual dissatisfaction, that carries original intellect; but to preserve review and the awareness of displeasure is tremendously demanding, and most individuals do not will their youths to have this kind of intellect, for it is very burdensome to be with someone who is repetitively questioning recognised and accomplished values. In other words, there is acknowledgement that conceptualizations of

activity, such as social and reproduction, ought to mirror the real involvedness of the system of society. Illustrations of this can be originate in the educational technology literature linked to technoethics and assessment systems from great systems thinkers and socio-cyberneticians like Boyd's emancipatory educational technology approach (1977) or Banathy's social systems works (1996). There are periods once we require indication that alterations within the system would not be sufficient. We comprehend that our determinations are not feasible any longer and we must adjust them in order to break technoethical educational memes. We are charming progressively conscious that the system does not harmonized with the democratic situation in which we should understand that we currently essential to alter the entire structure. True education ought to nurture a spirit of c in an open society, because "the education of Children [is called] a Culture of their minds" (Hobbes, 1660, p. 189).

According to Chomsky, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 1948 is based on three equal components: Civil and Political Rights (supported by many developed countries); Social and Economic Rights (liberalised by nearly all developed countries) and Community and Cultural Rights (totally ignored by most developed authorities): these are assumed to be building the foundations of a future with more perfect human rights within present social and political structures of education (2017). Nevertheless, Chomsky argues that the fundamental of popular education thereby is to instil fear, for instance irrational doctrines into the populace through some sort of rote-learning based education system. It fundamentally seeks to educate the public with learning by heart to correctly adhere to passivity, obedience, acceptance of fate and the status quo, to keep their perspective narrow, to limit understanding and to discourage free and independent thought by frightening the public into obedience within the democratic or authoritarian system. Nevertheless, this is not simply a nation-wide phenomenon; instead, the governance of educational in the name of imminent leadership is widely a global phenomenon. These national and global histories lead to particular challenges and opportunities for future education and so the tomorrow society, but also difficulties of and prospects for dissimilar players on educational grounds. When, for instance, one particular government attempts to reform their education system, it must do so within the framework of technological sophistication developed by and under the logic of corporate private interests, as public-private partnership, operated in the capitalist environment. Universal education within states is intended as a public or social good, but as time goes by, corporate and government interests begin to influence the education system through technological sophistication, changing the very nature of the education system. This makes the focus of education less about pedagogy and curriculums designed to create knowledgeable citizens and more about churning out a steady stream of new consumers and cheap labour paid for by the state for the benefit of the corporations and governments. This process is constantly intensifying, and is intensified further by technological mobility. "This is a new hegemonic vision which inserts competition and entrepreneurialism into the heart of the project of state education. Such narratives in turn serve to repopulate the field of policy; legitimating new actors... establish new key ideas and new social logics" (Ball, 2008, p. 753). The educational system is where the interaction between technological innovations and state-corporate relationships is most obvious. Therefore, we have two mutually reinforcing progresses: technological expansion unavoidably leads to national intervention in the educational system; and jointly, when the nation intervenes it uses a technological apparatus which it extends further. If the nation is not able to control, or at least adapt and modify its technological rules; and should it challenged to do so for technological reasoning, would it endure an inevitable setback, for instance partial successfulness in which what the clear is that "The national state is no longer the only, or taken-for-grantedly, the most important, actor in the area of education. This means that the first thing that is to be compared as globalisation affects education more and more is the governance of education" (Dale and Robertson, 2009, p. 1118)

In summary, in human nature, there is no such a thing pre-social circumstance, human are naturally and inherently social creatures, therefore it is not possible to analyse any educational sociology apart from their socio-cultural political historical atmosphere. Nevertheless, each educational political theory has an interpretation of human psychology and a clarification of how the world operates. It is so clear that the literature of technological education has its 'modern' sociological assumptions, acting as a Techno-utopianism (Nietzschean thoughts) or, at least, a dominated technological-determinist (Giant wishes) or what Deleuze and Guattari (1972) called it as neoliberal technological capitalism in societies of control in which the movement is from norms of societies to codes of conducts by the neo-liberal corporate exploitation. Control societies are various beginnings, not the mean of end in order to orchestrate some sort of socio-cultural technoethics educational memes. To illuminate this phenomenon further, 'rational ignorance' might be a helpful concept (Caplan, 2001). Rational ignorance refers to circumstances where

the public rationally agrees to stay ignorant about a particular matter since they assume that the burden included in producing the energy would not be in equilibrium with the advantage of receiving this information, as a necessary illusion in "because of the ignorance and superstition of the masses ... a whole new technique of control, largely through propaganda" because of the "ignorance and superstition [of]...the masses" (Chomsky, 1989, p.31). When it comes to issues of privacy, the public would mainly prefer to be rationally ignorant, such as when presented with a ten page license agreement when signing up for an internet service or application and simply clicking "I have read the agreement and agree to the terms" without actually reading a single word of it. Appropriately so, as the public would prefer their online experience to be convenient and hassle-free, so will consent to digital practices which they are unaware of and do not actually intend to consent to, such as the technique used by the many democratic or authoritarian governments where end-users of their mobile app may be subject to surveillance through their own smartphone camera without their knowledge such as the literature indicated. To choose not to adopt a posture of rational ignorance would mean forgoing many of the digital conveniences most take for granted or be forced to educate themselves on alternatives, which may be less convenient to use.

Cybernetics of Politics

In modern 21 century democracy, "liberty may only be limited for the sake of liberty and not for the sake of other social and economic advantages" (Rawls, 1999, p. 266). The approach of social primary goods is the one of the most fundamental outline from Rawls' theories regarding to justice and fairness, driven by the philosophical political liberalism. The social primary goods involve in those matter all individuals need, regardless of whatever else they wish. Such goods would be circulated or confirmed by private and/or public establishments and replicate what might be crucial to aiding our progressive and activity benefits as free and equal public. These goods are considered vital to social liberty and freedom, and Rawls provides predominance to 'extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others'. For Rawls, furthermore, a fair society involves a fair circulation of social primary goods, wherever such circulation will not damage the least-advantaged fellows. Rawls' philosophies have extensively supported social welfare policies, as well as those concerning educational establishment and funding. Social primary goods are fundamentally resources that are why means to the signification of freedom, liberty and so fairness are. The motivation is on the achievement and control of these resources, and neither on their practices, nor on the individualities of those who practice them. Involved surrounded by these social primary goods are fair liberal humanitarian principles as fundamental freedom of thought, association, proceeds, self-esteem, and so on that perform as indispensable resources. A vital principle of liberal philosophy centres on the significance of choice, and the predominance of freedom and subjectivism implanted in political liberal models would directive that choice is of a supreme notion.

In the United States, the right of freedom of speech and opinion is protected by the First Amendment of the US Constitution, and so service providers (or even corporate giants) have no precise right to choose what discourse is allowable or disallowable on their platforms. While they may remove content according to their code of conducts or the decisions of moderators, according to the Constitution they can be sued or subjected by the individual or private or public entity affected. This is not the case in the EU or many other nations, corporate giants and service providers are required to 'work harmoniously' with the First Additional Protocol (FAP) developed by the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime (COECC) in the EU. Many activists believe this system is problematic because the phrase 'work harmonious' is ill-defined and is highly suggestive of governmental and corporatist behaviour or even a Corporatocracy, which is inimical to the right of freedom of expression specifically and democratic principles in general. Even when service providers and corporate giants censor content or material which is obviously despicable, the public should exercise caution in allowing private capitalist interests to determine what the human right of freedom of expression is and will be. Since the internet has a strong intermediary role in international political discourse, the decisions made by private interests regarding their policies toward freedom of expression will have repercussions and potential negative outcomes for political discourse everywhere and everyone. Without some form of rule of law through principles of actual net-neutrality determining and justifying censorship, it can easily go out of control (Raz, 1979). Every time a corporation or government or both decide a particular website or online content is in violation of some 'code of conduct', they essentially define the boundaries of freedom of expression with often little transparency or accountability. Many social media platforms or government simply block or remove content without clearly explaining why it has been removed and by what justification, leaving few

clues as to what they view as tolerable or intolerable (Norris, 1999). There are no checks and balances within many states regarding freedom of expression on the internet, only the vague and slightly sinister term ‘work harmoniously’ used in the framework of the law concerning freedom of expression online. This may not have been so important ten or fifteen years ago, but increasingly online activity and expression defines reality and controls and determines what is happening in the offline world. It will not matter if freedom of expression is protected by the rule of law offline if there are no protections on them in an increasingly dominant online world. Anyone wishing to voice real dissent or practice their right of expression would be reduced to the level of a madman ranting on the side of the road.

“We are living through a movement from an organic industrial society to a polymorphous information system – from all work to all play, a deadly game” (Haraway, 1985, p. 128). In specific, the restriction of online content should be based on the foundation of a court order or an appeal in line with democratic principles, but in reality online content providers have become responsible for protecting the human right of freedom of expression and opinion through agreements with government bodies with whom they harmoniously work. What should be happening according to democratic principles of the ‘rule of law’, instead of undemocratic principles of the ‘rule by law’ (Woolf, 2004) is that online content providers cannot and shall not engage with government bodies on the issue of censorship without a court order supported by a procedure of checks and balances with international court orders. For instance, if any government wants information related to unwanted content (e.g. national security) from an online end-user they should have a court order which will be checked and balanced by an international court order in the jurisdiction of the end-user, such as the European Union, UNESCO or United Nation, as well as a court order in the jurisdiction of the online content provider, such as California in the United States. Developed countries are not only responsible or accountable for the freedom of expression and opinion online for their own citizens, but also the citizens of other developed and developing nations. This entire process should also be checked and balanced by independent non-government and non-profit organizations which are publically funded rather than supported by any private corporate entity, such as the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). All information should be available online in understandable language and updated in real time in order to inform end-users. Human beings possess human rights in progress, which means they should be constantly being improved rather than deteriorating or going backward, like in many states now. Defending freedom of speech requires us to come to a collective and consensus agreement and understanding of what discourse is allowed according to the rule of law. This must be protected by the constitution, not determined by politicians, government bodies, bureaucracy or private capitalist entities according to a changing analysis of cost and benefit. The common approach by the states when faced with online content they wish to remove or restrict the domestic population from accessing is to give a warning to the site’s owners to delete the contents or block access to the public users or they will be forced to leave the state within 24 hours if their servers are based domestically, or simply block all content of the website or IP address from domestic access if the servers are based abroad.

Whether in terms of public property, public priority or public privacy: the public are now submissive tools of the system; and in this particular case what we have is a plutocracy of technology. In this system it makes no difference whether that the public is governed by individual corporate monarchs or by a democratic or authoritarian state. Nevertheless, the dynamic of the condition is this public is not a community, but a crowd. Increasing the mixture of resources presented through the digital medium, some scholar added some interesting points of view, saying it does not really matter what kind of resources are available because the message is not in the ‘content’ of the digital medium, but our exposure to involvement in that kind of medium. When we have a direct communication with others, such as touching, even though we do not necessarily say anything, the mere touch itself may carry a communicative message. In a public political space, people do not need to say anything, but communicate a message merely by being present in the space. It is the same way in the digital era. When we are plugged in, if it is not turned on, we will really be like an old peasant mother leaning on a balcony and gazing at the busy street, watching life flow. That is not a true net, it would be a trap. “Most people use social media not to open their horizons wider, but to lock themselves in a comfort zone” (Bauman, 2016).

A capitalist liberal democracy is a system in which the public have methods to contribute to the decision making progression, and the government cannot stop them by suppression, imprisonment or violence (even though it would be often much more convenient to do so). This tension is an ever-present problem for democratic societies, known as the ‘core crisis of democracy’ by Chomsky. There are too

many people who wish to participate in the public decision arena to be organized into coherent political bodies. Therefore consent often needs to be manufactured to give the impression of democratic decision making while in reality most of the actual power of decision making lies with an intellectual elite able who devote themselves to political problems too complex or burdensome for the public to decide, as in the plutocracy of technology. In the classic libertarian literature, liberalism seeks to limit the enormous power of the state and protect individual human rights, but in the sense of the global technological word, this assumption is misleading because private corporate giants are perceived as an individual actor, not as parts of state power complexes. Nowadays, liberalism has the meaning of 'state capitalism' due to the high degrees of state intervention in the global capitalist economy in order to protect private governmental corporations' interests and agendas. That system might resemble a form of democracy but in the actual distribution of common and social goods is not particularly democratic. Capitalism is not only class struggle but also depends on the progress of technological knowledge. The production of technology is what is needed for human society to determine who owns that technology. So in each period of human history one class owned most of the means of production, and it was quite clear they did so.

In the global techno-political economy, the traditional separation of powers in each particular nation is insignificant in the face of globalized corporate-government cooperation and collusion achieved through technological means. Executive power would be mainly obsolete, legislative power has become so complicated and judicial power has been perceived as undervalued, rendering those with the power and knowledge of technology to be rendered so untouchable. Technology has become so indispensable to modern life that without technology we are effectively rendered disabled. There is no signification without technological definiendum. Indeed, technology defines what a human is or how to be a human, and what technology we need to overcome our disabilities and become a human without hindrance. In this sense, how far we can go along this road and still retain our human nature and reality is not the most crucial matter in this study even though matters of techno-social interactions may cause us to forget our imperfect global political and economic natures and realities. So we perhaps should be purely philosophical by reminiscing on the first Luddite, Diogenes of Sinop, to remember our antecedent to techno-social interactions. Technology is never neutral; they have all the logic of its creators and then its users and mostly its creators' intentions are not match with its users' intentions.

In summary, in the modern era, Giddens's (1990) analysis of globalised modernisation in which disembedding does mean to the technique in which modern social actions can no longer be principally demarcated by their foundations of social contract, or embeddedness, in the resident background of a limited habitation and time. It means that there is no social contract to follow in societies of control. Social actions are now, in a large part, detached from the proximities of setting, with the relationships they encompass characteristically being overextended over great territories of period and space. Local involvements and proceedings are formed by procedures attractive habitation on the other side of global, and vice versa. These are progressions, furthermore, that are principally personal and abstract. In this matter of technology, we have global philosophical movements, but also national politics. And this would not work harmoniously together. The state is not only controller who shapes our life. There might be two approaches to this disparity, either de-globalised the philosophical movement and turn it back into a national politics or globalised to political philosophy. In this sense, techno-progressives and democratic transhumanists have similarly underlined that developed nations are no longer the only modern technological power; the technological society that the developed nations have enjoyed in the twenty century has become shared, as the technological society has been spread. In this new era an international aggressive technological rivalry between governments and corporative giants has been ensured and that is the crucial issue throughout societies of global control.

Epilogue

"Historically, the most terrible things - war, genocide, and slavery - have resulted not from disobedience, but from obedience." (Zinn, 1997/2009, p. 420) An appropriate consideration of knowledge and technology in the present realm ought to contemplate the intertwining effects of governmental, conceptual, financial, and so social aspects (Gerovitch, 2002). Nevertheless, there is no divergence between political beliefs in terms of approaching the 'technological society'. In other words, it does not matter if someone defines themselves as a democrat, a liberal, a socialist, a communist, an anarchist, a libertarian, or any combination of the terms, the progression of technological expansion and improvement informs the same aims (the study of technological society) and objectives (the manner in

which the study of technological society is pursued) for all societies within the imperfect market reality and nature, as reflected in the current cliché of becoming a ‘Technological Knowledge Society’. If we believe that the heart of everything in a society is the production of technology; in global, a new approach is thereby vitally indispensable in order to make it possible to rescind this monogamy of plutocracy between techno-giants and societies in which “the aim of modern propaganda is no longer to modify ideas, but to provoke action... It is no longer to transform an opinion, but to arouse an active and mythical belief.” (Ellul, 1965, p. 25)

The global challenge in cybernetics is which of the structural networks in the current and next generation engine the control of societies because the networks are not really the accountable and responsible system, they have no checks and balances equability within technoethics of cybernetics. This system shows itself as a superior than the principles of liberal traditional democracy in many develop nations but it has an inherited issue that might be clarifies as tolerant or intolerant leading power. Perhaps it would never ever be overcame this issue. That means if they are tolerant democratic or authoritarian leaders, societies would be doing very well, however if there is no absolute guarantee that intolerant leaders would not be established and work harmoniously technological giants and that is inheritably destabilized particular societies through cybernetics powers. Then the actual question is that in the matter of well-institutional liberal democracy, are we going to achieve political consensuses to keep the societies as sustainable and secure? The cybernetics reasoning is well-organised and has become threat of liberal democracy somehow, and leads technological plutocratic governance. The problem with cybernetics is that there might be radical and perilous ideologies that appeal to certain type of technological movements. All these engineers work for not only technocratic corporatocracy, but also all authoritarian or plutocratic governance. That is all dependent on different kind of interpretations. What it is clear that experiencing with cybernetics has really confirmed that nation has not just collective will power; technology has a dictation of political outcome as well. The government would not provide social services without technological apparatuses. The question is then became the potential capability. In the future society, we need a state and particular technology which do actual things in the society, further we need rule of laws which fundamentally limited the state and technology of power to protect the society and then we need accountability and responsibility in which the government and technology response whole population, not just its own narrow interests on the consideration of cybernetics.

References

- Ball, J. S. (2008). New philanthropy, new networks and new governance in education. *Political Studies*, 56, 747-765. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2008.00722.x
- Banathy, H. B. (1996). *Designing social systems in a changing world*. New York: Plenum.
- Bernays, E. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright. Retrieved from <http://www.bahaistudies.net/asma/propaganda.pdf>
- Bauman, Z. (2016, January 25). Interview Zygmunt Bauman: “Social Media are a Trap” by Ricardo de Querol, *Elpais*. Retrieved from https://elpais.com/elpais/2016/01/19/inenglish/1453208692_424660.html
- Bingham, T. (2010, June 1), Lord Bingham: The Rule of Law, *ITC School of Laws*, Retrieved from <https://itc2u.wordpress.com/2012/06/01/lord-bingham-the-rule-of-law/>
- Boyd, M. G. (1977). Towards a formalisation of educational cybernetics. In Rose, J. & Biliciu, C. (Eds.). *Modern trends in cybernetics and systems*, Vol. III (pp. 15-21). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bunge, M. (1977). Towards a technoethics. *Monist*, 60(1), 96-107. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/monist/article-abstract/60/1/096/997301?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- Cannan, G. (1970). *Samuel butler a critical study*. Haskell House Publishers Ltd. Publishers of Scarce Scholarly Book New York. N.Y. 10012
- Caplan, B. (2001). Rational ignorance versus rational irrationality, *Kykelos*, 54(1), 3-26. doi: 10.1111/1467-6435.00138
- Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary illusion thought control in democratic societies*. Digital processing by The Electric Book Company 20 Cambridge Drive, London SE12 8AJ, UK.
- Chomsky, N. (2017, August 3). Chomsky: How the U.S. Developed Such a Scandalous Health System, *AlterNet*, Retrieved from <https://www.alternet.org/news-amp-politics/noam-chomsky-united-states-health-system-scandalous>
- Dale R., & Robertson S. (2009). Beyond methodological ‘ISMS’ in comparative education in an era of globalisation. In: Cowen R., & Kazamias A.M. (eds). *International handbook of comparative education* (pp. 1113-1127). Dordrecht: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-6403-6_69
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1972). *Anti-edipus capitalism and schizophrenia*. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, & Helen R. Lane (Trans.). New York: Penguin.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *The middle works, 1899-1924. Volume 9: 1916. Includes democracy and education*. Jo Ann Boydston (Ed.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Digitalright, (2017, September 29). Russia threatens Facebook over data localization, Spain orders companies to censor Catalan referendum content, U.S. and EU complete first annual Privacy Shield review, *Rankingdigitalrights.org*, Retrieved from <https://rankingdigitalrights.org/2017/09/29/corporate-accountability-news-highlights-russia-threatens-facebook-data-localization/>
- Durkheim, E. (1897/1951/2005). *Suicide: A study in sociology*, J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson (Trans.). New York: Free Press; Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Ellul, J. (1964). *The technological society*, J. Wilkinson (Trans.) New York: Knopf, 1964. London: Jonathan Cape, Rev. (Ed.): New York: Knopf/Vintage, 1967.
- Gerovitch, S. (2002). *From newspeak to cyberspeak. A history of soviet cybernetics*. The MIT Press Cambridge, Massachusetts London, England
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford CA, Stanford University Press.
- Green, J. E. (2016). Liberalism and the problem of plutocracy. *Constellations*, 23(1), 84-95. doi: 10.1111/1467-8675.12147
- Kline, R. R. (2015). *The cybernetics moment or why we call our age the information age*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1985). A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-feminism in the Late Twentieth Century. *Socialist Review*, 65-107 Retrieved from https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/english/currentstudents/undergraduate/modules/fictionnownarrativemediantheoryinthe21stcentury/manifestly_haraway_----_a_cyborg_manifesto_science_technology_and_socialist_feminism_in_the_....pdf
- Heidegger, M. (1977). The question concerning technology, 3-35. Retrieved from https://simondon.oculawitness.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/05/question_concerning_technology.pdf
- Heims, J. S. (1991). *Constructing a social science for postwar america. The cybernetics group*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Hobbes, T. (1660). *Leviathan*. Retrieved from https://www.ttu.ee/public/m/martmurdvec/EconPsy/6/Hobbes_Thomas_1660_The_Leviathan.pdf
- Luppincini, R. (2010). *Technoethics and the evolving knowledge society*. Hershey: Idea Group Publishing.
- Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: How not to liberate the world*. London: Penguin Group.
- Norris, P. (1999). *Critical citizens: Global support for democratic government*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Oppenheimer, T. (2004). *The flickering mind: Saving education from the false promise of technology*. New York: Random House.
- Osho. (2009). *Yoga: The supreme science*, Osbo. Penguin Books India.
- Mead, M. (1968). Cybernetics of cybernetics. In H. von Foerster et al. (Ed.). *Purposive systems: Proceedings of the first annual symposium of the american society for cybernetics* (pp. 1-11). New York: Spartan Books.
- Medina, E. (2011). *Cybernetic revolutionaries: Technology and politics in Allende's Chile*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Raz, J. (1979). *The authority of law: Essays on law and morality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. Revised edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, A., & Mesquita, B. B. (2012). *The dictator's handbook: Why bad behavior is almost always good politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Svolik, W. M. (2009). Power sharing and leadership dynamics in authoritarian regimes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2), 477-494. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2009.00382.x
- Tiqqun. (2010). *The cybernetic hypothesis. The anarchist library anti-copyright*. Retrieved from <http://klausgauger.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/tiqqun-the-cybernetic-hypothesis.pdf>
- Woolf, L. H. (2004). *Lord woolf squire centenary lecture: The rule of law and a change in constitution (transcript)*, Cambridge, UK, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge.
- Zinn, H. (1997/2009). *The Zinn reader: Writings on disobedience and democracy*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

GENİŞ ÖZET

Herhangi bir rejimi anlamak, ulusal anayasa, tarih ve karakteristik yaşam biçimini destekleyen soyut politik ve felsefi çatışmaların ve anlaşmazlıkların değerlendirilmesini gerektirir. Bununla birlikte, herhangi bir millet, belirli bir ülkede tezahür ettirdikleri biçimlerinden, diğerlerinden farklı olarak sosyal, politik ve kültürel renkleri yönlendiren belirli etik, meşru ve sivil anayasa uygulamaları ile bilgilendirildiği için, bir politik felsefi doktrin ve soyut şemaların birer dizininden daha fazlasıdır. Belirli bir rejimin uygun bir şekilde anlaşılması, hem kendi içinde hem de komşu ve ilgili yabancı devletlerin felsefelerine ve tarihlerine atıfta bulunarak, politik tarihinin gelişimini dikkate almayı gerektirir. Siyasi felsefi tarih, siyasal hareketliliğin eleştireliliğini, herhangi bir toplumda anayasanın kendi sivil organları tarafından nasıl şekillendiğinin ve uyuşmazlıkların nasıl sonuçlandıklarını, ulusal ve uluslararası norm ve ilkelerde özgürlük, adalet ve eşitlik için sosyal aktiflik karşısında topluluklar arasındaki mücadelelerin bir sonucu olarak yansıttığını kabul eder.

Akademik edebiyat, sibernetik meclisleri boyunca ilerleyen düşüncelerin hiç kuşkusuz ortaya çıkmayacağı ve yaygınlaştığı düşüncelerin belirli bir disipline dâhil olduğu disiplinler arası bir yaklaşımı

kapsamaktadır (Heims, 1991). Özellikle, sosyal siberetik, fikir ve toplum arasındaki etkileşimi temelde sosyal hareketin tasarımında kullanma, nesnel olarak kontrol edilebilir sosyal mekanizmalar tarafından ifade edilen istikrarlı bir toplumun idealini korumayı amaçlamaktadır; manipülasyon ve kontrol kavramı, teknolojik alanlarının yeni şekillerinin içinde yeniden doğdu ve farklı alanlara taşıyabildi (Kline, 2015). Günümüzde, küresel düzeyde, siberetiğin temel işleyiş tekniklerini değiştirmek için demokratik ve demokratik olmayan hükümetler tarafından yürütülen pek çok tartışmalı siyasi girişim olmuştur. Bu yazı, belirli bir devleti ele almadan siberetik tarihinin varsayımsal olarak ele alınmasını ve yorumlanmasını kullanarak, teknolojinin yönetim hareketliliğini, şartlarını ve siberetiğin doğasını ve gerçeğini anlamlandırmada gerekli literatürü kullanacaktır (Mead, 1968). Bu çalışma, teknolojinin, eğitimin ve politikaların sosyal siberetik kaygıları üzerine demokratik prensiplerde teknolojik etik ile yönetim hareketliliğine odaklanmaktadır. Öncelikle, Bunge bilim ve teknolojinin kimliğe büründüğü tekil komplikasyonlarına odaklanan yenilikçi bir etiksel teori formunun oluşumunu başlattı ve “teknoloji uzmanı, sadece tasarladığı veya uyguladığı her şeyden yalnızca teknik olarak değil aynı zamanda ahlaki olarak da sorumlu tutulmalıdır” dedi. Optimal olarak verimli olmalı ancak zararlı olmaktan uzak, yararlı olmalı ve yalnızca kısa vadede değil, aynı zamanda uzun vadede de faydalanmalıdır”(1977, s. 99). Bu çalışma, demokratik ilkelerin tartışılması ve uluslararası ilişkiler kisvesi altında halkın manipülasyonu ve kontrol edilmesi amacıyla, gerçekten de göz ardı edilmemiş, demokratik ilkelerin öne sürüldüğünü iddia eden teknolojinin felsefi önermesi yoluyla gözden geçirilmiş bir araştırma makalesi olarak şekillendirilmiştir.

Mevcut alanda bilgi ve teknolojinin uygun bir şekilde ele alınması, kavramsal, finansal ve sosyal yönlerin iç içe geçmiş etkilerini de düşündürmektedir (Gerovitch, 2002). “Teknolojik toplumunda” yaklaşma konusunda politik inançlar arasında bir farklılık yoktur. Başka bir deyişle, birisinin kendisini demokrat, liberal, sosyalist, komünist, anarşist, veya diğer terimlerin herhangi bir kombinasyonu olarak tanımlaması fark etmez, teknolojik genişleme ve iyileştirmenin ilerlemesi aynı amaçlarını (teknolojik toplum araştırması) ve hedefleri (teknolojik toplum çalışmasının sürdürüldüğü şekilde) bildirir, mevcut bir “Teknolojik Bilgi Toplumu” olma klişesine yansıyan, kusurlu piyasa gerçekliği ve doğası dâhilindeki tüm toplumlar için amaçlanmaktadır (teknolojik toplum çalışmasının sürdürüldüğü şekilde). Günümüz toplumdaki her şeyin kalbinin teknoloji üretimi olduğuna inanırsak; Küresel olarak, “modern propagandasının amacı artık fikirleri değiştirmek değil, eylemi kışkırtmaktır. ... [Propaganda] artık bir görüşü dönüştürmek değil, aktif ve efsanevi bir inancı uyandırmak için vardır.” (Ellul, 1965, s. 25). Bu yüzden günümüzün tekno-devleri ve toplumlar arasındaki bu çoğulculuk monogamisini iptal etmeyi mümkün kılmak sosyal siberetik için hayati bir öneme sahiptir.

Sosyal siberetikteki küresel zorluluğu, mevcut ve gelecek nesildeki yapısal ağlardan hangisinin toplumların kontrolünü oluşturduğudur; çünkü ağlar gerçekten hesap verebilir ve sorumlu bir sistem değildirler. Sosyal siberetik teknoloji içinde eşitliği kontrol etmiyor ve dengeleri yok ediyor. Bu sistem kendini pek çok gelişmekte olan ülkede liberal demokrasinin ilkelerinden daha üstün olarak göstermektedir, ancak hoşgörülü veya hoşgörüsüz lider gücü olarak açıklığa kavuşabilecek kalıtsal bir meselesi vardır. Belki de bu konuyu asla aşamayacağız. Mesela, eğer bu sosyal siberetik demokratik veya otoriter liderlerle hoşgörülü bir şekilde uyum sağlayacaksa, toplum içinde çok iyi iş yapacaktır. Ancak hoşgörüsüz liderlerin kurulmayacağına ve teknolojik devlerle uyumlu bir şekilde çalışmayacağına ve sonunda sosyal siberetik güçleri yoluyla kalıtsal bir istikrarsızlaştırılmış bir düzen oluşturmayacağına dair kesin bir yargıda doktur. Öyleyse asıl soru, iyi kurumsal liberal demokrasi konusunda, toplumları ilkeli ve güvenli tutmak için siyasi uzlaşmaya varacağımız mı? Siberetik muhakemesi iyi organize edilmiş bir şekilde liberal demokrasi tehdidi haline gelmiş ve teknolojik plütokratik yönetime öncülük etmiştir. Siberetik ile ilgili sorun, belirli türden teknolojik hareketlere hitap eden radikal ve tehlikeli ideolojilerin olabileceğidir. Tüm bu mühendisler sadece teknokratik anonim şirket için değil aynı zamanda otoriter veya çoğulcu yönetim için de çalışıyorlar. Bunların hepsi farklı yorumlara dayanıyor. Siberetik ile deneyimlemenin ulusun sadece kolektif iradeye sahip olmadığını doğruladığı kesin; teknoloji aynı zamanda politik sonuçlara da sahip. Hükümetler, teknolojik aparatlar olmadan sosyal hizmetler sunmayacaktır. O zaman soru potansiyel yeteneklerinin sınırlarının ne olduğuna geldi. Gelecekte toplumda, toplumda fiili işler yapan bir devlete ve özel bir teknolojiye ihtiyacımız vardır, ayrıca toplumu korumak adına iktidarın devletini ve teknolojisini temelden sınırlayan kanunlar kurması hayati önemini vurgulamaktadır. Ve kritik sorun, hükümetlerin ne gibi sorumluluklarına ve hangi yükümlülüklerine toplumun gerçekten ihtiyacı var olduğudur? Günümüz teknolojisi, sadece siberetik konusundaki dar görüşlülüğü değildir, tüm nüfusa cevap vermeye çalışmalıdır.