KADİR HAS UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
COMMUNICATION STUDIES DISCIPLINE AREA

CLOSING THE CIRCLE: TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS OF TRANSPARENCY

ÖZGÜ HAZAL ERTAŞ

SUPERVISOR: ASSOC. PROF. LEVENT SOYSAL

MASTER'S THESIS

ISTANBUL, JANUARY, 2019

CLOSING THE CIRCLE: TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS OF TRANSPARENCY

ÖZGÜ HAZAL ERTAŞ

SUPERVISOR: ASSOC. PROF. LEVENT SOYSAL

MASTER'S THESIS

ISTANBUL, JANUARY, 2019

I, ÖZGÜ HAZAL ERTAŞ;

Hereby declare that this Master's Thesis is my own original work and that due references have been appropriately provided on all supporting literature and resources.

ÖZGÜ HAZAL ERTAŞ

03/01/2019

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

This work entitled **CLOSING THE CIRCLE: TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS OF TRANSPARENCY** prepared by **ÖZGÜ HAZAL ERTAŞ** has been judged to be successful at the defense exam held on **03/01/2019** and accepted by our jury as **MASTER'S THESIS.**

Assoc. Prof. Levent Soysal (Advisor)   Kadir Has University

Prof. Dr. Bülent Diken   Kadir Has University

Assoc. Prof. Burak Özçetin   İstanbul Bilgi University

I certify that the above signatures belong to the faculty members named above.

Prof. Dr. Sinem Akgül Açıkmeşe
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ERTAŞ, ÖZGÜ HAZAL. *CLOSING THE CIRCLE: TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS OF TRANSPARENCY*, MASTER'S THESIS, Istanbul, 2019.

Framework of reference for the contemporary context of privacy has recently become the concern of media and communication studies. This is most clearly charted in relation to the advent of new media technologies which revolutionize the amount of personal data available. Subsequently, a wide range of responses has been generated regarding a world where the boundaries between privacy, publicness and intimacy are being challenged on a constant basis. This thesis suggests, then, to improve our understanding of the parameters of the debate concerning the relations between privacy, panopticism and governmentality. Accordingly, it puts forward *transparency* trait as a more robust tool to understand our ultra-connected, networked and quantified societies. In this, it is argued that transparency today is the function of the formalization and institutionalization of the new spirit of capitalism where even the very idea of private and public ceases to extinct. In order to show the new disciplinary structures at work, this thesis prefers a theoretical-conceptual approach and the analysis of Dave Eggers' techno-satire novel *The Circle* (2013) is used as a resource for theorizing.

Keywords: New media, connected world, everyday life, transparency, privacy, publicness, surveillance, neoliberalism, *The Circle.*

ÖZET

ERTAŞ, ÖZGÜ HAZAL. *ÇEMBER BÜTÜNLENMELİ: ŞEFFAFLIĞIN SINIR(LILIK)LARI*, MASTER TEZİ, İstanbul, 2019.

Günümüz şartlarında Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat gibi sosyal medya mecralarından Google gibi internet servislerine, her yerde bulunan ve herkesçe ulaşılabilir olan kameralardan, nesnelerin internetine kadar uzanan bir çok yeni medya teknolojisi ile mahremiyet, medya ve iletişim çalışmaları disiplini içerisindeki temel odak noktalarından biri haline geldi. Bu tür teknolojilerin sağladığı hizmetler ve servisler üzerinden ortaya çıkan faaliyetler, yeni görünürlükler ve görsellik ile aracılandırılmış görünümler ile beraberinde getirdiği özel olan ile kamusal olan arasındaki ayrımın bulanıklaşması, bir çok akademik çalışmada kendine yer buldu. Bu bağlamda bu tez mahremiyet, gözetle(n)me teknolojileri ve yönetimsellik arasındaki ilişkiye dair tartışmalara katkıda bulunmayı önerir. Bunu yaparken, *şeffaflık* kavramına idealist bir tasarı olarak dikkatimizi çeker ve bu kavramın günümüzün bağlantılı ve kantifiye edilmiş dünyasını anlamada ve kapitalizmin yeni ruhunu yansıtmada daha kullanışlı bir referans noktası sunduğunu ileri sürer. Ayrıca, ideal bağlamda şeffaf bir dünya inşasının ne tür öznellikler ürettiğini sorgular ve akabinde gündelik fenomenlere yönelik bir takım öngörülerde bulunmayı hedefler. Bu yeni tür disipliner pratiklerin hayatımızdaki yerini göstermek için, çalışmada teorik-kavramsal bir yaklaşım tercih edilmekte ve Dave Eggers'in hicivsel-teknolojik *Çember* (2013) romanının analizi kuramlaştırma için bir kaynak olarak kullanılmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yeni medya, bağlantılı dünya, gündelik hayat, şeffaflık, mahremiyet, kamusallık, gözetle(n)me, neoliberalizm, *Çember*.

INTRODUCTION

On April, 2018 Facebook Founder and Chief Executive Mark Zuckerberg was summoned to the Senate's Commerce and Judiciary Committees of United States, to discuss privacy on his social media network, Facebook. Prompted by the revelation that Cambridge Analytica, a British political consulting firm, collected the data of a projected 87 million Facebook users, Zuckerberg has come under intense scrutiny about the way his company handled user information. This specific case shows us, how our understanding of privacy concept today is strongly tied in relation to new telecommunication technologies which revolutionize the amount of personal data available ranging from Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, to internet related services like Google and IoTs. It also shows us, how the technical characteristics of these new technologies increasingly dominate explanations of our contemporary lives in indisputable ways. Today, we encounter with different forms of media that enable us to be in contact with one another at the press of a button. We are almost involved in every form of new media and social media on a daily basis, and sometimes even unwittingly. As our media tools became more portable and smaller, we started to become more interconnected through the use of such tools and everywhere and every time to an unprecedented degree. This not only means that the way we communicate and retrieve information have changed tremendously across the globe. But also with it, the information that taught of belonging to one realm or another can no longer fall within a strict categorization. That is today, it is becoming hard to fix the boundaries between public and private. In the wake of these, a wide range of responses are generated regarding a world where the boundaries of privacy, publicness and intimacy are being challenged constantly.

Hence, it would not be wrong to say that, the framework of reference for the contemporary context of privacy has recently become the concern of media and communication studies. Indeed, there is already a considerable body of literature exists on the debate related here advanced by scholars taking special interest in describing and explaining what privacy is in our information age and what threats are posed to privacy by new information technologies. For instance, Daniel J. Solove (2004), in this context, defines 'a digital person' composed in the collective computer networks. In order to fully understand the unique problems this

digital person might face, Solove suggests that we should conceptualize our understanding of what privacy is in the light of recent technological developments. Similarly, Julie E. Cohen (2012) makes recommendations on how the law can be reformed to simultaneously protect our privacy, so that we can enjoy the benefits of our increasingly digital world. By questioning what to do when it is time to balance privacy interests against other interests, she contends that privacy regulations must consider the complexities of the self-society relation, making sure people have physical and social participation in the new age. These kind of configurations of privacy in the digital age either promotes guidelines within governmental or business organizations or advocates certain regulations with regard to privacy protection. (Brock, 2016; Dörr and Weaver, 2012; Mills, 2008; Nissenbaum, 2010).

In a similar vein, numerous scholars are concerned with the conditions in which privacy may be claimed and enjoyed in the social networking sites. Zizi Papacharissi (2010) argues that social networking sites, through their design and functionality, encourage people to be more public with their information by default. Papacharissi also asserts that, in these networking sites privacy obtains the characteristics of a luxury commodity. Meaning, privacy in itself becomes a good which is pricy to the average individual's ability to acquire and preserve it. Under today's circumstances, not forsaking one's privacy in exchange of information goods and services places one at a disadvantage as Papacharissi argues. Marwick and boyd (2014) affirm that the dynamics of sites like for instance Facebook, make privacy challenging to achieve, since privacy settings are ever- changing and complex for the average user and infrequently offer meaningful protection. Hence, dynamics of these sites demand from the user to rework on their conceptions of privacy on a constant basis. Concerning social networking sites, many scholars also investigate friending activities on these social networking sites (Reich, Subrahmanyam and Espinoza, 2012; Thelwall, 2008) and strategies that are used in order to control the audience via privacy settings (Chakraborty, Vishik and Rao, 2013; Ellison et al., 2011; Lewis, Kaufman and Christakis, 2008). Sonia Livingstone (2008) found in her research that teenagers unlike as might be expected, report thoughtful decisions about what, how and to whom they reveal personal information and draw their own

boundaries about what information to post and what to keep off the site when necessary while communicating on the social networking sites.

Accordingly, most of the studies are involved in questions of how new telecommunication technologies alter practices of visibility (Blatterer,2010; Meikle, 2016; Singer 2014), what are the different motivations leading people to disclose (Awad and Krishnan, 2006; Krasnova et al., 2010; Park, Jin and Annie Jin, 2011) and does one enjoy exposing oneself (Calvert 2009; Koskela, 2002; Mendelson and Papacharissi, 2010; Munar,2010). The tendency over privacy invasion on online networks by state and the businesses has also taken much space on the literature. Mann and Forenbok (2013) engaged with the constructs of power and the practices of seeing and watching in the networked culture and concluded that: "Mobile ubiquitous computing, image capture, processing, distribution, and seamless connectivity of devices such as iPad, iPhone, Android devices, wearable computers, Digital Eye Glass, etc., allow for unprecedented 'on the ground' watching of everyday life". Several scholars, in this sense, have posited their work in relation to contemporary practices of surveillance: data storage, process and use without consent and proliferation of cameras, location and tracking systems (Allmer, 2014; Campbell and Carlson, 2002). They also tried to understand how big corporations and tech companies use sophisticated algorithms to investigate the consumption and entertainment patterns of individuals (Tavani, 1999; Whitley, 2009).

To this point, I have summarized the major studies revolving around privacy, how it is verbalized and how it is metaphorized in the digital age. It is by now clear that many of the studies expressed their concerns about obtaining and preserving privacy in today's world and the particular fashion in which privacy is studied has brought various understandings, regarding our information-driven and visually-mediated cultures. It can be said that, this thesis is fairly in line with the general argument that the meaning of what is public and what is private has undergone a seminal shift in our current day. On the other hand, privacy has been reshaped in other transformative moments in the history so I argue there is nonetheless a distinct form of transformation going on here. Hence, I position my understanding somewhat outside of the privacy debates. In our day the technical attributes of the new information and communication technologies increasingly dominate explanations of

contemporary change and development, determine our debates, set our discourses and privacy and publicness is not an exception to that. I argue, these are emblematic of a larger struggle within a various interconnected logics of power that seeks to define and control every experience of our daily lives. Initially, I point out that the present day occupation with the privacy concept is suffering a theoretical blind spot unless it draws parallels between with the invasion of the public and the invasion of the private, since their fate is interdependent. In a somewhat different way of looking at the same phenomena, one can assert that today not only private but also a particular conception of public and publicness has also been invaded. As it is also understood from, the problems regarding the privacy of the individual are not just the concern of private, but they are part of a larger phenomenon and therefore if we are to conceptualize them only as privacy problems, it also makes sense to conclude; problems that cannot be conceptualized in the context of one's privacy are not problems at all.

In this thesis, I put forward the case that in addressing the scope of the transformations we are currently witnessing in our societies, we need a different contextualization of privacy and publicness. I believe, having this standpoint may lead to different research patterns that can provide more robust tools in addressing our culture's contemporary imperatives. Therefore, I argue, today public and private cannot stand as recognizable, separate entities. Hence, in our present day we inhabit a space beyond public and private. This is not only because with the expansion of the private there is nothing public left in the lived experience, as crucial as this is. But, virtualization of the public has brought with it also the disappearance of private: since everything private is already public. Remarkably, the harms done to the public not only impaired one sphere but its broader implications have posed a major threat to both, excluding the possibilities for both spheres to survive. From this standpoint, incidentally, I argue we live in a world where there are no barriers to separate the public from the private. Indeed, such a fortification does not exist because there is nothing to separate, no public, no private but only *transparency*. Transparency emerges where these two spheres rendered invisible, disappeared, evaporated.

The analysis conducted within this thesis consists of two chapters. Initially, Chapter One begins by drawing our attention to the multiple intertwined dynamics of public and private.

To explore this intertwining, it focuses on discourses promoting of personal and intimate displays. It examines the nature of the close affinity between techno scientific understanding and capitalist organization of the society and oppose those reductive outlining of privacy debates that reduces more complex phenomena into personal choice and freedom. In doing that, in this chapter I designate three currents respectively: connected, networked and quantified. These conceptualizations speak to each other and they learn from each other. I contend that when formulated as such, engaging with these key frame of references can provide us with a better view regarding how this new world I am hypothesizing about come to be created. This chapter in this way assists us in our navigation through second chapter. In Chapter Two, I put forward the notion of transparency in detail as an idealist construct while at the same time as a very real power that explains and arranges our discourses and our lives. Following this, in what might be the core of the thesis, I argue that transparency today is the function of the formalization and institutionalization of the new spirit of capitalism. Hence, this chapter analyzes the ontological claims regarding transparency in our information age and the moral claims of practical necessity but also how transparency legitimizes its own reason d'etre, and how the logic of transparency and market ideology entered into a series of everyday practices today. In order to make my case, in this concluding chapter, my analysis reads Dave Eggers' techno-satire novel, *The Circle* (2013) and I make several diagnoses in relation to contemporary society.

CHAPTER 1

WHAT DO WE TALK ABOUT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE?

> "In the most public and most private ways we are helplessly becoming high-wire dancers in the circus tent. And many of us fall". – Ulrich Beck, Identity in Question

When to talk about public and private many of us think in binaries. Although, where the line between privacy and publicness should be drawn is not always clear a tendency is to delineate as precisely as possible the activities proper to each sphere. Accordingly, our practices and actions are shaped consulting to designated activities either for the public or the private. In general, when we think about public we mainly think about in terms of space like public parks, public buildings, public squares or in more nonfigurative terms: ideas, actions, sanctions, demands concerning the people as a whole. In other words, it could be said that things regarded as public in the sense that they are for the benefit of people in common. There are also a number of possible usages of the term private, such as private space generally referring to our homes, belonging to use of one particular person or groups, also private conversations, private family matters, private property. All in all, it can be said that then, public and private in our understanding is established on either/or binary. In this sense, public and private can be explained on the basis of exclusiveness and are dialectic tensions inseparable from and constitutive of one another.

Nevertheless, we can see that the nature of this distinction between public and private is usually taken as a given and their relationship to the economic and political conditions that makes possible such distinction is often left unproblematized. However, if we are to better understand what does public and private stand today in our societies we should look at and evaluate it in its historical framework. Hereafter, condition of the current impeding tendencies in referring to decline of the public is shared by quite a few scholars. These scholars identify several problems and processes in the organization of our world in which it is becoming increasingly difficult to construct and maintain public and private as separate

but inseparably interconnected entities. These scholars also give us hints at how the realm of both the public and private have come to be attacked either by totalitarian or market-based practices which later contribute to the deteriorating quality of life. Hence, projecting these tendencies can equip us better in addressing the scope of the transformations we are currently witnessing in our societies in the present day and in the present future.

On that basis, I would like to start the discussion by discussing the work of German philosopher and political theorist Hannah Arendt. Arendt in *The Human Condition* draws our attention to how the public and private formulated historically and what were the conditions that make such formulation necessary at an early date in history. Her work is also important in showing us the complex ways in which the personal and the public and the political interweave. According to Arendt, what we call private in the modern age has emerged in a particular time in history where its roots we can trace back to antiquity, especially to the Police. In her words: "the distinction between a private and a public sphere of life corresponds to the household and the political realms, which have existed as distinct, separate entities at least since the rise of the ancient city-state; but the emergence of the social realm, which is neither private nor public, strictly speaking, is a relatively new phenomenon whose origin coincided with the emergence of the modern age and which found its political form in the nation-state" (Arendt, 1998, p.28). Arendt (1998) insisted that this distinction was necessary for the existence of bios politikos where action and speech are not separable from one another and where people can be seen and acquire the status of public.

According to Arendt then, as of 16th- 17th century the experience of bios politikos is threatened by that of "rise of the social". The rise of the social, Arendt argued meant "the rise of the "household" (oika) or of economic activities to the public realm, housekeeping and all matters pertaining formerly to the private sphere of the family have become a 'collective' concern in the modern world" (Arendt, 1998, p.33). Arendt identifies the social in this sense, with all those activities formerly restricted to the private sphere of the household and having to do with the necessities of life (d'Entreves, 2006, last accessed 14th of December, 2018).

Arendt's claim is that with the tremendous expansion of the economy from the end of the 18th century, all such activities have taken over the public realm and transformed it into a sphere for the satisfaction of our material needs. Society has thus invaded and conquered the public realm, turning it into a function of what previously were private needs and concerns, and has thereby destroyed the boundary separating the public and the private. In this, "Obsessed with life, productivity, and consumption, we have turned into a society of laborers and jobholders who no longer appreciate the values associated with work, nor those associated with action (d'Entreves, 2006, last accessed 14th of December, 2018).

The rise of the social in this sense not only meant the blurring of the public and private lines with the expansion of market economy but, as the domain of the household or private (oikos) invaded the domain of the public, man has also lost its freedom writes Arendt: "To be free meant both not to be subject to the necessity of life or to the command of another and not to be in command oneself. It meant neither to rule nor to be ruled. Thus within the realm of the household, freedom did not exist" (Arendt, 1998, p.32). Hence, in search of an explanation for the deterioration experienced by man in the modern process, Arendt positioned the private (oikos) as an anti-space, a contradistinction against to public where one can enjoy being in the presence of others. Following Arendt, Zygmant Bauman also asserted that today, unlike before, the sphere of the public became almost a residual sphere. Moreover, "the 'public' has been emptied of its own separate contents; it has been left with no agenda of its own- it is now but an agglomeration of private troubles, worries and problems" (Bauman, 1999, p.65).

Although they research into different times in the history, late-Frankfurt school member German sociologist Jurgen Habermas, likewise Arendt, endorsed the position that with the rise of the modernity a particular understanding and embodiment of public is now invaded by the private. Habermas in a similar vein, searched for a sphere free from private interests and free from oppression and envisaged a world where the citizens can again be part of social, political and cultural production processes. Looking at the history under the categorizations of feudal period and bourgeois society, Habermas (1991) in his book *The Structural Transformation of The Public Sphere* examined the category of bourgeois *public sphere* and how it is shifted, through the course of modernity. He suggested envisaging the bourgeois

public sphere as, "an intermediary system of communication between formally organized and informal face-to-face deliberations in arenas at both the top and the bottom of the political system" (Habermas 2006, p.412). In this sense, the public sphere which forms "the periphery of a political system and facilitate deliberative legitimation processes" operated as "an intermediary system between state and society" (Habermas 2006, pp.412-415). According to Habermas, at the beginning of the 18th century, print media helped the formation of this public sphere where citizens can engage in political and moral debates equally and develop critical thinking skills regarding government policies and societal life "based on "a kind of social intercourse that, far from presupposing the equality of status, disregarded status altogether." It worked by a "mutual willingness to accept the given roles and simultaneously to suspend their reality" (Calhoun, 2013, p.4). However, in the 19th century the rise of market capitalism and emerging practices of advertisement sector has culminated in with the transformation of this public sphere Habermas positions, causing private sphere and the logic of power permeating the individual's life world and feudalizing again once was public.

Fast forward to today, the issue of how we define public and private, publicness and privacy has become also problematized by many scholars of our days who research onto difficulties in fixing boundaries of publicness and privacy. Internet without doubt is one of the most important actors in projecting the tendencies that are accelerated in the past twenty or so years as the scholars from various disciplines were trying to draw attention. Zeynep Tüfekçi for instance elaborates on how internet with its medium specific features to juxtapose time and space where "the past is always available and collapses spaces so that, different contexts can overlap". For Tüfekçi this brings about lessening of spaces designated for different social roles and identity management when it comes to maneuverability and negotiation between both realms (Tüfekçi, 2012, p.40). In light of this, also a number of scholars have studied public and private with regards to the increasing role new media technologies play in our lives. With the new media technologies' capacity to generate "imaginative travels" our understanding of what is private and what is public, what is frontstage and what is backstage, what is near and what is far is blurring wrote Urry (2000, p. 69). Also, scholars put the emphasis on how these new technologies bring activities traditionally reserved to the private

realm into public space. Steve Matthewman, illustrating on the digital audio storing devices Walkman and iPod drew our attention to the what he calls "privatizing appliances". For Matthewman, although these appliances such as Walkman and iPod that are in use today intensify individual experience and display interpersonal contact, at the same time recapturing levels of autonomy and control; pushed to their limits, they also carry out the risk to obsolesce public life (Matthewman, 2011, p.145).

Many scholars also drew our attention to the changing nature of intimacy in our digital worlds. In "Making Cents of Contemporary Intimacies", Katja Lee gives us an account of how our intimacies are shifting onto public spaces in the intersection of neoliberal agendas and discourses today and states that the intimate is both a collective concern and collective-making in today's world: "The intimacy acted out in public is not the same as the intimate brought into public: the first exists only in the public space, even as it suggests an alternate space for its performance, whereas the second has, seemingly, been removed from the context it was produced in and repurposed for an audience beyond the specific and limited group it was intended for" (Lee, 2016, pp. 218-219). Today our intimacies are actually "public intimacies" as Levent Soysal predicts. Drawing our attention to the increasing publicness in our lives, he further argues that the way the new individual experiences and enacts intimacy is engendered in globalized and virtual spaces that are beyond the confinements of the nation state. "Social is everywhere" as Google announces writes Soysal and "intimacies that matter are public not cultural...This world is not a utopian but real, no matter how much we scorn its intrusive existence, its lack of depth and face-to-face relations, and its alienating effects and uncanny ramifications" (Soysal, 2010, p.393).

Until now I have tried to give an account of how scholars have studied the changing nature of privacy and publicness and how they have reflected upon what is becoming lost to us in our ultra-connected world. As a way of clarification, I have to warn the reader that I have willingly overemphasized the dimension of communication and information over other aspects of social, cultural and political change within the scope of this thesis. This overemphasis works as a kind of methodological device to temporarily isolate a specific type of process for the purposes of my own work and analysis. Also, in this thesis I do not develop

a detailed work on the varied manifestations of social media or new media devices or gadgets nor I say much about how Facebook gathers user data or whether Google secretly tracks whereabouts of its users. A number of academics has already documented developments in these rapidly changing areas. Needless to say, reviewing Google, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and so on are the subject of numerous attempts in media and communication studies. My concern here is rather to open avenues for reflection regarding the current situation of transparency in our lives. Hence, I hereby start discussing connectivity, networking and quantification.

1.1. CONNECTED

 "Connectivity benefits everyone. Those who have none will have some and those who have a lot will have even more" (Schmidt and Cohen, 2013, p.28), so says former executive chief of Google, Eric Schmidt and CEO of Jigsaw (previously Google Ideas), Jared Cohen in their book *The New Digital Age: Reshaping The Future of People, Nations and Business*. Schmidt and Cohen start their discussion on the proliferation of new telecommunication technologies in our everyday lives. According to them, connectivity is the main driver in the transformation of nature of things today and technology driven change is inevitable. In the pages follow they don't only explore the future, but envision it: "this is a book about guiding human hand in the new digital age" (Schmidt and Cohen, 2013, p.11). So Schmidt and Cohen makes it very clear that they and their companies will be the ones who will be deciding what holds for the future within the scope of our societal lives. Hence, throughout the book among other issues which both challenges and the solutions driven by the rise of the connectivity, Schmidt and Cohen (2013) touches upon full of complex global issues involving news dealing, citizenship, statecraft, privacy, war and even revolutions. They discuss how one can acquire multiple identities by going online: "for those who are already connected, living in both the physical and the virtual worlds has become part of who we are and what we do." – "for citizens coming online means coming into possession of multiple identities in the physical and virtual worlds. In many ways their virtual identities will come to supersede all others." And if this is not enough of a task to undertake within the scope of one book they still come up with the delicate issues like how global connectivity will affect the way states

operate, negotiate and wrestle each other. In doing that, the authors are sure the citizen of the new digital age will experience a better quality of life with increased efficiency, more innovation more opportunity. They have the faith that with so many people connected in so many places, the future will contain the most active, outspoken and globalized civil society the world has ever known. (Schmidt and Cohen, 2013, pp. 32-121).

One important claim that Schmidt and Cohen founded is the one that, the new technology promises to deliver its users from the constraints of physical reality. In this view, the technological domain readily becomes a world of its own:

> In the virtual world we will all experience some kind of connectivity, quickly and through a variety of means and devices. In the physical world we will still have to contend with geography, randomness of birth, bad luck and the good and bad sides of human nature. The advance of connectivity will have an impact far beyond the personal level; the wats that the physical and virtual worlds coexist, collide and complement each other will greatly affect how citizens and states behave in the coming decades. The vast majority of us will increasingly find ourselves living working and being governed in two worlds at once. (Schmidt and Cohen., 2013, p.31)

And if you are worried that how our world will be effected by such changes, Schmidt and Cohen does also a very good job in pointing the enemy and it is obviously not them: "Everything a regime would need to build an intimidating police state is commercially available now. The most important form of data to collect for an autocrat isn't Facebook posts or Twitter comments. It is biometric information" (Schmidt and Cohen, 2013, 77). The belief that technology in itself has an autonomous essence and that whatever it encounters, whatever it comes into contact with, it changes in its face without having need to reference to societal world is well established in the authors writings. This kind of thinking is also in line with a general tendency in the society: people are deluded into thinking that the serious social problems we have today would be only solved if we had the proper technology. However, this kind of emphasize on a need to build new and improved communities with the resources of new telecommunication technologies are not unique to Schmidt and Cohen. Many arguments have been carried out on the arrival of a new society based on the foundations of telecommunications. Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg also thinks that digitization is the main driver in the transformation of the nature of things today. In his open letter to Facebook Community Zuckerberg writes:

> For the past decade, Facebook has focused on connecting friends and families. With that foundation, our next focus will be developing the social infrastructure for community -- for supporting us, for keeping us safe, for informing us, for civic engagement, and for inclusion of all…Progress now requires humanity coming together not just as cities or nations, but also as a global community. (Zuckerberg, 2017)

Facebook here also lays claim to public issues and not only assumes but also develops the social infrastructure through its design and functionality. So much so that, connection is taken as synonymous with the community in Zuckerberg's words. Predictably, it can be easily observed that the visionaries of cyberspace are immersed in similar discourses: Al Gore declared that the Internet was a revitalized Greek agora. Bill Gates claimed that the Internet was a space for ''friction-free capitalism'' (Kyong Chun, 2008, p.24). When Secretary of State Hillary Clinton delivered remarks on Internet freedom and the future of global free speech, one of the freedoms she addressed was the freedom to connect:

> The final freedom I want to address today flows from the four I've already mentioned: the freedom to connect - the idea that governments should not prevent people from connecting to the internet, to websites, or to each other. The freedom to connect is like the freedom of assembly in cyber space. It allows individuals to get online, come together, and hopefully cooperate in the name of progress. Once you're on the internet, you don't need to be a tycoon or a rock star to have a huge impact on society. (Clinton, 2010)

All of these are actually established precedents of a faith in internet's power to make inroads onto major transformations on the society and to build a digitalized world that made possible on the grounds of globalization and connection. Advocates of these argument understand technology as simply overcoming constraints whether these are of biological temporal or spatial. Technological processes are therefore represented as extending, enhancing and transcending natural processes. These are all becoming self- reinforcing and declare that all it takes to become part of a good, just and global community is up to connect. And that doesn't only sense an obligation to be online all the time, in order to be able to be part of the community, but also creates the spur that if one wants to go off the grid there is nobody but her/himself to charge. Similarly, they also make us believe that as long as we follow this line of progress, we can be free from the spontaneous and unprogrammed public life since an impulsive and an ambivalent life is perceived as risk laden.

Kevin Robins in his essay "Cyberspace and the World We Live In" is concerned with these utopian aspirations and sentiments regarding the cyberspace. He writes: "…all this is driven by a feverish belief in transcendence; a faith that, this time round, a new technology will finally and truly deliver us from the limitations and the frustrations of this imperfect world. In this respect too, the self-proclaiming visionaries tell us they have good news and great expectations. The utopian space-the net, the matrix- will be a nowhere-somewhere in which we shall be able to recover the manning and the experience of community and they also "tend to speak as if there really were a new and alternative reality; they would have us believe that we could actually leave behind our present world and migrate to this better domain. It is as if we could simply transcend the frustrating and disappointing imperfection of the here and now" (Robins, 1998, p.136).

These kind of thinking also promulgates that connectivity is identical with community. That is the more we are connected the better our communities will be. The authors of the book *Virtual Politics, Identity and Community in The Cyberspace* assesses if the internet does really enable a community as it is claimed and ask whether the human need for community is at risk of being the next technology commodity. "It is precisely around the question of community formation that the commodification question arises. Rather than enabling virtual communities, the internet continues the population constituting operation that is endemic to broadcast namely the partitioning of mass into atomized units. The internet exploits the dissolution of compositional and geographic community by selling lost levels of social integration to consumers in the form of time charging for human communication as the next technology commodity. It is remarkable that cyberspace appeals to a need for community given its quality as a compressively manufactured space" (Holmes, 1997, p.14).

The desire for connection and connectivity is not only in forming communities. Not only people but also businesses, societies, cultures, cities, devices and vehicles are getting connected which brings us to the next chapter.

1.2. NETWORKED

Today, the dominant logic of contemporary society is networking. Thus, to analyze the emerging social structure in theoretically meaningful terms, we have to define what information networks are, and elaborate on their strategic role in fostering and shaping current processes of social transformation. As the concept of network society finds its most prominent understanding in the works of Manuel Castells, I take the conceptualization of the network society here on the grounds of the qualities attained by authors'. Castells think that our current capitalist societies are moved from market capitalism to something more unique which is on the foundations of information. Proposed in his trilogy "The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture" (1997), Castells summarizes the main features of the transformations we have been witnessing in the last two decades and how this has shaped our social structures and specifically defines the network society as the social structure characteristic of the information age. Social structures he defines are organized around relationships of production consumption power and experience whose spatial temporal configurations constitute cultures. They are enacted reproduced and ultimately transformed by social actors rooted in the social structure. A fundamental feature of social structure in the information age is its reliance on networks as the key feature of social morphology. While networks are old forms of social organization they are empowered by new info communication technologies (Castells, 2000a, pp.17-19). Castells (2000a) explains that although the networks are actually old formations in our age where information has a leading role almost all of the enterprises of the society networks taken on a new life by becoming information networks.

For Castells, this is also strictly related with the emergence of a new technological paradigm. Castells argues that, we have entered into a new technological paradigm, centered around micro-electronics based information communication technologies and genetic engineering. Accordingly, "what is important characteristic of this technological paradigm is the use of knowledge based information technologies to enhance and accelerate the production of knowledge and information in a self-expanding virtuous circle" (Castells, 2000a, p.10).

Moreover, in his essay "Materials for an explanatory theory of the network society" Manuel Castells (2000b) examines this close specific interaction between network morphology and

relationships of production, consumption, power, experience and culture in the historical making of the emerging social structure at the turn of the millennium. (Castells, p.5). Hereby, Castells in his work designates three fundamental features for our new network based economies:

> First it is information that is the capacity of generating knowledge and processing managing information determine the productivity and competitiveness of all kinds of economic units, be they firms, regions, or countries. Second, this new economy is global in the precise sense that its core, strategic activities, have the capacity to work as a unit on a planetary scale in real time or chosen time. Third, the new economy is networked. At the heart of the connectivity of the global economy and of the flexibility of informational production, there is a new form of economic organization, the network enterprise. This is not a network of enterprises. It is a network made from either firms or segments of firms and/or from internal segmentation of firms. Large corporations are internally de-centralized as networks. (Castells, 2000b, p.9-11)

For Castells this new economy is without doubt capitalist. "But it is a new brand of capitalism, in which rules for investment, accumulation, and reward, have substantially changed. Besides, since nothing authorizes capitalism as eternal, it is essential to focus on the characteristics of the new economy because it may well outlast the mode of production where it was born, once capitalism comes under decisive challenge and/or plunges into a structural crisis derived from its internal contradictions" (Castells, 2000b, p.11).

Castells later shifts its attention to the cultural realm: However, in cultural realm too the dominant reasoning of networking is present. In this cultural networks, say Castells, we encounter: "similar pattern of networking, flexibility, and ephemeral symbolic communication, in a culture organized primarily around an integrated system of electronic media, obviously including the Internet" (Castells, 2000b, p.12).

As Manuel Castells also asserts, "today the network makes explicit the dynamics by which a globally connected elite is coming to dominate and control the lives of those who remain bound to the world of locality, thus reinforcing a 'structural domination of the space of flows over the space of places'" (Castells, 2000, p.8). According to this perspective, in network societies "the concrete time of places, bound to a specific mode of duration, is increasingly subsumed by the imperium of a single, electronic and global space accessible at the click of a mouse: 'the edge of forever or timeless time'" (Terranova, 2004, p.69).

1.3. QUANTIFIED

No one today can reasonably doubt the increasing role surveillance plays in our lives in the 21st century. In fact, it can be even said that surveillance has come to dominate all we practice and turned out to be even more complex and multi-layered than ever before- becoming ordinary, deriving itself from the forms of everyday relations; while it was an extraordinary practice that was once used for certain purposes. This is most clearly charted and visible to us in relation to new media technologies we are using such as web-related communication technologies, virtual reality, augmented reality, blogs, live streaming, social networking. Add to all this, there is the proliferation of micro cameras, as well as location and tracking systems and the use of sophisticated algorithms to investigate the consumption and entertainment patterns of individuals. These are not the same surveillance or same levels of surveillance everywhere, yet they still feature surveillance as one of their organizing principles.

"Building the space of the multi-media networks with the aid of tele-technologies surely then requires a new 'optic', a new global optics, capable of helping a panoptical vision to appear, a vision which is indispensable if the 'market of the visible 'is to be established (Virilio, 1998). Michel Foucault (2008) has already shown with great force that, as a generalizable model of functioning in terms of the everyday life of humans, panopticon served as a diagram for a new model of power. This power later extended beyond the prison to take hold throughout the whole social body and helped the formation of what might be called in general the "disciplinary society". He also drew our attention to the role surveillance can play beyond mere repression and how it can contribute to the productive development of modern selves. In a similar vein, Gilles Deleuze whose theoretical connections with Foucault can be also seen in his short but seminal article, "Postscript in the Societies of Control" analyzed dominant reasoning of panopticism. However, he argued that "the ultra-rapid forms of free floating control replaced the old disciplines operating in a closed system" (Deleuze 1992, p.4). On that account Deleuze basing his theories on the previous work of Foucault, examined that today we witness the formation of a "control society". While Foucault locates discipline society where the individuals never ceases passing from one closed environment to another: respectively family, school, the barracks, the factory from time to time to hospital and possibly the prison; the control society on the other hand emerged with the difference of

Foucaldian discipline society. Deleuze (1992) suggested that the enclosures of discipline society were molds and distinct castings, yet controls are modulations like a self- deforming cast that will continuously change from one moment to other. The control society then comes out as a Panopticon without walls, a new type of imprisonment since today what is at stake is the telecommunication technologies that are used to obtain power over minds.

Thereupon, in the control society we find ourselves surrounded by the pervasive telecommunication technologies that eliminate any kind of escape and hope to extricate ourselves. When considered in the current situation, today every one of us own at least one smart phone, one laptop, one tablet or each of them at the same time. This new media also not surprisingly built on advertising and are able to rewire itself according to the admired idea of mass customization and user-friendliness. Besides, as Deleuze states "in societies of control one is never finished with anything" (1992, p.5). In our mediated culture we are constantly told to stop what we are doing and search for something else, rather new things all the time. The new media we use are designed to incite us for the same purpose, to scroll down the screens of our smartphones and to refresh our Facebook page constantly. By the same token, it becomes harder to pay attention to the present. Deleuze saw these tendencies in our current societies and deduced that, the new communication technologies and new media's tendency to penetrate into every aspect of our lives also poses a threat, considering their impact on our human senses and the way we perceive the world around us. Deleuze further argued that in the societies of control individual has become a "dividual" and what is important for individual becomes a code that mark access to information or reject it. (1992, p.5) By dividuals, Deleuze stresses that humans are now can be divided and marked by the data about them by government officials or private sectors outside of our own will and control.

Consequently, today it wouldn't be wrong to say that, both Foucault's and Deleuze's predictions have already been fulfilled and even amplified to a new level. This is where the panopticon had succeeded: to keep the surveillance as part of our existence but not as an act, dictating the means by which we communicate and becoming deeply embedded within our mindsets. This is the unique position of panopticism.

Since panopticon and panopticism has been considered many times before in respect to modern day telecommunication technologies, this task will not be dwelt upon here. Rather I would like to examine here the works of two important scholars, David Lyon and Christian Fuchs. David Lyon (2003) in his article "Surveillance As Social Sorting" focusing on the emergent coding and mobile aspects of surveillance, examines the surveillance as a routine occurrence of everyday life. However, the notion "social sorting" highlights the classifying drive of contemporary surveillance for him. "It also defuses some of the more supposedly sinister aspects of surveillance processes (it is not a conspiracy of evil intentions or a relentless and inexorable process. At the same time, social sorting places the matter firmly in the social and not just the individual realm-which privacy concerns all too often tend to do" (Lyon,2003, p.13). In examining further, Lyon(2003) designates two developments in the course of surveillance practices. One thing is that improved information retrieving methods for marketing practices is a broader implication of a trend towards attempted prediction and preemption of behaviors argues Lyon. Secondly, the rapid proliferation of CCTV or video surveillance and growing range of locational devices are not merely technological innovations with social impacts; they are technologies that are actively sought and developed because they answer to a particular political-economic pressure: "if surveillance as social sorting is growing this is not merely because some new devices have become available, rather the device are sought because of the increasing number of perceived and actual risks and the desire more completely to manage populations-whether those populations are citizens, employees, or consumers" (Lyon, 2003, p.20).

Along these line, Christian Fuchs, in an essay "The Political Economy of Privacy on Facebook" analyzes the privacy settings and related surveillance practices in the social networking site. For Fuchs, when discussing privacy on Facebook we still operate within liberal privacy values. Liberal privacy values however have their limits and find the immanent critique within the reality of liberal-capitalist societies" (Fuchs, 2012, p.11). When discussing privacy on Facebook he therefore argues we should go beyond these. Moreover, as Fuchs proposes, mainstream research about Facebook and other social networking sites in general engages in privacy fetishism by focusing on information disclosures. These studies

stress the associated risks of disclosures. They conceive privacy strictly as an individual phenomenon that can be protected if users behave in the correct way and do not disclose too much information (Fuchs, 2012, p.42). Facebook is a typical manifestation of a stage of capitalism in which the relation of the public and private as well as labor and play collapse and in which capital exploits this collapse. Privacy can only be achieved in an economy that is not ruled by profit interests but is controlled and managed by prosumers, consumers and producers, thereby ending the need for privacy rules that protect us from domination. Achieving such a situation is not primarily a technological task, but one that requires changes in society (Fuchs, 2012, pp.43-48).

CHAPTER 2

TRANSPARENCY: BEYOND PUBLIC/PRIVATE

> "Completion was imminent and it would bring peace, and it would bring unity, and all that messiness of humanity until now, all those uncertainties that accompanied the world before the Circle, would be only a memory." –Dave Eggers, The Circle

Nowadays there is a considerable hype around transparency concept. The prevalent reliance in the virtues of transparency shows itself constantly, be it in political or economic debates or in the public agenda. From the magazines to the halls of congress members, industry leaders, politicians and journalist, everyone demands transparency as an overall cure to all our social and political problems. The concept is invoked to be the best thing in policing one's own behavior and in doing the right thing, it is assigned with the task of fostering security of citizens against corruption when it comes to big companies and big corporations. It has become the catch phrase for good governance among scholars, policy makers and activists. It is expected to foster democracy as well. Its democratizing dimensions in improving the functioning of governments are often highlighted. Calls for greater transparency have being made also by a multiple of international communities. The picture seems to please everyone especially those of markets and private sector organizations who benefiting from unlimited information flows, which makes possible the sustainability of a viable market. Today Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg gives the clues about the future of surveillance by upholding that their role in the system is to reflect what the current social norms are and privacy is no longer one of them (Balakrishnan, Salinas and Hunter, 2018) or Eric Schmidt, the CEO of the Google when asked about whether users should be sharing information with Google as if it were a "trusted friend," responds, "If you have something that you don't want anyone to know, maybe you shouldn't be doing it in the first place" (HuffPost, 2010).

The futurists have their say, too. David Brin, a science fiction writer and a scientist, who is also one of the first persons to describe the post-privacy stance, envisages transparency as an

effective tool to democratize surveillance. Brin in his book, *The Transparent Society* (1998), envisages a world where it is proven quite impossible to legislate away the surveillance tools. For him the djinn cannot be crammed back into its bottle so what he proposes is transparency for all. Brin (1998) suggests that, in order for us to deal with the detriments of such surveillance on individuals, we should remove information asymmetries by making the collection of data composed under various circumstances provided to all- to the common folk as he puts it. He further asserts that, with transparency in place, people would learn to ignore the vast amount of personal information made available and find better uses for their time than spying on their peers. And yet even the first generations to be surrounded by lenses may feel little nervous under the pervasive gaze, the next growing up with this situation would take it completely for granted.

It should be added at this point, however, the idea that transparency leads to peace of mind, that is more transparency means better information which ultimately leads to better action, is not new. Certain discourses about transparency already circulate among public figures, politicians and economists promoting transparency as a yardstick for better communities, better societies, better politics and better economy, as if only a good and democratic outcome is possible out of such practice. It is also argued that, digital privacy is both untenable and socially unrewarded so privacy activism and even personal privacy hygiene is not worth the effort. Similarly, there are some who propose to democratize surveillance by making the surveillance available for everyone. Proponents of democratic surveillance for example go on to suggest that the contemporary pro-privacy, anti-surveillance movement is similarly limited by interest convergence. Meaning, the movement is not primarily concerned with the harms imposed on the most vulnerable members of the society, but rather with threats to mainstream and elite interests. There is even a silver lining: surveillance and other privacy violations that were largely tolerated so long as they troubled common people are challenged now since they also affect privileged interests.

Many scholars across several different disciplines has already tried to elaborate on the question of how transparency attain this position in the society. Their work provided us with historical accounts of transparency in public and political life (Birchall 2011; Birchall 2014;

Cohen, 2008) and implications and changes that have accompanied its use (Flyverbom 2015; Zarsky, 2004). Hence, in this thesis my concern is not on tracing the history of the concept neither I am interested in effectiveness of specific transparency policies implemented. I here take a difference with these prevailing understandings of transparency deliberately and argue that with the emergence of telecommunication technologies and the increasing dominance of connection and networking in our world, the transparency concept become further complicated. Here my take on the situation is like this: Today, the use of *transparency* to convey openness in operations of government, politics, economics, and business is taking hold in domains on individual as well. Today, the grandeur is to be transparent, and to be transparent not only economically and governmentally but also individually. In our digital age, the quest for transparency has become a thing in itself, inherently good, instituting what it forenames. Moreover, transparency today is affiliated with wider practices of knowledge making. Its rhetoric and promises whirled up on purpose on a constant basis in the daily language. This has given rise to the present situation: under the guise of "common good" and "more democratic societies", transparency became a totalizing social institution aiming towards a state of mind in which all the multiple mediations between our public and private existence became imperceptible and even unnecessary.

In developing my perspective, I borrow heavily from Michel Foucault's conception of governmentality. Hence, here I want simply to highlight his ideas that have been so influential in shaping my thinking. In *The Birth of Biopolitics,* Foucault (2004) traces the history of what could be called the art of government. He questions to take state and society, sovereign and subjects as given propositions and tries to understand how these actually were able to be formed in the first place, in the course of the modernity. After studying these historical points, Foucault sets forth what he calls as "governmental reason". This governmental reason functions as his main theoretical tool for analyzing rationalities, techniques, and procedures of power in the modern world. "The problem is how this way of governing develops, what its history is, how its expands, how it contracts, how it is extended to a particular domain and how it forms, invests and develops new practices" (Foucault, 2004, p.6), writes Foucault. In this way his work enables an account of the mundane and daily ways

in which power is enacted and contested (Mills, 2003, p.34). Later his analysis extends the confinement of a precise domain of governmental power. Rather than locating power in centralized impersonal institutions like army and the police he becomes interested in things other than repression which leads people to conform (Mills, 2003, p.36). For Foucault, power in this sense refers to the specific historical development of the complex techniques which operates within everyday relations, between people and other people, between people and institutions. Another important inference Foucault makes is that, in order to fully grasp the power, what it is and how it operates one should also study the rationality behind reinforcing such practices and relations of power. "To understand power as a set of relations, as Foucault repeatedly suggested, means understanding how such relations are rationalized. It means examining how forms of rationality inscribe themselves in practices and systems of practices, and what role they play within them" (Gutting, 2003, last accessed 14th of December 2018). Along the lines of governmentality, "governing in Foucault's sense encompasses all manner of strategies aiming to structure the behavior of both people and things; these technologies strategies, however, do not restrict or dictate, but rather take the inner dynamics of the governed entities into account and thus create a milieu that structures the field of possible behavior. Technologies of governance are the constellations of techniques institutions and procedures that make it possible to gain knowledge about the entities in question and to establish rational modes of intervention which rather enact a governing at distance or a conduct of conduct than direct physical discipline" (Stauff, 2014, p.147).

Having delineated my line of thinking about transparency, in this part of the thesis I now want to begin with my analysis of Dave Eggers' techno-satire book *The Circle* (2013). Through this, I attempt to illustrate how the dominant reasoning of transparency colonizes sectors of our daily lives and ultimately I ask what this makes of us and our world. Let me now move to *The Circle*, so that I can clarify why I find this book adequate for articulating our current epoch.

Dave Eggers' novel *The Circle*, places connection, networking and modern day telecommunication surveillance in the heart of our present days. The book starts with our protagonist Mae, getting an entry level job in customer experience in the powerful technology

company and social networking corporation, The Circle. Among the thousands of employees of the company, there are three top executives of the Circle, called the "Three Wise Men" and there is the gang of 40 which consists of engineers, designers and visionaries. By gathering data about anything and everything, The Circle promotes the growth of knowledge and of new techniques to improve wealth, health and well-being through their technologies. Developments in the Circle happen with incredible frequency, they got things done and with remarkable speed and efficiency.

As their mantra the company designates: "No data, human or numerical or emotional or historical, is ever lost again" (Eggers, 2013, p.171). Thus, with a vision to improve the chaos of an "orderless" world and reach through for the "good of humankind", The Circle initiates various innovations and applications from creating an application called ChildTrack which enables parents and authorities to track their children all the time through a chip implanted in their ankle to, SoulSearch which crowdsource man hunting of convicted criminals through distributing their photographs to all of the Circle's social media followers. However, one of the greatest projects and the one that enables the company to channel the whole life into its network is called TruYou. TruYou combines every information of every user online: social media profiles, payment systems, various passwords, email accounts, shopping preferences, manifestations of their interests. Another important project of the company is Demoxie- "it is democracy with your voice and your moxie, and it is coming soon" (Eggers, 2013, p.217). Through this software, the company has plans to take over a public act like voting into its own hands. They claim that the Circle can make possible a new level of participatory democracy by requiring every voting age citizen to have a Circle account and through their services they suggest to replace costly elections by instantaneous ones, which is nearly cost free. In this way, The Circle plots to coordinate all the entities, even citizenry into its own domain, we understand.

In order for "CIRCLE MUST BE WHOLE" (ibid., 2013, p.178),"ALL THAT HAPPENS MUST BE KNOWN" (ibid., 2013, p.40). And so starts the Circle's own transparency plan. To become the monopoly of the world communication and to create the visibility to operate effectively worldwide, the company starts to produce the cameras known as SeeChange,

which enables one to get high definition quality resolution in a camera in the size of a thumb. The camera needs no wires. It is easy to hide. Besides, the technology is accessible and affordable for anyone. This follows with the installation of a thousand SeeChange cameras on campus and later nearly everywhere around world to the eyes of a billion-odd Circle users. With this technology the users everywhere but also The Circle achieve access to livestreaming of any place at will. One of the tech genius presenting the cameras proposes: "You want to see Fiji but cannot get there? SeeChange. You want to check on your kid at school? SeeChange. This is ultimate transparency. No filter. See everything. Always" (ibid., 2013, p.41).

To be free from constraints of space and time, to peep into someone else's life, to see places you can never see, to go where you cannot go, without even leaving your couch, these are what The Circle promises to its users through these new cameras. In this light, The Circle invites everyone else to become a part of its surveillance assembly, to spy out their peers and also pledges that anyone who uses their technologies will become "all knowing-all seeing". Spying on your peers in The Circle however, is not depicted as an immoral activity, rather it means democratizing surveillance. Even though, The Circle operates in the same reasoning with other kind of surveillance practices, unexpectedly it does not resemble to that intimidating Orwellian world. What is new in Circle is that here we don't witness any coercion, which is significant to the distinction of center and periphery in the 1984 (George Orwell). Here The Circle is surprisingly not a big brother, rather a close pal. Surveillance is not the real cause of anxiety, not being seen is. In this sense, several things about The Circle provides a framework that is much more robust in understanding contemporary surveillance in its current form.

Another important thing featuring in The Circle is that, while the inhabitants of this new world engineer the mechanisms of control within themselves, they still think they are doing it autonomously, that they are free. Jason Read (2016) explains this ideological spur around freedom sentiment or assurance by making use of Michel Foucault's concept of "homo economicus". Homo economicus gets its meaning from the emergence of neoliberalism. Foucault takes neoliberal ideal as to be a new "regime of truth", a new way in which people

make themselves as subjects and bringing together a new mode of governmentality. However, neoliberalism remains faithful to the freedom as long as it acknowledges the market, likewise on the condition that economic interests, investment and competition. This is where this trajectory follows a fundamental paradox, the more this new governmentality provides, the less one becomes free. In other words, the new system turns the freedom into means to further its own power. Hence reading of Michel Foucault here Read's analysis offers some help. Read writes:

> To govern without governing requires a great deal of freedom to act to: these freedoms however, the freedoms of the market are not outside of the politics of governmentality but rather an integral element of its strategy. In this sense rather than directly marking the body as a sovereign power it acts on the conditions of actions. And as power become less restrictive, less corporal it also becomes more intense, saturating the field of actions and possible actions. (Read, 2016, p.6)

Thus, on the one hand one can say that there are no oppressors only individuals willingly and desperately putting themselves and disclosing themselves through the network in The Circle. What we are confronted is a world where we inscribe surveillance power in ourselves and this world is actualized by The Circle. With all the company accounts, social media networks, and now the SeeChange cameras as well as the company's special effort to build an online community for itself, open information and unlimited communication yet still converts into totalizing control in The Circle. One instance we see the emergence of this phenomenon is when Mae starts to use the inner company Zing account. Very similar to architecture of Facebook, this Zing account serves as means of connecting the total Circle community. Everyone in the company have to hold a Zing account and are "encouraged" to be online all the time and keep up with their timeline on their social networking account. In this Zing account, people are evaluated based on their participation rank, they also call it the PartiRank which is actually a popularity rank. This rank works as an algorithm engendered software that takes into account all the activity of one's circle. One company worker explains to Mae: "… we actually see your profile and the activity on it as integral to your participation here. This is how your coworkers know who you are… If you visit a coworker's page and write something on the wall that is an act of community and act of reaching" (Eggers, 2013, p.55).

The idea that undistorted communication would bring a better society, if only people were eager to be more open about themselves and their lives is certainly not a new one and it has

been a part of discursive work of the proponents of cyberspace and a number of telecommunications corporations voice this worldwide for a long time. "Turning connectedness into connectivity by means of coding technologies is exactly what corporate platforms discovered as the golden egg their geese produced. Besides, generating content peer production yields a valuable by-product that users often do not intentionally deliver: behavioral and profiling data" (Van Dijk, 2013, p.16).

Here, The Circle operates on a like economy. Changing connectivity into means of furthering its own private economic interests is strongly overlaid with Byung Chul Han's analysis in an important book "The Transparency Society". Han suggests that those who takes transparency only in relation to freedom of information fails to recognize its scope. In this, Byung-Chul Han writes: "Under today's immaterial relations of production, more information and com-munication (the emphasis here is author's) mean more productivity and acceleration. In contrast, secrecy, foreignness, and otherness represent obstacles for com-munication without borders" (Han, 2015, last accessed 14th December 2018). One of his most important insights is that, the society of transparency manifests itself first and foremost as a society of positivity. According to Han (2015), the society cannot afford the negativity because the system need stability since "communication reaches its max velocity where like responds to like, when a chain reaction of likeness occurs. Transparency in Byung-Chul Han's words "… does not harbor negativity that might radically question the political-economic system as it stands. It is blind to what lies outside the system. It confirms and optimizes only what already exists. The society of positivity avoids negativity in all forms because negativity makes communication stall." Han (2015) further asserts the value of communication is measured solely in terms of the quantity of information and the speed of exchange. The mass of communication also augments its economic value. Negative judgements impair communication. Further communication occurs more quickly following "Like" than "Dislike." Most importantly, the negativity that rejection entails cannot be exploited economically as Han (2015) states, since standing up would dis-turbs and delays the smooth communication of "the Same".

> Matters prove transparent when they shed all negativity, when they are smoothed out and leveled,
> when they do not resist being integrated into smooth streams of capital, communication, and

information. Actions prove transparent when they are made operational—subordinate to a calculable, steerable, and controllable process. Time becomes transparent when it glides into a sequence of readily available present moments. This is also how the future undergoes positivization, yielding an optimal presence. (Han, 2015, last accessed 14th December 2018)

What happens if you don't connect then? What happens when you are not part of The Circle's scheme? After our protagonist Mae misses the parties and social activities around The Circle multiple times and not being present enough in the company's social networking site, we see her getting scolded by one of the Circlers. She gets accused of being selfish and for holding onto the information and experiences she has for her several interests. So, after this intervention Mae feels worried about she cannot conform to the community of The Circle. She feels alone, casted away. In order to make up for it, she starts posting continuously on the company's social network. An even though at times she is not at work, spends her free time to recreate herself online and constantly composes and posts every detail of her daily life to improve her Partirank. This is why throughout the book Mae lets her individual identity constantly monitored by TruYou, she takes part in various means of connecting and self-creating in the inner company Zing account and the reader is constantly provided with information about her PartiRank, health statistics, viewership, customer ratings, and more.

So just like "homo economicus", Mae's self becomes a quantified self. She becomes an entrepreneur and entrepreneur of herself in a world where economic activity became a general matrix of all human social and political relations (Foucault, 2008, p. 226). Mae's self becomes a quantified self in this sense, in order to survive in a world where The Circle is the law. From this intersection, "the discourse of the economy becomes an entire way of life, a common sense in which every action- crime, marriage, higher education, and so on- can be charted according to a calculus of maximum output for minimum expenditure; it can be seen as an investment in human capital" (Read, 2016, pp.8-9). Circle creates a world where there is no standard of worth other than one's constant orientation towards sharing its data by becoming transparent. Although The Circle claims to supply transparency as means for realizing a free and just society and a secure world, it fails to do so. It is from these foundations of the company that the strongest continuities can be found since transparency here not only rational basis of a just society but it is the means to an end. That is indeed the

economic activity, is the impulse what lays behind The Circle's rationale. Here The Circle's ideology is strictly tied with that of neoliberalism. Hence a few word on it necessary.

Importantly, though conceptions of transparency are rooted in a logic of market functionality and it is not all the time easy to see it yet it is crucial to see it explains Garry Rodan in his essay "Neoliberalism and Transparency: Political Versus Economic Liberalism". This is partly because the concept of transparency is powerful one often time evoking positive connotations and have an appeal well beyond neoliberalism as Rodan (2004, p.22) draws our attention to and this is precisely why it is important to guard against. Crucially, what we observe Rodan (2004, p.22) continues, "neoliberal objective of broadly institutionalizing the values of market is an inherently political agenda, but one that is often concealed as such by the seemingly technical processes and ideas through which it is advanced. "This is especially through of the neoliberal transparency drive which is being pursued in promoting and embedding the ideological notion that the value of transparency is to be measured- whether directly or indirectly-by its market utility (Rodan, 2004, p.23). Such idea however, endorses the internalization of market relationships as natural givens beyond challenge, so that markets can function better.

Through the end of the book, there are still non adopters, people who are against a world where The Circle has eradicated all competitors and can control all information. People who are against a world of unnaturally extreme social needs and the level of contact that is purveyed by The Circle. Some claims it creates "a mob rule", "a filterless society". However, the question, from the executives, visionaries and proponents of the transparency is obvious and loud: If you aren't transparent, what are you hiding? If you weren't operating in the light of day, what were you doing in the shadows? So although some citizens and commentators protest Circle's rule on grounds of privacy, the momentum crushes all such arguments and the progression continues. At one instance, one of the characters of the book called Mercer- who had been a boyfriend of Mae's- during a conversation with Mae tries to appeal to her intuition and explains his worries about the future: I expect this is some second great schism, where two humanities live apart but parallel. There will be those who live under the surveillance dome you are helping to create, and those who live, try to live, apart from it, so

he says. After a while from this conversation, Mercer feeling suffocated from the ideology of The Circle, takes his car to move to the woods away from The Circle. As Mercer has tries to go off the grid, however, finds himself on the highway being chased by a swarm of drones trying to get him to respond to messages of friendship. This, later causes him to commit suicide by driving off a bridge. Bailey, after this says that this tragedy would never have happened if he owned one of the self-driving cars the company itself produces. Unsurprisingly, The Circle in this way also makes the resistance of the other, the non-adopter impossible.

Significantly, another mechanism of control that gives The Circle its unique position is that, the demand for transparency in The Circle is on the one hand a mechanism of morality, posited as an instrumental good associated with accountability and security and a moral good evocative of sincerity, truth, honesty. Given that preeminence The Circle have the chance to establish and legitimize its own reasoning. Here, The Circle declares a code of conduct: one morality that serves as a simple window dressing for every practice and every action it has been involved. We see this morality emphasis several instances at the book but one that we reach the tension of the story occurs when Mae got caught acting against the company's common code of conduct (PPT: Passion, Participation and Transparency). So as the story goes, Mae after a bad day back at her hometown with her family, feeling wretched goes to beach where she always goes for kayaking to have some alone time, relaxing. It is late at night so thinking that her law breaking episode may go unnoticed she steals a kayak. But when she goes to work after morning she discovers that thanks to a SeeChange camera located on the beach The Circle knows all about it. After that Mae finds herself in one to one meeting with Bailey one of the three executives of the company. Bailey is angry with Mae because she didn't share her runaway episode with others through the network: "So what happens if I deprive anyone or everyone of something I know? Aren't I stealing from my fellow humans?" (Eggers, 2013, p.166). Mae is afraid of losing her job. But Bailey on the other hand has another agenda. What he does is, he asks Mae that if she knew there were Seechange cameras on the beach would she still steal the kayak. "What if we all behaved as if we were being watched? Would not it lead to a more moral way of life? Finally, finally we

can be good in a world where bad choices are no longer an option we have no choice but to be good" (Eggers, 2013, p.161) so says Bailey.

Immediately after this meeting, Bailey arranges a presentation for the Circlers where he announces, Mae by wearing a camera on her chest and broadcasting live 24/7 her own personal life to the millions of viewers around the world, would be "going fully transparent" immediately. Mae make statements during a screening with Circlers and millions of followers as reads: "Secrets are lies. Sharing is Caring. Privacy is theft". At this point, Mae and the Circle builds their mantra upon today's society's commonplaces where, for instance the current definition of secrets is treated as a lie and privacy is a theft- like the secrets and privacy is the real infringement upon personal life. Or take the saying "sharing is caring" for example. Connotation of this phrase is different in The Circle. Even a saying that have altruistic motives which is often time associated with communism, in The Circle refers to revealing all information about oneself online and to opening up oneself to all available forms of data collection. Here, The Circle declares a society that is built upon the ethos of the company has cultivated. This is also where the rule of transparency and morality becomes inseparable from themselves. Coupling ideas of social good to the global market it also establishes its own ethical capitalist subject. It dictates how we should conduct our lives and how we should organize the society and exhorts every other human being to comply with it. And herein lies its dictatorship.

The book comes to conclude where we find Mae, ending on a final note, announcing the closing of the circle, but also announcing a world where "everyone could know each other truly and wholly without secrets and without the need for permission to see or to know" (Eggers, 2013, p. 268). Soon more people go transparent, and even if it becomes difficult to follow other people, one could always go back and review the recording. The Circle is closed then, for Eggers when the world has become full of people wearing SeeChange cameras on their chests and livestreaming their lives to millions of people worldwide. The world Circle describes then becomes a world where it is increasingly difficult to create and maintain a world free from the "spectacle" in the Debordian sense. Guy Debord seeks to understand the true essence of what capitalism is and argues that capitalism's constant focus on the growth

results in a society in which various aspects of our human existence are evaluated on the basis of *exchange value.* In the beginning of his book, *Society of Spectacle,* remarking the opening lines of Marx's Das Capital the first aphorism reads as: "In the modern conditions of production, life announces itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles" (Debord, 2005, p.7). With regards to this, whereas Marx refers to "immense accumulation of commodities" ; Debord uses the concept of spectacle to describe the unique cultural phenomenon of modern society as "an abstract general equivalent of all commodities" (Debord, 2005, p.24). Debord explains, there once was a being which do not need having possession of something. However now in our modern age, as the image becomes more and more important in facilitating our understanding of the world this mode of being that is not obscured by possession becomes nonexisting. According to Debord in this sense the world The Circle depicts is a world of spectacle. As Mae becomes more affiliated with The Circle, through her character evolution we see that the difference between appearances and being grow ever wider in her world. In this world appearance becomes the *reason d'etre* for Mae. She is constantly in search of creating new visibilities for herself in the company's social networking sites where the accounts of daily lives of individuals are displayed constantly and their private lives are made visible and knowable to an unprecedented degree. Unknown to Mae somehow, these networks of socially oriented activities require of the constant introduction and presentation of the herself and actually force Mae to continually document and display aspects of her private life as well as other Circlers. Also, there is a constant demand to recreate herself online and seek validation and gratification through images. With this, Mae becomes to be obsessed with self- promotion over the substance of her real relationships, and the more she focuses only on appearances, the less effective she becomes at understanding the real world around her. Spectacle in this sense exists in the very heart of The Circle's *real unreality*. Hence, spectacle proceeds into a state of ultimate appearing.

As crucial as the capacity of The Circle to make a spectacle out of Circlers lives and turns this into capital, Eggers' narrative here is heavily visual. Indeed, it can be asserted that The Circle had been closed long before people started wearing SeeChange. The Circle was

complete even before Mae was willingly agreed to go transparent with her own life. Although, the spectacle of Mae and the other Circlers going fully transparent is important: The Circle and its transparency scheme were succeeded already, when Circle acted directly upon the virtual, simulating what is possible and what is not. The perfection has been perfected then, when The Circle achieved to create a space where the outside is eliminated entirely and one encounters only oneself and one's own. It completed when, "All social phenomena, no matter how impersonal in structure, are converted into matters of personality in order to have a meaning. Political conflicts are interpreted in terms of the play of political personalities; leadership is interpreted in terms of "credibility" rather than accomplishment (Sennett, 1992, p.219).

We live in this paradox now where all social configurations unravel themselves even before the new ones come to existence. This position is most clearly articulated by Zygmant Bauman's conceptualization of liquid modernity. Bauman asserts that "fluidity" or "liquidity" conceptualizations are of use when we seek to comprehend the nature of the present phase in the history of modernity. Bauman uses the liquid example on purpose since liquids "unlike solids cannot easily hold their shape. Fluids, so to speak, neither fix space nor bind time" (Bauman, 2000, p.2) Also "…fluid do not keep to any shape for long and are constantly ready (and prone) to change it; and so for them it is the flow of time that counts, more than the space they happen to occupy: that space, after all, they fill but 'for a moment'" (Bauman, 2000, p.2). These fluids however necessary "to set earnestly about the task of building a new (truly solid!) order" (Bauman, 2000, p.4). In this, Bauman also explains the reason why we have the concept of the liquids in the first place is because they serve for a certain ending for the constitution of our current capitalist societies. He writes: "that all this was to be done not in order to do away with the solids once and for all and make the brave new world free of them forever, but to clear the site for new and improved solids; to replace the inherited set of deficient and defective solids with another set, which was much improved and preferably perfect, and for that reason no longer alterable" (Bauman, 2000, p.3). As he puts it:

These days, patterns and configurations are no longer given, let alone self- evident. There are just too many of them, clashing with one another and contradicting one another's commandments so that each one has been stripped of a good deal of compelling coercively constraining powers. The liquidizing powers have moved from the 'system 'to society from politics to life policies-or have descended from the macro to the micro level of social cohabitation. (Bauman, 2000, p.7)

The result is the emergence of a segmented, disseminated, self-referential human subject. This is also the conviction of Ulrich Beck and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim in an essential book *Individualism: Institutionalized Individualism and Its Social and Political Consequences*. According to Ulrich and Elisabeth Beck we are in the heart of a fundamental change in the nature of society and politics. These changes centers around two processes that of globalization and individualization. In examining the individualization, Ulrich and Elisabeth Beck (2002) discusses the new demands, new controls and constraints being imposed on individuals in the modern societies. The decisive feature of these modern regulations or guidelines is that, far more than earlier, individuals must in part, supply them for themselves, import them into their biographies through their own actions, as the authors argue. "By all these requirements, individuals are not so much compelled as peremptorily invited to constitute themselves as individuals: to plan, understand, design themselves and act as individuals- or, should they 'fail', to lie as individuals on the bed they have made for themselves. Opportunities, dangers, biographical uncertainties that were earlier predefined within the family association, the village community, or by recourse to the rules of social estates or classes, must now be perceived, interpreted, decided and processed by individuals themselves" (Beck, 2000, pp.3-4).

Today our world, as in depicted in The Circle, is a world that is made possible by the availability of information, that is built in the idiom of technological fix and the utopian faith in connecting and sharing with promise of a better society. Our information age utopia is an error free world of transparency, efficiency and computability as Eggers discloses to us. Today, it wouldn't be wrong to say that, we lack the very question to our ever growing detachment and disenchantment in an age we have never been most omnipresent to each other but we have also never insulated ourselves from contact with those in physical proximity. We have all the information on the world at our hands like Mae in the book, but

no vantage point to dialogize that information into knowledge. Hereby, we can no longer conceive the idea of public be it in geographically defined spaces or abstractly conceived realms, spheres, or domains, we lack the space for encounters with "the other", a space for lexis (speech) and praxis (action) and for a collective experience. Hence, Circle for us is not exceptional but part of our normality in our age. Once again science fiction predicts our future becoming the reality by means of our technological transformations.

All these I recount, are just a few examples of how the concerns that underlie the Circle then, is long standing in our information driven and visually-mediated societies. I think this is how one must read the Circle in order to understand the ongoing social transformations in which techno-scientific knowledge, technological "progress", and capitalist state of mind support each other in deeply fixed configurations. Today, logic of transparency has been articulating and entering into a series of everyday practices in our world. Indeed, it is these transformations that we are able to grasp and understand them through the manifestations of privacy debates, surveillance practices and so on. Hence, "whoever connects transparency only with corruption and the freedom of information has failed to recognize its scope. Transparency is a systemic compulsion gripping all social processes and subjecting them to a deep-reaching change. Today's social system submits all its processes to the demand for transparency in order to operationalize and accelerate them" (Han, 2015, last accessed 14th December 2018).

Writing well in advance of the emergence of new media technologies in our lives, it is Henri Lefebvre maybe who explains our current epoch best:

> Information ideologues assert that society and the social are being transformed, and that a qualitative leap is about to occur. They also believe that information technology is necessary and sufficient to establish new norms and values. Which ones? The end of opacity and impenetrability - and hence transparency! If we credit these ideologues, the information society will finally realize the Truth. Not in the manner of the philosophers, as thought and abstract system, but as reality and practical system. No more secrecy! Anything that happens, anything that supervenes, will immediately reverberate in the totality with all its details. In short, a universal game of mirrors, finally materialized! An effect of signs, finally totalized! (Lefebvre, 2008, p.146)

In this chapter, I made use of the analysis of The Circle to explicate my arguments. Initially, I argued, there is no space impervious, unattended, non-transparent from the dominant logic of the transparency today. I also asserted that in our world, the disappearance of first and foremost the public and later the private transformed the possibilities of social interaction

and public dialogue. In doing that, I paid attention to the rhetoric and promises of transparency to see, how transparency today resonates with narratives of liberalism. I also tried to elaborate on the ways, in which transparency gives shape to our thinking, creating in its wake new ways of being and new nets of control. Secondly I argued that, the analysis of The Circle provides the contemporary day metaphor for understanding the wider social, economic and political restricting processes as well as transformations we are currently witnessing in our societies. This thesis however is not an attempt to end a conversation but start one. Most of the studies undertaken are based on consumer behavior, governmental transparency and civil rights implications when it comes to researching transparency. The exploration that the thesis sets out, proves that it is even more relevant today to study the implications of enlarging of transparency regime into the domains of our societal lives. Therefore, this thesis fosters further attempts to discover this concept.

CONCLUSION

As of October 2017, British multinational telecommunications conglomerate Vodafone, which is one of the largest telco in the world with over 400 million connections and customers across 36 countries, announced a significant evolution of its branding positioning strategy and visual identity. Since the introduction of the "Power to You" strapline in 2009 and the 'speech mark' logo in 1998-one of the most recognizable symbols of Vodafone- this is the first major change in the company's history. As indicated in their website, "the strategy is designed to underline Vodafone's belief that new technologies and digital services will play a positive role in transforming society and enhancing individual quality of life over the years ahead" (Vodafone,2018). The new strapline of the company also goes along with this utopian vision: "The future is exciting. Ready?". There is one more important thing however Vodafone tells us and it is related with its new speech mark logo, which is designed as transparent. The logo now appears as in a new 2D design in place of a skeuomorphic 3D approach, although they keep the speech mark shape, now it is hollow. Vodafone uses the logo as the central graphical focus overlaying it on all its marketing communications activities.

Should we be the least but surprised then, the changes in the telecommunications company are not limited to changes in its branding. Not long ago, Vodafone also announced it new "V for Vodafone Products" which consists of several types of devices and home appliances, among them are V-Kids Watch, where parents can see where their children are with GPS tracking, V-Home which makes your home smart and safe, or state of the art, weather proof, night vision V-Camera, with motion and sound detection alerts. When these taken into account, it can be also said, Vodafone not only makes a major shift in its branding strategy by pushing its new logo onto the market, but it also acclaims the position that: Let us delve into these changing times together, let us lead you into it: "The future is transparent, Are you ready?"

Vodafone example can be regarded of a localized example of a much larger tendency in the very fiber of our modern media networks and has obviously broader implications for the scope of our societal lives. The degree to which the terms of for instance, digital

transformation, transparency, a better society take its root in the popular imagination, whether in the rhetoric of the industry or in the vocabulary of public insiders, is partly the result of these discursive work. Indeed, these rhetoric, promises and methodologies that fused into complex propositions of our lives, now span much of the terrain of our ordinary experiences. Today "we live in a world of images and sound bites. The electronic media are to us what "nature "was to earlier times. That is to say, the electronic media are the inescapable back ground against which we live our lives and from which we derive our references and meanings" (Shaviro, 2003, p.64). Undeniably, ours is a world where clusters of business units with capacities of global mapping, home automation systems, autonomous gadgets, VR headsets, machine learning, miniaturization of sensors, wearable devices produce our experiences of everyday life unlike any we have ever known, not to mention they play an intimate role in the lives of numbers of people.

Google is not only an internet server we go search for things we do not know anymore or an advertising revenue. Google and its parent company Alphabet today are pushing into entirely new areas from genomics to healthcare. Google today claims " to create radical technologies to solve some of the world's hardest problems", and if at any point comes across with criticism it pushes out Google critics at Google-funded think tank. Similarly, Amazon today is not only a transportation company, but it can tell a lot about your grocery market data by delivering food into your house and turning your home into a smart home. Add to all this, Amazon taking employee monitoring to the next level by patenting for a radio-frequency wristband system its warehouse workers could wear that would ring to alert the bosses know when they are reaching for the right places. Microsoft's work on invisible technologies on the skin in the Tattio Project is similar with these tendencies of the telecommunication industries to acquire different sectors of life into their own domains, as does also Apple's attempts to get blood oxygenation, heart rate and body temperature via its Earbuds. This shows us that, today, these companies not only take advantage of a staggering business opportunity, but they pose to have profound impact upon shaping the infrastructure of our lives, becoming the social fabric of what we breathe, where it becomes hard to avoid them or to get off the grid of their coverage area. Thanks to these, as the prominent new media

theorist Scott Lash (2007) suggests, we can no longer think of our lives as mediated by information and software, but that they are increasingly constituted by or comprised of them. "What was a medium … has become a thing, a product' (Lash, 2007,p.18) says Lash. Our society is not primarily a society in which "the production of information displaces the production of good. It is also not primarily a society in which knowledge or information becomes the most important factor of production. It is instead an order in which the principle of 'society' becomes displaced by the principle of 'information'. An order in which sociality becomes displaced by a certain 'informationality'" (Lash, 2002, p.75).

This is precisely the reason why the privacy concerns of our age or the threats to privacy posed by these telecommunication conglomerates cannot be overcome by basic law enforcement or EU regulations, since the fundamental problems lays within deeper. I believe, levelling down these discussions to purely and simply to privacy and onto the individual level don't offer much help in explaining the multiple intertwining of power in our modern capitalist societies. Dealing with Mark Zuckerberg's Facebook, Jeff Bezos' Amazon, Sundar Pichai's Google detached from the wider social phenomena and thinking that the real oppression is not social but technical obscures rather than reflects the complexity of the issue. Hence in this thesis I tried to put forward the case that these people and these companies are just material manifestations of a culture that demand all our actions visible, viewable and traceable, where even the very idea of public and private ceases to extinct. In other words, my main motivation during the study was to call out to euphemisms and show that the present day transformations we are currently witnessing in our societies are caused by a partnership in the power system that functions as an oversight. This partnership also brings about new ways of being subjects, new ways of engineering control and new mediated intimacies with implications for the scope of our social relationships.

Once again, in this thesis I wanted to show that the transformations we are currently witnessing in our societies is on the basis of the power on which the surveillance is the sole means to a secure world and connection and sharing makes sense only when allotted to neoliberal market. For this reason, privacy or surveillance debates should not be considered on its own, but it should be read with practices that open up possibilities for it. To conclude

I would like to remark one more time that rhetoric and promises of the transparency give shape to today's thinking under the conditions defined by the contemporary constitution of capitalism and works as a way of reordering social reality. All these I tried to recount,

are just a few examples of how difficult it is becoming to struggle against the dominant reasoning of transparency invading sectors of our social lives, to stand up, but also to have the right to disappear, to be forgotten in the information age**.** In the present day circumstances**,** together all of these phenomena I tried to explain earlier, are producing and will continue to produce sweeping transformations in almost every realm of existence.

SOURCES

Allmer, T. 2014, 'Social Networking Sites in the Surveillance Society: critical perspectives and empirical findings' in A. Jannson and M. Christensen (ed.), *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social perspectives*. New York, Peter Lang Inc.

Arendt, H. 1998, *The human condition*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Awad, N. and Krishnan, M. 2006, 'The Personalization Privacy Paradox: An Empirical Evaluation of Information Transparency and the Willingness to Be Profiled Online for Personalization', *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 1, p.13.

Balakrishnan, A., Salinas, S. and Hunter, M. 2018, 'Mark Zuckerberg has been talking about privacy for 15 years — here's almost everything he's said', *[online] CNBC*, 21 March, viewed 14 December 2018, https://www.cnbc.com/2018/03/21/facebook-ceo-mark-zuckerbergs-statements-on-privacy-2003-2018.html

Bauman, Z. 1999, *In search of politics*. Oxford, Polity.

Bauman, Z. 2000, *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. 2002, *Individualization: institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: SAGE.

Birchall, Clara. 2014, 'Radical Transparency?', *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp.77-88.

Blatterer, H. 2010, 'Social Networking, Privacy, and the Pursuit of Visibility' in H. Blatterer, P. Johnson and M. Markus (ed.), *Modern Privacy: Shifting Boundaries*, *New Forms*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Brin, D. 1998, *The transparent society : will technology force us to choose between privacy and freedom?* Reading, Mass., Perseus Books.

Brock, G. 2016, *The Right to be Forgotten - Privacy and the Media in the Digital Age*. London, I.B.Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Calhaun, C. 2013, The Problematic Public: Revisiting Dewey, Arendt and Habermas. The Tanner Lectures in Human Values. Delivered at University of Michigan, April 11,2013.

Calvert, C. 2009, *Voyeur nation*. Boulder, CO, Basic Books.

Campbell, J. and Carlson, M. 2002, 'Panopticon.com: Online Surveillance and the Commodification of Privacy', *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 46, no.4, pp.586-606.

Castells, M. 2000a, *The rise of the network society*. Cambridge, Mass., Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, M. 2000b, 'Materials for an explanatory theory of network society', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 51, no.1, pp.5-24.

Chakraborty, R., Vishik, C. and Rao, H. 2013, 'Privacy preserving actions of older adults on social media: Exploring the behavior of opting out of information sharing', *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 55, no.4, pp.948-956.

Debord, G. 2005, *Society of spectacle*, London, Aldgate Press.

Deleuze, G. 1992, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', viewed 14 December 2018, http://www.jstor.org/stable/778828?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

d'Entreves, M. 2006, 'Hannah Arendt (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)', viewed 14 December 2018, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/arendt/.

Dörr, D. and Weaver, R. 2012, *The right to privacy in the light of media convergence: perspectives from three continents*, 3rd edn, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co. .

Eggers, D. 2013, *The Circle*, New York, Vintage Books, a division of Random House LLC.

Ellison, N., Vitak, J., Steinfield, C., Gray, R. and Lampe, C. 2011, 'Negotiating Privacy Concerns and Social Capital Needs in a Social Media Environment' in S. Trepte and L. Reinecke (ed.), *Online perspectives on privacy and self-disclosure in the social web.* New York, Springer.

Foucault, M., Senellart, M. and Burchell, G. 2008, *The birth of biopolitics: lectures at the College de France*, *1978-79*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Fuchs, C. 2012, 'The Political Economy of Privacy on Facebook', *Television & New Media*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp.139-159.

Habermas, J. 1992, *The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

Han, B.-C. 2015, *The Transparency Society*, Stanford, California, Stanford Briefs.

Holmes, D. 1997, *Virtual Politics: Identity and Community in Cyberspace*, SAGE, London.

HuffPost. 2010. 'Google CEO On Privacy: 'If You Have Something You Don't Want Anyone To Know, Maybe You Shouldn't Be Doing It'', *HuffPost,* 18 March, viewed 14 December 2018, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/12/07/google-ceo-on-privacy if_n_383105.html.

Koskela, H. 2002, 'Webcams, TV Shows and Mobile phones: Empowering Exhibitionism', *Surveillance & Society*, vol. 2, no.2/3.

Krasnova, H., Spiekermann, S., Koroleva, K. and Hildebrand, T. 2010, 'Online social networks: why we disclose', *Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 25, no.2, pp.109-125.

Lash, S. 2002, *Critique of information.* London; Thousand Oaks, Calif., SAGE.

Lee, K. 2016, 'Making cents of contemporary intimacies: The private in the public' in Marshall, P. D., D'cruz, G., Mcdonald, S., and Lee, K (ed.), *Contemporary Publics:*

Shifting Boundaries in New Media, Technology and Culture. London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Lewis, K., Kaufman, J. and Christakis, N. 2008, 'The Taste for Privacy: An Analysis of College Student Privacy Settings in an Online Social Network', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, vol.14, no.1, pp.79-100.

Livingstone, S. 2008, 'Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression', *New Media & Society*, vol.10, no.3, pp.393-411.

Lyon, D. 2003, *Surveillance as social sorting: privacy, risk, and digital discrimination*, New York, Routledge.

Mann, S. and Ferenbok, J. 2013, 'New Media and the power politics of sousveillance in a surveillance-dominated world', *Surveillance & Society*, vol. 11, no. 1/2, pp.18-34.

Marwick, A. and boyd, d. 2014, 'Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media', *New Media & Society*, vol. 16, no.7, pp.1051-1067.

Matthewman, S. 2011, *Technology and social theory*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Meikle, G. 2016, *Social Media: Communication, Sharing and Visibility*, 1st edn, New York, Routledge.

Mendelson, A. and Papacharissi, Z. 2010, 'Look at us: Collective Narcissism in College Student Facebook Photo Galleries' in Z. Papacharissi (ed.), *The Networked Self: Identity, Community and Culture at Social Networking Sites*. New York, Routledge.

Mills, J. 2008, *Privacy: The Lost Right*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Munar, A. 2010, 'Digital Exhibitionism The Age of Exposure', *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp.401-422.

Nissenbaum, H. 2010, *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life,* Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Papacharissi, Z. 2010, *A Private Sphere: Democracy in a Digital Age*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Park, N., Jin, B. and Annie Jin, S. 2011, 'Effects of self-disclosure on relational intimacy in Facebook', *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 27, no.5, pp.1974-1983.

Read, J. 2009, 'A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity', *Foucault Studies*, no. 6, pp. 25–36.

Reich, S., Subrahmanyam, K. and Espinoza, G. 2012, 'Friending, IMing, and hanging out face-to-face: Overlap in adolescents' online and offline social networks', *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 48, no.2, pp.356-368.

Robins, K. 1996, *Into the image : culture and politics in the field of vision*, New York, Routledge.

Schmidt, E. and Cohen, J. 2013, *The new digital age: reshaping the future of people, nations and business,* New York, Alfred A. Knopf.

Shaviro, Steven. 2003, *Connected: Or What It Means to Live in the Network Society,* University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota.

Solove, D. 2004, *The Digital Person: Technology and Privacy in the Information Age,* New York and London, New York University Press.

Soysal, L. 2010, 'Intimate Engagements of the Public Kind', *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol. 2, p. 393.

Tavani, H. 1999, 'Informational privacy, data mining, and the Internet', *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol.1, pp.137–145.

Terranova, T. 2004, *Network culture: politics for the information age,* London, Pluto Press.

Thelwall, M. 2008, 'Social networks, gender, and friending: An analysis of MySpace member profiles', *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 59, no.8, pp.1321-1330.

Tüfekçi, Z. 2012, 'We Were Always Human' in Whitehead N.L. (ed.), *Human No More : Digital Subjectivities, Un-Human Subjects, and the End of Anthropology*. Boulder, University Press of Colorado.

Urry, J. 2000, *Sociology beyond societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*, New York, Routledge.

Zarsky, Tal. Z. 2004, 'Thinking Outside the Box: Considering Transparency, Anonymity, and Pseudonymity as Overall Solutions to the Problems of Information Privacy in the Internet Society', *University of Miami Law Review*, vol. 58, no. 4.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information
Name Surname   : Özgü Hazal Ertaş

Education and Training
Bachelor Degree   : Ankara University, Faculty of Communication (2011-2016)
Master Degree   : Kadir Has University, Communication Studies (2016-2018)
Other language(s)   : English

Work Experience
Workplace and
Date of Employment   : Kadir Has University, Research Assistant (2017-Present)

Contact Details
E-mail   : hazalertasa@gmail.com