

KOÇ

An Analysis of the Concept of Surveillance in terms of Minority Report Movie

Erdem KOÇ

Abstract

Contemporary modern surveillance, its power, effects and discipline concepts are determined by Michel Foucault's Panopticon theory. Panopticon is a kind of jail architecture which was designed by Jeremy Bentham in late 18th century. This jail has a special structure which enables watching the prisoner's cells from one point. While the guard's centre can see the all sides, prisoner's can't see the inside of guard point thus the prisoners all the time have the feeling of being watched. This situation causes prisoners to internalize the sovereign power and supplies the autocontrol system with minimum human power. Modern surveillance units of our age are revealed in Minority Report.

Key Words: *Surveillance, Panopticon, Prison, Power, Movie, Society*

Özet

Günümüzün modern gözetleme, gücün yapısı ve disiplin kavramları Michel Foucault'un Panoptikon analizinde ortaya konmuştur. Panoptikon 18.yy'ın sonlarında Jeremy Bentham tarafından dizayn edilmiş bir hapisane mimarisidir. Bu hapisane, bütün mahkûm hücrelerinin tek bir noktadan izlenebilmesi olanağı veren bir yapıdadır. Gardiyanın bulunduğu merkezi bölüm her noktayı görürken, mahkûmlar gözetleme noktasının içini görememektedirler ve bu yüzden her an gardiyanlar tarafından izlendikleri hissi taşımaktadırlar. Bu durum hapisane içerisinde güç yapısının mahkûmlarca içselleştirilmesini ve herhangi bir fazladan insan gücü sağlamadan mahkûmlar arasında otokontrol sistemi sağlamaktadır. Çağımızın modern gözetleme üniteleri ise Minority Report filminde gözler önüne serilmektedir.

KOÇ

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Gözetleme, Panoptikon, Hapishane, İktidar, Film, Toplum*

Introduction

In the information society, the whole society has become the subject of control and its inseparable partner, surveillance. “The power of technical control over nature is extended today directly to society” (Habermas, 1971: 56). What happens in the information society different from the past is the increase of control and surveillance via new technologies. Surveillance and control are not limited within the boundaries of the labor process but diffuse to all aspects of life. Therefore, Lyon (2001) sees information societies as also surveillance societies. Here, all people in the society are potentially subject to surveillance. While there were discipline and correction through confinement in Foucault and in Fordism, surveillance societies in the post-Fordist period deals with continuous control without confinement through tracking people in all fields of life.

This process is not performed by a single entity as the nation-state or the managers unlike the case of Fordist mode of production, but by several entities, such as states, small or large corporations, transnational firms, professional associations and even private households. In the current society, “rather than being concentrated in the hands of a few, disciplinary power appears nearly everywhere, dispersed, and fragmented” (Staples, 2000: 26). The dispersion of surveillance and control to every individual and to every field of life is achieved by means of information and communication technologies as computers, mobile phones, closed-circuit TV (CCTV) cameras, smart cards, satellites, GPS-based locational technologies, and the Internet.

Thus, Marcuse (2002) has right in considering technology as a form of social control and domination. In order to strengthen their hegemony over the society and to maintain rationality in which everything/everyone is visible and controllable, power holders need to track individuals under the names of crime/risk prevention and efficiency.

The reason of taking precaution helps power to maintain rationality which is based on safety, serenity and welfare. Actually, power aims to ensure both domination over the society and strengthen its authority on the society. Weber defines this situation as “iron cage” of bureaucracy, the principal elements of rationalization. He says “..regarded surveillance as a necessary accompaniment to the increased rationalization of the world” (Ball and Webster, 2003: 11) where people are in the “iron cage” of laws, rules, and regulations.

KOÇ

The leading tool of rationalization, that is, of achieving predictability and control, is the tracking of such as workers and employees in the workplace, students in schools, consumers in shopping, users of the Internet and, comprehensively, all individuals in the society. Feenberg (1995: 11) states that “rationalization is our modern horizon, and technological design is the key to its effectiveness as the basis of modern hegemonies”. The authority still intends to keep people under control not merely through bureaucratization and rules and laws accompanying it, but through technological tools. Although means have changed, rationalization is still the main character of contemporary life. Thus, surveillance practices have been given much importance in order to reach a predictable and controllable environment.

In today’s world, state agencies and private corporations have the capacity to track individuals and to record their personal data through ICTs, more concretely, through surveillance and control technologies, such as CCTV monitoring, biometrics, chip-embedded smart cards, and also the Internet. The monitoring of individuals is not a new phenomenon although it is considered together with the development information and communication technologies in the late twentieth and in the twenty-first centuries.

One of the earliest forms of watching was the neighborhood gaze in order to be sure whether neighbors are good people or they are harmful to the environment and to the common life. It was, and also is, necessary for the security of the community. In addition to such attempts for the safety of the social life, there was also the gaze of people in order to maintain and strengthen social order. In this case, people watched and controlled -as also seen in the current society- themselves and others in order to make everyone obey the rules, traditions, and customs.

Previously, the state agencies kept several records of individuals, and also the private companies did. For example, in addition to surveillance and control over workers, the voting lists, the tax files, and medical records of citizens were written down by related state officials. Besides, the employee numbers and their information were also recorded by both state agencies and private companies.

The turning point of keeping records of individuals was the computerization in the late twentieth century. The computerization of surveillance has given more capacity and power to monitor people. Before the computerization and digitization of surveillance and control, the

KOÇ

monitoring and control activity were realized through face-to-face control. Besides, wiretapping, eavesdropping devices and other techniques of monitoring were used by espionage agents of the states throughout the history. Whether declared or not, the main aim was to prevent risks and to provide social order.

Although keeping records of citizens was largely witnessed in the nation states in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is not peculiar to that period. For example, “recorded counts of population for conscription or for taxation occurred in ancient societies such as the Roman Empire” (Lyon, 2007: 30) in order to get and store information about people. By this way, people were categorized according to their wealth, education, social status, and other dimensions.

As for nation states, in addition to such measures of sorting of people, the census, registration of births and deaths, taxation records, voting lists, and data of criminals have been the forms of systematic surveillance over the society. As for the working life, monitoring for capitalist endeavors was such as recording workers and employees, and their wages and performances. Surveillance as we understand it today emerged with the nation states, modern bureaucracies, and the capitalist enterprises. On the other hand, the measures of surveillance and control in today’s world have become technological and computerized, and their use has gone beyond the abovementioned means.

What is different today from the surveillance in the previous times is the widespread use of technologies and the systematic and institutional structure and functioning of surveillance. Not only in the past but also in today’s world, security and social order are the initial goals of the states. Power always needs to know every event and to get information about every potential threat in the society. Otherwise, it is thought that struggle against risks and uncertainties would be impossible. In order to eliminate uncertainty and spontaneity and to be ready against potential threats, power needs an all-seeing and all knowing eye. This role is performed by surveillance and control technologies through providing a rationality which forms a visible, predictable, and controllable environment.

While a broad definition of surveillance is the close observation of a person or a group of persons, it does not meet the structure and features of surveillance in today’s world. Lyon (2001: 2) defines surveillance as “...any collection and processing of personal data, whether identifiable or not, for the purposes of influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered”. Surveillance, in this wise, involves the systematic monitoring of people in every

KOÇ

field of life and the collection of data about all their actions and communications for the purpose of controlling and managing them by whether governmental agencies or private corporations in accordance with specified goals. These goals are the goals of capitalism, more broadly, of power, which work to cement people to the status quo and to enforce the domination of power over individuals and over the society.

The state has been the most influential figure and has had a considerable role in the practice of surveillance. States have used several measures to keep their citizens under gaze and control in order to strengthen its power and to maintain social order in the society. Other than ideological means as the media which are very influential in today's world, states, previously, mostly benefitted from the coercive functioning of state apparatuses as bureaucracy and/or army. These apparatuses of the state have surveilled and controlled the citizens according to the will of the state, of power, to ensure the hegemony and to augment domination of power over the society.

Such a case was taken into account by Orwell (1987) as a dystopia. In this regard, he portrayed, in his novel 1984, the most conspicuous picture in which total surveillance-and-control society was described. He narrated the state, the society, the individuals, and their relations in Oceania, one of three countries in the world. The State uses several watching and listening devices in order to keep people under its gaze and control. For example, there are eavesdropping devices hidden behind the pictures on the walls of people's houses and hidden inside tree branches. There is also telescreen, a kind of a television, through which not only people watch and listen declarations of the State, of the so-called Big Brother, but also Big Brother watches every action of the person inside the house even if the telescreen is not open.

In Orwell's dystopia, a totalitarian state was described, in which all people are subject to coercive means of surveillance by Big Brother whether inside or outside their houses and have no chance to question and challenge the structure and functioning of power and of these measures. While considering the practice of surveillance described by Orwell, it can be claimed that today's society surrounded by new technologies goes beyond Orwell's dystopia in that current power holders have more opportunities and a lot of technologies, such as cameras, biometrics, smart cards, mobile phones, and satellites, to monitor people in all spheres of life.

While Foucault presented a social reality, Orwell narrated a dystopia in which a totalitarian state, the Big Brother, monitored, controlled, and manipulated actions and even thoughts of

KOÇ

people. Thus, “whereas Orwell’s vision could be viewed as a „possible but preventable future” ... Foucault’s Panopticon often appears as imminent and inevitable” (Lyon, 1994: 204). This is because the institutions discussed by Foucault in the case of the Panopticon do not function in the same manner as in the case of the Big Brother in Orwell. While there is no chance of challenge in Orwell’s dystopia due to coercive institutions as army and police, there is the chance of objection but also paranoia due to the comprehensive existence and functioning of surveillance practices in all fields of life.

On the other hand, disciplinary societies and the sites of confinement of Foucault were no longer the case of the twentieth century. The most influential criticism to disciplinary societies came from Deleuze (1992), according to whom, control societies are taking over from disciplinary societies. He asserts that “we are definitely moving toward control societies that are no longer exactly disciplinary no longer operate by confining people but through continuous control and instant communication” (Deleuze, 1990: 174). Paranoia of being constantly monitored has much been instilled into the conscious of people because there is no longer confinement to train individuals, but allseeing eyes everywhere to surveil and control them continuously.

Confinement has no longer been the leading means of the institutions since late the twentieth century, since the development and extensive use of information and communication technologies. Rather than centralized disciplinary mechanisms which train individuals in order to create good -that is, good for the will of power- students, workers, and, finally, loyal and docile citizens, control societies have performed several forms of “free-floating control” (Deleuze, 1992) in all aspects of life in accordance with the same goal. For example, the education is not limited with the school-term period of children but expands to every level of human life; the media, for instance, are the area in which people are continuously being educated or, say, influenced and even manipulated through presenting standardized opinions and standardized forms of lifestyles.

Panopticon and Surveillance

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore the relationship between; 1.) systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation and, 2.) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge comes from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events

KOÇ

recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility - a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behaviour is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviours he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that "by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process" (Foucault 1977).

For Foucault, the real danger was not necessarily that individuals are repressed by the social order but that they are "carefully fabricated in it" (Foucault, 1977), and because there is a penetration of power into the behaviour of individuals. Power becomes more efficient through the mechanisms of observation, with knowledge following suit, always in search of "new objects of knowledge over all the surfaces on which power is exercised" (Foucault, 1977).

Minority Report Movie

Minority Report is a film directed by Steven Spielberg and scripted after a short story by science-fiction author Phillip K. Dick. It tells the well-known tale of one who believes in the perfection and legitimacy of the system, until inevitably he himself becomes its victim. Tom Cruise plays John Anderton, chief of a special police unit, that in the Washington of a near future is conducting a field experiment, in the center of which are the so called 'Pre-Cogs' – humans, who are capable of telling future crimes, which, as the film rightly suggests, for them is rather a curse than a gift. But with their help, crime rate has dropped to zero, because Tom Cruise and his high-tech special 'Pre-Crime' unit can prevent crimes before they are de facto committed. On its surface the film reflects the philosophical question about whether a person can be punished for a crime he or she has not yet committed. But philosophical speculations on moral antinomies are quickly put aside, when Anderton himself suddenly turns up on the list of future criminals. The film then follows the conventional topoi of pursued innocence, of the hunters and the hunted, who is willing to risk all in order to proof not only that he is innocent, but also to reveal who is behind all this, who has set him up. Anderton is convinced he is not guilty, because he does not even know the person he is supposed to kill within the

KOÇ

next 48 hours. The audience is led to believe that he was framed. While the Ex-Cop on the run is hunted ruthlessly by his former colleagues, the film sketches out the portrait of a society under total surveillance. The police deploy a huge array of surveillance technology, including cameras, heat sensors, extensive electronic databases, biometrical access control and even little robot spiders that can spy into the most remote corners of a building. However, the movie *Minority Report* doesn't stop at this Orwellian picture of the all-seeing, all-knowing state. It goes further than this. Private corporate enterprises seem to have even more power of controlling every citizen's movements or consumer habits. When Anderton, still on the run, walks past a 'smart' billboard, the irises in his eyes are automatically scanned and so his identity is biometrically verified. "John Anderton, you look like you could use a Guinness!" the talking billboard calls out to him. The hunted one has no choice but to take the path of Oedipus, the blind visionary of Greek mythology. He has his eyeballs surgically removed and replaced by the pair of a different person. Since he knows the surveillance system and its technologies and has worked for the police, Anderton for a while manages to stay one step ahead of his pursuers. But he doesn't manage to escape from fate: He really kills the person, and in exactly the same way as the 'pre-cogs' have predicted. He knows technology, but he doesn't know himself. The message of the movie: Technology doesn't fail. It is humans that fail. That is precisely Anderton's dilemma. He trusts a system, which threatens his life and has put him into an inescapable situation. In the end, he finally escapes and uncovers the plot that had been laid against him, because he stills believes the predictions the pre-cogs make. He succeeds, as soon as he starts using the surveillance system against his enemies. He never attacks it directly – rather, he implodes the Kammerer: *Video Surveillance in Hollywood Movies Surveillance & Society 2(2/3) 470* system by uncovering the inherent antinomies and contradictions, that have always been at once the conditions of the working of the system and, finally, it's undoing. The 'System' itself does not make any mistakes, only the human interpreters, who have not learned to read the images properly. In the interpretation of the images, they used a narrative logic, where a 'logic of the image' should have been applied.

Concept Of Surveillance in Minority Report Movie

While the concept of surveillance is determined as permeating the private life, this concept is moved one step forward in *Minority Report* movie and the mechanism of surveillance is at the level of analysing someones possible future attitudes and punishing in advance. In this dream

KOÇ

world, talented people can see the future crimes and thus prevent the possible negative facts which may harm the society. Minority Report movie emphasises the phenomenon of surveillance which restricts the individual freedom and social pressure. The movie tries to show that a semi-utopic world can be established with the help of preliminary detection of crimes in terms of surveillance. But the system which is based on *colonization of the subconscious*, collapses again due to the human fault.

Surveillance and justice elements are the basics of Minority Report movie. Due to overdose surveillance, there is almost no privacy in human life. Another determining element of the movie is surveillance is not only practiced by the official authority but also civilian authorities. (Kammerer, 2004: 468). This case is obviously seen in two scenes of the movie; in the first scene, while Anderton (Tom Cruise) is trying to escape from his followers the picture is shown in different angles; side profil and overhead shot. These scenes are trying to prove that it is impossible to escape while living in the World of surveillance. In the second scene, while Anderton is being an eye surgery in order to escape from surveillance. This scene shows how the civilian surveillance in shopping centres are in advance.

According to Benjamin Muller, “ *It is possible to evaluate the politic institutions in Minority Report movie. Industry’s elements and policies are taken into considerartion in Hollywood Films within the subject of biometrical technologies and it is praised.* ”(Muller 2004:286) Michael Shapiro handles this issue from different point of view. According to his definition, the protagonist’s (John Anderton) having a painful eye surgery to avoid retinal-based identification symbolizes a person who tries to avoid from being a destructive character; “*Anderton wants to change his body into surveillance system... Thus he has a self-evasive charecter. When the police’s first attempt to catch him, he says everyone escapes and then he runs. This indicates the escaping from coding system and its elements.*” (2005:30)

According to Shapiro, Anderton’s body scene at the beginnig of the film, symbolizes the surveillance mechanism of the power.

“Minority Report” movie describes a total surveillance society in which all people are under constant surveillance and control. And authorities want to control the future in addition to the current time. While potential crimes are foreseen by three psychics called as precogs, every current action of individuals is seen by authorities through, for example, iris-scanning devices. These devices, located everywhere such as on the subway, have the capacity to identify all

KOÇ

individuals. Iris, thus, has become the ID of the individual, which means that one's escape from tracking is only possible through removing his/her eyes, as witnessed in the movie. In addition, as presented in the movie, people continue their daily lives with iris trackers all around the city as if these devices are natural parts of their lives; for example, they are iris-scanned for identification not merely in workplaces, public transportations, or official buildings by biometrics-equipped cameras, but also in their own houses by spider robots at any time. The issues handled in this movie can be regarded as the signs of an Orwellian State, in which the Big Brother has a considerable and effective technology and power to spy on their citizens everywhere and every time, and to control them constantly. Here, it is implied that people feel themselves weak and desperate against the surveillance and against the power behind the surveillance structure. In the movie, surveillance system which has an all-seeing and all-knowing power is not only the fact of the science-fiction, but is also presented as the realities of our daily lives. The movie implies that surveillance exists in the current society for public safety and for the benefit of all people. Live safety through surrounded by cameras and live safety under the constant surveillance of power, in short, live "safety in prison" (Goldsmith, 2006). Besides, *Minority Report* movie implies that living with surveillance devices around us is not an exceptional case of the human nature, but is a usual condition of the current society.

Function of the Surveillance

In today's world, the surveillance mechanism is serving a lot of positive aims; like, creation of secure areas, protecting of valuable things and our loved ones. Wherever people may go, they are always under surveillance. At first glance, this situation seems bona fide and useful for society, but due to the extreme surveillance mechanism it started to have negative consequences on society.

The basic aim of the surveillance is to prevent possible crimes in advance. But later on, it causes disappearance of private life which is guaranteed by the law and society start to have a worried and anxious type of mood. Because they start to have a feeling that any act or any word may turn them as a threat. Thus, people start to develop an autocontrol mechanism in order to avoid from it.

Surveillance is started with Panopticon and developed with *Minority Report*. Baudrillard describes this situation like this;

KOÇ

“ Masses change directions of all the things in blocks and transforms it into display which are sent to them. No other code is required for his. They don't have a problem like meaning. They do not resist. They prefer to shift everything into a formless lump of meaningless and into a circle of stimuli that spans all directions” (Baudrillard,2006).

Surveillance concept has reached to the peak with the Minority Report movie. Today, with the help of the growing technology, people are under surveillance at buildings, offices, airports, schools, shopping centres and almost everywhere through security cameras and electronic identity cards. At first glance, it seems that these surveillance are practiced due to security reasons but dramatically these performances eliminates the privacy in personal life and reveal people's choices. For example, Migros markets customer cards seems that they supply discounts and special advantages to their loyal customers, but with the help of this magnetic card, Migros company can observe their customers shopping frequency and shopping trends. So, Migros company has create a type of surveillance and supervise centre in itself.

This type of surveillance is considered as “usual” by the majority of the society, on the other hand some group of people think that this is a problematic situation in terms of privacy and even they prefer to move to rural areas in order to live a pastoral type of life. According to George Simmel, *“The deepest problems of modern life arise from the effort of the individual to protect his or her own existence independence and individuality, against the dominant forces of society, against the weight of historical heritage, external cultures and life techniques.”(Simmel, 2003).*

Surveillance in Popular Culture

Popular culture, through movies, TV shows, series, and even games, leads to the emergence of individuals who are subject to the indoctrinations of dominant ideology, of power; this is because popular culture introduces standardization and pseudo-individuation to human life (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1996). To clarify, products of popular culture present us standardized forms of opinions and lifestyles which are imposed according to the will of power. As also pointed out by Marcuse (2002: 52-53), “a rising standard of living is the almost unavoidable by-product of the politically manipulated industrial [or, say, information] society”. Power wants individuals and the masses think, decide, and live in accordance with these standard forms. To concretize, in almost all TV series, for example, in Turkey, the existing social relations, the existing relations of production, the specified function of woman

KOÇ

in the society, the superiority of social order over liberties and over challenges are broadcasted and presented in the same manner, in the viewpoint of dominant ideology. Furthermore, such indoctrinations of popular culture "...impede the development of autonomous, independent individuals who judge and decide consciously for themselves" (Held, 2007: 106). This case is the cause of pseudo-individuation which means that the individual is open to the manipulation of the popular culture, thus, of power. Besides, this is the individual who does not criticize, challenge, and/or question these manifestations of power which function to create obedient people.

In addition to such outcomes of popular culture, it also has an effect and function in the "production of consent" (Hall et al, 1978). In order to get the consent of the masses, fields of popular culture function ideologically in the legitimization of surveillance technologies. In movies, TV shows, and series, several surveillance techniques are used in order to present that these techniques are usual issues in the current society and that people can potentially be tracked at anytime and anywhere. Mathiesen (2006), in this issue, points out another notion in the discussion of panopticism concerning the media: synopticism. While panoptical surveillance means that the few watch the many, synopticism means that the many watch the few. He mentions that the media have this synoptical structure through which manifestations of the few, of power, are reached to the many. In this context, reality TV shows are one example where synopticism is witnessed. The masses watch behaviors and even personalities of one or more individuals. Thus, as declared by Mathiesen, we live in "the viewer society" where the many see the few. Mathiesen takes into account the complementary relation between the media and the surveillance technologies; he sees the functioning of the synoptical surveillance, of the programs via the media as "means or potential means of power in society" (Mathiesen, 2006: 48).

There are reality shows on the TV, the examples of the viewer society, which are designed on the basis of the practice of surveillance. Various formats of Big Brother in various countries are one of the basic examples concerning reality shows in which viewers watch all actions, behaviors, speeches, and, thus, personalities presented to them. For instance, TV shows as various Big Brother programs in different countries, such as "Biri Bizi Gözetliyor" in Turkey, portray, in a way, the relation between the mass media and the concept of surveillance. They all imply us that surveillance is a natural and usual phenomenon in the human life and in the

KOÇ

social life, that it does not erode privacy as seen on the screen, and that there is no reason to question the existence and functioning of the surveillance practices in our actual lives.

Similar case is also seen on TV programs, the so-called reality programs broadcasted during the daytime, which present private lives and personal problems of individuals and families. Such programs and viewers' excessive interest on them introduce that this form of surveillance is similar to neighbor surveillance witnessed in all societies. People, interested in the lives of their neighbors, accordingly, show great attention to these programs. In this respect, there occurs the notion of "scopophilia" (Lyon, 2006a), or, in particular, the voyeur gaze, which means the love of looking. What is the difference of today's scopophilia in the case of synopticism from that in previous times is its technology-intensive feature; the boundaries of neighborhood gaze have extended so much that people can witness private lives of other ordinary people via the mass media.

The status quo is reinforced, potential objections and challenges are minimized, and self-control of people due to the fear of the all-seeing and all-knowing eye is maintained through the effective functioning of the products of popular culture. They "...serve to enhance political control and to cement mass audience to the status quo" (Held, 2007: 88) through "controlling individual consciousness". Through the effective functioning of not only popular culture but also other institutions in the social life, surveillance and control have introduced as usual, natural, and routine elements of human life and of contemporary society; thus, it has become a culture in living.

Conclusion

It is the fact that several technologies have been employed, in the last decades, not merely to improve economic and social development, but also and more notably to increase surveillance and control over individuals and over the society. While, previously, the criminals and suspects were subject to being tracked, today, whole society has become the subject of surveillance and control practices. Being innocent and harmless does not necessarily lead to the escape from being surveilled.

Surveillance and control and their technologies and practices are regarded by most people as a necessity and precondition of today's so-called risk societies due to the increasing demand of security. Together with the introduction of these technologies into our lives, we have faced with several technologies surveilling us and all our actions.

KOÇ

Children grow up with cameras around them, students are always under the control of their parents and school authorities, employees work with several monitoring measures used as a managerial control and, overall, all individuals live surrounded by cameras and other forms of surveillance every day and every time. In addition to being monitored by the cameras, their personal data are gathered and stored by others while they are using credit cards, mobile phones or loyalty cards of supermarkets, or while surfing in the Internet. Personal data of individuals may easily be reached by anyone; we do not know who use these data how and for what purposes.

As a result, the surveillance element has begun with a sense of curiosity in human nature and has become an inseparable whole with life in the modern age together with social changes and developing technology. The powers that hold power in the social system are constantly scarce of the oversight mechanisms in order to sustain their own hegemony, and they perceived people as the potentials that could put their power in danger and almost overlooked the people by ignoring the boundaries of individual freedoms. This concept, which has become more prevalent in large metropolises where industry and capitalism dominate, and draws people out of their will. Those who do not want to be included in this system within individual preferences and possibilities have moved or looking forward to move to rural areas where there is no great interest.

Works Cited

- Ball, K. and Webster, F. (2003), "The Intensification of Surveillance", in K. Ball and F. Webster (eds.), *The Intensification of Surveillance: Crime, Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Age*, London: Pluto Press, 1-15
- Deleuze, G. (1992), "Postscript on the Societies of Control", *October*, 59, 3-7
- Feenberg, A. (1991), *Critical Theory of Technology*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1971), *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science, and Politics*, London: Heinemann

KOÇ

- Held, D. (2007), Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas, London, Melbourne and Auckland: Hutchinson
- Hoberman, J. (25 Haziran 2002). "[Private Eyes](http://www.villagevoice.com/2002-06-25/film/private-eyes/1/)". villagevoice.com.
- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T. W. (1996), Dialectic of Enlightenment, New York: Continuum
- Jean Baudrillard, ‘‘Sessiz Yığınların Gölgesinde; Toplumsalın Sonu’’, Çev: Oğuz Adanır, Doğubatu Yayınları, Ankara, 2006, s. 42.
- Kammerer, Dietmar, ‘‘Video Surveillance in Hollywood Movies’’. *Surveillance and Society* 2.2/3 (2004): 464-473
- Lyon, D. (2001), Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life, Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press
- Lyon, D. (2007), Surveillance Studies: An Overview, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Marcuse, H. (2002), One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society, London and New York: Routledge
- Mathiesen, T. (2006), ‘‘The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault’s ‘Panopticon’ Revisited’’, in C. Norris and D. Wilson (eds.), Surveillance, Crime and Social Control, Hampshire: Ashgate, 41-60
- Michel Foucault, **Hapishanenin Doğuşu**, Çev. Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay. İmge Kitabevi. 2. Baskı. Ankara 2000, s. 329.
- Michel, Foucault 1977. Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Michael Shapiro, 2005. *Sovereign Lives: Power in Global Politics* Routledge; New edition edition (20 Oct 2005): 142-146
- Muller, Benjamin J., 2004, '(Dis)qualified bodies: securitization, citizenship and 'identity management'', *Citizenship Studies*, 8:3, 279 – 294
- Orwell, G. (1987), Nineteen Eighty-Four, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books
- Simmel, Georg, *Modern Kültürde Çatışma*. Çev: T. Bora, N. Kalaycı, E. Gen, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2003. s 92
- Staples, W. G. (2000), Everyday Surveillance: Vigilance and Visibility in Postmodern Life, New York and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

KOÇ