

Derleme Makale
(Review Article)

Neslihan BULUR¹

Orcid No: 0000-0001-6148-5556

¹ Araştırma Görevlisi, Üsküdar Üniversitesi,
İletişim Fakültesi.

sorumlu yazar: neslihan.bulur@uskudar.edu.tr

Keywords:

Dataism, Algorithm, Data Politics, Data
Colonialism, Neoliberalism.

Anahtar Sözcükler:

Dataizm, Algoritma, Veri Siyaseti, Veri
Sömürgeciliği, Neoliberalizm.

DOI: 10.56118/euifydhd.1070636

Yeni Düşünceler, 2022, 17: 66-81

Dataism As A New Form Of Politics

Yeni Bir Siyaset Biçimi Olarak Dataizm

Alınış (Received): 09.02.2022

Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 13.04.2022

ABSTRACT

Today, when big data technology has made great progress, it is discussed whether algorithms can be used as a mechanism for the social benefit that exceeds human will. The fact that our entire lives are connected to the Internet raises the possibility that algorithms that know us better than ourselves can make better predictions for both individuals and the benefit of society. On the other hand, there are also hesitations that the existence of technology as a technical infrastructure will encompass the whole society as a social benefit. The purpose of this study is to discuss whether algorithms will further marginalize existing unequal social relations at the point of social benefit or will they build an ideal social order as the philosophy of dataism advocates. In the first part of the study, the new power technique that neoliberalism emerged with the developing technology and the effect of this technique on people's consciousness was emphasized. In the second part of the study, it is questioned how the philosophy of dataism, which approaches the dominance of algorithms from a cyber-utopian perspective, will change the way of doing politics. The study is an evaluation article and is based on theoretical analysis.

ÖZ

Büyük veri teknolojisinin büyük gelişme kaydettiği günümüzde dijital teknolojilerin toplumsal fayda konusunda insan iradesini de aşan bir mekanizma olarak kullanılıp kullanılmayacağı tartışılmaktadır. Bu tartışmaların çıkış temelini oluşturan gelişme ise algoritmalar ve yapay zekâ teknolojileridir. Tüm yaşantımızın, hatta kullandığımız eşyaların dahi internete bağlı olması, bizi bizden daha iyi tanıyan algoritmaların, hem bireyler için hem de toplumun yararı için daha iyi öngörülerde bulunabileceği ihtimalini ortaya koymaktadır. Öte yandan teknik altyapı olarak teknolojinin varoluş zemininin, toplumsal fayda olarak tüm toplumu kuşatacağı noktasında tereddütler de vardır. Bu çalışmanın amacı ise, algoritmaların toplumsal fayda noktasında mevcut eşitsiz toplumsal ilişkileri daha da marjinalize mi edeceğini yoksa dataizm felsefesinin savunduğu gibi ideal bir toplumsal düzen mi inşa edeceğini tartışmaktır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, çalışmanın birinci bölümünde neoliberalizmin gelişen teknolojiyle birlikte ortaya çıkardığı yeni iktidar tekniği ve bu tekniğin insanların bilincine etkisi üzerinde durulmuştur. İktidar teknikleri, bir anlamda siyasetin uygulanma biçimine dair de bir ipucu verdiği için birinci bölüm çalışmanın amacına yönelik bir temel oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmanın ikinci bölümünde ise algoritmaların hükümrانlığına siber-ütopyacı bir perspektiften yaklaşan dataizm felsefesinin siyaset yapma biçimini nasıl değiştireceği sorgulanmıştır. Sonuç ve tartışma kısmında ise algoritmaların siyaset, insan iradesi ve toplumsal fayda bağlamında değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışma değerlendirme makalesi olup teorik analize dayanmaktadır.

INTRODUCTION

The main issues that cause the data and algorithms to be discussed on the axis of politics are issues such as the unilateral manipulation of the other party and violating their privacy. This is a social determinist perspective and demonstrates the importance of data in determining the strategies of politicians. In addition, there is a techno-determinist perspective that questions how data changes politics and the way of doing politics, especially when we consider today's big data, algorithms and artificial intelligence technologies. While explaining the relationship between politics and technology, new concepts such as cyber-populism and techno-politics have emerged recently to combine these two perspectives. The point where all these perspectives agree is that data provides an important power in politics. In this direction, in today's world where big data technology has made great progress, it is discussed whether technology can be used as a mechanism for the social benefit that goes beyond human will. The development that forms the basis of these discussions is algorithms and artificial intelligence technologies. The fact that our entire lives, even the items we use, are connected to the internet reveals the possibility that algorithms that know us better than ourselves can make better predictions for both individuals and the benefit of society. On the other hand, there are also hesitations that the existence of technology as a technical infrastructure will encompass the whole society as a social benefit. This study aims is to discuss whether algorithms will further marginalize existing unequal social relations at the point of social benefit or will they provide an ideal social order, as advocated by the philosophy of dataism. For this purpose, in the first part of the study, the new power technique that neoliberalism emerged with the developing technology and the effect of this technique on people's consciousness was emphasized. The first part provides a basis for the purpose of the study, as the power techniques also give a clue about the way politics is implemented. In the second part of the study, it is questioned how the philosophy of dataism, which approaches the dominance of algorithms from a cyber-utopian perspective, will change the way of doing politics. In the conclusion and discussion part, algorithms are evaluated in the context of politics, human will and social benefit. The study is an evaluation article and is based on theoretical analysis.

Neoliberalism and the New Power Technique

The free movement of capital is a mode of operation of neoliberalism; As a political administration, it has a functioning based on democratic order. The fact that the technical infrastructure of the digital media enables the free flow of data also creates a ground that reinforces the free movement of the capital principle of neoliberalism. While this situation creates a new earning area for capitalist institutions/companies; It has also created some discussion areas such as individual freedoms, the future of the phenomenon of public space, and the transformation of the perception of privacy. In particular, it is a matter of debate that what kind of era the neoliberal process has led humanity to, together with the new control mechanisms created by social media. The center around which these discussions are shaped is largely the phenomenon of control and surveillance. Therefore, the most basic question to be asked while giving place to these discussions is; "In a neoliberal order in which social media plays an important role, is biopolitics sufficient to define the given order's form of power?" is the question. In the neoliberal order, biopolitics is not enough to define the power form of the given order. Before discussing why it is not enough in the context of social media, it would be a good starting point to talk about how biopolitics is a control mechanism, to explain the power form of the neoliberal order, which is largely directed by technology. Although Foucault was not the first to use the concept of biopolitics (Koç, 2018: 195), it was Foucault who grounded this concept in 1974 as a means of regulation and control of power. (Lemke, 2011: 34-35) Foucault defined biopolitics as follows: "Biopolitics, which is more important

than anything else for capitalist society, is biological, somatic, bodily. The body is a biopolitical reality; medicine is a biopolitical strategy.” (Foucault, 2001: 137) In his book *The History of Sexuality* (2007), he touched on the history of the concept of biopolitics. Population policies related to bodily processes such as birth/death rates, average life expectancy, and level of health gained importance in the 18th century. Because in this century, which corresponds to the period in which the industrial period developed, the performance of the body gained importance and the policies of the power tended to surround the body. The power technique that enables the power to be inserted into human life in the industrial period is not with the threat of death, but with the responsibility of life. The power distributes life, not death, to transform the body into a form that it can benefit from; it also aims to fit the population to the measurable standards of capitalism. Therefore, according to Foucault, biopolitics is an important part of the development of capitalism (Foucault, 2007: 102-103). Foucault also built his thoughts on the punishment mechanisms of power over the concept of biopolitics. Because the control mechanism of the modern period is about controlling and supervising the behaviors, namely the body. The panopticon is a metaphorical representation of this mechanism. Panopticon aims to produce docile bodies based on biopower. Cyberspace, on the other hand, has necessitated the change of power techniques both in terms of its technical structure and the role it plays in the process of socialization and cultural construction. Due to the technical nature of digital media, there is no need for bodies to exist in cyberspace. On the other hand, disembodiment necessitated the change of the form of power that operates through the control of the body. The form of power-building necessarily shifted from body control to the more abstract realm, mind control. Although we cannot explain why human minds are important for power simply through the digitalization of the socialization form to a large extent, we can evaluate it in the context of the new economy and hegemonic relations that have emerged as an extension of this socialization form.

Beyond being a means of communication and socialization, social media has also become a part of for-profit activities. This has created a new market beyond the reflection of the current market in the digital field. This market is called the new economy. Castells named the new economy a new form of capitalism because it was built on technological developments and for the first time in history made the whole world interdependent with global capitalist networks (Castells, 2008: 202). The commodity of the new economy is data, not tangible products. The fact that the data is easily accessible and analyzable is of great importance, both politically and commercially. Couldry and Mejias associated the concept of data with the concept of colonialism in their article titled “Data Colonization: Rethinking the Relationship of Big Data with the Modern Subject” (2020). Because one dimension of capitalism is to organize and manage people's lives through data. In other words, there is data colonialism today. Data colonialism is a form of colonialism specific to the 21st century (Couldry and Mejias, 2020). Colonialism has gained a global dimension today through companies such as Youtube, Facebook and Google, which have an impact both globally and on the local population. Because digital platforms produce sociality and open this area of life to capital. All produced data can be combined with other data and used for capitalist purposes. Therefore, data plays a fundamental role in today's world in combining capitalism and colonialism. Due to the positioning of social media users as prosumers, users constitute the commodity of the economic relationship between advertisers and social media companies.¹ For example, Google, the most accessed internet platform, can sell user data to other companies or offer companies' commercial products to users in return for a fee it receives from companies. In this sense, Google has made changes in its operation recently. It has

¹ Smythe calls this the 'audience commodity' (Smythe, 1977: 3-5). Christian Fuchs, on the other hand, draws attention to the unpaid labor of users and calls this situation "digital labor". (Fuchs, 2014: 93).

developed many tools for users to create and share content. Because Google's purpose is to organize the information of everyone in the world; to make this information accessible and useful when necessary. It achieves this goal with programs such as AdWords and AdSense. Fuchs says that Google exploits users in two ways. One of them generates economic income from the unpaid labor of the users who produce content and increases the brand value. The other is that even if they do not produce content, they earn from advertisers through users who spend time on Google-owned platforms. Because the income it provides from advertisers constitutes the largest share of its total income. All this happens thanks to the content produced by the users and the personal data they provide to the platform. Therefore, according to Fuchs, the problem is not these technologies, but the capitalist relations of production behind these technologies. YouTube, which was acquired by Google, encourages its users to produce content that will increase the number of views by paying a certain amount of money to its users who produce quality content from advertising revenues. This is one of the most worrying aspects of Youtube's economic model, namely the commodification of labor. (Wasko and Erickson, 2020: 132-144; Fuchs, 2018: 71-79). The user-oriented policies of Youtube, such as the presentation of personal content, and its democratic-seeming practices, such as users being the determinant of which content will come to the fore, ultimately strengthen global capitalist relations.

This economy model of social media platforms is often called the monitoring economy (Lokke, 2018: 69) and is based on digital surveillance. With the massive digitization of the commodity of production; mental creativity gaining importance by losing the importance of physical strength in the production process; Transformations such as the rise of data-based economies have also transformed the forms of control of power. If we explain the features of the new form of control over the panopticon, which is a representation of bodily control (as well as biopower), more sophisticated forms of panopticon (synopticon, omnipticon, banopticon, etc.) have emerged with the integration of control mechanisms with technological developments. In these new forms, power has spread beyond bureaucratic structures and institutional organizations to discourses, human relations and leisure activities. Now, people automatically provide the information needed for power and enjoy it (Farinosi, 2011: 63). The poster states that the difference between these new forms and panopticon is at the level of "consciousness". While subjects in the Panopticon are conscious of their determination, in these new forms, individuals are exposed to the objectification process so that they are not aware of their own identities and cannot understand how the information organized in databases is used to create consumer, producer or citizen profiles (Hope, 2005: 361). The fact that social media platforms have strengthened control mechanisms both qualitatively and quantitatively has led the government away from the desire to provide discipline and to the desire to provide control. Like Foucault, Deleuze considered the transition from the disciplinary society to the control society as a new social dynamic. Deleuze explained the significant difference between the disciplinary society and the control society as follows: In the disciplinary society, it is not so important for the individual to have a separate identity from the society. It is only important that the individual is in unity with the society. In the control society, the personal identity of the individuals is clarified and each individual in the society has a unique numerical expression (Deleuze, 1992: 3-5). This creates a false sense of freedom. In the neoliberal order, individualization does not mean complete liberation. On the contrary, it means more tightly articulated with the capitalist system. By atomizing people, they gain value as independent consumers. The individualized person, on the other hand, directs his anger to himself, not to external factors. Han also attributed to this situation why today's people have a depressive mood rather than a revolutionary mood. According to Han, this anger stems from neoliberal exploitation. Marx said that collective production liberates man. In today's neoliberal order, there is collective consumption, and individuality has

become a glorified value. Marx saw this understanding of individual freedom as a game of capital. In free competition, it is capital, not individuals, that is free. In the neoliberal order, capital exploits the freedom of the individual by creating conditions for free competition. Capital grows by establishing relations with other capitals through free competition. A sense of freedom and individuality do not create class structures that can form the basis of an organization like the working class, as in previous periods, everyone is responsible for themselves, which is what ensures the functioning and stability of the neoliberal order. Class struggle has been replaced by the struggle of man with himself (Han, 2020: 14-22).

Today, social media platforms offer everyone their means of production as an important part of the neoliberal economy. Thus, with its new business models, social media transforms labor power into a project which everyone designs himself, assigns responsibility to himself, and seeks fault in himself when things go wrong. For example, Influencers on Instagram, Youtubers on Youtube without being dependent on any institution; earns money from the content it produces individually. Considering the features such as the interface, features and free use of social media accounts, technically it offers every member an equal and democratic usage area. However, income-generating factors such as the content produced in the profile and the number of followers are dependent on real capital (as well as the types of capital Bourdieu mentions). For example, equipment and hardware such as a good professional camera, montage program so that Youtubers can produce quality content; They need suitable locations for shooting. Or, real capital is needed at the beginning to reach the number of followers necessary to become an Influencer and earn wages from advertisements. If we explain Bourdieu's capital types, people who have social capital in real life, that is, have a wide network of relations, can make money through their social media accounts, even though they do not produce quality content on their social media profiles to have a large following. This is not just the reflection of capitalism in the digital realm. It is the strengthening of capitalism and capitalist relations with new economic models. McChesney's predictions for the internet also explain the role of social media in neoliberal policies today. According to McChesney, the internet does not hinder the monopolistic or oligopolistic development of the media; on the contrary, the internet itself is involved in this process. The Internet will always be in harmony with economic relations and will serve the purpose of meeting the needs of consumers. In addition, according to McChesney, the internet is the area where profit can be obtained most easily (McChesney, 1999: 32-35). For this reason, Erdoğan says that before positivist thoughts are directed toward the internet, it is necessary to look at how the internet reinforces the dominant powers with strategies such as commodification, privatization, advertising and propaganda, and consciousness management, and what opportunities it offers for other potential powers (Erdoğan, 2011: 442). Therefore, neither Habermas's idea that social media creates a new public space (Habermas, 2001: 619) nor Giddens's idea that it enables 'dialogical democracy' (Giddens, 2007: 16) cannot prevent it from taking shape accordingly.

The governments use very different methods and techniques from each other with the historical context of each period. But whatever the historical context, power relations are also power relations and they always have the potential to be reversed. Therefore, these relations inevitably give rise to anti-government movements at any time. Foucault also sees power as a dynamic process that can create counter-power. However, the greater the resistance that is likely to occur, the more powerful and cunning the governments try to hold power in their hands. By the use of force, Foucault does not mean domination, suppression, prevention or punishment. Because it is not possible for the governments that do these things to be adopted and they do not sit on solid ground. Therefore, according to Foucault, what makes power the most powerful is that the basic functioning of power is not negative. For it to be adopted by

large masses, it should also have positive effects on the society such as producing information and creating desire. It is very difficult to get rid of the power that is intertwined with desire and pleasure and penetrates the consciousness (Foucault, 2012: 49-74, 176-177). For the government to have this expected positive effect on society, it must have a great deal of information about the orientations, desires, wishes and expectations of the mass it wants to influence. This can only be possible through the surveillance of this mass. According to Foucault, spying creates a power relationship, whether it is in the form of direct spying in the real sense or metaphorically spying through the acquisition of personal information. In this power relationship, which is based on the duality of seeing and being seen, the power has both the equipment to create a database by recording and the technical means that enable data mining and classifying people (Lyon, 2013: 44, 125-126). Lyon present-day surveillance is “any collection or processing of unidentified personal data to influence or manage those about whom data is collected.” (Lyon, 2006: 12-13).

Through communication, a mind includes all the procedures by which it can affect another (Shannon, 1949: 3-5 cited in Beniger, 2011: 444). Today's surveillance systems and facilities facilitate the determination of communication strategies in a way that the power can easily interfere with the minds, and these strategies have gained even more importance in the neoliberal order. We can explain why it gained importance through Deleuze's statements summarizing his transition from a disciplinary society to a neoliberal society: "Man is no longer a man imprisoned in disciplinary societies, he is a debtor of control societies." (Cited from Deleuze, 1990. Lazzarato, 2020: 70) Today's control mechanism works on debt. Borrowing is not just debt in the economic sense, it is a feeling of moral indebtedness felt towards the government as a result of the burdening of the responsibility of the grievances, earnings and conditions of the individual in free competition conditions. Beneficiaries of social rights also turn into debtors and it is not a monetary payment expected from debtors. They pay their debts with the attitudes expected of them, the harmony they provide to the economic order, the individual equipment they add to themselves, etc. payments are requested.² (Lazzarato, 2020: 80-95). However, being one's own boss is not the liberation of labor, but rather the exploitation of the individual's creativity and potential by the economy. It is because the construction of the "ideal self", the self-cultivation of the person in the best way, is a glorified human quality, and that it is the guarantor of the individual's productivity and innovation rather than moral concerns. As Lazzarato puts it, “The autonomy and freedom that entrepreneurial activity should bring to labor has turned out to be a greater and more intense dependence on institutions but also on itself.” (Lazzarato, 2020: 73) For example, in Youtube's economy model, a user who earns money on Youtube ultimately provides site traffic to Youtube and increases the brand value of Youtube. Just like factories or companies in real life. But there is a difference. YouTube did not initially hire an employee to produce the content. When we think of content creators as employees, the user has full responsibility and can only earn money by producing good content. There is always a risk that things will turn around and the content it produces will lose its former popularity. The entire burden of this insecurity rests with the content creator. Because Youtube can part ways with that user when he loses his popularity and joins his ways with another user who starts to produce better content. Considering the consumption culture and postmodernism's tendency to consume everything immediately, it is not easy to be permanent. But the contradiction also arises here. Because it is these global social media platforms that build and maintain this culture, creating new economic models and feeding neoliberal colonialism. The cultural space is also hegemonic and social media platforms have a strong role in culturally supporting neoliberal

² Foucault called this type of debt "social debt", which can handle both economic and political heterogeneity (Lazzarato, 2020, s. 81).

policies. The new gatekeepers of our age, opinion leaders, life coaches and sources of inspiration are social media phenomena. These phenomena determine popular thoughts, ideal lifestyles, or lead to their spread. This new actor, added to the power relations, while making economic gains without security, at the same time plays an important role in the field where culture is built and glorifies neoliberal values. Neoliberal power is fed by this contradiction. It covers this contradiction by encompassing the minds and penetrating the consciousness, and thus makes this contradiction work. This is achieved through digital surveillance, because being able to intervene in consciousness only depends on obtaining the best information about the subject of control. Particularly, the 'interactivity' and 'instantness' features of social media provide a convenient database for the government in terms of capturing the pulse of the society. In addition, social media has gamified surveillance, made it fun and even made surveillance an element of cultural structure. Participation in surveillance is no longer a forced action, but a voluntary action.

In the technical possibilities of social media that are suitable for producing counter-power and the seemingly democratic and libertarian policies of neoliberalism, governments had to turn to more populist policies (Müller, 2020: 13-46). Because while the use of social media has become so widespread, while there are social media phenomena followed by large masses, and every application of the government can become visible to everyone in a short time, it has become difficult for the governments to reach and control the public. The way they can overcome this difficulty depends on their ability to establish a hegemonic dominance. Gramsci, hegemony is not a power that is achieved once it is won; He says that it is necessary to constantly struggle to maintain hegemony. The basic strategy is the 'building of common sense'. For this reason, governments give up some of their privileges to get the support of civil society. Because creating a perception of equality in a general structure that includes everyone is the main element that builds common sense, hides ideology and ensures the continuity of hegemony. Thus, when the ideology of power is accepted as the common sense of the entire civil society, the ideological structure is hidden and hegemony is ensured (Fiske, 2003, pp. 224-225). Here, if social media is evaluated independently of power structures and political economy relations, it provides an infrastructure that provides a real public space (McMillan, 2002: 275). But social media is also a part of power structures and is not independent of these relations. For example, the free service of social media to everyone; In other words, although providing a free socializing, sharing and democratic participation area gives the new media an appearance independent of these relations, the material value provided by the users' own data and the social media platforms, advertising companies, analysis companies, etc. relations between them are political economy relations. For the continuity of hegemony, governments sometimes give up some of their interests to gain more; makes some concessions. Continuing with the previous example, providing social media for free to everyone can also be considered an economic compromise, but the value gained by user data in this process is that they are persuaded to consume by advertising companies; Ensuring the adoption of their policies by the governments and the high profitable gains they have achieved as a result have caused the 'free and democratic public sphere' of social media to turn into an arena of persuasion. It is the "empathetic workers" who are exploited by this system, who have a large share in the creation of a culture in which the slippery ground and precarious atmosphere of neoliberalism are not viewed negatively; it shows that this arena is ending in favor of power, and at the same time, the dominance area of power goes beyond the bodily and infiltrates the cognitive area. Therefore, biopolitics, which is the management technique of disciplinary power, cannot overcome the resistances in the cultural structure of the neoliberal period and is not sufficient to define the power form of the neoliberal order. Because the power relations of the neoliberal order are completely out of sight and biopolitics cannot reach this abstract area. Biopolitics based on population statistics, like the power

technique based on data surveillance [Han called it "psychopolitics" (Han, 2020)], cannot be legitimately grounded and does not fit into the socio-cultural dynamic of neoliberalism.

Discussions on the Relationship between Dataism and Politics

Neoliberalism, which has risen with the promise of social welfare and democracy, has entered a crisis as global competitiveness undermines welfare state policies and democracy. On the other hand, social, economic, etc., which have changed with digital technology. structures created some gaps in the current political order and revealed the need for change. In this period, when neoliberalism has dragged society into a dead end and technology has advanced to such an extent that it has the potential to exceed human will, ideas have emerged that algorithms can fill the political gap that neoliberalism cannot cover; At the same time, a search for a new political order in which a more peaceful and just world can be made possible on the global level has been sought. The philosophy of dataism, on the other hand, envisages a political order that operates on data through big data and algorithms. This creates new areas of discussion. For example, Morozov in his article "The Rise of Data and the Death of Politics" mentions that these technologies have become law enforcement with the use of technology as surveillance technology in general. The name of this new type of management based on technologies is algorithmic regulation. Algorithmic regulations are developed to prevent crimes such as tax evasion and fraud. However, in the article, it is questioned whether algorithmic arrangements are used only for these purposes. Another question is that the operation of algorithmic regulation towards the desired results destroys the ideological clarity that there can be many desired results, and this changes the way of doing politics. The problem here is that the fact that everything is based on automatic operation makes political maneuvers trivial and weakens people's ability to question politics. This is why Morozov thinks that Dataism kills politics (Morozov, 2020). Rather than providing the death of politics, dataism ensures the death of resistance and criticism against politics, as it makes the power invisible by pacifying the masses. Politics, on the other hand, become legitimate and invisible behind the data-based algorithmic order. As Foucault mentioned, the power that is not based on domination is based on knowledge. All the advances in power are provided by knowledge. According to Foucault, knowledge and power cannot be considered separately from each other (Foucault, 1992: 257). Wherever there is power, there is also politics.

Lyon talks about the concept of information politics. Information politics is a form of politics based on surveillance and control (Lyon, 2013: 282). The development of digital technologies day by day and their taking up more space in our daily lives have made information politics the most basic form of politics. In fact, when the concepts of digital media and politics are considered together, it is possible to look at this from both sides: On the one hand, there are thoughts focused on the collection and sale of our data to various institutions and on our control over our data, on the other hand, there are more techno-deterministic thoughts on changing the politics of societies with digitalization. has. As an example of his techno-determinist perspective, Mangat gave the Spring and the 2016 US Presidential Elections as two important examples of how social media plays a role in shaping the political futures of governments and peoples (Mangat, 2020: 399). In particular, interactive digital platforms change many of our daily practices such as shopping, playing games, living our daily lives, expressing ourselves, and also changing the way we do politics. Although there are debates that digital technology, which has expanded to cover all aspects of life and has even become a fundamental part of social life, breaks the democratic controls in the political sphere and allows the transition from representative democracy to direct democracy (Giddens, 2007: 121), when we need to explain politics around dataism, we need a techno-deterministic perspective. It may be a more correct approach to approach the society determinist point of view rather than the economic-political context. Because, as Byung-Chul

Han states in his book *Psychopolitics*, Dataism is closely related to surveillance mechanisms (Han, 2020). Since the earliest communities of humanity, governments have always sought ways to control people. Surveillance, on the other hand, is one of the most basic motives of humanity, depending on the desire of a social segment to govern other segments. As human motives and desires direct the development of technology, technology can also carry these motives and desires of people beyond their physical competence. In other words, although surveillance is not a new practice, it has become easier and more effective with strategies based on digital technology.

Foucault used the structure called "Panopticon" as a metaphor to express the phenomenon of surveillance in modern society. Bentham's panopticon is an architectural form of this arrangement based on the phenomenon of surveillance (Foucault, 1992: 251). However, when we consider today's technologies, the structure called "Panopticon" is insufficient to define current surveillance and control practices. In fact, we can define old-style surveillance methods and new digital surveillance methods as 'non-strategic' and 'strategic ones'. While the old surveillance methods were based on simple human senses such as hearing, sight and touch, the new surveillance is based on the use of technical tools to extract data, which is expressed as "data mining", and transform them into meaningful information. As Byung-Chul Han mentioned, surveillance based on the panopticon is limited to visual perspective. For this reason, desires and thoughts remain in the blind spot of the surveillance mechanism (Han, 2020: 64). However, with the development of digital technology, new forms of panopticon³ have emerged and the psychological dimension that panopticon perspectives cannot reach has been included in the field of surveillance.⁴ These new forms of surveillance are also techniques suitable for today's postmodern and neoliberal order. From a cultural point of view, every technology also reinforces certain lifestyles, various social roles and structures of human relations. Rose sees the current technology of each period as government technology and sees these technologies as technologies equipped with aspirations and desires to shape behavior in the hope of producing the effect that the government wants to produce and to prevent some undesirable events. According to Rose, these technologies are tools that reflect human intention, motives and human capacity (Rose, 1996: 52). For example, biopolitics is the management technique of disciplinary power. But it is not a suitable technique for the neoliberal regime. Biopolitics using population statistics cannot overcome the resistances in the cultural structure of the neoliberal era. Because in this period when the disciplinary power has lost its importance, productivity is not under the control of the bodies; It is based on the optimization of minds. In neoliberal power, relations of domination are completely out of sight and cannot reach the biopolitical psychological field using population statistics. This is where "...statistics differs from Big Data. Psychodrama of the unconscious can be created with Big Data. In this way, it will be possible to illuminate and exploit the soul to the unconscious." (Han, 2020: 30) Governments now place psychopolitics at the center, not biopolitics. In other words, they aim to dominate the soul by going beyond dominating the body. Digital technologies, on the other hand, contribute to the realization of these goals. For example, by blurring the distinction between private and public spheres, they included the private sphere in the public sphere and thus opened the private sphere to bureaucratic institutions. For this reason, digital platforms in particular provide a

³ These new forms consist of new surveillance systems based on digital technology such as synopticon, omniopticon, superpanopticon, panopticon.

⁴ "In this way, data mining will act as a digital magnifying glass, magnifying human actions and making an action area kneaded unconsciously behind the conscious action area accessible. The microphysics of Big Data will make visible the actomes, that is, the micro-actions, located outside the known." (Han, 2020: 72)

rich database for big data, while creating a "virtual archeology field" (Haggerty, 2006: 30) for power, as defined by Haggerty. Dataism is related to issues such as big data, algorithms and the internet of things, rather than the features of digital platforms and the interaction opportunities they create for people. Therefore, focusing on this aspect of digital surveillance will draw a more specific framework when discussing the relationship of Dataism with politics.

While defining the concept of surveillance, Lyon emphasized the importance of personal data in the surveillance process and drew attention to the abstract aspect of surveillance. According to Lyon, surveillance is "any unspecified collection or processing of personal data to influence or manage those about whom data is collected." (Lyon, 2006: 12-13) Personal data, on the other hand, are "pieces of truth isolated from individuals", according to Lyon. Therefore, a new type of surveillance has emerged that is not based on direct vision, but uses data stacks to create digital profiles that define the people to be seen: Big data surveillance (Lyon, 2013: 34). The pioneering work that forms the basis of big data surveillance is the mapping system created by Doctor John Snow to detect the disease in the cholera pandemic that emerged in London in 1854. The success of this system, which is based on data processing, is that it makes it easier to identify the factor causing the epidemic by focusing on the points where the epidemic is high (Lokke, 2018: 59-60). Now, digital technologies such as the Google Search Engine are used for broader detections. Google has the potential to record who researches what, in which region, how often, globally. For example, people now use Google to self-diagnose when they get sick. Google, on the other hand, can reveal the epidemic simultaneously with the speed of its spread by recording the increase rate of the search word belonging to the symptoms of the disease in a certain location. Thus, Google can detect the disease and the region where the disease has spread before many health institutions. In addition, big data is the basis of most processes such as the comprehensive monitoring of suspects by a state's intelligence agency, persuading customers to buy a product, clearing traffic jams, connecting household goods to the Internet. An important part of big data is data analysis. Klous and Wielaard see big data as an umbrella concept that includes new opportunities, possibilities, techniques and threats. Therefore, according to them, instead of discussing whether big data is beneficial or harmful to humanity, first of all, it is necessary to see big data as an integral part of the information society. Big data is developing and becoming widespread just like a language, depending on the development of technology. Unless societies want to give up the convenience, comfort and opportunities that technology brings, big data is an inevitable mechanism that will infiltrate every area where technology infiltrates. For this reason, the main question to be asked should not be how much big data should be restricted, but what we want as a society and how big data will benefit from this (Klous and Wielaard, 2016: XV – XVII, 104-105).

Harari, on the other hand, in his book *Homo Deus* (2016), in which he positions dataism against humanism, says that dataism has already spread by promising to fulfill these humanist demands. But he questions what happens to humanistic goals when authority moves from humans to algorithms and the Internet of Things starts to run smoothly. According to him, the human mind also has an algorithmic operation and the human mind cannot keep up with the intensity of today's data flow. But algorithms that can analyze large chunks of data that no human mind can handle are capable of solving all kinds of complex patterns. People who cannot cope with the data storm will leave their authority to the free market, the collective mind of the masses and algorithms after a while. It will be a techno-deterministic future that Harari envisions. Artificial intelligence algorithms that have the potential to declare their sovereignty will refute individualism and liberal belief based on free will in the future. Although the first steps of algorithms based on artificial intelligence have been taken

by humans, as these algorithms develop, they will surpass the human mind and begin to step on their paths that no human has ever walked or followed before. Just as motor vehicles have replaced horse-drawn carriages, algorithms have been used by doctors, lawyers, poets, musicians, etc. When it comes to a level that can take its place, which is not far away considering the speed of self-healing and development of algorithms, the anthropocentric worldview will be replaced by an efficiency-centered worldview. Just as the human mind destroyed the theocentric approach and brought humanism in the 18th century, algorithms will overthrow the human mind and replace it with dataism (Harari, 2016: 303-414). Harari's vision is a future that can be realized. Algorithms have already begun to shape daily life to a large extent and even play a fundamental role in the development of digital economy models. But the question to be asked here is: What will be the role of politics in determining its future? Algorithms also play an important role in politics. It is a unique power for politicians, especially when it comes to the manipulation of the masses. But just like any other technology, algorithms will evolve, or be allowed to evolve, to the point where they benefit power. There are several reasons for this:

First, power structures have infiltrated into social relations and are reproduced through social interactions. Artificial intelligence is also a mechanism that improves itself by using human data. This is problematic in many ways. If we look at the digital divide; Some social segments that do not have or have limited access to the internet are invisible to databases. Therefore, algorithms provide an imperfect representation of the world. If we look at it in terms of reproduction of discourses; While social relations are being reproduced, algorithms play a role in reinforcing these discourses. Because artificial intelligence develops itself by modeling social relations. Google Translate can be a good example of this. Although Google Translate currently offers masculine/feminine translation services, it has been making translations that reinforce gender roles until recently. Written in Turkish, "He's a doctor." the sentence, "He is a doctor." He was making translations by perceiving some occupational groups as masculine and others as feminine. Another example is the artificial intelligence chatbot named Tay, developed by Microsoft. The robot, which uses digital data produced by humans, has recently come to the fore with its racist statements on Twitter (theguardian.com, 2016).

Secondly, othering or stereotypes created by classifications made through algorithms play a role in reinforcing power relations. The emphasis here is on the mechanical operation of algorithms. As a result of the decisions being taken by algorithms with mechanical functioning, citizens cannot find an interlocutor to blame. This ensures that policy makers can easily avoid responsibility. In this respect, algorithms act as a front between power and its interests. Marx mentions the concept of 'categorical doubt' in his book 'Windows Into the Soul' (2016) (Marx, 2016: 336). Surveillance is no longer applied only to criminals or suspects. It is applied categorically to include everyone. Categorizing people as workers, students, bureaucrats, and those living in luxury neighborhoods poses the risk of being marginalized under categories such as 'dangerous', 'requiring treatment', and 'useful' (Lyon, 2013: 121). Thus, socio-economically disadvantaged segments become even more disadvantaged. The raw data collected categorically can be combined and used for certain purposes. What makes data surveillance more strategic than all other types of surveillance is the process of analyzing and making sense of data. The meaning-making process is an activity that is socially produced and performed in the context of power relations. Algorithms, on the other hand, are techniques by which forms of meaning-making can be applied to data fields. In this respect, big data also serves the purpose of verifying the social rules stipulated by dominant ideologies with technical standards (Andrejevic and Gates, 2014: 186). To give an example, as a result of the analysis of data obtained from different sources, algorithms can

determine which districts require more police officers (Klous and Wielaard, 2016: 1). The distinction between "idle" and "tourist", which Bauman deals with in his book *Globalization*, is an example of this situation. Although they both do similar things in terms of activities, they are considered two different categories. Because one of these categories is inside the system, while the other is outside. Bauman "Wanderers are travelers who are not given the right to become tourists." (Bauman, 1999: 96) he summarizes the pathological aspect of this categorization. Anyone included in the negative category is potentially a 'criminal', even if he or she has not committed any crime. Because there is no benefit to the perfect functioning of the system. The most important reason for the interest and high valuation of big data is that these raw data can be used by recombining them at different times and for different purposes. Big data can produce something of a different nature by reprocessing large amounts of complex data. Who poses a danger, what jobs they are suitable for, whether they are suitable for lending, etc. All of these judgments arise as a result of the reprocessing of the data. In the future, it will be possible to determine how much credit can be given even by the number of friends on a social media user's list. By means of algorithm analyses that have the power to reveal human tendencies and behavior patterns, behaviors that have the potential to occur in the future can also be predicted. The social dimension of these analyses is that the decisions to be taken are based on data to a large extent (Lokke, 2018: 60-65). Therefore, in the social order that works in favor of a certain segment, data surveillance is a mechanism that ensures the continuity of the order, with the categories and classifications it creates, in the smoothest way, by obtaining the consent of ordinary people. Classification and profiling stages, which are effective both in providing privileges and obtaining rights and in the operation of exclusionary and punitive processes, play a reinforcing role in real life structures, according to Lyon, no matter what purpose they are applied. For example, customer relationship management wants to identify consumers who have the potential to provide high profits to the company and those who cannot make a profit and classify them accordingly. As a result of this classification, some consumers are given a more privileged status than others by providing advantages such as different pricing or waiting times. The same algorithms can also declare people with certain socioeconomic status as potential terrorists in line with political purposes, and accordingly otherize these people and expose them to different bureaucratic processes (Lyon, 2013: 151-267). In summary, algorithms have become a part of information infrastructures covering most sectors such as management, security, marketing, entertainment, manufacturing and serve various purposes such as gaining more efficiency, profit or security concerns. Hiding all these aims, which are based on human motives, behind algorithm mechanisms, ensures that public reactions are broken and these aims are placed on a legitimate basis.

Third, the transformation of the perception of privacy with digitalization is the reflection of the political field. What needs to be done is that the state is transparent; the citizen's privacy. But with data policies, about the citizen is transparent; the state has become private and invisible. Although the perception of privacy was actually born as a result of the individuation tendency of the modern period and the freedom discourses of liberalism, it has evolved into a completely different place with the phenomenon of surveillance. In other words, paradoxically, surveillance has become a set of practices that are both included with the desire for individualization and violate the individual space. Therefore, surveillance can operate as a process that people are not aware of, but also as a process in which people are consciously involved. Just as algorithms are an important source of power for governments, it is a preferred technology with the convenience it provides to ordinary people. People may even see their privacy as a concession for these conveniences. For example, it may be a reason for preference that algorithms provide personalized interfaces to people and offer them suggestions in line with their preferences. In addition, in cyber-culture, which is a new

cultural form with digitalization, privacy is not seen as an area that needs to be protected and even considered as a part of the basic form of socialization, the entertainment world. Alan Westin says that privacy has functions such as autonomy, emotional relaxation, self-evaluation, and self-protection (Westin, 1967: 35). But this has lost its meaning for the new social order based on digital. As Waldman said, trusting relationships in ancient cultures are now possible with digital sharing. People can build trust with their shares, the number of friends on their list, the interactions they enter, by seeing and being seen (Waldman, 2015: 590). Politicians can also be effective and trust the masses when they are digitally visible. Social platforms also make power actions visible and criticizable; Thus, although there are thoughts that it softens the asymmetrical relations between the government and the people (de Souza, 2014: 227), surveillance is a basic entertainment tool in cyber-culture (Haggerty, 2000: 616). Social platforms, which carry cultural construction to digital, are constantly looking for ways to motivate people to share their data and nurture surveillance-based interaction. Avcı conceptualized this social structure, which is based on people's enjoyment of seeing and being seen, as a surveillance society (Avcı, 2015: 261). Han calls this period the Second Enlightenment. Transparency is the motto of the Second Enlightenment, based on data totalitarianism. Everything should be based on digital data and information. The First Enlightenment period, which opposed myths and put reason in its place, adopted statistics as the basic value in order to save knowledge from mythological elements. The Second Enlightenment period, which glorified algorithms by excluding the mind, sees big data as a fundamental value. But just as chiralism has turned into a barbarism, now there is a data barbarism. Therefore, according to Han, a third enlightenment period is needed to get rid of this period that has turned into digital data work and even slavery (Han, 2020: 64-67). In order for this enlightenment to take place, people must first become aware of themselves; should question what concepts such as privacy and freedom mean. However, the transformation of the perception of privacy leads people to leave digital traces at any time, and this makes the internet a rich database for political propaganda and political strategies. The reflection of privacy in the political arena is not limited to this. Big data also brings the end of freedom and free will, as it makes the future predictable and manageable. Because the freedom of information means the power of information for the powerful party. Therefore, ordinary people have come to be surrounded by hegemony. People who have become only data, reduced to numbers and lost themselves, have lost their freedom. To regain freedom, they must find themselves. The self, on the other hand, owes its existence to the narrative, as Han said (Han, 2020: 67). However, the digital data of individuals and the narrative of their life are constituted by the powers for them. Taking all control of daily life; This new algorithmic order, which aims to exploit individuals by inducing positive emotions, is the biggest political move. Because individuals who have lost their freedom define themselves as free and believe that they are free. There are no prohibitions to obey; they have the comfort of freely presenting their selves in the public sphere, being spied on and being visible. Why shouldn't they feel free? However, "the greater the power, the quieter it works." (Han, 2020: 23)

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

As a result, in the new social structure where the understanding of private space shifts to the public sphere, even new applications such as the sharing economy that can undermine capitalist monopoly also function as a part of data surveillance. Even the illusion of the economy becoming autonomous reinforces the invisibility of politics. If human-replaceable algorithms are to work ideally for the benefit of society as a whole, this aspect of politics that harms the "social good" can be avoided. But this seems unlikely. Because: Algorithms trap people in filter bubbles and – perhaps for this reason – increase the time people spend on platforms, causing people to be stuck in their habitus. Therefore, the content that is

automatically presented to the socio-culturally disadvantaged individuals creates a barrier for them to get out of their world and find the opportunity to develop themselves. But the same algorithms offer companies or governments the ability to influence these people who are trapped in their world. We can also think of this as double exploitation. This is also a problematic area, although some platforms have recently undergone and are experimenting with algorithm changes that put political content in the background (facebook.com, 2021). Because social platforms are also the ticket to open up to the world for people who produce counter-policies and want to raise awareness. Therefore, “What exactly is the scope of the politics to be thrown into the background?”, “What if content that has policies that are beneficial for society is also excluded from the algorithm?” Questions such as: Giorgio Agamben made a realistic comment on this subject. Giorgio Agamben said that it is difficult and expensive for governments to manage the causes of social problems, and therefore they only try to manage the consequences. Algorithmic surveillance also plays a role in consolidating power policies by controlling the consequences of this problem. And governments will have to expand and multiply control as long as the aim is not causes but effects (Morozov, 2020: 41). Therefore, if algorithms are used to manage the results, not to find the causes of the problem and find solutions to them, cognitive awareness of politics will decrease in people, but politics will never end. Artificial intelligence applications, transferring data between objects (internet of things) etc. Since human processes play a role in the programming of semantic web-based technologies, algorithms are unlikely to solve social problems. Because in order to determine whether something is a problem or not, it must first be experienced. Since the society based on technocracy will create a new elite class - technical elitism - these will also be the designers, implementers and funders of algorithms. Therefore, semantic web technology will never be able to evaluate society through the eyes of those affected by the problems and victims. Algorithms can be used for many purposes, be it beneficial or harmful for the 'social good'. But as long as power inequality in real society persists, algorithms will also present a marginalized reflection of society. Algorithms will increase the vulnerability of the weak, while adding strength to the power of the strong, in addition to some of the conveniences they provide to the society. So they will not have a purely good-oriented operation, just like human nature. Although it is not very logical to avoid these technologies in our age, we should accept these technologies with their disadvantages - as Illiadis and Russo also recommend within the scope of Critical Data Studies (Illiadis and Russo, 2020: 10) - we need to have sufficient knowledge about big data and increase our data literacy. we need to develop.

REFERENCES

- Andrejevic, M. ve Gates, K., (2014). Big Data Surveillance: Introduction, Surveillance & Society, 12(2): 185-196.
- Avcı, Ö. (2015). Dijital Yaşamın Dijital Özne(l)leri: Herkes ya da Hiç Kimse, Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8(1).
- Bauman, Z. (1999). “Küreselleşme: Toplumsal Sonuçları”, Çev. Abdullah Yılmaz, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Beniger, J. (2011). ‘Kontrol Devrimi’, (Der.) Crownley, D., Heyer, P., ‘İletişim Tarihi: Teknoloji, Kültür, Toplum’, içinde (442, 455) Çev. Berkay Ersöz, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Castells, M. (2008). ‘Ağ Toplumunun Yükselişi’, Enformasyon Çağı: Ekonomi, Toplum ve Kültür, 1. Cilt İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.

- Couldry, N. ve Mejias, U. A., (2020). Veri Sömürgeciliği: Büyük Verinin Modern Özne ile İlişisini Yeniden Düşünmek, (Ed. Aydoğan Boschele, F.) Yeni Medya Kuramları 2, içinde (15-34), Çev. Esra Cizmeci Ümit, İstanbul: Der Kitabevi.
- De Souza, R. R. M. (2014). ‘Inverse Surveillance, Activist Journalism and the Brazilian Protests: The Midia NINJA Case’, *Birkbeck Law Review*, 2(2): 211-228.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’ *October*, 59: 3-7.
- Erdoğan, İrfan, (2011). İletişimi Anlamak, Ankara: Pozitif Matbaacılık.
- Farinosi, M. (2011). “Deconstructing Bentham’s Panopticon: The New Metaphors of Surveillance in the Web 2.0. Environment”, *Triple C: Cognition, Communication, Cooperation*, 9(1): 62–76.
- Fiske, J. (2003). İletişim Çalışmalarına Giriş, (Çev. Süleyman İrvan), Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat.
- Foucault, M. (1992). Hapishanenin Doğuşu, Çev. Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Foucault, M. (2001). Power, (Çev. Robert Hurley vd.) New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2007). Cinselliğin Tarihi, (Çev. Hülya Uğur Tanrıöver) İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Foucault, M. (2012). İktidarın Gözü, (Çev. Işık Ergüden), İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Fuchs, C. (2014). Digital Labour And Karl Marx, New York and London: Routledge.
- Fuchs, C. (2018). Google Kapitalizmi, (Ed. Aydoğan Boschele, F.) Yeni Medya Kuramları, içinde (71-83), Çağla Çavuşoğlu, İstanbul: Der Kitabevi.
- Giddens, A. (2007). Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (2001). İletişimsel Eylem Kuramı: İşlevselci Aklın Eleştirisi Üzerine (1. ve 2. Cilt), (Çev. Mustafa Tüzel), İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.
- Haggerty, K. and Ericson, R., (2000). ‘The Surveillant Assemblage’ *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4): 605-622.
- Han, B. (2020). Psikopolitika: Neoliberalizm ve Yeni İktidar Teknikleri, İstanbul: Metin Yayınları.
- Harari, Y. N. (2016). Homo Deus: Yarının kısa bir tarihi, Çev. Poyzan Nur Taneli, İstanbul: Kolektif Kitap.
- Hope, A. (2005). Panopticism, Play and The Resistance of Surveillance: Case Studies of The Observation of Student Internet Use in UK Schools, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(3).
- Illiadis, A. ve Russo, F., (2020). “Eleştirel Veri Çalışmaları (EVÇ): Giriş” (Ed. Aydoğan Boschele, F.) Yeni Medya Kuramları 2, içinde (1-14), Çev. Filiz Aydoğan Boschele, İstanbul: Der Kitabevi.
- Koç, A. (2018). Michel Foucault’nun “Biyopolitika” Kavramının Teorik Çerçevesi, *ANKASAM Uluslararası Kriz ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2): 193-218.
- Klous, S. ve Wielaard, N., (2016). We are Big Data: The Future of the Information Society, Amsterdam: Atlantis Press.

- Lazzarato, M. (2020). Borçlandırılmış İnsanın İmalı: Neoliberal Durum Üzerine Deneme, (Çev. Murat Erşen), İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Lemke, T. (2011). Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction, (Çev. Eric Frederick Trump) New York and London: New York University Press.
- Lokke, E. (2018). "Mahremiyet: Dijital Toplumda Özel Hayat" Çev. Dilek Başaran, İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Lyon, D. (2006). Gözetlenen Toplum, Çev. Gözde Soykan, İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- Lyon, D. (2013). Gözetim Çalışmaları, Çev. Ali Toprak, İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- McChesney, R. (1999). Küresel İletişimin Politik Ekonomisi, (Der.) McChesney, R., Wood, E. M., Foster, J. B., 'Kapitalizm ve Enformasyon Çağı: Küresel İletişim Devriminin Politik Ekonomisi', içinde (7, 38) (Çev. Nil Senem Çınga, Erhan Baltacı, Özge Yalçın), Ankara: Epos Yayınları.
- McMillan, S. J. (2002). A Four-part Model of Cyber-interactivity: Some Cyber-places Are More Interactive than Others, SAGE Publications.
- Mangat, R. (2020). "Diversity: The Military's Representation of Diversity on Social Media", (Ed. Hunsinger, J. Allen, M. M. Klastrup, L.), Second International Handbook of Internet Research içinde (395-412) The Netherlands: Springer Nature B.V.
- Marx, G. (2016). Windows Into the Soul: Surveillance and Society in an Age of High Technology, The University of Chicago Press.
- Morozov, E. (2020). "Verinin Yükselişi ve Siyasetin Ölümü", (Ed. Aydoğan Boschele, F.) Yeni Medya Kuramları 2, içinde (35-50), Çev. Aysel Ay, İstanbul: Der Kitabevi.
- Müller, J. (2020). Popülizm Nedir? (Çev. Onur Yıldız) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Rose, N., (1996). Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smythe, D. (1977). "Communications: Blindspot of Western Marxism". Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory. 1(3): 1 -27.
- Wasko, J. ve Erickson, M. (2020). Youtube'un Ekonomi Politikası, (Ed. Aydoğan Boschele, F.) Yeni Medya Kuramları 2, içinde (129-144), Çev. Erdem Yedekci, İstanbul: Der Kitabevi.
- Westin, A. (1967). Privacy and Freedom, New York: Ig Publishing.
- facebook.com, (2021). <https://www.facebook.com/business/help/208949576550051?id=288762101909005>.
- theguardian.com, (2016). <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/mar/24/tay-microsofts-ai-chatbot-gets-a-crash-course-in-racism-from-twitter>.