

MANOKHA, I., 2018. Surveillance, Panopticism, and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age. Surveillance & Society, 16(2), pp. 219-237.

Manokha's paper discusses the continued relevancy of the intentions behind the panopticon structure, where the discipline lies within self-governance and the feeling of ever-present observation from people or organisations in authority even where there may be none.

Of particular relevancy to my studies he talks about the "chilling effect", a term widely used in this context to describe how an individual changes their behaviour once made aware of being under surveillance, as a means to conform to the expectations they believe the watcher to have. He references the revelations of Edward Snowden who shared information on the details of NSA surveillance and other intelligence agencies carried out on the public, that obtained their information from spaces such as Facebook, and later studies revealed that there was an observable difference once individuals learnt of their surveillance in their online spaces. There were no additional acts of coercion that prompted the change in behaviour, purely the knowledge of where and what was being seen caused self-censorship and discipline from users. Manokha also speaks of how peer-to-peer surveillance is just as prominent in a digital space as it is in a physical one, which is again of importance to reading around my topics of panopticism and internal-discipline.

The paper is an excellent point of reference in applying the visions and theory of Foucault and Bentham to our modern-day structures, as well as introducing me to the Snowden files that became a pivotal talking point specifically in regard to the topic of surveillance and individual consent to being observed.

Nandy, D. (2023) 'Human Rights in the Era of Surveillance: Balancing security and privacy concerns,' Journal of Current Social and Political Issues, 1(1), pp. 13-17.

This paper looks into case studies in order to discuss the ethical concerns of surveillance in a democratic society and how individual human rights are becoming an increasingly important aspect of the debate about evolving security systems, such as how AI and biometrics are getting introduced more and more into these systems.

Nandy rightfully acknowledges the complex balance that these systems have to strike, making mention that there should be accountability measures in place as to both ease

public concerns over their potential invasion of privacy and to be a way to reign in the governing authorities from implementing evolving technology in a heavy-handed manner. He is realistic when stating that limits must be defined if society is to keep pace with its observation of an 'increasingly interconnected world' while preserving the rights of the individual.

A lot of my personal research and projects are done in consideration of the ethics of surveillance, particularly of what the current regulations can allow me to do in my art. This paper further informs both areas of my work as it takes an informed perspective on how these regulations need to change with the pace of evolving methods of surveillance, and I find it useful to have alongside my other resources that talk about the previous philosophies regarding the panopticon.

Caluya, G. (2010) 'The post-panoptic society? Reassessing Foucault in surveillance studies', *Social Identities*, 16(5), pp. 621–633.

Within this resource, Caluya is arguing how Foucault's discussion of the power structure of the panopticon is still incredibly relevant to the modern-day discussion of surveillance despite how numerous surveillance study scholars argue that its interpretation is too limited and outdated when talking about the present times. He also explores Deleuze's work and how his philosophies differ and compliment Foucault's framework for exercising power despite the rising popularity of people seeming to favour Deleuze over Foucault.

He uses other sources of Foucault's work (such as interviews, related papers, etc) to justify why panopticism, as Foucault saw, is much more complicated than the matter of the observer having power over the observed. The gaze is ultimately a tool for power but is not the limitations of the power structure that panopticism entails (specifically related to the self-management we exhibit when under the belief we even *might* be observed in that moment).

This resource offers an excellent and comprehensive understanding of Foucault's points in his book *Discipline and Punish* as well as his further work to provide a context for his writing, as well as putting its conclusions side by side with another French philosopher of the time Gilles Deleuze. It's does well on explaining exactly why Foucault should still retain relevancy to my work exploring modern surveillance and why the broader exercise of power on a mass scale makes his writing an important source of information for my projects.

Vermeercsh, H. and De Pauw, E (2017) 'The acceptance of new security oriented technologies: A framing experiment', in Friedewald, M. (ed.) *Surveillance, privacy and security*, Routledge eBooks.

From an edited book discussing the evolving surveillance technology and how that plays into the privacy and security of the public, this chapter is of particular interest as it talks about how the 'framing' of surveillance systems could likely be what predominantly sways public opinion on the presence of mass surveillance, when they lack the self-attained knowledge about the ethically dubious roads evolving technology can lead down.

Within the study of the chapter, they inquire as to how the framing of smart CCTV to participants influences their own opinions on the matter, as well as taking into account other factors such as their trust in public authorities. It's an insightful study into how the preexisting biases of a subject and their optimism/pessimism for changing technologies can influence how much they support certain aspects of new surveillance that get introduced, and they take equal consideration of previous studies conducted around the area of 'framing' as well as their own results.

I want to consider the reasons that my art will perhaps receive backlash from an audience, and this research has provided insight to me specifically in how the wider world forms opinions on subjects they may not know particularly well. The work I create, and a lot of the work I discuss in my writing, are confronting and have been questioned for their own ethics when that is precisely the critique they're expressing. It's also of interest to me as I consider whether the desensitisation to a camera in the current year could likely contribute to the lack of awareness for privacy concerns and how exactly that could show up in works of art I explore