

13 Conclusion

Based on the Baconian imperative that "knowledge is power", the drive for transparency gathers up ever-more speed. Especially in politics and economics, transparency has become a widely used catchphrase.

Transparency is supposed to alter information asymmetries, improve market efficiency and establish a more inclusive and fair political praxis. While transparency is hoped to alter power relations, and thus to be a revolutionary or at least a reformative tool, surveillance is the privilege of those already in power, and thus regarded as a reactionary tool.

The studies in this joint volume have investigated this dichotomy by looking at various actors in regard to their possibility to change or cement existing power relations, symmetries, improve market efficiency, and establish a more inclusive and fair political praxis. While transparency is hoped to alter power relations, and thus to be a revolutionary or at least a reformative tool, surveillance is the privilege of those already in power. Each contribution, in its unique way, took a skeptical stance towards potential power shifts induced through societal or behavioral changes. This book examined a multitude of societal actors and the power relations between them. Although all contributions highlighted very different subject matters, some common themes emerged. These common themes ought to be highlighted in this final section. Moreover, this final chapter allows us to briefly summarise the central themes and most important finding of each article.

The first contribution treats surveillance and transparency as two sides of the same coin in the sense that both are attempts at changing behaviour by increasing the visibility of actors. Zeijl examines several attempts at transparency from a wide variety of actors. He argues that transparency, as it is currently put in practice by governments and companies, is more lip

service than real concern with accountability and openness. Zeijl claims that these attempts at transparency are influenced by the logic of surveillance and therefore consolidate already existing power relations. While there are alternative ways of constructing transparency, they all have possible adverse effects that cannot and should not be easily cast aside. Therefore, one needs to critically assess what the exact benefits of transparency are in order to reach a balanced judgement on whether these possible adverse effects are worth the risk. Since transparency is more often invoked than defined, it is absolutely crucial to pay attention to the structure that transparency is supposed to assume, its organisation, its agents, and its potential impacts. Otherwise, transparency becomes a metaphysical catchphrase to graze (political) support rather than a real concern for accountability and openness.

Groene and Duffy adopt a historical perspective and investigate surveillance policies enacted during the German autumn. Informed by Marx's concept of "new surveillance", they claim that counter-terrorist measures which increased the level of surveillance greatly impacted on the social hierarchy. By blurring the boundary between normality and a state of emergency, basic principles of the German *Rechtsstaat* were undermined. The increase in surveillance greatly empowered executive and legislative powers at the expense of individual rights and liberties. While counter-terrorist policies were directed towards capturing the RAF, they have outlived their original purpose and now belong the normality of the German *Rechtsstaat*. An important part of these counter-terrorist policies was the computerization of data and the establishment of big databases, pushed by BKA president Herold.

König's work is informed by the importance of databases and by the concept of "new surveillance", too. However, her contribution focusses on post-9/11 technologies and addresses the disempowering effects of

surveillance on non-EU citizens. König assesses the European border surveillance systems Eurodac, VIS and SIS and concludes that all three exhibit features of social sorting. In doing so, the traditional concept of borders is greatly changed. Previously, a place-bound border checkpoint was responsible for dividing into in- and outsiders, whereas today increasingly interoperable databases classify migrants according to a fixed set of categories of risk and worth, and aim at the exclusion of migrants from society. Therefore, border surveillance is not limited to territorial demarcations anymore but exceeds the boundaries of nation-states. As the lines between internal and external security threats are blurred and the "enemy within" becomes the rationale of borders, the border is being shifted into society itself. To describe this new kind of border, König has coined the term "socio-digital border" which brings together the social purpose of classification and rebordering and the technical means by which this is done.

Sombetzki & Quicker highlight which risks can emerge for individuals when stringent surveillance regimes generate disproportionate power relationships. These power relationships can pit individuals against each other through the creation of an inside and an outside group. The surveillance systems "SIS II and EUROSUR enforce a conflation of asylum and illegal immigration and thus foster an exclusion of asylum seekers". Sombetzki & Quicker clarify with their insightful and detailed analysis of EU policy documents how an asymmetrical, unidirectional transparency gaze is established that fortifies the power exertion of observing state bodies. The text of Sombetzki & Quicker exhibits what relevance the concept of Bentham's Panopticon still has today. Their contribution stimulates readers to think about the impact extensive technology-based surveillance is having on asylum seekers. This impact intensively influences individuals lives, so that one starts to wonder if we are experiencing the formation of a new and complete panopticism.

Hensels focusses on the framing of transparency regarding the Dutch Royal family. She analyses reports in the newspapers *Trouw* and *de Volkskrant* in between the years 2000 and 2015 in order to find out which frames have been used in the media. She reconstructs three mutually exclusive frames which have been used in the media under scrutiny by means of a qualitative, inductive content analysis. The first frame is labelled "maintenance of the status quo is untenable-frame" and is linked to progressive thinking. Central notions of this frame are "progress" and "democracy". In this frame, transparency is seen as an intrinsic good and is linked to the idea of an open and honest government. It is demanded from the Royal Family to catch up with society and other institutions and to modernise. The second frame, "argument of untouchable value(s)-frame" is diametrically opposed to the first and represents conservative ideas. In this frame, the Royal Family is seen as fragile cultural heritage that needs to be protected from the contemporary media landscape and its drive for ever-more transparency. The last frame, "it is not of life importance-frame" is linked to pragmatic thinking. In this frame, the transparency issue is not seen as relevant since the monarchy merely has a symbolic function.

The findings of van der Most indicate that the EU institutions fail to make use of the full potential social media offers for bringing increased transparency and participation into society. The obstacles van der Most describes are mainly the lack of collaboration between Brussels policy makers and their social media teams and their self-conception as being supranational actors that do not require as active and direct input from citizens. Despite these difficulties, van der Most lines out that the EU institutions' social media presence is bringing more transparency by providing additional information. The facebook pages of the EU institutions, however, fail to make use of the unique interactivity characteristic of social

media for participation and collaboration purposes, and therefore limit the empowerment of the people to mere information provision.

Quite similar were the findings of Leclerc who offers an interesting perspective on how Facebook is being used in the hope of activating civil society and reconnecting it to their democratic representatives. He, however, remains very skeptical to what degree the full potential of social media is being used as interaction between electorate and elected remains modest. Leclerc suggests that the reasons for the quiet reserved behaviour of citizens lies amongst others in a lack of trust in politicians, limited social media activity and the perception that information shared by politicians is irrelevant.

A different perspective on surveillance yet again comes from Bucholski. He questions the direction of the gaze within the social platform Facebook. Bucholski quickens us to realise that Facebook could just as much as being seen as a forum for mass surveillance, could also be seen as one of sousveillance. The perspective of sousveillance highlights the possibility that power relations may be reverted. This in turn could mean that users are being empowered to surveil themselves, rather than merely being surveilled from above, *vis-à-vis* the website. Bucholski finds that the direction of power exertion is not to be identified with full certainty. He claims that it all very much depends on the way users make use of social media. There remains no question that Facebook can be equated with an "immense scope of online surveillance", given that Facebook operates a "specific power knowledge". In stark contrast to this stands the fact that through making "complete personal transparency" the norm it opens the door to the empowerment of its users. For Bucholski, no clear power relations remain in a context where the gaze could be directed in both directions. The users bring to light these two sides of the same coin. It is up to them to use Facebook in their own interest.

Zeijl and Bucholski are united in their critical stance towards sousveillance. Both acknowledge its potential and consider it to be a major new development. While Zeijl and Bucholski value sousveillance as a legitimate new theoretical perspective, they are reluctant to endorse the enthusiasm of its inventor Steve Mann. Mann reckons technology to be inherently good and invokes new devices as quick-fix. Bucholski and Zeijl, however, draw attention to the human element and highlight the importance of the way technology is actually used by us.

Governments and other political actors often wish to make more information on certain processes publicly accessible online and hope that this would increase transparency. The popularity of this practice, however has led to question its effectiveness, usefulness and purpose. The question often becomes: does more information necessarily lead to more transparency, and does this alter the daily decision making of ordinary citizens? That Internet-based transparency tools to a large extent remain ineffective, was also one of the main findings of Werner. Patients in the Netherlands remained reluctant to make use of the targeted transparency tool provided for them. The main message here is once again that expectations need to be managed when it comes to using internet resources to empower certain societal actors. Empowerment requires that those ways chosen to bring more transparency are running parallel to the daily routines of the targeted audience. This appears to be the case regardless whether we speak about patients or the voters and citizens.

To subtract a common message from all these different pieces of work remains challenging but on a very basic level they all turn to one question: how do power relations shift through changes of degrees of transparency and its counterpart surveillance? Our texts can be divided into two main categories: on the one hand, the first four articles all highlight how surveillance can lead to those actors in control increasing their power over

other actors in a society. It becomes clear that this most certainly is possible and helps us to understand better *via* which processes this occurs. On the other hand, the last articles focus greatly on the question of how transparency can actually empower people and alter their relationship to actors that have certain power over them (be it doctors or politicians). Van der Most, Leclerc and Werner all highlight the potential for empowering actors within a society by employing transparency tools that make use of computer based technology. They, however, all report that great difficulties remain to reach any form of empowerment through these new technologies. The common message needs to be that the potential to empower certain actors through increasing transparency is great but that many obstacles remain. How great the potential of the 21st century's digital networks is, becomes tangibly clear in Bucholski's text. The picture of power being exercised through surveillance systems drawn by Groene and Duffy and König, is a system of surveillance that appears very rigid and solid. So solid indeed that one may start to question if it is actually possible to change these institutions. Bucholski however, encourages imagining that changing the patterns of surveillance could still be possible. The last three articles have little to say about surveillance but that does not mean that the discussion around it does not affect the studied matter.

We conclude that surveillance and transparency are necessarily interlinked and are merely two different sides of the same coin. One has to conclude that when things become transparent to one group, this may also give them the power to surveil. The message that can be taken from this joint volume needs to be that those power relations that are underlying the prevailing pattern of transparency and surveillance are rigid to change. Their rigidity is linked to their connection to the existing power relations in a certain moment of time. When considering that knowledge is power, changes in knowledge through changes in the transparency or surveillance

patterns in society can alter power relations. The rigidity is only the logical consequence of the desire of those that possess certain powers to maintain or even extend these.