L'ASSUJETTISSEMENT AND SURVEILLANCE CAPITALISM: UPDATING THE CONCEPT THROUGH THE LENS OF A NEW ECONOMIC ORDER

Ana Elisa Sobral Caetano da Silva Ferreira
Visitor Scholar na Universidade da Califórnia Berkeley (UCB),
Professora efetiva do Instituto Federal de São Paulo (IFSP),
Doutoranda em Linguística pela Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCAR)

ABSTRACT: Surveillance Capitalism proposed by Shoshana Zuboff (2019) is the starting point for a reflection that aims at updating Pêcheux's concept of *assujettissement* (1995), or subjection. Considering *obliviation 1* and *2* and Althusser's definition of Ideological State Apparatueses (ISA) this study focus at discussing how the evolution of digital technology allowed private companies to colonize (DEBRAY, 2019) the western cyberspace, by self-regulating and defying their own privacy policies. Self-regulation has a decisive role in the process of stabilizing Surveillance Capitalism as a new economic order because it allowed practices like *behavioral value reinvestment cycle* (ZUBOFF, 2019) that can intervene and control users' decisions. Behavior modification has reached a very sophisticated point due to algorithms programing and technology companies have transformed human experiences online into a new commodity that directly impacts current social practices, therefore, having significant influence in Discourse Studies.

KEY WORDS: Discourse Study, Surveillance Capitalism, Algorithms

RESUMO: O capitalismo de vigilância proposto por Shoshana Zuboff (2019) é o ponto inicial para uma reflexão que visa atualizar o conceito de assujeitamento de Pêcheux (1995). Considerando a ordem dos esquecimentos 1 e 2 e a definição de Aparelhos Ideológicos do Estado de Althusser, este estudo procura debater como a evolução da tecnologia digital possibilitou que empresas privadas colonizassem (DEBRAY, 2019) o ciberespaço ocidental, por meio de auto-regulamentação e políticas de privacidade próprias. Auto-regulamentação tem um papel decisivo no estabelecimento do Capitalismo de Vigilância como uma nova ordem econômica, pois permite práticas como o ciclo de reinvestimento do valor comportamental (ZUBOFF, 2019) que pode interver e controlar as ações dos usuários. A modificação comportamental alcançou um patamar sofisticado com a programação algorítmica e companhias de tecnologia transformaram experiências humanas online em uma nova mercadoria que tem impactos nas práticas sociais e, portanto, influência significativa nos estudos do discurso.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Análise de Discurso, Capitalismo de Vigilância, Algoritmos

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS: FRENCH DISCOURSE STUDY

Discourse Study (DS) is a very diverse filed what makes it hard to converge the multiplicity of "schools" into one, however, "the common denominator of the many strains in Discourse Study is that they consider meaning as a product of social practices." (ANGERMULLER, MAINGUENEAU and WODAK, 2014, p. 3).

If DS deals with the construction of meaning by social practices, the proposal of a new economic order will have profound effects in this field, independently of the "schools". However, the main purpose of this paper is to discuss how *subjection*, as Pêcheux describes in *Language, Semantics and Ideology,* can be updated through practices of Surveillance Capitalism.

Surveillance Capitalism is a concept proposed by Shoshana Zuboff (2019) to designate "a new economic order that claims human experience as free raw material for hidden commercial practices" and as "the origin of a new instrumentarian power that asserts dominance over society" (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 11).

These two definitions proposed by Zuboff are the grounds to rethink and update the concept of subjection in discourse, mainly because they connect human experience and dominance in a way that is possible to revisit Althusser's definition of *Ideological State Apparatueses* and the influence of private companies in maintaing the structure of dominant ideology.

The French school, mostly Pêcheux's research, was profoundly influenced by Althusser's ideas that social practices are deeply related to the concept of Ideology that "interpellates individuals by constituting them as subjects" (ALTHUSSER , 2014, p. 87). For Pêcheux (2011), this interpellation is part of the discursive process in which the subjects believe they are the origin of their discourse.

> It is possible to regard **the effect of the preconstructed as the discursive modality of discrepancy by which the individual is interpellated as subject…while still being 'always-ready a subject',** stressing this discrepancy (*between* the familiar strangeness of

> this outside located, before, elsewhere and independently *and* the identifiable, responsible subject answerable for his actions) operates 'by contradiction' (PÊCHEUX, 1994, p. 149)

The mechanism of ideological recgogination relies on Althusser (1994) definition of the *Ideological State Apparatueses* (ISA) as "a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions" (ALTHUSSER, 1994, p. 107) that are part of a complex structure that keeps a certain ideology dominant.

> Of course a social formation is not complexly structured simply because everything else – that s the traditional, sociological multifactoral approach which has no determining priorities in it. A social formation is a "structure in dominance". It has certain distinct tendencies; it has a certain configuration. This is why the term "structure" remains important. (HALL, 1985, p. p.91)

One should not be mistaken by the word *State* when designating such apparatuses. Althusser had already affirmed that private companies could be part of the process of keeping the "structure in dominance".

> The distinction between the public and the private s a distinction internal to bourgeois las, and valid in the (subordinate) domains in which bourgeois law exercises its 'authority' […] It is unimportant whether the institutions in which they are realized are 'public' or 'private'. What matter is how they function. Private institutions can perfectly well 'function' as Ideological State Apparatuses. (ALTHUSSER, 1994, p. 108)

Private technology companies such as Facebook and Google worked in maintaining a certain structure functioning, mainly with their interference in the political scenario, like Facebook, when it came to decisions like the United States elections in 2016 or Brexit.

To understand Althusser's influence in Pêcheux's discursive concepts, it is fundamental to acknowledge the role of ISA in maintaining a structure that allows certain *discursive formation* to be formulated and how they are related to the interpellation that is connected to *assujettissement* or subjection.

The institutions that represent the ISA rely on certain rituals, including their technical objects, that legitimatize the structure in which the social formation is configured. If one takes the School, as an example those institutions that 'educate', by using sanction, exclusion or selection methods to keep a certain ideology functioning (ALTHUSSER, 1998), one could look at the change of its technical objects as a hypostasis to understand how the discourse is not only present in enunciates but also in practices.

Once the classroom was a place for blackboards, chalks, books and notebooks, because those were the technical objects that were related to the work market and its values.

> It takes children from every class at infant-school age, and then for years, the years in which the child is most 'vulnerable', squeezed between the family State apparatus and the educational State apparatus, it drums into them, whether it uses **new or old methods**, a certain amount of 'know-how' wrapped in the ruling ideology. (ALTHUSSER, 1994, p. 112)

As the technical objects in society change, the same happens at schools, little by little computers and smartphones are part of the environment. Connection is the buzz word and the schools embrace it by bringing this discourse to the classroom in their objects and practices. (FERREIRA, 2018). The influences of the digital technology paradigm in recent educational curricula are present in the discourse of naturalization of technical objects[1] understood as extensions of the human body.

> We've all become a bit cyborg. Our phone is an extension of our memory; we've outsourced basic functions to algorithms; we've handed over our secrets to be stored on servers and minded by computers. What we need to always remember is that we're not just merging with machines, but with the companies that run the machines. (FOER, 2017, p. 8)

---

[1] "The idea that technical artifacts represent extensions (projections, amplifications) of the human being and, what is not less, of the human body (the senses, limbs, nervous system, etc.) has become a *topos* of modern thought . What we might call the prosthetic theory of technology was formulated in a variety of texts between 1860 and 1870" (MARTINS, 2012, p.15) translated from Portuguese

Foer is arguing about the general use of smartphones in western society and how it has become something naturalized. And although schools struggle to incorporate those new technical objects in their routine, it is undeniable that the students are already living in the new economic order proposed by Shoshana (2019).

The discursive confrontation, in education, is divided into two main fields: adopting the new discourse of digital technology or resist it. Some countries like Brazil and France adopted policies[2] against the use of smartphones in classroom, however, it is undeniable that digital technology has had profound interference in social practices and the educational field is one place where those two discourses are still being debated. Mainly because adopting a certain technical object means adopting the values of the company that manufactures that object.

> New ways of understanding and appropriating are not likely to be developed automatically. A favorable disposition of mind is prerequisite. And this disposition is best fostered in educational settings. Young people today learn digitally mediated modes of expression largely *outside* of school, and those out of school uses of digital technologies are often more varied and more sophisticated than those they encounter at school. (KERN, 2015, p. 257)

However, this will not be an issue for a company that "is standing on the shoulder of giants"[3]. Google, understanding the importance of school as a place of appropriation, has found its way back to academia. From Google Scholar to Google Classroom, the tech company has invested to be one of the only companies to gain the schools ground. "Chicago Public Schools, the third-largest school district in the United States, with about 381,000 students, is at the forefront of a profound shift in American education: the Googlification of the classroom." (SINGER, 2017, p. s/p)

---

[2] France and Brazil are example of countries where public policies against the use of smartphones in the classroom were established. < https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/20/world/europe/france-smartphones-schools.html> and < https://www.al.sp.gov.br/norma/74333> accessed in May 15th 2019

[3] Google schoolar motto: "Stand on the shoulders of giants" < https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/about.html> accessed May 15, 2019

The changes at schools are just one example of how social practices are impacted by a new economic order and its objects. Foer's idea of phones as an extension of human memory dialogues to Debray's (1995) midiology concept in which the mediations between the social and the technical can explain cultural changes. However, the most import aspect is beyond the object itself; it is about the discourses processes that allow and naturalize the usage of those objects. "The *medio* in mediology does not refer to media or medium but to mediations, that is to the dynamic totality of procedures and intermediary institutions that intervene between the production of sings and the productions of events" (DEBRAY, 1995, p. 29)

When these mediations ("What does communication mean? To transport information *through* space. What does transmission mean? To transport information *through time*. Communication has eroded, harassed, and finally swallowed up transmission" (DEBRAY, 2019, p. 77)) are made through digital tools and the intermediary institutions are billionaire companies that develop, maintain and define how those tools work, the impacts in social practices and history are colossal.

> Mediation also has agency, for when we communicate, we don't start with a kernel of pure meaning and then look for an optimal medium through which to express it. […] The medium itself provides structure, audience, and purpose; we just need to invent content to fill in the available slots. (KERN, 2015, p. 54)

Mediation and the companies responsible for the newest technological tools have their agency, and this is not always recognizable by its users. Thought history the *medium* has played an important role in delivering the message, nevertheless, this is the first time that the medium allows companies to have access to persons' data in a very intrusive way, even reshaping how people interact.

> New technologies can act as catalysis in the creation of new social configuration, as when members of a special interest group living in different locales develop an online community. At other times, new technologies reshape and extend existing social groups, as in social networking, where an existing face-to-face social network is transformed and extended online. But the practices that people establish in these environments are fundamentally social, not technological. (KERN, 2015, p. 98)

Considering that DS works with social practices to analyze meaning, it is also important to look at history as a fundamental base to understand the concept of *discursive formation*. History and language are not transparent. "A discursive formation exists historically within given class relations and may provide elements integrating into new discursive formations, constituting itself within new ideological relations involving new ideological formations" (PÊCHEUX e FUCHS, 2014, p. 93)

Orlandi (2015) points out that meaning does not exist in itself; it is always part of a socio-historical process in which words are produced. The author affirms that discursive formations regulate what can or should be said in a specific social-historical moment.

The individual interpellated as subjective is at the same time free and submissive. Everything can be said; however, the language defines what and how to say it, (ORLANDI, 2015) this is fundamental to understand the effect of subjection.

In Pêcheux's poststructuralist perspective of discourse, the effect of subjection or *assujettissement* occur due to *oblivion 1* and *oblivion 2*. The author describes *oblivion 1* as:

> The relative externality of an ideological formation in relation to a discursive formation is reflected within this very discursive formation: it refers to the necessary effect in a given discursive formation, of ideological non-discursive elements (representations, images related to practices, etc.). Better yet, it includes induces inside of a discourse a gap that reflects this externality. This is the gap between one discursive formation and another, the first serving as a kind of representational material for the second, as the discursivity of this 'raw material' vanished in the eyes of the speaker. (PÊCHEUX e FUCHS, 2014, p. 94)

While *oblivion 1* is connected to the ideological part of the process, *oblivion 2* is directly connected to the enunciation. The subject has the illusion that the origin of the discourse is the enunciation, ignoring that words always dialogue to previous words that set paraphrastic families, meaning there is always another way to enunciate something that seems unique.

> We mean that we believe the production of meaning for a subject fades in the eyes of the subject. We mean that we believe the production of meaning is strictly inseparable from the paraphrase relations between sequences such as the paraphrastic family of these sequences, which might be called the matrix of meaning. This means that it is from the relationship inherit to this family that the effect of meaning is constituted as well as the relation to a referent involved effect. (PÊCHEUX e FUCHS, 2014, p. 93)

For this perspective of Discourse Study, paraphrastic processes are connected to the stabilization in which memory is related to what is sayable, producing different formulation of a sedimented discourse. (ORLANDI, 2015).

Going back to School as an example of ISA that stabilizes certain discourses, there is a certain sedimented image of its actors and procedures. This image is created through history with the repetition of practices. The teacher as source of knowledge, the students as mere spectators, books as their technical objet.

However, change comes within the polysemic process, which means a rupture in what is sedimented. A breach in the matrix of meaning that allows the Other to occur. "Lacan metaphorically designates by the 'Other' with a capital 'O; in this sense, the monologue is a special case of dialogue and of interpellation" (PÊCHEUX e FUCHS, 2014, p. 95).

The Other of the sedimented teacher is the facilitator, an entertainer; class must be fun! "The new psychic economy has an element: space; a regime; the image; and a fixed star: happiness." (DEBRAY, 2019, p. 72) Students find their Other in a society of production, they must know before entering the class, they must access everything and they must seek results all the time. There is no time for contemplation (BONDÍA, 2002).

> How has this happened? By replacing institution by equipment. Institutions make a bridge between yesterday and today; equipment between here and there. The former have a function (family, church, state academy, school, language) and guarantee transmission while the second has a circulation. The explosion of mobility (of persons, capital, opinions, skills, jobs, and so on) has gone hand in hand with the implosion of continuities (and the discomforts of identity that result from this) (DEBRAY, 2019, p. 79)

This change is a product of a discourse change that has affected the postmodern man. The "old" and "disposable" teacher must get out of the way and let the novelty arrive. In the postmodern society, there is no time for the old, for the contemplation. Time is money and this is the motto for every single person.

SURVEILLANCE CAPITALISM: A NEW ECONOMIC ORDER

In surveillance capitalism, *human experience* is money. The companies that have access to users' data, specially their *surplus,* are the ones more likely to decide users' future needs and desires. Automated cars, digital personal assistants, *smart* homes. All those technical objects produce data from its users that are stored at companies' clouds. However, those companies began before there was any kind of regulatory law to determine what could be done with people's data and those corporations found it fare to regulate themselves by doing their own privacy policies.

By *human experience*, Zuboff means the users' data tech companies are storing not necessarily with users' knowledge. This *behavioral surplus*, or this raw-material supply, was first seem as something profitable by Hal Varian, who acknowledge the impacts of computers mediating human interactions. (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 102)

The lack of regulation by governments made it possible for those companies to profit from human experiences mediated by computers and smartphones. The Law is an example of what Maingueneau (1999) defines as *founding* discourse. It's an *archeion* that legitimate discourses. "This notion of *archeion* binds tightly *founding* operations in and by discourse, the determination of a *place* for legitimate speakers and addressees, and the management of *memory*." (MAINGUENEAU, 1999, p. 183).

Those *founding* discourses bring within themselves the possibility of other discourses. Law, Science, Religion are examples of those sources that validate discourses. Hardly could one affirm that Capitalism is declining as the economic order, however; digital technology has brought undeniable changes that are reframing how the world economy works. Surveillance capitalism

could be understood as anOther of the current economic discourse due to the Globalization (SANTOS, 2017).

Nevertheless, the novelty of its ideas and the fact that surveillance capitalism has stablished its own rules can make one wonder if it hasn't acquired the status of "ultimate" discourse.

> To found other discourses without being founded by them, they must set themselves up as intimately bound with a legitimizing Source and show that they are in accordance with it, owing to the operations by which they structure their own context, the way they emerge and develop. Analysts have no access to the world beyond limits of speech, but they can analyze the textual operations by self-constituting discourses manage their self-foundation. Self-constituting discourses take charge of what could be called the *archion* of discursive production in a given society. (MAINGUENEAU, 1999, p. 183)

Shoshana Zuboff's book *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism – The Fight For A Human Future At The New Frontier Of Power* is somehow aiming at these *archion*, by defining what surveillance capitalism is. The title itself brings the adjective *new* to describe the changes mediate by technology and its relation to power. Kevin Werbach describes the book, in its back cover, as "the classic study of how everything changed", saying that in the future Zuboff's research will serve as reference to understand our era.

To understand the age of *the new frontier of power*, one needs to look at who holds this power and how information is connected to the new definition of dominance. Private companies, like Facebook, Apple, Google and Amazon rule the western cyberspace. They have been redefining human interactions by its own policies. The colonization of the cyberspace resembles the violent procedures suffered by different peoples throughout history.

Professor Shoshana Zuboff (2019) compares, for example, Columbus's arrival in Cuba in 1513 and its *Requerimiento* to Google's declarations that were crucial to establish how tech companies manage users' personal data.

> The age of surveillance capitalism was inaugurated with six declarations that defined it as an age of conquest. Surveillance capitalism succeeded by way of aggressive

WWW. LETRA MAGNA .COM

Revista de Divulgação Científica em Língua Portuguesa, Linguística e Literatura
Ano 15 - n.24 – EDIÇÃO ESPECIAL – 2019 – ISSN 1807-5193

declaration, and its success stands as a powerful illustration of the invasive character of declarative words and deeds, which aim to conquer by imposing a new reality. These twenty-first-century invaders do not ask permission; they forge ahead, papering the scorched earth faux-legitimation practices. (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 273)

Online interactions leave a trace that can be used to not only to personalize and customize, but also to monitor users' behavior. Customization is the first step to colonization in the cyberspace. One can compare the process proposed by Zuboff to Debray's idea of civilization.

The author (2019) says,

> Victory can be declared when, instead of *one*, there is only *the* civilization, its language a lingua franca and its currency a common measure. When it can withdraw to its homeland and still be a beacon. When allogenous tribes adopt its tics, its habits and its norms, without even being aware they are cut-and-pasting them. When the commander no longer needs to command. A civilization has won when all its shapes become natural. (DEBRAY, 2019, p. 14)

Surveillance Capitalism can be seen as the *victory* of the tech companies – *Google[4] it* - over the governments or at least a new way to deal with political power – the new frontier of power. As strong as this statement may sound, recent facts have shown the how much power surveillance capitalism can have over western democracy.

One recent example is the impact Cambridge Analytica had over United States presidential election in 2016. The English consulting firm harvested private information from Facebook profiles using a breach in Facebook system that enabled the company to predict possible scenarios in the American election and use them as a strategic weapon in Trump's campaign.

> A leaked Facebook document acquired in 2018 by the *Intercept* illustrates the significance of data drawn from the depths in the fabrications of Facebook's prediction products, confirms the company's primary orientation to its behavioral futures markets,

---

[4] Google has become a verb to describe look for information online. The Oxford English Dictionary minted it in June 2006. <https://www.wired.com/story/just-google-it-a-short-history-of-a-newfound-verb/> accessed May 19 2019

> and reveals the degree to which Cambridge Analytica's controversial practices reflected standard operating procedures at Facebook. The confidential document cites Facebook's unparalleled "machine learning expertise" aimed at meeting its costumers' "core business challenges." To this end it describes Facebook's ability to use its unrivaled and highly intimate data stores "to predict future behavior", targeting individuals on the basis of how they will behave, purchase and think. (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 414)

This great knowledge about users' behavior has given tech companies a leverage over the Ideological State Apparatuses described by Althusser. In 1970, when *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* was first published there was no perspective that technology could have this kind of access to people's information.

That is why a change in the economic order allows an update in concepts proposed by Pêcheux when thinking about discourse and its relation to Ideology.

THE ALGORITHMS: THE TOOL TO NEW KIND OF SUBJECTION

The allure of a technical artifact solution, to prevent the analyst's ideological reading, made Pêcheux, in the middle 60's, propose an *instrument* to aid researchers,

> Before outlining the main features of Pêcheux's automatic discourse analysis, it is to be recalled that it was his aim to develop an instrument that would produce *experimental* results (i.e. results which ae the product of a theory-driven practice) as opposed to *experimental* results (i.e. results which are based on everyday experience). In order to study the meaning of those discourses, he had to construct an instrument that required discourses (not meanings) as its input. I other words, the instrument must construct metaphoric relations whithout the analyst 'feeding' it with information about the experiential meaning of the words that build up these discourses. (HELSOOT e HAK, 2008, p. 172)

This instrument would work based on algorithms "that could produce the metaphoric matrix in the phase of discourse analysis" (HELSOOT e HAK, 2008, p. 174), however one should consider that algorithms programing resembles language when it comes to bias. There is no such a thing an unbiased discourse and the algorithms always answers to their master.

Pêcheux realized the dangerous of outsourcing memory and its relationship to discourse to machines in 1982 when he wrote,

> Dans cette mesure, le risqué, c'est tout simplement celui d'une <u>police de énoncés,</u> d'unce <u>normalization hygiénique de la lecture et de la pensée,</u> et d'un <u>effacement selectif de la mémorie historique:</u> "quand on veut liquider le peoples, écrit Milan Kundera, on commence per leur enlever la mémorie"[5] (PÊCHEUX, 1982, p. 45)

As Foer (2017) stated, the risk is not the technical object itself but the companies and the values behind it. By outsourcing memory to platforms like Facebook, users are also offering a fertile ground for the development of surveillance capitalism.

The question that should interest discourse analysts is how users came to trust these companies, or yet their technical objects, to the point of exposing their most intimate everyday activities and keep a lifelong log online. One hypothesis is mathematics as the universal language, as pointed by Finn (2017),

> a *mathesis universalis*, a language of science that the philosophers Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, René Descartes, and others presaged as a way to achieve perfect understanding of the natural world. This perfect language would exactly describe the universe through its grammar and vocabulary, becoming a new kind of rational magic for scientists that would effectively describe and be the world. (FINN, 2017, p. 25)

And algorithms are associated to this idea of perfect language to describe the world in an effective manner. "We have come not just to use but to *trust* computational systems that tell us where to go, whom to date, and what to think about." (FINN, 2017, p. 15). What seems to be the origin of a new discourse, the digital technology discourse, in fact comes from the trust in Science built throughout human modern history.

---

[5] To this extent, the risk is simply that of a police enunciation, a hygienic normalization of reading and thought, and a selective erasure of historical memory: "when we want to liquidate the people, writes Milan Kundera, begin their memory removal

Science and academia are strongly related. This relation is crucial to understand how Maingueneau's concept of scenography (ANGERMULLER, MAINGUENEAU e WODAK, 2014) can be applied to certain discourses that helped naturalized Google as a synonym of the internet itself. Vaidhynathan (2011) emphasizes the influence of Stanford brand in the development of Sergy Brin and Larry Page's PageRank algorithm.

In 1997, Google's URL was *http://www.google.stanford.edu* and the search engine offered two options for its user: search Stanford or Search the web. The information displayed at the URL and the possibility to search Stanford archives built the scenography that helped legitimizing Google as a source of unbiased information.

> Scenography thus appears as both what generates the discourse and what is generated by this discourse; it legitimizes an utterance which, in turn, should legitimize it: it must establish that this scenography from which the speech comes is precisely the scenography required to speak appropriately of politics, philosophy, science etc., or to promote some merchandise […] what the text says is meant to validate the scene through which the content arises. (ANGERMULLER, MAINGUENEAU e WODAK, 2014, p. 152)

What is there not to trust when it came from a legitimized source like University of Stanford. However, Google was not a product that belonged to the university and soon it made his way to the stock market.

Users had already put their trust in the search engine developed by Brin and Page and naturalized its use without much questioning about the company intentions. Mottos like "don't be evil" and "do the right thing" helped to build this image of an unbiased product that always delivered the best information to its users.

Nevertheless, Google engineers followed Hal Varian's lead and started working on ways to store users' data and turn it into a commodity. "I call this the *behavioral value reinvestment cycle*, in which all behavioral data are reinvested in the improvement of the product or service." (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 224)

But how can this cycle interfere in users future behavioral and what is the connection with the concept of subjection proposed by Pêcheux?

In the chapter called *Make them dance*, Zuboff explains how the "internet of things" is about "intervention, action and control" (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 924)

> This action capability defines a new phase of prediction imperative that emphasizes *economies of action*. This phase represents the completion of new *means of behavior modification*, a decisive and necessary evolution of surveillance capitalists "means of production" toward a more complex iterative, and muscular operational system. It is a critical achievement in the race to guaranteed outcomes. Under surveillance capitalism the objectives and operations of automated behavioral modification are designed and controlled by companies to meet their own revenue and growth objectives. (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 926)

Objectives that are aligned with the companies' values, that are not yet regulated by governmental laws. That does not mean the governments will have a solution for this complex problem, but in a certain away puts those companies above any regulation rather than the ones they create.

Pêcheux's *assujettissement* faces a new step due to behavioral modifications led by algorithms. The essence continues the same, the individual is interpelated into subject by the dominant Ideology, however it is possible to wonder if the interpellation has changed due to technological developments.

One could say that propaganda has always worked in ways to manipulate social practices, nevertheless there was a part of the individual that was always private, that although the social interactions were made there was no way to track them this deep in the way it is done online nowadays.

Conditioning and reinforcement are not new to behavior studies, but surveillance capitalism allowed experiments using complied data that makes companies know more about their users them themselves.

> Varian awards surveillance capitalists the privilege of the experimenter's role, and this is presented as another casual fait accompli. In fact, it reflects the final critical strep in surveillance capitalists' radical self dealing of new rights. In this phase of the prediction imperative, surveillance capitalists declare their right to modify others' behavior for profit according to methods that bypass human awareness, individual decision rights, and the entire complex of self-regulatory processes that we summarize with terms such as *autonomy* and *self-determination*. (ZUBOFF, 2019, p. 942)

For Pêcheux (1995) there was no such a thing as an autonomous subject when it came to discourse practices. All individuals are interpelated by Ideology, although having the illusion of freedom. Possenti says that

> Discourse Analysis questions three hypotheses successively: a language that would have been univocal, a subject as a unit controlled by reason, and that it succeeded in "saying what it wanted" and, finally, a conjuncture uniform because societies are (have always been) divided into classes or groups.[6] (POSSENTI, 2004, p. 359) (translated from Portuguese)

Those hypotheses continue to be the core of Discourse Study, mainly for the French school, nonetheless, it may have arrived the time to consider how technological objects and algorithm programing can interfere in the interpellation process once proposed by Pêcheux.

REFERENCES:

ALTHUSSER, L. The character of the unconscious. In: ANGERMULLER , J.; MAINGUENEAU, D.; WODAK , R. The Discourse Studies Reader. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014.

---

[6] "A Análise de Discurso (AD) põe em questão sucessivamente as três hipóteses: a de uma língua que teria sido unívoca, a de um sujeito como unidade controlada pela razão e que fosse bem-sucedido em "dizer o que quisesse" e, finalmente, a de conjuntura uniforme porque as sociedades são (sempre foram) divididas em classes ou grupos." (POSSENTI, 2004, p. 359).

_____, L. Ideology and Ideologival State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation). In: ZIZEK, S. Mapping Ideology. New York: Verso , 1994. p. 100-141.

_____, L. Aparelhos Ideológicos do Estado. Tradução de Joaquim José de Moura Ramos. Lisboa : Presença, 1998.

ANGERMULLER, J. Truth after post-truth: for a Strong Programme in Discourse Studies. Palgrave Communication , p. 1-7, 218.

ANGERMULLER, J.; MAINGUENEAU, D.; WODAK, R. The discourse Studies Reader: Main currents in theory and analysis. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publising Company, 2014.

BONDÍA, J. L. Notas sobre a experiência e o saber de experiência. Revista Brasileira de Educação [online], 2002. 20-28.

CADWALLADR, C. My TED talk: how I took on the tech titans in their lair. The Guardian, 21 abril 2019. Disponivel em: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/apr/21/carole-cadwalladr-ted-tech-google-facebook-zuckerberg-silicon-valley>. Acesso em: 22 abril 2019.

DEBRAY, R. Manifestos Midiológicos. Tradução de Guilherme Joao de Freitas Texeira. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1995.

_____, R. Transmitir: O segredo e a força das ideias. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000.

_____, R. Deus, um itinerário: Material para história do Eterno no Ocidente. Tradução de Jonatas Batista Neto. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004.

_____, R. Technologie et souveraineté. Revue internationale et stratégique, 110, n. 2, 2018. 51-59. https://www-cairn-info.libproxy.berkeley.edu/revue-internationale-et-strategique-2018-2-page-51.htm.

_____, R. Civilization: How We All Became American. New York: Verso , 2019.

FERREIRA, A. E. S. C. D. S. Sistemas de Gerenciamento de Aprendizagem e as imagens do professor no século XXI. Araraquara: Letraria , 2018.

FINN, E. What Algorithms Want: Imagination in the Age of Computing. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2017. 272 p.

FOER, F. World Without Mind: The existential threat of big tech. New York : Penguim Press, 2017.

HALL, S. Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates. Critical Studies in Media Communication, 1985. 91-114.

HELSLOOT, N. A. T. H. Pêcheux's Contribution to Discourse Analysis. Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung, 33, n. 1, 2008. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.berkeley.edu/stable/20762262.

HELSOOT, N.; HAK, T. Pêcheux Contribution to Discourse Analysis. Historical Social Research , 33, 2008. 162-184.

KERN, R. Language, Literacy, and Technology. Berkeley : Cambridge University Press, 2015.

MAINGUENEAU, D. Self-constituing discourses. Discourse studies , 1999. 183-199.

MCNAMEE, R. Zucked: waking up to the facebook catastrophe. New York: Penguin Press, v. 1, 2019.

MOSCHOVAKIS, Y. N. What is an Algorithm? In: BJORN ENGQUIST, W. S. Mathematics Unlimited - 2001 and Beyond. Berlin: Springer , 2001. p. 1236.

ORLANDI, E. Análise de Discurso: princípios e procedimentos. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2015.

ORLANDI, E. P. Os sentidos de uma estátua: Espaço, individuação, acontecimento e memória. Entremeios: Revista de estudos do discurso , 1, n. 1, julho 2010.

PÊCHEUX , M.; FUCHS, C. From ideology to discourse. In: ANGERMULLER , J.; MAINGUENEUAU , D.; WODAK, R. The Discourse Studies Reader. Philadelfia: [s.n.], 2014.

_____, M. Lire l'archive aujourd'hui. Archiver et documents de la Societé d'histoir e et d'epistémologie des sciences du langage, 1982. 35-45.

_____, M. Ler o arquivo hoje. In: ORLANDI, E. P. Gestos de Leitura - Da História no Discurso. Campinas : Editora da Unicamp , 1994. p. 55-66.

_____, M. The Mechanism of Ideological (Mis)recognition. In: ZIZEK, S. Mapping Ideology. New York : Verso, 1994.

_____, M. Semântica e Discurso: Uma Crítica à Afirmação Do Óbvio. Tradução de Eni Pulcinelli Orlandi [et al.]. 2a edição. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1995.

_____, M. Análise de Discurso. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2011.

POSSENTI, S. Teoria do discurso: um caso de múltiplas rupturas. In: BENTES, A. C.; MUSSALIM, Introdução à Linguistica: domínios e fronteiras. São Paulo: Cortez, v. 2, 2004.

SANTOS, B. D. S. Para um novo senso comum: a ciência, o direito e a política na transição paradigmática. 4a. ed. São Paulo: Cotez , v. 1, 2002.

SANTOS, M. A natureza do Espaço. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, 2017.

SINGER, N. How Google Took Over the Classroom. The New York Times, 13 may 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/13/technology/google-education-chromebooks-schools.html.

VAIDHYANATHAN, S. The Googlization of everything (and why we should worry). Updated edition - eBook. ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011. 1008 p.

ZUBOFF, S. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. New York: PublicAffairs, v. 1, 2019.