Article

Capitalism in Language the Digital Era

Asian Linguistic Anthropology
2023, 5(1): 38-52

DOI: 10.47298/jala.v5-i1-a3
Jala.pub

Janis Tenett
Independent Scholar

Abstract

This paper examines salient features of linguistic capitalism in the digital era, focusing on the dimensions of space, speed, and marketplace. We attempt to reconstruct the linguistic and economic connections of computation and algorithmic or cybernetic capitalism that reinforces global industrialization. We draw on work that discusses the keystone of Google's success, which is built on three algorithms, PageRank, Adwords, and auto-completion. Auto-completion transforms linguistic materials with little economic value into a potentially profitable economic resource. We discern some semiotic aspects of data-isation and monetization of digital language. In the digital language spaces dominated by algorithmic capitalism as an aspect of informationalism, signs are detached from their narrative function and temporal dimension, while referring only to other signs. We then explore touch on the question of speed and velocity, which define a new linguistic capitalism. Here, 'fast language' is a key element in the marketplace of digital language, both as content and as technology. With the current dominance of companies such as Google, such a study is significant, as it sheds light on the economy of language and linguistic capitalism in the current highly pervasive online context.

Keywords: Linguistic capitalism, linguistic algorithm, commodification of language, lingnuistic anthropology, Bourdieu

Preliminary Remarks

In print capitalism, which generally began in the 19th century, and which was sustained until the mid-20th century and beyond, words began to transform into an economic system of exchange and commercialism, in media such as books, newspapers, billboards, and the like, and hence prio to electronic media, that is, the online world.[1] Much like the digital revolution that focused on the use of information and communication, and hence that indistinctly began in the 1990s, accelerated linguistic capitalism within this print capitalism displayed one essential difference to conventional capitalism. Within linguistic capitalism, the commodity does not simply occupy a semantic space of words, but rather, exists in the software-based space between lexical items. Redefining this space between words can be thought of as an algorithm, which companies such as Google have capitalized on, in order to achieve great financial wealth, by globally applying linguistic algorithms and software to create and manage the linguistic spaces of the Internet.

The language communicated by the platforms and portals of the World Wide Web is mediated, governed, and manipulated, by large technology companies that dominate the Internet. In particular, this process of governance has been developed for advertising purposes by these mega-communication companies, and hence those such as Google and Facebook. Texts that circulate in digital spaces, through carriers such as keywords, e-mail, search engine maximization techniques, or information dissemination, have increasingly embodied a distinct economic value. In this regard, texts and words as data become separated from their original function (referential, narrative, poetic, etc), as highly entextualized, and as a medium for the human communication that they perform. Here, these texts now increasingly act as a vector for the flow of information and cultural capital through both online and offline realms.

The modern technology landscapes are now becoming globally ubiquitous. However, in a current digitally networked society, words on web platforms develop and acquire the monetary value of the data they present. The mode and structure of these digitized languages is thus largely predicated on the monetary value of these texts, and act performatively predominantly in the online advertising industry. To this, Google has become a market key skate holder, and its profiteering on and commercialization of the language have become the important forms of linguistic capitalism of our time.

This study purports to summarize yet to discuss main features of linguistic capitalism that have emerged with the advent of the digital revolution. As such, the paper takes a transdisciplinary perspective, and is thus grounded in several disciplines, such as linguistics, semiotics, anthropology. sociology, political economy, and so forth.

For this, we structure the paper in the following way: Firstly, we establish a conceptual basis of linguistic capitalism, and move to discuss the features of merchandising, monetization, and

capitalization of language, particularly in terms of the political economy of language in context of digital capitalism triggered by digital information and communication. We then discuss the principles of Google's linguistic algorithm, which are at the heart of linguistic capitalism. Finally, we note and touch upon the influence and control that language on the Web exerts, as an unimaginable influence on the creation and dissemination of information. In this context, we then move to explore the texts created through digital platforms and languages when online modes are optimized for the diffusion of capital rather than for true narrative communication.

An Emergent Linguistic Capitalism and its Ideological Foundations

The Language of Late Capitalism

The new global economy strongly correlates with profound transformations of language and communication in many ways (Castells 2000; Giddens 1990). These transformations involve the emerging tensions between state-based public sectors and corporate private sectors in local, national, and supranational arenas, and between hybridity and uniformity in domains of linguistic identities and practices (Heller 2003). In the context of digital capitalism, a new economic regime has resulted in the commodification and monetization of language. Although language can still be analyzed as a commodity, its salience as a resource of exchange value has increased with the growing importance of language in the new globalized economy, and more so, under the political and economic conditions of (a post-) late capitalism. It may be necessary to scrutinize how and in what ways such conditions have exerted a commodifying effect on linguistic capitalism, and to position contemporary tensions between ideologies and practices of language in the transition from modernity to late modernity (c.f., Duchene and Heller 2013).

In this regard, one must be reminded of Bourdieu's (1991) portrayal of the linguistic marketplace and characterization of language as symbolic, to appropriate Bourdieu's insight that language is embedded within, and circulates within, systems of political, economic, social, and cultural distinction in the language's role in the production of value. In particular, we see it as important to seize two aspects of the process of objectification: The externalization and materialization of meaning and value, which are central to understanding the significance of the linguistic capitalism of the digital era.

In this digital era, new scales and contexts for circulation provide different possibilities for language objectification, such as the rise of print capitalism as constitutive of nation building, through the unification of real yet disparate contexts into imagined communities, and by assigning fixity to the printed forms of the language, to thus distinguish legitimate status forms as standards, and others as non-official, non-standard, and non-legitimate (Anderson 1991). Although print — language in text form — is often central to these processes of objectification in

order to develop imaginary communities, linguistic materialism in print capitalism represents a certain type of language objectification.

Concerning the question of circulation of texts and language through the commodification of language, we here significantly raise the concern as to whether aspects of language circulate in the same way as do other commodities. We pose this concern, as the commodification of language takes various forms across economic and social and cultural contexts. The fact that language commodification is also a process of semantic and pragmatic transformation contributes to the construction of linguistic value, and potentially transforms linguistic meaning. Furthermore, objectified language may be confined to its original site, yet commodified language tends to be ready to move beyond local communities and societies into national and global boundaries — levels at which the analysis of language can become difficult, at best. There are crucial differences between language commodification and circulation within national boundaries, and between the ways in which these processes become manifested within globalized flows of capital and the structures of power of these globalized flows. Throughout the processes of this circulation and flow, neoliberal (de)regulation and similarly capitalist economic structures become marked when sociopolitical and economic regimes of power and global media articulate the commodification of linguistic forms in global arenas of circulation.

Linguistic capitalism is a newly emerging economic regime characterized by the monetization of languages. This linguistic capitalism was largely brought into existence by Google, who capitalized on the global monetization of the communication of languages. Within the process of linguistic capitalism, players purport to mediate spoken and written languages through online algorithms, and to remain outside of this mediation, as non-citizens, and hence, to not attract attention and to not influence the intentions of audiences outside of the scope of the algorithm. Through such a model of obscurity, players develop intimate and lasting linguistic relationships with a proliferation of users, and in the process, are able to model and inflect linguistic behavior, to build and develop linguistic markets, and to control the ideological positionings of words. As such, language has been transformed into an economically exploitable resource.

Companies such as Google monitor the movements of living languages, to optimize the use of these languages, and to ring these texts into the field of commercialized language. Yet, commercially exploitable language can and frequently does offer a predictable and regularized resource. Through this technology of linguistic capitalism, a linguistic planning emerges, and language becomes a capital that is transformed to the point where it becomes a mediation device that comprises linguistic expressions, and that culminates in an accumulation of monetary capital. In this regard, we find it necessary to mention the neoliberal assumptions of value through which players frame the commodification, and the symbolic and economic values, of language. In the neoliberal conception of value, the value of language is attributed to a discursive

commodity and to discursive processes associated with the imaginary. Here, the explicit recognition of discursive and semiotic dimensions of the language, and the material and social interaction between capital, labor, and language, in the valuation of linguistic commodification, is crucial (Simpson and O'Regan 2018).

Commodification of Language: Linguistic Markets and the Exchange Value of Language

A consideration of languages as commodities signifies the existence of markets in which languages and language varieties, like other tradable commodities, are afforded economic exchange value. We can trace the concept of 'linguistic market' back to the French philosophers of the 20th century, and for example, Bourdieu (1977, 1982), who highlighted the multifarious ways in which language constitutes an important part of symbolic capital, that is, one that can be mobilized in markets as interchangeable with forms of material capital.

In recent years, the notion of commodification has appeared prominently in the expanding lexicon of both sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. The term is now at present frequently employed not only in reference to the evolution of language orientation (as well as the epistemology of language) in society, but also in reference to the forever shifting ontologies of language. In this sense, we suggest that we take the opportunity to explore and understand the ways in which language exists in the real world, that is, in its application and in its overall signification as deployed in human interaction. Clearly, terms such as the real world here are contestable, blurred, and can be problematized. Those who use the term commodification generally rely on a basic understanding of the term, and hence as a process mediated by items that were previously unmarketable become marketable. Furthermore, those who use the term commodification see the term and its processes as fairly recent phenomena, in that there is a highly widespread misconception that the transformation of language and identity over the past forty years globally has been mediated and shaped by neoliberal economic policies and practices over the same period (cf. Kochelman 2006; Shankar and Cavanaugh 2012).

However, recent scholarship on language as a commodity is exposing an emerging form of this exchange value, and requires discussion on two levels. The first of these two levels concerns the extent to which the forms of exchange (standardized language for employment, for example) were once treated discursively as matters of race, taste, intellectual competence, good education. In this regard, rational thought has come to be treated as directly exchangeable for material goods, and in particular, for money. The second of these two levels concerns the extent to which the movement of goods, which at one point in time depended (mainly or exclusively) on the deployment of other types of resources, is now well predicated on the deployment of linguistic resources. Here, as an example, we note that in some fields, obtaining a job can be predicated on

the availability or on the deployment of linguistic resources. Another example can be the dependency on aesthetic qualities such as physical attraction. Also, at present, communication skills and knowledge of the use of technology and online media are necessary for obtaining work. Both of these two levels are generally regarded as a characteristic of the era of late capitalism. More generally, we are currently seeing an appropriation and extension of such an ideology under new real and virtual world conditions. These conditions test the limits and the capacity of this ideology, and in this way, we explain and aim to direct our social activity. What we are not seeing is a break from the ideology of language as a whole, that is, as a limited system bounded by the geographic borders of the nation-state and the historical continuity (and iconicity) of a culturally, politically, and often genetically unified population, as custodians of its distinct worldview (Heller 2003; Pujolar 2007).

> The commodification of language (which renders language amenable to redefinition as a measurable skill, as opposed to a talent, or an inalienable characteristic of group members), as well as the simultaneous marketing of authenticity, challenge State-and community-based systems of producing and distributing linguistic resources, redefine the relationship between language and identity, and produce new forms of competition and social selection.
>
> (Heller 2003, p. 474)

Linguistic Capitalism as Semio-capitalism: Algorithmic and Cognitive Capitalism

We must therefore necessarily and increasingly consider aspects of the relationship between technological changes at the present time and concurrent social processes, to thus develop a strong notion of the commodification of language, and the capitalist intentions and possibilities of such linguistic capitalism. Through its subjugation to an industry of concentrated media production, and to an industry comprising a configuration of cables, artificial intelligence, binarisms, and algorithms, this subjectively conceptualized and positioned commodity unconsciously obeys images and a digital technology that incorporate networks, social media, mainstream professional media, academic platforms, and other forms of electronic and non-electronic interconnectivity, by socializing the people into the development of old and new habits, perceptions, knowledge, choices, and sensitivities. Such a subjectivity is being increasingly communicated by the non human, that is, by machines and their interconnected mathematical algorithms, and in the process, are decreasingly allowing direct human interaction among humans, largely owing to the decreasing need for such. Such a techno-cultural shift may have well inhibited, among many other things, the use of human affordances with which to

empathetically or sympathetically pick up on the emotional dynamics of the other, and similarly, the mutual affectation of bodies, a fundamental condition of love and politics. Yet such a claim has long been debated and requires substantial scholarly work, owing to the fact that it may surely trigger highly positivist understandings of evolution and the technological world, yet within an anthropological lens. Furthermore, such a strong debate would also need to draw on other fields, such as the field of phenomenology.

The Italian philosopher Bifo Berardi, continuing the work in Baudrillard's footsteps, in his own work 'Phenomenology of the End,' describes neoliberalism as a semio-capitalism, a mode of production in which the accumulation of capital is essentially accomplished by means of the accumulation of signs, that is, of intangible goods. Such a semiology of simulation is largely predicated on the effacement of the reference. Here, the linguistic sign has fully emancipated itself, and this abstraction has shifted to science, politics, art, communications, and more or less, the whole system of exchange. A new neoliberalism founded upon the capitalism that is no longer industrial but rather financial and at times intangible and virtual signifies the most advanced point of financial virtualization, where money can transform into more money by surpassing and circumlocuting around the production of useful and tangible goods and other commodities. Semio-capitalism is thus predicated on the de-territoriality and the de-materialism of production, on virtual exchange and on the exploitation of the soul as a productive force. From this category of organization, then, multinational companies and organizations have gained absolute freedom to be position themselves as bodies that move their non-material assets from one locality to another, following transnational flows where financial automatisms have replaced political decision-making, and where bounded nation states have deliberately or non-deliberately renounced their influences, through denigrating the spirit of the nation state, through imminent or virtual collapse, and through the denigration of skills of the populace at large. Such an unregulated capitalist absolutism exercises its right to control lives in unrestricted ways, and in the process, may have naturalized the reduction of reason and emotional resolution, globally.

In neoliberal semiotization, to aid progress, we see that an exchange of virtual signs predominates, as does the removal of the body, which is one of the most disturbing consequences to humanity. The addition of two new aspects of capitalism in semio-capitalism is now possible. These two new aspects are algorithmic and cognitive capitalism. To the question, "what is digital?," Pierry Levy answers resolutely that it is fundamentally an algorithmic medium, rather than a digital one, owing to the fact that its main character is to calculate automatically the symbols – or to industrialize their transformation – in addition to recording them, duplicating them, and disseminating them as did previous media (2017). This semio-capitalism does integrate a cognitive capitalism, seen in the fact that semio-capitalism is an element of a broader cybernetic capitalism, yet is predicated on conceptualizations of digital labor. Semio-capitalism

is also an algorithmic capitalism in that, as an integral component of informational and cybernetic capitalism, it is grounded in the cyber-system, e.g., an algorithm, the network and modeling of which render feasible an overwhelming performativity through the systememtized virtualization of data storage and access (see Peters 2017 for work on 'the epoch of numerical reason').

Google's Language Algorithms as an Economic Resource

Three Google Linguistic Algorithms: Words Matter for Google

The algorithms that Google employs have together effected Google's tremendous success, as the algorithms in Google's original business model. Over several decades and until the present time, Google has implemented these algorithms to both draw on and develop a system of language and symbolism.

The first algorithm, *PageRank*, has constituted a new way through which to link web pages to a search, and by employing one or more keywords. Here, a ranking system appears, as one that employs ranked and mostly used words to provide visibility for users and their organizations on line.

The second algorithm contains a mechanism with which to assign a commercial value to those keywords. As such, Google is structured on the accurate understanding of the semiotics of these words, and hence, the significance of these written texts to the way Google operates is crucial. In the second algorithm, *Adwords*, advertisers compete for keywords and phrases to reposition themselves at the top of a search engine. In the process, language merges with the logistics and with the values of this linguistic market. From a semiotic perspective, one could characterize the underlying paradigm of Google's operational logistics as a 'semantic determinism,' that is, a world where everything is expressed through the symbolic form of words, and is then indexed by the company, which in this case is Google. More significantly, however, beyond the indexing of these words or word lists or keywords, in Google words also lies a commodity that finances the company, that is, the process of commodifying words, by having advertisers all attempt to bid on search terms with which they associate their ads, and hence, in the process all compete against each other for a rank that surpasses the rank of other bidders and players.

The third algorithm is the cornerstone of Google's business. With this algorithm, Google has sought to link both of the two algorithms above (PageRank and Adwords), and has thus created a system whereby it compresses these two other algorithms into a new auto-completion algorithm. Such an algorithm can act to transform non-valued linguistic materials into profitable economic resources (cf. Kaplan 1994 for more on this system). In this algorithm, as one which

draws on, yet also creates a linguistic capitalism of sentences, phrases, and words, the grammar, the pattern, and the frequency of the language are not a linguistic coincidence, but rather, emerge through the efforts of the advertisers and other players competing for keywords, a competition that ultimately produce monetary profit. In digital age linguistic capitalism, words evidently acquire a currency as one that is distinct from its narrative function. Here, the prices of words fluctuate in reference to neoliberal competition, as do Google's centralized interference and controls in the form of various regulations, censorship, and other linkage applications, also fluctuate. These fluctuations hence purport to deliberately and significantly distort the market (c.f., Holborow 2015). Language data and its monetization hence constitute a dynamic process that affects the density and frequency of specific words in a searchable database. In this space of Google's linguistic capitalism, languages and symbols only point to other languages and symbols, and thus the nature and authenticity of the language is no longer necessary, or at the very least has denigrated its semiotic expansion.

In sum, the process of commodification of words may well trigger not only the transformation of words into monetary value, but it may also constitute the (re-)production of representations, by linking words and their meaning. Here, we note that words have the highest monetary value for Google at times when their meaning can accurately be determined and commodified.

Digital Linguistic Capitalism: Google as an Industry of Words

The digital stage of grammatization raises several issues. One such issue is the problem of radical change in conditions connected to reading, writing, and linguistic expression. The formalization, discretization, and externalization of human language behaviors in tertiary digital retention seem to restrict Internet users from reappropriating their knowledge. Here, in order to capitalize on the Internet user's searches, Google exercises control over language in several ways, such as by using automatic correction and completion tools. By encouraging users to use the statistically most frequent and speculative words for advertising, automatons bring the advertising into the field of 'predictable' language, which is commercially exploitable by the company. Largely owing to this algorithmic mediation of expression, Google has succeeded in transforming linguistic material into a viable economic resource. However, this phenomenon, described by Frédéric Kaplan (2014) under the name of 'linguistic capitalism,' directly regularizes and homogenizes natural languages, and induces their complete commercialization, on a global scale. This retroactive effect of technologies on language appears to have given birth to a new syntax and a new lexicon, informed by the linguistic capacities of machines and the economic value of words (c.f., Sack 2017).

The key here becomes the fact that the algorithm includes words as advertising tools in a way that favors their exchange value over their linguistic value. The two factors, the real effect that

words have on the way we think, and the reduction and manipulation in our online vocabulary through the flow of information to the digital age, well indicate that Google has engineered a powerful form of language control (Thornton 2019). Google auctions words to advertisers through its AdWords and AdSense platforms, and as such, significantly alters the spread of quality and integrity of viral news, political bait, and the information returned by search queries.

While focusing on exchanging language for money, Google has assigned greater agency to money to control the narrative, thus mediating the economic control of the narrative, and thus effecting the growth of a new linguistic economy in which the primary motive for language regulation has become a surplus value. Together with this, Google's control of the flow of words therefore invites the possibility of political and social influence.

Subprime Language: Precarious Value of Words and the Age of Linguistic Capitalism, Digital Advertising, and Fake News

The fact that the value of passwords has shifted from meaning transporter to capital transporter suggests that Google has emerged as the transcendental usurer of language. As tech companies such as Google increasingly publicize and monetize the respective information landscapes by employing search and advertising platforms and algorithms, such as AdWords and AdSense, the ongoing and perpetuating effects that mediate the language they commodify have become increasingly palpable. In the viral spread of legitimate and illegitimate news and political bait, and in daily highly competitive battles for exposure, words are possibly loaned against a narrative that is tenuous to the extent where its linguistic function has lost its semiotic potency. With an underlying neoliberal intention to encourage advertising revenue in place of narrative objectivity, the discursive side effects of this semantic shift reveal a weakness well rooted in the linguistic market that by far pervades the linguistic sphere, politics, and other domains, yet the effects of this are adverse, at best. In the absence of a dominant meta-narrative of neoliberal logic, such change in the ontology of digital language may appear to be a clear consequence to or materialization of the postmodern condition (Graham 2018). Some researchers have discussed this notion as sub-prime language, predominantly by investigating the extent to which the language can be bought, sold, or 'borrowed' prior to the exhaustion of its meaning and prior to the restriction of expression and comprehension (Thornton 2017).

We now question a language's resilience or submission to a capitalist system of exploitation, and consider the possibility of collapse of linguistic capitalism. By developing a familiarity with the historical and cultural agency of the language, and with the patent fragility and volatility of its grounding economic system, we may be in a position to predict the suppression of the language and the curtailment of its functions. Yet these socio-environmental, socio-economic, and socio-political factors themselves have the agency to alter the language environment and its

appropriation. To think about and transform this linguistic environment, both old and new, Sack (2017) suggests that we should articulate the functions of human and machine toward these languages, where, if linguistic capitalism is grounded in the sale and manipulation of words, such a process may also be applied to their automation. Furthermore, we can aim to conjoin such an automated environment into a knowledge development project. As such, software engineering and software studies may have the capacity to become a mode of resistance to linguistic capitalism. Here, and elsewhere, we must necessarily and increasingly define the spatial and temporal places at which technology and epistemology can establish an effective dialogue that can itself effect change in social, economic, political, and cultural goings on. To this, we would do well to ask linguistic and cultural questions in the forever changing technological and economic contexts, and on the placement of these dominant (and not so dominant) languages in machine and algorithm alike, which act to narrow the semiotic repertoire of a language, through efforts to increase the linguistic capital of the language. However, this algorithmic intermediation in translation is not without retroactive effects on languages, cultures, and idiomaticity. To this, we now turn to a discussion of the positioning and performance of language through technological advancement and natural or environmental change, and their vulnerability, as a possible way forward.

New Language Performances: The Question of Vulnerability

Scholarship for centuries has questioned the ways in which language connects to itself and the ways in which it connects the human to the world. In the current age, and hence at a time when technology has moved quite pervasively to the online realm, and where all systems constitute a global interconnectivity, intertextuality concerns and is commensurate to the online world, which has possibly become a new performativity. These online texts and applications have become a means through which manipulation and representation occur, a pervasive means perhaps. The performative powers of online language are therefore central to the current world, and this is now being increasingly acknowledged in scholarship and beyond. What has yet to be significantly accepted, however, is the fact that intertextuality and its conflation with the world is in fact virtual, and hence, fully susceptible to a new imperialism and control, as it were, by online agents of governmentality, not least of whom are online giants such as Google, Facebook, and controllers of media such as CNN, the BBC, and so forth.

Here, we return to the investigation and processes of a prevailing phenomenon: Within this phenomenon, search terms and the actions performed by search engines in digital spaces are frequently redirected by market forces, which themselves are predicated on the governing forces by algorithms which are in continuous shift and which are less than transparent to most. Here, economic and sociopolitical security are in question, in that, the online system to which we are now increasingly subjecting ourselves is assigned the agency to regulate this giving of affordance,

through a systematic and systemic manipulation and monetization of digitized language. This manipulation threatens the security and stability of our current online and offline society, and yet renders so language increasingly vulnerable as an accomplice to the creation of this social and economic predicament. As such, in this study, we have sought to at least, in part, identify the vulnerability of language triggered by the digital economy, from a somewhat critical perspective, and to suggest a possible alternative to the imperialism of online technologies in their efforts to endanger the range of semiotic affordances of the language we use. For this, we can also devise a complex set of notions of integrated processes, which would facilitate the developmental fragmented, ideologically, and commercially oriented interpretation of the world.

In anticipation of the interactions among the online world and the human, systems such as Google appropriate information from users to, as Pasquinelli notes, become "a parasitic apparatus designed to capture the value produced by the common intelligence" (2009, p. 155). Here, Pasquinelli begins to suggest the fact that the function of Google and its algorithms have surely become hegemonic, in that Google seizes the surplus value of already existing networks and following this, it attempts to establish a hegemonic power structure that inhibits users from accessing the web without Google's influence. For Pasquinelli, Google's monetization of text and humanity have well constituted part of a wider shift within existing economic and social arrangements, which he then goes on to describe as 'cognitive capitalism,' and thus, he positions his salient and significant scholarly work within a post-Fordist framework.

Economic and Semiotic Values of Language

For Jean Baudrillard, consumer goods can have a use value, an exchange value, a sign value, i.e., social prestige, and so forth. Here, the term 'use' refers to the manipulation of objects, things, and in our current case, language. Such a use value is predicated on a number of significant factors, which can vary across contexts. Through its use value, a language takes on an exchange value. In current global societies, these exchange values purport to condition both use value and sign value, where exchange value is determined in the market so as to aid economic exchange, and where linguistic and cultural exchanges occur. Here, we ask, to what extent can the language maintain its autonomy in relation to external forces, and in this case, algorithms, and economic pressures, and language as an economic value, thus aiming to affect its exchange value? Yet, we affirm that the economic value of a language is determined by the language exchange market, which includes linguistic exchanges in which we find values of use, change, sign, and symbolic power, the latter avoiding the evaluation of the market. As such, we assess the state of a language in terms of the market, to consider the extent and characteristics of linguistic exchanges, and therefore to frame the language as a resource.

Conclusion

The connection between the Internet and the language we employ particularly concerns the issue of speed. As such, linguistic capitalism and also 'fast language' are predicated on such speed, which is central to linguistic capitalism, not only as content but also as technology. Speed redefines the system itself, and is responsible for the ever growing and rapid circuit of linguistic capitalism (cf. Peters 2015, 2017). In this regard, as Virilio (1977) succinctly noted, the financial world places the value of time before the value of space in the sense that speed makes money. Speed, vector, and velocity are three of the major aspects of the new language capitalism, and which are grounded in the now highly sophisticated set of algorithms. Here, what is at the heart of the ever-changing linguistic system is the relationship between global capitalism and these new information and communication technologies. The rapid transformation of digital logic and system properties can thus be well captured in the notion of this algorithmic capitalism, and thus, as a specific aspect of informationalism.

Bibliography

Agger, B. (1998). Fast Capitalism. Champaign, Il, University of Illinois Press.

Agger, B. (2003). The Virtual Self: A Contemporary Sociology. Oxford, Blackwell.

Agger, B. (2004). Speeding Up Fast Capitalism: Cultures, Jobs, Families, Schools, Bodies. London, Routledge.

Agha, A. (2011). "Commodity registers," Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 21 (1), 22-53.

Berardi, F. (2014). Phenomenology of the end. Cognition and sensibility in the transition from conjunctive to connective mode of social communication. Aalto Arts Books, Helsinki.

Boltanski, L. and E. Chiapello (2006). The new spirit of capitalism. London: Verso.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). "The economics of linguistic exchanges," Social Sciences Information, 16 (6), 645-668.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Boutet, J. (2001). "La part langagière du travail: Bilan et évolution," Langage et société, 98, 17-42.

Boutet, J. (2012) "Language workers: emblematic figures of late capitalism" in Duchêne, A. y Heller, M. A Language in Late Capitalism. Pride and Profit. New York: Routledge: 207-229

Duchêne, A., andHeller, M. (2012). "Multilingualism and the new economy," in M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, and A. Creese (Eds.), The Routledge handbook of multilingualism (pp. 369-383). London: Routledge.

Duchêne, A., andHeller, M. (Eds). (2013). Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1999). "Global Capitalism and Critical Awareness of Language," Language

Awareness, Vol.8, N.2, 71-83.
Foucault, M. (2008 [1978-79]). The Birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1979-1979. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Fuchs, C. (2014). Digital labour and Karl Marx. London: Routledge.
Graham, R. (2018). "Google and advertising: digital capitalism in the context of Post-Fordism, the reification of language, and the rise of fake news," Palgrave Communications, 3:35, 1-19,
Jobin, A. and Glassey, O. (2014). "'I Am not a Web Search Result! I Am a Free Word': The Categorization and Commodifcation of 'Switzerland' by Google," René König and Miriam Rasch (eds), Society of the Query Reader: Reflections on Web Search. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures.
Heller, M. (2003). "Globalization, the new economy and the commodification of language," Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7(4), 473-492.
Heller, M. (2010a). "Language as Resource in the Globalized New Economy," in N. Coupland (Ed.), The handbook of language and globalization (pp.349-365). Malden: Blackwell.
Heller, M. (2010b). "The Commodification of Language," Annual Review of Anthropology. 39, 101-14.
Heller (Eds.), Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit, (pp. 27-229). London: Routledge.
Holborow, M. (2015). Language and neoliberalism. London: Routledge.
Kockelman P. (2006). "A semiotic ontology of the commodity," Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 16 (1), 76-102.
Kaplan, Frederic (2014). "Linguistic Capitalism and Algorithmic Mediations.," Representations 127, pp.57-63.
Levy, Pierre. (2017). "La pyramide algorithmique," Sens Public. (15th december 2017).
Marx, K. (1904 [1859]). A contribution to the critique of political economy, Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.
Pasquinelli, M. (2009). "Google's Pagerank algorithm: diagram of cognitive capitalism and the rentier of the common intellect" In: Becker K, Stalder F (eds.) Deep search: the politics of search beyond Google. Studien Verlag, Innsbruck, pp 152–162.
Peters, M. A. (2015). "The University in the Epoch of Digital Reason: Fast Knowledge in the Circuits of Cybernetic Capitalism" In: Universities in the Flux of Time: An exploration of time and temporality in University Life, Paul Gibbs, Oili-Helena Ylijoki, Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela, Ronald Barnett (Eds.). (London andNew York, Routledge.
Peters, M.A. (2017). "Algorithmic Capitalism in the Epoch of Digital Reason," Fast Capitalism, Volume 14, Issue 1, 65-74.
Park, J. S.-Y., and Wee, L. (2012). Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world. London: Routledge.
Rossi-Landi, F. (1977). Linguistics and Economics. The Hague: Mouton.

Rossi-Landi, F. (1983). Language as Work and Trade: A Semiotic Homology for Linguistics and Economics. South Hardley, MA.: Bergan and Garvey.

Rubdy, R. and Tan, P. K. W. (Eds.). (2008). Language as commodity: Global structures, local marketplaces. London: Continuum.

Sack, Warren (2017) "Out of Bounds: Language, limits, language planning, and the definition of distance in the new spaces of linguistic capitalism," Computational culture 6.

Silver, Rita Elaine (2005). "The Discourse Of Linguistic Capital: Language And Economic Policy Planning In Singapore," Language Policy, volume 4, 47–66.

Simpson, W. and O'Regan, J. P. (2018). "Fetishism and the language commodity: a materialist critique," Language Sciences, 70, 155-166.

Shankar, S., and Cavanaugh, J. R. (2012). "Language and materiality in global capitalism," Annual Review of Anthropology, 41, 355-369.

Thorton, Pip (2017). "Geographies of (con)text: language and structure in a digital age," Computational Culture, Issue 6, (28th November 2017).

Thornton, Pip (2019). Language in the Age of Algorithmic Reproduction: A Critique of Linguistic Capitalism. Royal Holloway, University of London.

Virilio, Paul (1977). Speed and Politics: An Essay on Dromology. New York, Semiotext(e).

Vaidhyanathan S. (2012). The googlization of everything. 2nd updated edition University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles.

Endnotes

[1] The political scientist Benedict Anderson coined this specific terminology, to reveal cultural transformations such as these.