(1000)

In “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses”, Althusser understands Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs) as establishing the political-existential conditions for production, and Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) as facilitating the very reproduction of the relations of production. Particularly, Althusser identifies the school and the family as the dominant ISAs of the modern-capitalist epoch. The educational apparatus both serves as a direct communication of ideology in both explicit and implicit forms and as a multi-tiered sifting mechanism priming and placing ‘fresh’ individuals (i.e. children) into their place in society as subjects, thereby preserving the structure and relations of the existing class configuration. Moreover, Althusser investigates the incredibly complex contradictory nature of ideology as core to its efficacy. Ideology acquires individuals through unrelenting ‘hailing’, in which individuals come to understand and represent themselves as fundamentally *within* ideology, and therefore can be directly ‘called’ by ideology into various physical and mental configurations. Ideology maintains ‘itself’ by establishing an adaptive set of rituals as an axiom of the subject-epistemology/consciousness, such that all knowledge derivations (i.e. what the subject consciously ‘knows’) are built from and premised upon such rituals any doubt of such rituals threatens the stability of the subject’s entire knowledge-worldview. The result is that every subject ‘sees’ ideology from *within* its entirety, but never *at* its entirety.

As a computer science student, reading Althusser and thinking about how his insight into ideology manifests in my experience within educational institutions has been particularly jarring. Computer Science – not as the field of study, but rather as an institution-like trajectory of education, career, and inevitably status within society – is, as few can object to, doused in the dominant capitalist ideology. The school of Computer Science not only produces workers that

propagate the current-era technological giants' (i.e. 'big Tech') extraordinary production of information-commodities, but workers epistemologically primed to support the reproduction of these relations of production. This epistemological priming is enforced through repeated naturalization of ritual into axiom; these axioms become the always seen but invisible, and therefore unquestionable, basis through which the individual-turned-subject see and contribute to this technology machinery.

It is most difficult to see something when you have always seen from within it, like the canonical example of a fish 'seeing' water. Since taking ENGL 308 – which has been only the second humanities class I have taken at the UW, after a dubious English composition class – I have begun an epistemology/consciousness-shaking. I believe Walter Benjamin's concept of the dialectic image – which Melissa Wright applied to the woman maquiladora worker – is a sort of anti-axiom, an entity that was always seen from within but is being seen for 'what it is' and thus forces the seeing of the broader system. I have been observing miniature dialectic images in my Computer Science education that have allowed me to, I believe, move away from seeing within and towards 'real seeing'.

The first miniatures that came to my attention are the architectural ones, physical elements embedded in the buildings of Computer Science that its students routinely inhabit and hold as constants of their environment. The hallways of the Computer Science buildings are more laden with artwork than any other building than I have walked through, including – ironically – the buildings devoted to the study of Architecture, Music, and Art itself. Moreover, this art is obsessively uniform – framed in the same square black frames and filled with abstract art. This art is not in relationship with the world, like the mural in Kane Hall or the paintings on the wall in Suzzallo, but in fact anti-relational – designedly unpolitical, unsocial. The art is filled

with geometric shapes and aesthetic colors which are engaging in only an abstract sense, only to be appreciated in isolation and detachment. A second example is the heavy presence both of glass-stratified spaces and keycard-restrictions to the areas behind the glass. The question of interest, of course, is how one sees when they actively see from within the glass-walled-spaces. Both are viscerally physical examples of seeing without seeing, the difference between the former and latter 'seeing' being the position of the viewer relative to the system. They demonstrate the axiomatic physics of social relations that begin to firmly root themselves in the minds of those that routinely inhabit these spaces.

A higher-level ritual of Computer Science is the cursory but passionate nod at Social Impact within Computer Science curriculum. Instructors will incorporate Social Impact into the computing curriculum such that both the instructor and the students feel that the work they are doing and will continue to likely perform in industry will be morally virtuous with particularly *their involvement*. The underlying narrative is that computing work has externalities that, if left unchecked, and cause damage. The ideological-interpellative act of the curriculum is to address the student and say "*you* – you have learned about Social Impact and now are its disseminator, and it is your involvement in this computing work that will redeem it and make it virtuous". As a Teaching Assistant in an introductory computing course, I myself have noticed a significant increase in individuated and direct language in both internal and external course material on this topic. The Social Impact that is taught, however, comes from a profoundly *inside* vantage point. Ironically, social theory itself is never taught – what is instead communicated is a surface-level *awareness*, and the implicit notion that this awareness is more or less enough. Social Impact is not a 'checkbox' in the same way that I have observed the Diversity credit to have been perceived by many students, but an idea-entity that excites and emboldens the tech student and

therefore accelerates the broader information-commodity economy. In this sense, it is an ideological effect (as opposed to compliance enforced by a ‘repressive’ state apparatus).

I have been enveloped in this world for a long time. My father works in technology and heavily pushed me to pursue computer science because of the high pay, job security, and status one obtains when inside Computer Science. Now, I am slowly beginning the work of shaking my worldview, axiom by axiom, to see more clearly what I always saw.