

The Society of the Spectacle and the Society of Control.

EDVAN ARAGÃO SANTOS¹

¹(Master in Philosophy/Department of Philosophy/ University Federal of São Paulo)

ABSTRACT *In the work The Society of the Spectacle, Guy Debord writes an essay-manifesto critic - of a philosophical and literary nature - in which he directs his criticism, above all, at the way in which contemporary social life is gradually transformed into a mediated experience by the spectacle, in which it pretends to represent life and its social relations, starting, above all, the apparatus of images. From the constitution of the spectacle society, for Debord - as a global domain over the totality of society - we aim to understand the development of this concept and two possible relationships with the concepts of Control Society (Foucault/Deleuze/Guattari) and, finally, from Empire (Hardt/Negri).*

KEYWORDS *Spectacle. Image. Control. Biopower. Empire.*

I. DEBORD AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SPECTACLE SOCIETY CONCEPT.

The society of the spectacle - Guy Debord's manifesto book was one of the most influential works of the so-called situationists¹ in the events of May 68 in France. The work presents us with a strong criticism to the form of the spectacle and its supposed possibility of approaching society as a whole, its social strata and its relations. For Debord, it would express a form of reality manufactured by a type of society that arose from the evolution of the forms of production of contemporary capitalism and that radically affected social relations, in the last case, in the totality of relations, consumption, culture, work and leisure. The spectacle emerges as an image creator in the human imagination and as a constituent of a form of merchandise². Now, it is necessary to be aware of how this concept³ is presented. In order to reach it, Debord looks at its

¹ Debord himself wrote a situationist manifesto and was one of its main articulators, this movement of a political to artistic nature had as its purpose the debate of an art linked to life and revolutionary action, dialoguing, above all, with the aesthetic advances of the Surrealists and Dadaists.

² And therefore, because of this development of forms of production, which cannot speak of something totally unreal or false, it is an effective and self-manufacturing reality, as Debord himself will point out below; the reality of the show.

³ To help in the understanding of his criticism, it is necessary to pay attention to his method, which is absolutely distinct from a thesis, whose characteristics are defined by a prose that is expressed in a narrative chain of arguments, in Debord, differently, his style is closer to a manifesto, in the form of short excerpts and aphorisms. Such a model is driven by a method that does not promote syntheses of thought, but that follows the exercise of negative dialectics. His style is presented in a tone of messianic pessimism in which it is added to an irony that the only thing that will succeed is the fall of this model of society. The great job for understanding your text is to sew the concept of spectacle that appears in formulations that break in its deviant narrative.

historical development. The spectacle is, above all, the result of an economic and social process in which it would become a system in itself, extending the reach of capital by creating realities (or extending reality) and interfering in the ways of life and the production of consumption, and that includes criticisms - already announced by Adorno and Benjamin - of art and culture and their commercialization and technical reproducibility.

For Debord, one of the most important tools of the society of the spectacle is the image, place of production of goods and forms of consumption, in which it has a decisive influence on communication and the production of subjectivities, gaining a significant importance to his theory. The image, for Debord, is associated with the Marxist category of merchandise and its value, which starts to present a suprasensitive nature - filled with metaphysical and symbolic content - and appears in the sensitive form, in which it starts to be produced in the form of fetish⁴. - than just image as a media or advertising representation, mimetic, which are some of its facets. The spectacle is the mediation of social relations in their entirety - in which the image has a fundamental function - as a result of the extrapolation of the commodity as an exchange relation to the spectacle form.

This society of the spectacle appears as a form of mediation of concrete life and induces the possibility that the world can re-establish itself in a social unit - a unit that had been fragmented by the capitalism's own modes of production, arising from the division of labor and distancing from the means of production of those who actually produce⁵. It allows unity in its access to the consumption of goods and a unity established as a global communication, in which people and social classes would communicate completely, this assumption would provoke a kind of unifying State⁶. However, what happens is that even with such mediation, the barriers of separation still remain, that is, unity would be established as long as the parties remain in their proper places. It is in this apparently positive effect of global space that the dimness of a controlled and separate society appears. Debord states:

The spectacle is, at the same time, part of society, society itself and its instrument of unification. As part of society, the show concentrates all eyes

⁴ Another important aspect born from the commodity form is the concept of commodity fetishism, that is, when this commodity form gains a value beyond the sensitive, and becomes a metaphysical object, having almost mythical meanings. Fetishism is a word of Portuguese origin, from the term *feitiço* (spell), given by the Portuguese to material objects with supernatural and magical powers worshiped by African peoples. The fetish, according to Debord, in the society of the spectacle, is due to the accumulation of capital, being capital itself that in its superabundance starts to produce new forms of merchandise and mediate human relations, endowing the merchandise with value beyond the need for survival, that is, giving super-sensitive values to the goods that appear in the form of an image.

⁵ This way of constituting the illusion as an ideology in the formation of the society of the spectacle is an effect, above all, by the distancing of production by the one who produces, the worker distances himself from the product and the consumption of what he produces, thus, what is produced by it arrives in a fragmented and dispersed way, the attempt at a fragmented approach produces, on the one hand, the alienation of work and on the other hand the form of fetishized merchandise.

⁶ As Debord himself will announce, in his comments on the society of the spectacle, a work written later, in 1987, which revisits *The Society of the Spectacle* in 1967.

and consciousness. Because it is something separate, it is the focus of deluded eyes and false consciousness; the unification it accomplishes is nothing but the official language of generalized separation. (DEBORD, 1997, p. 14).

This possibility of unification is the touchstone of a contradiction in the society of the spectacle - it is the unity of a generalized separation - precisely because it is everywhere it is unified, but it is at the same time the result of a process of historical fragmentation in the which experienced the society whose one of its assumptions would become the accumulation and overproduction of merchandise, forms of production engendered from the birth of capitalism - if there is such a unity, Debord will tell us, only if it is that of misery. In this process of expansion, the spectacle begins to gain a fundamental importance as a form of commodity production, extending the reach of capital in a superior form of capitalism.

The unification previously dictated by the theological model, a God and his religious unity, endowed with the old specular form and the domain of the magical power of the world, is gradually being replaced by capital unification, it is the spectacle of capitalism, as the domain of a new theology of political economy that resumes this unification of a total conscience. What was before the critique of political economy operated by Marx, becomes, in Debord, the criticism of culture and spectacle.

This unification is operated both by market forces that would become global, which is where the show is presented in its most advanced and diffuse form, in which we will point out ahead, as well as by a state model, and there a form of concentrated show⁷. It is a new theology of the political economy of self-regulation of the market, and also a type of State that functions as an apparatus for this form of production and that provides the subsidy for the maintenance of the spectacle. State that soon after the bourgeois revolution is associated with the nascent power, that is, it will exist then as a fusion between State and Capital. Right after this revolution, the State becomes the bureaucratized form - as occurred in post-revolutionary Russia - this model becomes the substitution of the mercantile model for the bureaucratization of the state, as an absolute ideology of control in a type of capitalism late in which the conditions for economic advance are forced in order to accompany the development of the most advanced countries or even within a project of revolution.

Debord, therefore, points out wholesome criticisms both of the model of capitalist state and of the experiences of totalitarian states, be it the so-called dictatorships of the proletariat, and the fascist states that, for the author, copied the model implanted by the Russian revolution, using its bureaucratic matrix

⁷ Here Debord uses the figure of the vedete "star", that is, the image of a living personality socialized as a show, which is the apparent life without depth, as a model to be followed, figuring lifestyles. Vedete in a concentrated society is about the figure of only one person, a unique model of individual to be mirrored. Debord refers to totalitarian states and their heads of state. Here Debord summarizes about the stars: "They embody the inaccessible result of social work, by implying by-products of this work that are magically transferred above it as their purpose: power and vacations, decision and consumption, which are at the beginning and at the end of an undisputed process" (DEBORD, 2003, p. 43).

and its ideological centralization. But, unlike the proletarian revolution, the fascist state is radically opposed to the expansion of the power of this class and resumes in its ideological base mythical and archaic values.

If, at first, the production of the commodity existed as a surplus for survival, at the moment when economic progress begins to expand and allow a super abundance and a gradual transformation of a qualitative production, that is, that is related to production reality and the lived experience, for a quantitative form - the mass production of goods - the commodity form arises that promotes a radical transformation in society, as Debord himself explains:

The incessant expansion of economic power in the form of commodities, which transformed human labor into commodity labor, in wages, leads cumulatively to an abundance in which the first question of survival is undoubtedly resolved, but in such a way that it must be resolved. always find yourself again; it is, each time, put back to a higher degree. Economic growth frees societies from the natural pressure that demanded their immediate struggle for survival, but it is then from their liberator that they are not free. (DEBORD, 1997, p. 31).

In the accumulation of the surplus, the merchandise appears as an object of exchange and transmutes the work also in the form of merchandise. The commodity and its form surpass its initial condition as just a way of solving the question of survival and emerge as an extension of this condition, transforming economic relations and becoming itself, the economy itself. These same forces that liberated man from the primary issue of survival - promoting an abundance of production - are the same that end up enslaving.

The economy in this form of surplus has a strong influence on the way of life, on the time lived, on leisure, on holidays, Debord tells us:

Although in the primitive phase of capitalist accumulation "the political economy saw in the proletarian only the worker" who should receive the minimum necessary for the conservation of his workforce, without ever being considered "in his leisure, in his humanity", this position of the ideas of the ruling class to reverse as soon as the degree of abundance reached in the production of goods requires a surplus of collaboration by the worker. This worker, completely despised in the face of all the modalities of organization and production surveillance, sees himself, every day, from the outside, but is apparently treated as a great person, with an obsequious delicacy, under the guise of the consumer. (DEBORD, 1997, p. 33).

It is a significant change in the way of behaving with the worker, the working relationship becomes more sophisticated. If before, his will was neglected in a more rigid and serviceable society that coordinated work relations in a vertical way, with the participation of the proletarian as a consumer, the relationship appears to be more humanized⁸. Behind this humanization, however, there is a form of society that participates and controls its consumers, including in the sphere of desires, dictating, almost always a choice already made, it is this society itself building new forms of subjective relationship consummated in its entirety by all types of show, information, advertising, entertainment “The form and content of the show are the total justification of the conditions and purposes of the existing system”. (DEBORD, 2003, p. 15). It is in this total domain of the economy as a society of the spectacle and its dominion over the leisure of humanity that Debord's diagnosis becomes emphatic: this society becomes the negation of humanity and this type of society that is everywhere, is the negation of human existence.

The spectacle that emerged from the process of capitalism's emancipation becomes, then, the relationship between men, it is not just an image in the sense of common sense, it is the global bond that allows the unification of differences; social classes, ethnic groups, peoples, workers and employers, forming a totality in which the image becomes the crystallized reality itself. However, as a force capable of inventing and producing images and consumer goods, the spectacle society provides elements that radically modify social and subjective values. For Debord, there is a radicality above all in the ethical values of “being”, which starts to emphasize “having”, and “having” in “appearing”, above all, because in this type of society, what appears is what is. It not only reverses these values, but produces a false historical and social conscience - by producing realities from the spectacle and the spectacle constituting reality.

The interference of the spectacle in reality, therefore, becomes so incisive that it presents a novelty in the constitution of historical truth, presupposed in the philosophy of the history of modernity; the society of the spectacle appears just like the liar who lies to himself, that is, the lie is dressed as truth, and what appears to be a step towards reaching the true, becomes the truth itself. Such an inversion goes against the Hegelian formulation in which he says that the lie / falsehood in a concrete and historical reality would present itself as real steps to reach the true, that is, as if the lie were before, phases of mistakes and successes for if, in fact, truth is reached as a final stage of the social process, already in the society of the spectacle with the real world inverted in representation, Debord would state; “In the really inverted world, the true is a moment of the false” (DEBORD, 2003, p. 16).

In short, the society of the spectacle appears as an effect of the way in which capitalism has developed since modernity when constituting the commodity form, this form resulting from the quantification of work and capital accumulation, in which it transformed work into commodity, until that

⁸ The capitalism that previously established a relationship with the worker based on an exhaustive exploration to obtain the juice of his work, that is, the added value, qualitatively changes his relationship with him, still maintaining a safe distance, the now “Proletarian” is treated more respectfully, as a consumer.

form merchandise would finally become a spectacle. For this capitalism, if the question of survival is no longer the most important, it is necessary to create ever renewed needs for survival, fetish and consumption⁹.

When the spectacle becomes the mediation of the human relationship, the control of information appears from a new perspective. In this new condition, the receiver of the information is merely a contemplator of a falsehood dressed up in truth, it is the half truths that, unlike a control of political power, no one knows who controls what, the information is decentralized and it becomes part of a game of articulations in which nobody else knows who manipulates whom¹⁰. Power, unlike modernity that presented itself in a vertical and hierarchical way, now becomes diffuse among individuals, horizontal and faceless, is the gradual transition to a new type of society.

With controlled information, the sense of cause of the facts is dispersed by the logic that the factual truth is represented in the form of an image, in this way a reference to the real is lost, for example: if the cause of a particular war is mobilized by some factors "Obvious" like searching for oil or ore, these reasons can be completely different from what is propagated, so that we never know which ones, in a large network of conspiracies. It is a society of political control and control of information and the power of those who hold the information.

This control of information would lead us, therefore, to a subjection of human life, and freedom itself, or freedom of choice, above all of the market is previously determined as an omnipresent force, in which there is a predetermined choice for what is offered.

Fetishism takes on a life of its own in which, by dulling the imaginary power of the commodity, the need for consumption goes beyond its immediate condition and is manufactured and coerced into being consumed, it is not just a manufactured need, it is also what is produced by those who are producers do not enjoy what they produce. Fetishism maintains the state of torpor of the one who contemplates and consumes, the subject becomes partially satisfied temporarily in his contemplation of the merchandise at the same time that his desire expands to the infinite given the always renewed stimulation alternated with its suppression - that is, the desire is never completely satisfied, it is always deprived of its desire. These are subtle new forms of social control that are announced and a gradual transition to a new society of control takes shape, who attests to this new paradigm is Foucault, who provides decisive elements to understand this process.

⁹ Needs undergo transformations in totalitarian States, says Debord, in addition to the imposition of a totalitarian ideology, in which what it says is what it is, this state intends to transform perception, through State policing. Not only in totalitarian states, but especially in the most advanced and diffuse capitalism, which is the keynote of our investigation.

¹⁰ Obviously, the internet seems to have brought a new dynamic in relations, giving voice to a larger and multiple discourse and a capacity for political organization without major mediation, however, perhaps, Debord's analysis is still relevant, if he were alive and could evaluate this new tool, could associate this new technology through the bias of policing and the unity of a generalized fragmentation, for example.

II. THE CONTROL SOCIETY; BEYOND THE FIELD OF INSTITUTIONS.

It was Michel Foucault - when analyzing the forms of power - who announced the constitution of a disciplinary society and later to the society of control, his studies on the nature of forms of power allowed the understanding of the subtle sophistication of these models of society and in the action of their power over individuals. According to the author, the disciplinary society is constituted under the aegis of the social hierarchy, in which it distributes power in a diffuse network, in these networks the institutions would be tasked with managing the obedience, inclusion and exclusion of individuals. Regarding disciplinary society, Foucault stresses:

Two images of the discipline. At one extreme, the bloc discipline, the closed institution, established on the margins, and all focused on negative functions: doing for evil, breaking communications, suspending time. At the other extreme, with panoptism, we have the discipline-mechanism: a functional device that should improve the exercise of power making it faster, lighter, more effective, a design of subtle constraints for a society to come. The movement that goes from one project to the next, from an exceptional discipline scheme to that of generalized surveillance, rests on a historical transformation: the progressive extension of discipline devices throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, their multiplication throughout the social body, the formation of what could be roughly called a disciplinary society. (FOUCAULT, 1987, p. 173).

The image of the prison as the *Panopticon*¹¹ of the English philosopher and jurist Jeremy Bentham that Foucault alludes to Watch and Punish is appropriate for visualizing the transition from medieval

¹¹ This prison structure is very different from the medieval dungeon in which the prisoner was enclosed in a structure in which he was in complete isolation, so that he was not fully guarded and could not see, in accordance with the principle of locking, deprived of light and to hide. About this structure, Foucault writes: "Bentham's Panopticon is the architectural figure of this composition. The principle is known: on the periphery a ring construction; the peripheral building is divided into cells, each spanning the entire thickness of the building; they have two windows, one for the interior, corresponding to the windows of the tower; another, which faces outwards, allows light to pass through the cell from side to side. Then just put a watchman in the central tower, and lock a madman, a sick person, a convict, a worker or a schoolchild in each cell. By the effect of the backlight, it is possible to perceive the small captive silhouettes in the cells on the periphery of the tower. So many cages, so many small theaters in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. The panoptic device organizes space units that allow you to see without stopping and recognize immediately. In short, the dungeon principle is reversed; or rather, of its three functions - to lock, to deprive of light and to hide - only the first is preserved and the other two are suppressed. The full light and the look of a watchman capture better than the shadow, which he finally protected. Visibility is a trap. (FOUCAULT, 1987, p. 165-166).

punitive society to modern disciplinary society. The Panopticon consists of a building structure located in the center of a building, initially used in prisons so that if it were possible from a single point to have a view of all the compartments, so that the prisoner would be watched at all times without it be aware of such a situation or who could watch and watch others.

In another aspect, Foucault will signal for another type of society, that of control, in which the mechanisms of power become more “democratic” and horizontal, distributed in the social body. Hard and Negri pay attention to Foucault's theory:

Disciplinary power is manifested, in effect, in the structuring of parameters and limits of thought and practice, sanctioning and prescribing normal and / or deviated behaviors. Foucault generally refers to the ancien régime and the classical age of French civilization to illustrate the rise of disciplinarity, but even more generally we can say that the entire first phase of capitalist accumulation (in Europe and elsewhere) was conducted under this paradigm of power. We must understand the control society, in contrast, as those (which develop within the limits of modernity and open up to postmodernity) in which mechanisms of command become increasingly “democratic”, increasingly immanent in the social field , distributed by citizens' bodies and brains. (HARDT, NEGRI, 2001, p. 42).

Gilles Deleuze in a Post-Escriptum on the control societies - released in an interview book called *Conversations* - makes pertinent comments on Foucault's thesis. According to Deleuze, the new paradigm marks the passage from the modern organization of institutions, family, church, school, army, factories - in which there was a separation between inside and outside, in which discipline was dictated by institutions and outside them and the subject was in a way protected - for a society of control in which the barriers of inside and outside are broken, they are now hybrid forms of disciplines that come out to the social body. Deleuze asserts:

We are in a general crisis of all means of confinement, prison, hospital, factory, school, family. The family is an “interior”, in crisis like any other interior, school, professional, etc. The competent ministers are constantly announcing supposedly necessary reforms. Reform the school, reform the industry, the hospital, the army, the prison; but everyone knows that these institutions are doomed, in a more or less long term. It is just a matter of managing your agony and occupying people, until the installation of the new forces that are announced. Control societies are replacing disciplinary societies. (DELEUZE, 1992, p. 219).

If before we could determine the forms of domination over the individual confined in prisons, factories or schools, new more sophisticated and autonomous forms of control appear, in which everyone's vigil becomes more effective. These new forms of control are changing and adaptable to the new demands

of society managed by world capital. The logic of the focus on production is transferred to products and services, as announced by Debord. Factory or schools, are now replaced by the dynamics of companies, it is the new face of social life, which no longer regulates the individual by coercing him in the vertical power of the institution, but from open and readjusted forms in a modular way.

But today capitalism is no longer directed towards production, often relegated to the periphery of the third world, even in the complex forms of textiles, metallurgy or oil. It is a capitalism of overproduction. It no longer buys raw materials and no longer sells finished products: it buys finished products, or assembles spare parts. What he wants to sell are services, and what he wants to buy are stocks. It is no longer a capitalism directed towards production, but towards the product, that is, towards the sale or the market. So it is essentially dispersive, and the factory gave way to the company. (DELEUZE, 1992, p. 221).

The company becomes “the soul of the business” and provides an indispensable engine for this new society, its continued formation of the “proletarians” gradually replaces the schools. Wages in the form of meritocracy and the gradual encouragement of individuals to compete with democratic and liberal airs, give a horizontal and no longer vertical face to labor relations. Control does not need to be confined in a closed place, but in open forms, the individual does not need a number or identification, he becomes identified by his number, by more sophisticated and subtle forms of control. Deleuze again:

There is no need for science fiction to conceive a control mechanism that gives, at each instant, the position of an element in open space, an animal in a reserve, a man in a company (electronic collar). Félix Guattari imagined a city where everyone could leave their apartment, their street, their neighborhood, thanks to an electronic card (dividual) that would open the barriers, but the computer that detects the position of each one, legal or illegal, and operates a universal modulation. (DELEUZE, 1992, p. 222).

For Deleuze and Guattari¹², capitalism acts through movements, displacement and agency of territories and identities, capitalism is as if it were a monster that, like an unconscious machine, was swallowing up all the changes in society and its ways of life¹³. Capitalism, in this way, starts to evolve even more the process of transformation from worker to consumerist, it co-opts discourses previously legitimized

¹² In a way, the concept of a society of control, even though Deleuze affirming Foucault's authenticity, may have been imputed by Deleuze himself, affirming Hardt, in which he, in fact, in his books with Félix Guattari, studies capitalism and its forms agency, is the case of the famous books of the 1970s, *The Anti Oedipus* and *Thousand Plateaus - Capitalism and Schizophrenia*.

¹³ Paulo Arantes would say that some “French ideologues” are like “excellent seismographs” of structural changes in capitalism. Vladimir Safatle in quote to Paulo Arantes in his book “*Grande Hotel Abismo*”. (SAFATLE, 2012, p. 19).

by critics, such as autonomy, freedom, hedonism, and starts to encompass them as legitimate and controlled forms by capital .

Hardt and Negri observe in Debord a current concept of social unity and fragmentation, formed by the breaking down of territorial barriers of postmodernity, allowing the creation of a new Empire, that is, a true global empire that is no longer restricted to barriers nation-States and institutions.

The form of the spectacle society as a specular power that reaches a worldwide proportion in Debord's thesis, is also found, modified and expanded, in the concepts of Negri and Hardt as a global Empire in new forms of control, Hardt and Negri point out in a different way. healthy for changing this paradigm, they write:

The transition to the Empire arises from the twilight of modern sovereignty. In contrast to imperialism, the Empire does not establish a territorial center of power, nor is it based on fixed borders or barriers. It is a device for decentralization and deterritorialization of the general that gradually incorporates the entire world within its open and expanding borders. The Empire manages hybrid entities, flexible hierarchies and plural exchanges through regulatory command structures. The different national colors of the imperialist map of the world came together and merged, in a global imperial rainbow. (HARDT, NEGRI, 2001, p. 12-13).

The Empire is the real point of arrival of capitalism, that is, in which a global economy governed by financial capital controls all markets, in the form of transnationals and the financial market. With this new paradigm, significant changes in the social structure begin to occur; one of them is the effective devaluation of public space in large cities, in which there is a production of ties and relationships under siege in large private spaces. It also produces the dissolution of modern binomials, between inside and outside, between me and another in which what appears as disciplinary or institutional also appears in structures without spatial rigidity in fluid spaces in the field of immanence of capitalism¹⁴.

The show also reaches these private spaces and communicates the body of subjective relations beyond the borders of traditional institutions¹⁵. This new space of the control society allows the total emancipation of biopower¹⁶ by internalizing in individuals the forms of power previously partial to disciplinary society, points out Hardt and Negri:

¹⁴ We can think of the control of surveillance cameras, the protection of condominiums, the proliferation of social networks on the Internet, it is the destruction of the distinction between inside and outside.

¹⁵ Such an approach creates new problems regarding alterity, now racial and territorial issues, for example, are situated in new problems linked no longer to the threat of a clear enemy, these appear in the form of corruption of the same social body, they are micro - conflicts, thousands, and the resumption of old disputes (such as ethnic disputes in the former Yugoslavia, or conflicts between Israel and Palestine) that emerge from the same field.

¹⁶ In the conception of biopower, the power, of the institutions or of the State, is in control of life itself, that is, in addition to the issue of the threat of death, and issues of regulation and health come into debate. Foucault explains: "This year I would like to start the study of something that I had called, a little bit in the

In disciplinary society, therefore, the relationship between power and the individual remained stable: the disciplinary invasion of power corresponded to the individual's resistance. In contrast, when power becomes entirely biopolitical, the entire social body is embraced by the power machine and developed in its virtualities. This relationship is open, qualitative and expressive. Society, grouped within a power that extends to the nodes of the social structure and its development processes, reacts as one body. (HARDT, NEGRI, 2001, p. 43).

Hardt, in his text *The world control society* summarizes the control society based on three hypotheses: The first is that the control society is characterized by corruption, unlike the modern society that was defined by the crisis based on its bipolarity, in this case Cold War, for example, or modern racism based on qualitative difference, genetic differences. The spaces of the control society are hybrid, impure spaces. This means that the way in which current capitalism acts is by breaking up, by deforming and forming new subjectivities. As a second hypothesis, the control society actually defines the final stage of capitalism in its crumbling form, that is, there is now no distinction between a transcendent power of the state and the immanent social body, but an aggregation of capitalism to the immanent body, to all social territory, without a barrier between power and the social body, is what Deleuze calls a striated field. And as a third hypothesis, it is to think of the control society as a world market, the world market is the starting and ending point of capitalism, its crumbling and its distribution beyond borders and that defines, therefore, the control society as truly a world market.

III. CONCLUSION

We can identify, therefore, relations between the concepts of spectacle and control, let's see some of them: 1) The idea in which the spectacle as well as the control acts on individuals, operating a kind of conditioning of their subjectivities and their freedom 2) A idea that there is a kind of social unity, that is, belonging, inclusion, consumption of goods, leisure and culture and that this would produce a type of unification and social balance that, however, is not effective, either through cooptation strategies,

air, of biopower, that is, this series of phenomena that seems to me quite important, namely, the set of mechanisms by which what , in the human species, it constitutes its fundamental biological characteristics will be able to enter a policy, a political strategy, a general strategy of power. In other words, like society, modern western societies, from the 17th century onwards, once again took to heart the fundamental biological fact that the human being constitutes a human species. It is generally what I call, what I called, to give it a name, biopower.”(FOUCAULT, 2008, p. 10).

fragmentation and control. 3) Finally, the conception that the spectacle, as well as control, has gained worldwide, breaking with the isolations of the localities or even an idea of Nation-State.

REFERENCES

- [1] DEBORD, Guy. *A Sociedade do Espetáculo*. São Paulo: Ed. Contraponto, 1997.
_____ *La Sociéte du Spetacle*. Paris: Éditions Champ Libre, 1971.
- [2] DELEUZE, Gilles. *Conversações: 1972-1990*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1992.
- [3] DELEUZE, GUATTARI, Gilles, Félix. *O Anti-Édipo*. São Paulo: Ed.34, 2010.
- [4] DELEUZE, GUATTARI, Gilles, Félix. *Mil Platôs: Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, 1997.
- [5] FOUCAULT, Michel. *Microfísica do Poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Graal, 4º edição, 1984.
- [6] FOUCAULT, Michel. *Segurança, Território, População*. São Paulo: Ed: Martins Fontes, 2008.
- [7] FOUCAULT, Michel. *Vigiar e Punir*. Petrópolis-RJ: Ed. Vozes, 1987.
- [8] HARDT, Michael. *A Sociedade Mundial de Controle*. In: Alliez, Eric. *Gilles Deleuze: uma vida filosófica*. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2000.
- [9] HARDT, NEGRI, Michael, Antonio. *Império*. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Ed. Record, 2001.
- [10] HEGEL, G. W. F. *Fenomenologia do Espírito*. 2. ed. Petrópolis Rj: Ed. Vozes, 1988.
- [11] SAFATLE, Vladimir. *Grande Hotel Abismo: por uma reconstrução da teoria do reconhecimento*. São Paulo: Ed. Martins Fontes, 2012.