

**SOCIETY AND CONSUMPTION: AN ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER RELATIONS
AND THE PROCESS OF SUBJECTIFICATION IN MODERNITY¹**

***SOCIEDADE E CONSUMO: UMA ANÁLISE SOBRE AS RELAÇÕES DE CONSUMO E
O PROCESSO DE SUBJETIVAÇÃO NA MODERNIDADE***

***SOCIEDAD Y CONSUMO: UN ANÁLISIS SOBRE LAS RELACIONES DE CONSUMO
Y EL PROCESO DE SUBJETIVACIÓN EN LA MODERNIDAD***

Remo dos SANTOS²
Pedro Augusto Dinelli CRUZ³

ABSTRACT: This study will search through bibliographic research a study about the subjectification process in the Consumer Society. This will require the use of writings by theorists such as Michel Foucault for an analysis of the structure of societies throughout history, which will reinforce a statement of the type of behavior of each society. This is an important point to determine what is the consumer culture in this society. Consumption will be shown here beyond the actual act of consuming, creating logic and behaviors, demonstrating that for the consumer society, the exercise of owning is in the background, when it is the very pursuit of the desire to consume that keeps the consumption wheel spinning. Consumption here is central and the subject will show itself as an agent of consumption, being driven and transformed by it.

KEYWORDS: Subjectivity. Society. Consumption.

RESUMO: Este estudo buscará, por meio de pesquisa bibliográfica, um estudo sobre o processo de subjetivação na Sociedade de Consumo. Para isso, recorrerá a escritos de teóricos como Michel Foucault para uma análise da estrutura das sociedades ao longo da história, o que reforçará uma afirmação do tipo de comportamento de cada sociedade. Esse ponto se faz importante para determinar o que é a cultura do consumo nessa sociedade. O consumo se mostrará aqui para além do próprio ato de consumir, criando lógicas e comportamentos, demonstrando que para a sociedade de consumo, o exercício de possuir fica em segundo plano, quando é a própria busca pelo desejo de consumir que mantém a roda do consumo girando. O consumo aqui é central e o sujeito se mostrará como agente do consumo, sendo impulsionado e transformado pelo mesmo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Subjetividade. Sociedade. Consumo.

¹ Translated by Alexander Vinicius Leite da Silva - Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.

² University Center of Barra Mansa (UBM), Barra Mansa – RJ – Brazil. Graduated in the Psychology course. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0143-0534>. E-mail: santos.remo@gmail.com

³ Estácio de Sá University (UNESA), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Professor of the Psychology course (UBM). Master's in Social Sciences (UFRRJ). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9523-9713>. E-mail: pdcruz88@gmail.com

RESUMEN: *Este estudio buscará, a través de la investigación bibliográfica, un estudio sobre el proceso de subjetivación en la Sociedad de Consumo. Para ello, recurrirá a los escritos de teóricos como Michel Foucault para un análisis de la estructura de las sociedades a lo largo de la historia, que reforzará una afirmación del tipo de comportamiento de cada sociedad. Este punto es importante para determinar cuál es la cultura de consumo en esta sociedad. El consumo se mostrará aquí más allá del acto real de consumir, creando lógicas y comportamientos, demostrando que para la sociedad de consumo, el ejercicio de la propiedad está en segundo plano, cuando es la búsqueda del deseo por consumir lo que mantiene el consumo funcionando. El consumo aquí es central y el sujeto se mostrará como un agente de consumo, siendo impulsado y transformado por él.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Subjetividad. Sociedad. Consumo.*

Introduction

Societies go through processes of change, throughout history, and in each of them we can identify practices that characterize them. These practices are in the field of the social imaginary and can be identified through studies of social and historical sciences competence. When we observe a society with care, we can identify traces that are always transferred from the previous ones to the most current ones. This paper intends to analyze some of them with main focus on the Society of Consumption.

Starting from a historical process, through bibliographical research, we will show how social relations are manifested and organized. After all, what social practices differentiate other societies from the society of consumption? The answer to this question is the main objective of this article.

In the Society of Consumption, we will try to demonstrate how the relations happen, of which, Bauman (2008) will call attention to obsolescence and liquidity. We will see that the consumer market invests technology and time to form consumer agents and that within this logic, everything is consumed, and consuming becomes a right and a duty of the subject of this society.

To this end, there is a formation, an institutionalized structure that promotes the logic of consumption and provides support for such practices. The people in this society are themselves “commodified”, as Bauman warns (2008).

Therefore, we are interested in observing which types of agencies or captures are made in this process of consumption that potentialize such practices. To do so, we will try to point out the question of the agency of desire flows, through the re-reading of Deleuze and Guattari

that show a desire linked to the social and political field and that much makes sense to this article.

At the end of the study, we will try to highlight all these issues that concern the current practices of modern society.

Societies, institutions and practices

Thus, we will start our dialogue bringing the meaning of what a society is and how it is formed, through the writings of Baremlitt (2002) who states that “society” is an organized form of human association, with rules and customs, and can also be called culture or practices, and are formed by “[...] a network, a fabric of institutions” (BAREMBLITT, 2002, our translation). Still according to the author, the institutions concern human practices and logics, which depending on the degree of formalization may become laws, but which are not limited only to formalization, but may also be informal and understood as cultural habits, but which always concern human organization in a social context.

What do these logics mean? They mean the regulation of a human activity, they characterize a human activity, and they pronounce themselves valiantly with respect to it, clarifying what should be, what is prescribed, and what should not be, that is, what is proscribed, as well as what is indifferent. These logics, these discriminative bodies, are various [...] (BAREMBLITT, 2002, our translation).

Still second (BAREMBLITT, 2002, our translation): “On a formal level, a society is nothing more than that: a fabric of institutions that interpenetrate and articulate among themselves to regulate the production and reproduction of human life on the earth and the relationship among mankind”. Faced with these analyses, we are able to conclude, for the moment, that a society is formed by institutions that concern human practices. However, these practices belong to the field of the abstract. “Now, understood as such, institutions are abstract entities, no matter how much they may be recorded in writing or kept in traditions” (BAREMBLITT, 2002, our translation).

According to Baremlitt (2002) for an institution to fulfill its function of regulating human life it must materialize in large or small concrete sets that give it life and meaning, and to these devices he gives the name “Organizations”.

However, Baremlitt (2002) still points out that even the “organizations” being a form of materialization of the institutions, these are still composed of structures and or smaller units that can have diverse natures and that collaborate for the function of the institutions.

Baremlitt (2002) writes in his text about the existence of agents, human beings who protagonize forms, lifestyles and verbal or non-discursive practices, but that generate actions, behaviors and dynamism to this institutional elaboration. These actions generate transformations in reality, according to the author.

Societies show themselves, within the institutional perspective, a large and elaborate complex of formations, with a range of sectorized logics - Institution, Organization, Establishment, Equipment, etc. – and that end up giving meaning to human practices. However, they not only give meaning and engender human behavior, but they are also transformed by these behaviors, in a reciprocal relationship.

However, it is still necessary to understand how the logics coming from the institutional transformations, conceptualized as “Instituent”, which according to Baremlitt (2002), are the forces that tend to found, modify or transform these institutional logics, are formed.

Therefore, we will see that this production of institutional logic, called Instituent, also generates a product, called Instituted, which “[...] is the effect of the Instituent activity” (BAREMBLITT, 2002, our translation).

It is important to understand these dynamics within the institutional logic of societies, because it is through this dynamism that historical and social practices that bring meaning to life in society will be affirmed. In fact, it is within this context that we will be able to maintain a communication between societies and the practices of their agents.

According to Baremlitt (2002), the instituent is then what passes and signals which practices are possible in a society and which are not, within a social and historical plan. It is the instituent force that is capable of giving identity to a society, such as that of consumption. And the instituted is where these practices and rules are deposited, it is in it that laws are reinvigorated and a whole social behavior is evidenced.

Now that we are able to understand all the instances that constitute a society and understand from the reading of Baremlitt's text what the institutions are and how they give meaning, even if abstract, to the social logic, through their organizations, their agents and practices, and we also understand that a society is a network of institutions that concern the practices and forms of social organizations within a historical context.

We will now proceed in a concise and objective way in order to bring to this article a brief analysis of the texts by the authors Deleuze and Foucault, two examples of societies: Disciplinary Society and Control Society, so that, from then on, we can begin to problematize the Society of Consumption, by means of other theoreticians.

Discipline and control

In order to better understand these societies, it is necessary to highlight, and we will begin with the Disciplinary Society, the meaning that was given to life, because in that society, it was where power was exercised: “In the classical theory of sovereignty, you know that the right of life and death was one of its fundamental attributes” (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation). Following this logic, sovereign power was exercised through the body, or rather: “In a certain sense, to say that the sovereign has the right to life and death means, deep down, that the sovereign can make people die and let them live [...]” (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation). So, in disciplinary society, in that socio-historical context, relationships were submitted to a verticalized, hierarchical logic. Differentiated between the reality of the sovereign and that of the subject.

When it goes a little further and, if you like, even the paradox, this means deep down that, in relation to power, the subject is neither alive nor dead. It is, from the point of view of life and death, neutral, and it is simply because of the sovereign that the subject has the right to be alive or has the right, eventually, to be dead. In any case, the life and death of the subjects only become rights by the effect of the sovereign will (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation).

Making evident that the excellence of the functioning of that society was pure sovereignty. It was the place where relationships were idealized and how they became legitimate. However, these functional logics were changing and becoming still in the 19th century.

And I believe that, precisely, one of the most massive transformations of 19th century political law has consisted, I don't say exactly in replacing, but in completing this old right of sovereignty – to make die or let live – with another new right, which will not erase the first, but will penetrate it, pass it on, modify it, and which will be a right, or rather, a power exactly the opposite: the power to “make” live and “let” die. The right of sovereignty is, therefore, the right to make die or to let live. And then, this new right is installed: the right to make live and to let die (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation).

However, as Foucault (2005) tells us, this transformation did not occur suddenly. It became necessary due to the demand for a new form of institutional mechanism, with other techniques and technologies of power.

This transformation, now concerned with the body for work, made the exercise of power through what he will call “[...]disciplinary technology of work. It was installed at the

end of the 17th century and throughout the 18th century” (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation).

As Foucault (2005) stated, this new technique is directed to the living human being, to the life of humans. Since the disciplinary society, on the contrary, was maintained by the sovereign's right to make die, now the life of the human beings becomes more important. However, from now on, human beings are seen in a new aspect.

The disciplines practically dealt with the individual and its body. It is not exactly with society that one deals with this new technology of power (or, finally, with the social body as defined by the jurists); neither is it with the individual-body. It is a new body: a multiple body, a body with countless heads, if not infinite, at least necessarily numberable. It is the notion of "population". Biopolitics deals with population, and population as a political problem, as a scientific and political problem at one time, as a biological problem, and as a problem of power [...] (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation).

From there we move on to a problem no longer of the individual alone, but of a social body, which lacks norms, regulations and control. An individual in a control society.

This is not, unlike the disciplines, an individual training carried out by working in one's own body. It is not absolutely about being connected to an individual body, as the discipline does. It is not, therefore, absolutely a matter of considering the individual at the level of detail, but, on the contrary, by means of global mechanisms, of acting in such a way as to obtain global states of balance, of regularity; in short, of taking into account life, the biological processes of human-species, and of ensuring over them not a discipline, but a regulation (FOUCAULT, 2005, our translation).

Such regulation demands a discipline of the body and a control of the social environment, which takes care not to lose the whole institutional process built up until this historical moment. Foucault (2005) will point out that in general the element capable of controlling and circulating between the disciplinary order of the body and the random events of a biological multiplicity is the “norm”. As a norm we understand the set of rules that govern a society and man in society.

Deleuze shows us that “disciplinary societies have two poles: the signature that indicates the individual, and the registration number that indicates its position in a mass” (DELEUZE, 1990, our translation). This is a characteristic of the discipline, but it is also present in control. Societies change, but they do not cease to bring customs of the past. At this historical moment we no longer find ourselves in a Discipline-Control or Mass-Individual dichotomy.

It is no longer in front of the mass-individual pair. Individuals have become “divisible”, and masses have become samples, data, markets or “banks”. It is money that perhaps best expresses the distinction between the two societies, since discipline has always referred to coins minted in gold – which served as a standard measure – while control refers to floating exchanges, modulations that make a percentage of different samples of money intervene as a figure (DELEUZE, 1990, p. 2, our translation).

In this sense, we have here another problem, money, concentration and also production. “The market conquests are made by taking control and no longer by forming disciplines” (DELEUZE, 2005, our translation). The problem of weakening institutions is then created, which at that moment took care only of human beings and their power over them, thus creating a crisis of institutions, opening the way for the implementation of a new regime of domination (DELEUZE, 1990, p. 4).

Deleuze (1990) ends the PostScriptum reporting the birth of a new form of market production, caused by this whole process of crisis of the institutions, generated by the change also in the economic logic, commenting on the sales service and marketing. Now society would enter a phase of consumption and would leave for a new institutional form whose “[...] control is of short term and rapid rotation, but also continuous and unlimited, while the discipline was of long duration, infinite and discontinuous” (DELEUZE, 1990, p. 4, our translation).

Society and consumption

From this link between industrial production and consumption, Baudrillard (2010, p. 82), perceives the transformation of focus on industrial production, which starts to see in the Human Being of the Society of Consumption a demand greater than that of industrial production, making people the object of the science of consumption, because it perceives, in the need of the consumerist agent, an opening for the exploration of the desire to purchase already existing in all agents “liquid-modern”. Thus giving a new direction to the manufacturing logic of this century, of this Consumer Society that starts to adopt industrial production always linked to the production of needs, in a system of needs.

The object of production, not ceasing to be the product, but being even more a system of needs, does not remain alone without first being able to change the demand of society, building a logic in the relations and changing the form of meanings. “The truth of consumption lies in the fact that it is not a function of pleasure, but a function of production - and therefore, as with material production, a function that is not individual, but immediate and

totally collective” (BAUDRILLARD, 2010, p. 91, our translation). This is happening because the relations are being transformed, they are now resignifying themselves, “Modern people spend less and less of their lives in production for work and more and more in the continuous production and innovation of their own needs and well-being” (BAUDRILLARD, 2010, p. 94, our translation). In this sense, Bauman (2008) takes us back to a time in the history of society that he calls “Society of Producers”.

In a society of producers, the “long term” had preference over the “short term”, and the needs of the “whole” had priority over the needs of its “parts”. The joys and satisfactions extracted from “eternal” and “supraindividual” values were considered superior to the ephemeral individual raptures, while the raptures of the collectivity were placed above the fate of the few, being seen as the only valid and genuine satisfactions amidst the multiplicity of “pleasures of the moment”, seductive but false, invented, illusory and, ultimately, degrading (BAUMAN, 2008, our translation).

Unlike the Society of Consumers, the Society of Producers did not yearn for present achievements, but had, in the future, projects, fruits of the application of its work: “The ‘present’ was only a means to an end, that is, to a happiness that was always in the future, always ‘not yet’” (BAUMAN, 2008, our translation). And with the change in social behavior, sustained by the difference in the connection with consumption, it is also noteworthy that “The consumer society is perhaps the only one in human history to promise happiness in earthly life, here and now and in every successive ‘now’. In short, instant and perpetual happiness” (BAUMAN, 2008, our translation).

As in other societies, there is now also, a whole Norm, a Logic, which prepares man for consumption. Norms and Logics that, as we already know, are part of an institution, a hierarchical apparatus, for meeting institutional demands.

Since before the production until the post-production, Baudrillard (2010, p. 81) alerts us, the logic of consumption is already being applied, producing means to take from the consumer agent the control and the power of decision and leaving to the companies this control that can be manipulated. The consumer of this society can not escape this logic already institutionalized, being only a means, an agent in this relational complex that manages social practices. After all, it is these equipments that, serving the institutions and investing on the behavior of its agents, give sense to the socially accepted practices.

Therefore, to be able to think about the consumer society, we must first try to understand that the consumer culture, in this study, does not intend to be seen in a perverse way, which tends to steal from the subject his right to life, as previously in disciplinary

society, we could find, however, as a situation from which society relates in a socio-temporal manner.

The consumer society itself, says Bauman (2008), with its agencies, mechanisms and tools stimulate these consumer practices as an existential strategy that allows a better quality of life in society.

It could hardly be otherwise, since consumerism, in sharp opposition to previous forms of life, associates happiness not so much with the satisfaction of needs (as its “official versions” tend to leave implicit), but with an ever-increasing volume and intensity of desires, which in turn implies the immediate use and rapid replacement of objects intended to satisfy it (BAUMAN, 2008, our translation).

In this society of consumption, according to Baudrillard (2010), the individual does not feed the industrial system only through its financial gains, but all the way and even more, by the consumption of its products.

Bauman (2008) brings to light the understanding that the crucial objective of consumption in consumer society is not the satisfaction of needs, but the change of the idea of the body itself, what he would then call 'commodification' or 'recomodification' of the consumer: to elevate the condition of consumers to that of saleable goods.

“Comodification” for Bauman (2008) is the capacity that the subject and/or agent of the Consumer Society has to behave as merchandise and saleable product, whose social value follows the logic proposed by this society, a logic of agencies for consumption: The consumer agent itself becomes the object of exchange and sale, always positioning itself in evidence for a valuation of itself in relation to belonging, both in the social and economic field.

“On the other hand, there is no other religious, political or moral activity for which it is prepared in such a complete, scientific and expensive way” (BAUDRILLARD, 2010, our translation). After all, there is a great elaboration of organizations, establishments and tools that prepare the subject for a life of consumption. Thus, we have a society where the end of consumption is consumption itself. And the objects are nothing more than places of changeable and replaceable meanings.

The consumer in the Society of Consumption lives between obsolescence and novelty. “The reason is that consumption begins as a discourse orchestrated with an end in itself, tending to exhaust itself in this minimal exchange, with its satisfactions and disappointments. The object of consumption isolates.” (BAUDRILLARD, 2010, our translation).

Agency and subjectivation process: subjectivity

We are now interested in elaborating an analysis about the process of subjectivation, so that we can better understand the aspects of desire within the Society of Consumption. In this context, it was interesting to dialogue with two theorists, Deleuze and Guattari, through the writings of Savazzoni.

When we think of “desire”, situated in the reading of Deleuze and Guattari's writings, this thought always implies the Social, Historical and Political field.

For Deleuze and Guattari it is important to think about the desire for agencies and, therefore, “outside” their supposed object. When we desire, we do not desire alone, we always desire together, in groups, because the desire invests on a whole social, historical and political field (SAVAZZONI, 2012, p. 87, out translation).

In order to better understand this, it is important to know that “agency is connected to a perspective that conceives desire as ‘flow’ or ‘intensity’ and of a ‘productive’ and ‘active’ nature” (SAVAZZONI, 2012, our translation). The author continues stating that “understood in the order of intensities (multiplicities) there is no desire that does not run to an agency, because the desire considered in its immanent production, comprises only flows” (SAVAZZONI, 2012, our translation).

It is important that we understand this dynamic of desire and its relationship with the agencies, because within this understanding, “Everything goes through agencies, we are crossed, produced by them, and we also constitute ourselves on them” (SAVAZZONI, 2012, our translation).

Therefore, when we seek to understand the elaboration of subjectivity, we must go through the logic of desire agencies, in a state of constant change and transformation, “[...] subjectivity is understood as essentially 'industrial' or 'machinist', in the sense that it is constantly modeled, manufactured and consumed” (SAVAZZONI, 2012, our translation). This means that subjectivity is situated in culture in relation to the socio-historical environment, and therefore it responds to the cultural mechanisms that shape it at all times and do not standardize it, but transform it, always agenciating the flows of desire and creating new forms of subjectivation.

The question posed by the problem of (production of) subjectivity finds strong resonance with the analyses of Deleuze and Guattari about the processes (agencies and devices) that make up the (plane of immanence) field of experience of the world in which it will be possible to appear types

of “subjectivation” of which the “subject form” will be produced (SAVAZZONI, 2012, p. 67, our translation).

Within the context proposed by the article and recalling our object of research, we must then think of subjectivation aimed at the culture of consumption, which responds to a capitalist logic of production of subjectivities. We will return to this relation later on. But, what is valid is its reinforcement now.

It is important to point out here that this production of subjectivity that passes through individuals is always in relation to the institutionalizing forces, and they are in charge of managing agencies in the flows of desires that are always constant in the social body. Initially, we can affirm that ‘the’ subject is a ‘point (of subjectivation)’ resulting from a process of mass production, where it is demarcated, modeled, and consumed: they are the ‘agencies of subjectivation’ (SAVAZZONI, 2012, p. 68, our translation).

We understand that the subject becomes the result of a process of mass production, institutionalization and agency, whose flows of desire, through agency, produce subjectivities.

In this context, we cannot think of desire as the product of the subject, who expects some kind of permission from the unconscious field in order to make itself evident in this relationship, as an inner instance of the subject, in which it shelters itself in order to create flows as something that is always searching for an object, as if it also depended on such an object to affirm itself.

Savazzoni (2012, our translation) reiterates “the question of desire consists, therefore, in thinking of its “exteriority”, that is, it is neither interior to a subject, much less it walks towards an object (since it is the object itself) [...]”. Desire is then characterized as flow, and which can only be felt or captured by means of agencies, in which it is evidenced, but does not become its threshold.

The desire, as a flow, is in the midst of the relationships, evidenced through agency. “[...] one can only act through desire, and one can only desire by acting, without this implying, however, a dichotomy between the ‘desiring’ subject and the ‘desired’ object” (SAVAZZONI, 2012, our translation).

There is no difference from the perspective of flows of desire between “desire” and desired object, since desire can only be extracted and demonstrated through agencies. Therefore, it is the agencies that give meaning to desire, not to desire. For desire is a free flow and object in itself. Always changing in a continuous and infinite becoming.

Therefore, desire is never alone. It is in the set of relationships between terms that the reality of an agency is produced, that is to say, it is in the

middle, and through the middle, in the connections, in the mixtures of bodies and in the incorporeal transformations, as well as in the territorialities and in the processes of deterritorialization that the plane of desire is constituted while becoming. (SAVAZZONI, 2012, p. 88, our translation).

In this regard, the subject here is necessary as an integrant of analysis for a social context of consumption that integrates the forms of subjectivation to affirm its practices, because “due to its high technological development and also because it configures a competitive market and consumption, the logic of capitalism “needs” a subject, as a point of “articulation” or “subjectivation” of capital” (SAVAZZONI, 2012, our translation).

It is not, therefore, about conceiving subjectivity as a container where things or external representations would be “interiorized”, but, on the contrary, the production of subjectivity creates modes of subjectivation that are (immanent) to the way of guaranteeing the functioning of the system (SAVAZZONI, 2012, p. 67-68, our translation).

It is through this capture of the forms of subjectivation that the capitalist and consumption system keeps alive its logic of functioning, rescuing for itself the flows and agencies and producing new flows and agencies as well.

In the Deleuzian diagnosis, capitalism and desire are intrinsically linked in a process of alienation to the point of being able to say that the strength of this alliance has become one. This is because capitalism takes advantage of a characteristic of the type of constitution of modern man's personality to install itself as the unique form of desire and of obtaining the satisfaction of that desire by merging desire and need into a single hallucinatory object that is infinitely repeated/revived in consumption (ANTUNES, 2014, p. 249, our translation).

From necessity to consumption desire

As Bauman (1999) states, the consumer in a consumer society is too different from consumers in other societies. “If our ancestors [...] reflected on whether humans work to live or live to work, the dilemma we are most considering today is whether it is necessary to consume in order to live or whether humans live in order to consume” (BAUMAN, 1999, p. 88-89, our translation). This occurs because in today's consumption, logic does not move only toward the acquisition of goods – accumulation of palpable objects, but, of sensations, Bauman, (1999, p. 91). This occurs as Baudrillard (2010) tells us because the object can be replaced by another object, when the intention of the acquisition starts from the principle of desire in the production of signs or social relations.

The needs in the Society of Consumption have gained a new meaning and now carry other intentions. They do not seek the object itself, its form or utility, but make a different path, because “needs aim more at the values that objects and their satisfaction have in the first place the sense of adherence to such values” (BAUDRILLARD, 2010, p. 79, our translation), thus making it understand as something that is beyond the object, beyond the very act of consumption. The need for desire is now in constant motion, passing through objects, unfolding into liquid movements without feeling trapped at an end.

It is perceived, through the re-reading of Baudrillard (2010, p. 90), that desire is found here as an insatiable force in a continuous search for satisfaction, in a paradoxical activity in which the object on display, buying and/or selling, is not yet the final object to satiate this need, but just another change of significance. And about this Bauman (2008) brings, in his arguments, that the logic of the society of consumption walks towards the perpetual non-satisfaction of its members, since the yearning for the path of satisfaction never reached is what keeps the wheel of consumption spinning at full speed.

Bauman (2008) continues to argue that this gap between the promise and its fulfillment is not a failure of this society, or a miscalculation that needs to be corrected, but a necessary form of operation for the consumer society to continue to prosper and remain present in human consumption relations. It is understood then that it is now a logic inherent in the life practices of consumer agents. A practice of a society that understands that the realization of desire will always be replaced by the yearning for new desires, not yet perceived: “for good consumers it is not the satisfaction of needs that torments the person, but the torments of desires not yet perceived or suspected that make the promise so tempting” (BAUMAN, 1999, p. 90, our translation).

Bauman (1999) tells us that the relationship of consumption is not limited to having to be faithful in the choices of the object on display, but one cannot escape the option of having to choose.

Thus, we now agree that consumption is no longer just a cultural practice, but the existence of an institution already crystallized, forming this consumerist relationship. “Consumption appears as active and collective conduct, as coercion and morality, as an institution, making up a whole system of values, with all that this term implies as a function of integration of the social control group” (BAUDRILLARD, 2010, p. 95, our translation).

Following this logic, the consumer society is characterized not by producing objects for consumption, but by being concerned about always generating in the consumer agent the desire for consumption. “The secret of every durable social system (that is, that it reproduces

itself successfully) is to transform its “functional prerequisites” into behavioral motives of the actors” (BAUMAN, 2008).

The industrial movement of manufacturing consumables now somehow focuses its attention on building consumption practices and behaviors.

The product of global competitiveness of the manufacturer of the century ceases to be the product, the object, the thing; the commodity itself. The members of this society start to have this role of goods, products of market manufacture. “The members of the consumer society are themselves consumer goods and it is the quality of being a consumer good that makes them authentic members of that society” (BAUMAN, 2008, our translation). They are commodities because they adopt the place of exchange and attention in market negotiations, thus placing themselves in the role of active agents of consumer marketing..

It is not new that currently marketing uses the desire of consumer agents to sell products, but this is an aptitude of the member of the consumer society, as Bauman (2008, our translation) shows us, “in this society, consumption seen and treated as a vocation is at the same time a universal human right and duty that knows no exception”.

It is perceived, then, that the own industrial production in a consume society is in charge of producing the purchase desire, no longer being the consumer the final product of this relation, but as a result of all this process, as Barenblitt (2000) states.

Conclusion

The society of consumption is characterized by having the dynamics of consumption as the center of relations and through which the agencies and strategies already institutionalized assert themselves. Its form of organization happens on the bias of consumption as well, and even the industrial production focuses its attention no longer only on the manufacture of products, since the very consumer agent of its productions, starts to acquire new intentions, new needs.

The consumption in this society is characterized in a kind of institution, in which it dictates the norms and practices of this society, having the consumer as an instituted, to which all this norm is addressed.

Through the agency of desire, consumption manages to relate to the practices of this society, which unlike the others, seeks satisfaction in the now and immediately.

In the question of the production of subjectivity, we can highlight the captures of desire flows made by the agencies proposed by Deleuze, which bring meaning to this logic of

consumption, because, at all times, we are involved in relationships, productions and consumerist practices in which these constant captures of desires through the culture of consumption potentialize the practice.

With this, we can try to conclude that the consumer society creates subjects, way of life and practices that do not escape consuming, but not only in the buying and selling relation, we saw that consuming is, for such society, the parameter for the relations, in which the subject puts itself at the disposal of this practice. Getting involved and letting itself be involved.

In a forthcoming study, we are interested in seeking what effects this consumption relationship brings to the quality of life of its agents, because we have already realized that it is capable of producing subjectivity and if it forms subjectivity it also forms affections, but what kinds of affections?

REFERENCES

ANTUNES, M. Â. O. de S. L. C. **O desejo maquínico em Gilles Deleuze**. 2014. 387 f. Tese (Doutorado em Filosofia) - Universidade de Évora, Évora, 2014.

BAREMBLITT, G. F. **Compêndio de análise institucional e outras correntes: teoria e prática**. 5. ed. Belo Horizonte, MG: Instituto Felix Guattari, 2002.

BAUDRILLARD, J. **A sociedade de consumo**. 3. ed. Lisboa: Arte e Comunicação, 2010.

BAUMAN, Z. **Globalização: as consequências humanas**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1998.

DELEUZE, G. Post-Scriptum sobre as sociedades de controle. **L'Autre Journal**, n. 1, 1990.

FOUCAULT, M. Aula de 17 de março de 1976. *In*: FOUCAULT, M. **Em defesa da sociedade**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005. p. 285-315.

SAVAZZONI, C. A. **Subjetividade e devir à luz da filosofia de Deleuze e Guattari: contribuições para uma psicologia**. 2012. 116 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia) - Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, 2012. Disponível em: <https://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/59/59137/tde-04062012-102459/publico/mestradosavaz.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 out. 2019.

How to reference this article

SANTOS, R. dos; CRUZ, P. A. D. Society and consumption: an analysis of consumer relations and the process of subjectification in modernity. **Doxa: Rev. Bras. Psico. e Educ.**, Araraquara, v. 22, n. esp. 1, p. 255-270, out., 2020. e-ISSN: 2594-8385. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30715/doxa.v22iesp.1.14132>

Submitted: 20/04/2020

Revisions required: 15/06/2020

Approved: 20/08/2020

Published: 30/09/2020