

Cinema, power and control:

Entertainment at the service of submission to consumerism

Cinema, poder e controle:

O entretenimento a serviço da submissão ao consumismo

Claudio Luis de Camargo Penteado

*PhD in Social Science (PUC-SP) and Professor at the Postgraduate Program in Human and Social Sciences
(UFABC)*

Universidade Federal do ABC, Programa de Pós-graduação em Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Santo André (SP), Brasil.

Bruno Novaes Araujo

PhD in Human and Social Sciences (UFABC)

Universidade Federal do ABC, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Santo André (SP), Brasil.

Introduction

The concept of power is a constant subject of discussions in the Humanities and Social Sciences. It is a subject that has been extensively discussed among great theorists and several scholars, who seek a better understanding of what power really is and what is necessary to conquer it. Sociology generally defines power as the ability to impose your will on others, even if they resist in some way. It is expressed in different social relationships; thus, it can be said that where there are power relations, there is politics. In turn, politics is expressed in different forms of power and can be understood as politics related to the State, as well as, in a broader sense, and not less important, in other dimensions of social life.

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

ALCEU (Rio de Janeiro, online), V. 21, Nº 44, p.257-280, mai./ago. 2021

In this article, I will initially present the collaboration of four important theorists for the understanding of this concept so dear to Human and Social Sciences: Max Weber, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze and, more recently, Manuel Castells. Max Weber brought a definition that is still debated by several authors. Michel Foucault innovated: unlike Weber, he did not only analyze institutionalized power, but saw it in all social relations. From the Foucaultian view, Gilles Deleuze developed observations about the new mechanisms of power in contemporary society, which he calls the Society of control. Manuel Castells, more recently, added the communicational dimension to this concept. In view of these notes, the entertainment cinema, a vehicle of wide spread, will be discussed in this work as one of the control mechanisms of contemporary society, propagating a consumerist ideology that transmits the feeling of freedom that the individual does not find in his daily life ,

Power according to Max Weber

To understand the concept of power in Max Weber, it is necessary to observe how he defines “Domination” and “Discipline”, concepts that are closely linked:

Power means all the probability that, within a social relationship, it will impose its own will even against resistance, whatever the basis of that probability. Domination will be called the probability of finding obedience to an order of certain content in certain people; Discipline will be called the probability of finding a ready, automatic and schematic obedience to an order in a given crowd of men, by virtue of a trained attitude. (WEBER, 2010, p. 102)

The concept of power in Weber is associated with two categories that complement each other: the Domain, in which, from a certain order, whatever its content, there is a probability of being followed by a certain number of people, and the Discipline , who, following an order, sees their immediate obedience taking place, without questioning by the group due to a set of attitudes that are visual and ingrained. While the concept of power is sociologically amorphous, that is, any man, depending on his qualities and the historical conditions of the moment, can reach the condition of imposing his will in a given situation, domination is something more precise, because it can only mean probability of finding submission to an order. The concept of discipline “encompasses the training of uncritical obedience and without resistance from the masses.”(Weber, 2010, p.

Legitimation is characterized by Weber (2010, p. 2) as the recognition, by the one who receives the orders, of the authority of the one who issues them, that is, when all individuals acknowledge and accept to receive orders from someone freely without being coerced , giving it power, thus being in a situation of domination.

To have power, domination is necessary. Weber (2010, p. 3) sought to differentiate the types of existing dominions. He distinguished three basic types of domination: bureaucratic-legal, traditional and charismatic.

Bureaucratic-Legal domination is one where any right can be created and modified through a properly sanctioned statute, with “bureaucracy” as the purest type of domination. The fundamental principles of bureaucracy, according to the author, are the functional hierarchy, the administration based on documents and the demand for professional learning; the assignments are made official and there is a requirement for all the professional's income. Obedience lends itself not to the person, by virtue of his own right, but to the rule, which he knows is competent to designate to whom and to what extent one must obey.

Traditional Domination is one where authority is, quite simply, supported by the existence of traditional loyalty; the ruler is the patriarch or lord, the dominated are the subjects and the official is the servant. Patriarchalism is the purest type of domination. Obedience is given to the person out of respect, due to the tradition of a personal dignity that is considered sacred.

Finally, Charismatic Domination is one where authority is supported, thanks to affective devotion on the part of the dominated. It is based on the "beliefs" transmitted by prophets, on the "recognition" that heroes and demagogues personally reach, during wars and revolutions, in the streets and on the tribunes, converting faith and recognition into inviolable duties due to them by the governed. Obedience to a person is due to his personal qualities.

Power in the Disciplinary Society

The philosopher Michel Foucault never dedicated a specific book to the question of power. His theory about this concept was consolidated in his numerous historical analyzes on hospices, madness, medicine, policing, prisons, sexuality, through which he explained the functioning, actions and effects of power, explaining in a clearly how it works. While Weber, based on his observations of the functioning of institutions, systematized and grouped certain features that characterized power more broadly, Foucault sought to understand how power was exercised within disciplinary institutions and described the effects of that power on human bodies, biopolitics.

According to Foucault (1988, p. 103), power is neither an institution nor a structure, and it is also not a certain power that some are endowed with, but “the name given to a complex strategic situation in a

given society. "Based on this line of reasoning, he argues that power is not something that is acquired, snatched or shared, but it is something that is exercised from innumerable points and in the midst of unequal and mobile relationships. Power relations are not in an external position with respect to other types of relations, but they are immanent. Power comes from below, that is, in the principle of power relations there is no binary opposition between dominators and the dominated, a duality that reverberates from top to bottom and on more restricted groups down to the depths of the social body. Power relations are intentional, not subjective, and that it is always exercised by "aiming" at something, with clear objectives. Foucault (1988, p. 104-105) warns of the fact that "where there is power, there is resistance, and yet (or better, for this very reason), it is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power. Power is a relationship of forces that is present and in constant movement in all social spaces, be they public or private, generating tensions that are exercised in all relationships. Resistance then appears as a constituent part of this relationship, as it is always present, and appears as an exercise in freedom. Power is a relationship of forces that is present and in constant movement in all social spaces, be they public or private, generating tensions that are exercised in all relationships. Resistance then appears as a constituent part of this relationship, as it is always present, and appears as an exercise in freedom. Power is a relationship of forces that is present and in constant movement in all social spaces, be they public or private, generating tensions that are exercised in all relationships. Resistance then appears as a constituent part of this relationship, as it is always present, and appears as an exercise in freedom.

In this sense, Foucault and Weber's approaches have something in common, such as research Ambrózio and Ramos (2006) demonstrates:

But, a common point between the two approaches is the context of the exercise of power. For both Foucault and Weber, power relations could only exist if the members involved in such relations enjoyed freedom. Contrary to usual thinking, power is not contrary to freedom. Societies in which individuals do not enjoy political freedom are judged by relations of submission and not relations of power. (AMBRÓZIO and RAMOS, 2006, p. 63).

However, in such approaches, differences are prevalent. Unlike Weber, Foucault did not see power as emanating from a fixed point and a sum of 0 relationship, that is, something that some would hold and others would not. Nor would power have the characteristic of repressing those who have it. Therefore, for Foucault, power only works and is exercised in a network, in flow. Individuals are always in a position to exercise this power and to suffer their actions. The individual would be the effect of power, its center of transmission.

Foucault did not want to minimize the role of the state, but to diverge from the prevailing idea in his day that all power emanated from the state. For him, power relations emanated beyond the state limit because, despite their size, it would not be possible for him to occupy the entire field of power relations. In addition, the State could only act, according to the author, based on other existing power relations, as a superstructure in relation to a whole series of power networks that invest in the different spheres of society; Foucault's intention was to detect power relations that do not pass through the State directly, nor through its “apparatus” of domination, the so-called micro powers.

Therefore, according to Foucault, one should not analyze power from a central point, but understand the technical controls that intend to carefully discipline the body of individuals.

Foucault develops this notion of power based on his analysis of what he calls “Disciplinary Societies”.

Until the Industrial Revolution (1830) we had sovereignty societies, in which it was necessary that the power of the sovereign was visible to be feared. The sovereign had power over the death of his subjects, which was more important to him than managing life, that is, he decided whether individuals could die or if it was not convenient for that to happen.

However, that sovereign society would later be replaced by the disciplinary society. In the words of Foucault (1997):

Two images, therefore, of the discipline. At one extreme, the bloc discipline, the closed institution, established on the margins, and all focused on negative functions: stopping evil, breaking communications, suspending time. At the other extreme, with panoptism, we have the discipline - mechanisms: 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 another, from an exception discipline scheme to that of generalized surveillance, rests on historical transformations: the progressive extension of discipline devices throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, their multiplication throughout the whole body the formation of what could be roughly called disciplinary society. (FOUCAULT, 1997, for. 173)

In this society, power would not have as much visibility, as it would not be centralized, but distributed in the various institutions existing in society, such as barracks, schools, the army and the family, which would have the function of docilising bodies, that is, managing life, producing and regulate the customs of individuals so that they could produce and live in society in an increasingly individualized way and without questioning the existing power structures.

THE panopticon was considered by Foucault as the ideal figure of the architecture of the disciplinary society, being this a penitentiary center developed by the philosopher Jeremy Bentham, in 1785. It is the type of place that would allow the vigilante to observe all the prisoners without them

knowing that they were being or not observed. In the panopticon it would be possible not only to arrest the prisoners, but also to imprison the insane and to instruct the population. From this, the discipline would become institutionalized in the institutions and collaborate for the consolidation of this type of disciplinary power in the 18th century. This technology of power allowed the exemplary punishment presented by the sovereign to his population to become unnecessary. The important thing, then, would be to give visibility to prisoners and the general population, having control of the bodies and disciplining them for production. In this way, disciplined bodies would produce more and better, since repetitive exercises would be done with the aim of increasing their strength, leading to the multiplication of productive forces.

4 - The Control Society

The beginning of the 20th century brought a crisis to disciplinary society. Technological development and a period of great wars led the transition from disciplinary society to what Gilles Deleuze (1992) calls it the Control Society.

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 new forces; however, it is a moment of transition and one society does not completely replace the other: it is as if they lived together, interacted, until a certain moment when the previous one is overcome. (DELEUZE, 1992, p. 1)

Unlike the disciplinary society, the control society allows individuals greater mobility and flexibility.

We live in society with a greater sense of freedom, without realizing that we are constantly being watched. The individual is not molded as in disciplinary society: he is modulated, as he does not need to be incarcerated, where he was constantly starting over, since the rules of the house where he lives are different from the rules of the school in which he studies, therefore when referring from a disciplinary institution for another, it was necessary to adjust to the rules of each place of incarceration. In the control society, modulation acts differently:

Confinements are molds, different moldings, but the controls are modulation, like a self-deforming mold that changes continuously, at every moment, or like a sieve whose meshes changed from one point to another. This is clearly seen in the question of wages: the factory was a body that brought its internal forces to a point of equilibrium, as high as possible for production, as low as possible for wages; but in a control society the company replaced the factory, and the company is a soul, a gas. Undoubtedly, the factory already knew about the award system, but the company strives more deeply to impose modulation for each salary, in a state of perpetual metastability, which goes through extremely comical challenges, contests and colloquia. (DELEUZE, 1992, p. 2 and 3)

Individuals follow disciplinary standards to the letter without anyone pressing them directly, as other individuals also watch over them and are constantly watched. Competitiveness modulates people to live in a society where the logic is no longer simply to discipline individuals to produce, but to sell, and that is why it is a more dispersed society apparently: marketing is the discourse that allows control of the social world and the sales center is the heart of the company. In Deleuze's words, "man is no longer the confined man, but the indebted man." (1992, p. 5)

Control technologies are spread everywhere, from cameras in banks, as well as in school environments and hospitals. Cellular devices, internet sites and many other technological devices serve as control devices that allow people to be found when it is considered necessary by those who control the various institutions of society. The logic of confinement is established without the need for prison walls: those who are constantly watched also watch, this being the perfect panopticon that maybe Bentham couldn't even imagine. Advertising, through its charming speeches, increasingly sells these technologies as necessary and that will bring with them the happiness of having something increasingly sophisticated. However, what is not noticed is that the control is more and more sophisticated, and that the modulation present in this new society is becoming more and more successful. According to Deleuze (1992, p. 6) in the prison system, the search for "substitute" sentences is already found, at least for petty crime, and the use of electronic collars that force the convict to stay home at certain times. In the school regime, we observe the forms of continuous control, continuous evaluation, and the action of permanent training on the school, the corresponding abandonment of any research at the University, the introduction of the "company" at all levels of education. In the hospital regime, we see the new medicine "without doctor or patient", which rescues potential patients and those at risk, which in no way demonstrates progress towards individuation, as they say, but replaces the individual or numerical body with the figure of a "dividual" matter to be controlled. Finally, in the company's regime, new ways of treating money, products and men are perceived, which no longer go through the old factory form. These are fragile examples, but they would allow us to better understand what is meant by the crisis of the institutions, that is, the progressive and dispersed implantation of a new regime of domination. which rescues potential patients and those at risk, which in no way demonstrates progress towards individuation, as they say, but replaces the individual or numerical body with the figure of a "divual" matter to be controlled. Finally, in the company's regime, new ways of treating money, products and men are perceived, which no longer go

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

ALCEU (Rio de Janeiro, online), V. 21, Nº 44, p.257-280, mai./ago. 2021

through the old factory form. These are fragile examples, but they would allow us to better understand what is meant by the crisis of the institutions, that is, the progressive and dispersed implantation of a new regime of domination. which rescues potential patients and those at risk, which in no way demonstrates progress towards individuation, as they say, but replaces the individual or numerical body with the figure of a “divual” matter to be controlled. Finally, in the company's regime, new ways of treating money, products and men are perceived, which no longer go through the old factory form. These are fragile examples, but they would allow us to better understand what is meant by the crisis of the institutions, that is, the progressive and dispersed implantation of a new regime of domination. new ways of dealing with money, products and men are perceived, which no longer go through the old factory form. These are fragile examples, but they would allow us to better understand what is meant by the crisis of the institutions, that is, the progressive and dispersed implantation of a new regime of domination. new ways of dealing with money, products and men are perceived, which no longer go through the old factory form. These are fragile examples, but they would allow us to better understand what is meant by the crisis of the institutions, that is, the progressive and dispersed implantation of a new regime of domination.

The discourse that such technologies and modular procedures are necessary “for the safety and well-being of the population” contributes to the legitimation of this control by society. In this way, the power structures that are rooted are not questioned. Individuals live under the control of disciplinary devices and do not even realize it, without the need for an authority present constantly dictating what should be done or known, as was done in disciplinary society.

As Deleuze (1992) argues, the transition from a disciplinary society to a control society has the fundamental strategy of emptying the image of its virtuality, in order to make it pure information, part of the surveillance and monitoring devices. Communication is paramount, as it is through it that information will be transmitted with the aim of modulating individuals in the control society. Therefore, the control of the speeches present in the information is of fundamental importance, since they are the ones that will make it possible to control the speeches of individuals in this type of society. Foucault, in his work “The order of discourse” (2006, p. 8 and 9), already warned about the selection and organization of speeches transmitted to the population with the purpose of maintaining a certain group in power and eliminating the dangers that can lead such a group to lose it.

Therefore, from this selection, the individual starts to interdict discourses other than those that are widely accepted. The individual cannot say everything he wants or under any circumstances, being

conditioned to be careful with what he says and to spread a hegemonic discourse favorable to the practices of those who control power and who transmit the modulating information in the control society. More than that: those who control power, and consequently speeches, are seen by a large part of society that is not resistant to this power as the only ones qualified to transmit it and give favorable directions for the maintenance of the “well- to be social ”. Society is surrounded by speeches that convey a certain comfort. Thus, a large part of society does not question these discourses and the power relations that structure society, accepting the same truths and discarding all other alternatives. According to Foucault (2006, p. 36), discipline is a principle of controlling discourse production. The doctrine links individuals to certain types of utterances and prohibits them from all others. It links individuals together and differentiates them from everyone else. The only condition required is the recognition of the same truths and acceptance of certain rules of compliance with validated speeches.

This specialized, political control of information and, mainly, of the selection of the speeches that will be sent with the information, leads to a perspective of power that includes the communicational dimension in a more ingrained way, as will be shown below.

The Power for Manuel Castells

Manuel Castells, in 2009, wrote the book “Communication Power”, which brings a definition of power that partially mixes the conceptions of Weber and Foucault, and adds the communicational dimension. According to Castells (2009):

Power is the relational capacity that allows a social actor to asymmetrically influence the decisions of other social actors in a way that favors the will, interests and values of the trained actor. Power is exercised through coercion (or the possibility of it) and / or the construction of meaning based on the discourses through which social actors guide their action. Power relationships are framed by domination, which is the power that is incorporated in the institutions of society. The relational capacity of power is conditioned , but not determined, by the structural capacity for domination. Institutions can engage in power relations that depend on the domination they exercise over their subjects (CASTELLS, 2009, p. 10)

Castells argues that power occurs through domination, which in turn is embedded in the institutions of society. In this sense, he approaches Weber, who saw power as institutionalized power, that is, power legitimized by the dominated that allowed the authorities to exercise domination over their lives. However, it is clear that Castells is also close to Foucault, as he visualizes the resilience and does not understand power as a sum-0 relationship:

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

Relational capacity means that power is not an attribute, but a relationship. It cannot be abstracted from the specific relationship between the subjects of power, those who are empowered and those who are subject to such empowerment in a given context. Asymmetrically, it means whereas while the influence in a relationship is always reciprocal, in power relations there is always a greater degree of influence from one actor over the other. However, there is never absolute power, a zero degree of influence from the subjects to power in relation to the who are in positions of power. There is always the possibility of resistance that questions the power relationship. (CASTELLS, 2009, p. 11)

Therefore, it is clear that Castells sees, as does Weber, that violence is the last resort to be used, when there is no longer any possibility of domination by other means. Thus, the State, as an institution that has a legitimate monopoly on violence, can use this power in order to control situations and try to maintain dominance over citizens on the basis of the force that was previously legitimized. However, where there is power, there is resistance. In this sense, Castells and Foucault have a clear dialogue, since power for both is not a sum-0 relationship, where one has the power and the other does not, but a relationship in which an individual or group has a greater influence capacity than others in a given context. Thus, battles can be fought in the sense that those who previously legitimized domination no longer legitimize it, and take counter-power actions.

However, for Castells, there is no way to talk about power in contemporary society without talking about communication. For him, the power in the network society is the power of communication. The battle for power takes place in the conquest of the human mind, and this conquest occurs through the use of the means of communication. The main point of Castells' work is the question of power, because whoever has it defines the "rules of the game" in all societies. It is essential to know where it comes from and how power is structured, since it is from there that the way we will live socially, culturally and politically is defined. What Castells seeks to show is how a battle is built in the human mind to influence minds, and this struggle takes place in communication. Therefore, power will not only occur through the control of the State's repressive apparatus, but will be exercised through the control of the educational system,

In this sense, it is possible to establish a dialogue between the control society Deleuzian and the theories formulated by Manuel Castells. The Deleuzian control society uses the discourses that are propagated in order to legitimize the power relations in force in society, as well as to make them naturalized. These speeches, transmitted by the various media, among them the entertainment cinema, aim to discipline society and make individuals internalize the meanings transmitted in the individual process of building their identities.

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

ALCEU (Rio de Janeiro, online), V. 21, Nº 44, p.257-280, mai./ago. 2021

According to Castells (1999), identity is a process of construction of meanings based on a cultural attribute or on several interrelated cultural attributes (p. 23). Although each and every identity is built, the social construction of identity always takes place in a context marked by power relations, that is, the signs that collaborate to compose social identities are introduced by social institutions with the aim of strengthening social relations of domination over society. The ways that institutions find to explain their functions and legitimize their actions also seek to describe and structure individuals' access to the various means of participation in life in society. Therefore, what we seek to create is what Castells calls a legitimizing identity, which is "introduced by the institutions of society in the sense of expanding and rationalizing its domination in relation to social actors." (1999, p. 24). Therefore, following this perspective, the speeches carry an ideology of domination, which aims to sustain the current power relations. Therefore, cinema entertainment is a means of mass communication that can carry a discourse that legitimizes the power of groups interested in having it or keeping it within the institutions that relate directly or indirectly to the capitalist market.

Entertainment, consumption and control cinema

The relationship between cinema and consumption can be established by observing, historically, the Hollywood film industry aimed, in its productions, to stimulate consumer practices based on the dissemination of brands and by exposing products associated with a sense of glamor. Cigarettes found in cinema a great ally for this. Great actors and actresses used this product in striking scenes: Humphrey Bogart and Ingrid Bergman in "Casablanca" (1942); Rita Hayworth in "Gilda" (1946) and Audrey Hepburn in "Bonequinha de Luxo" (1961) are examples of great stars who associated their images with cigarettes in cliché scenes in order to encourage the use of this merchandise. The money injected by the tobacco industries in the production of films financed large productions, while "glamorizing" the habit, encouraging many to use the product. Soon, the cigarette found a great advertising partner in the cinema, as it associated its use with moments of glamor and pleasure.¹

According to Lipovetsky (2010), between the 1950s and 1970s, there were greater democratization of consumer goods and practices were directed towards the present and no longer towards the future.

¹Available in: <http://ofilmequevontem.blogspot.com.br/2010/01/o-cigarro-no-cinema-1897-2009.html>

Consumption was focused on comfort, ostentation and immediate satisfaction of desires. Consumption has become a way of demonstrating progress. The cinema, in turn, intensified the dissemination of products and a consumerist lifestyle. In the 1950s, for example, cinema played a major role in the ideal type of beauty for women and the promotion of new products. Actresses like Grace Kelly and Audrey Hepburn incarnated the role of naive chic, characterized by joviality and naturalness. Other actresses were in the “fatal woman” genre, like Rita Hayworth and Ava Gardner, while others mixed ingenuity and sensuality, like Marilyn Monroe and Brigitte Bardot. Many women of that time went to beauty salons to “consume” these new beauty styles. In these films, new products that appeared with the purpose of facilitating and providing greater comfort to the life of women at the time, such as the vacuum cleaner for housewives, were also disclosed. It was a society that yearned for post-war comfort. Men, in turn, identified in the films of the “007-James Bond” franchise the ideal type of man: charming, successful, adventurous, and with access to the most modern when it came to goods and technological devices.

Still in the late 1980s, films exalted this society with unrestrained consumption patterns. Reis (2005, p. 143), in his article “Cinema, multiculturalism and economic domination”, shows how cinema reflected and reaffirmed consumerist practices as belonging to the type of ideal social standard to be pursued by American society at that time. According to the author, wrapped in the cycle of financial wealth promoted by the reforms of the Reagan administration, the ‘yuppie’ type has become the main reference in the image of Hollywood consumerism. Films like “9 ½ de amor” (1986), “Wall Street - Poder e Cobiça” (1987), “Uma Secretária do Futuro”, (1988), among many others, brought a gallery of eccentric characters from urban types found among young stock market executives. Reis argues that, drawn from the fashionable consumerist image, the “yuppie” aesthetic, disguisedly minimalist and frankly nostalgic, had the function of amalgamating in a glamorous typology the main characteristics of the new “bourgeois” man”. Namely, consumerist, egotist, androgynous, compulsively turned to work (“wokaholic”), and unethical. Finally, he still says that the public success achieved by the films mentioned leaves no doubt that the magnetism of cinematic “yuppies”, embodied by actors such as Mickey Rourke, Kim Basinger, Michael Douglas, Charlie Sheen, Sigourney Weaver, Melanie Griffith, Harrison Ford and others, worked. its function was to amalgamate in a glamorous typology the main characteristics of the new “bourgeois” man”. Namely, consumerist, egotist, androgynous, compulsively turned to work (“wokaholic”), and unethical. Finally, he still says that the public success achieved by the films mentioned leaves no doubt that the magnetism of cinematic “yuppies”, embodied by actors such as Mickey Rourke, Kim Basinger, Michael Douglas, Charlie

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

Sheen, Sigourney Weaver, Melanie Griffith, Harrison Ford and others, worked. its function was to amalgamate in a glamorous typology the main characteristics of the new “bourgeois” man “. Namely, consumerist, egotist, androgynous, compulsively turned to work (“wokaholic”), and unethical. Finally, he still says that the public success achieved by the films mentioned leaves no doubt that the magnetism of cinematic “yuppies”, embodied by actors such as Mickey Rourke, Kim Basinger, Michael Douglas, Charlie Sheen, Sigourney Weaver, Melanie Griffith, Harrison Ford and others, worked.

However, Lipovetsky (2010) points out that in the late 1970s consumption by ostentation is replaced by the pursuit of well-being. It is a hedonistic consumption, aimed at satisfying pleasure. Happiness is in consumption, although it is momentary. Emotional consumption becomes ideal and promotes the feeling of playfulness, nostalgia and the promise of "living forever" to individuals. Bauman (2008), in turn, follows reasoning similar to that of Lipovetsky, pointing to the emergence of a Consumer society in which the individual becomes the promoter of the merchandise he sells at the same time that he becomes the merchandise itself; seeks to become attractive, salable. Cinema, in turn, has also gone through this process recently. The “007-James Bond” franchise is an example of what sought to create a new outfit to become attractive to the younger audience. The glamorous hero became more adventurous and less charming, more explosive and less rational. The sense of adventure that the character conveys on the screens becomes the ideal type of life that many people would like to have. At the same time, the character continues to have major merchandise brands associated with him and to have access to what is most technologically modern: different types of cars, watches and others.

Lipovetski calls this society formed from 1970 “Society of Hyperconsumption.”. In it, ostentation is no longer the main motivation for consumption; it is replaced by the search for well-being, where access to comfort and satisfaction of pleasures become the main motivations for happiness.

According to Lipovetski (2010, p. 36-37), in this phase traditional marketing is replaced by emotional consumption, which starts to show the consumer the importance of experience and affective memories linked to brands. From sound experiences, store odors and different environments, consumer senses are stimulated, which leads to purchases no longer motivated by the quality of the product, but by the concept that such merchandise carries. It is the imperative of the image based on the brand's imaginary. It is the so-called sensorial or experiential marketing, which stops focusing on rational arguments and functional dimension of products to act on affective issues, roots, nostalgia. According to the author, others emphasize the playfulness, myths, or even citizenship and ecology.

In the hyperconsumption society, consumption abuses are no longer repressed. On the contrary: at that moment, individuals no longer buy as motivated by social pressure, but motivated by will, for the satisfaction of their own pleasure. It is a moment of hedonism, where the individual needs to present himself as full, satisfied and happy to the rest of society. However, shopping acts like the opium of society, because according to Lipovetski (2010, p. 37), individuals are increasingly isolated and frustrated with loneliness, with boredom and pressure from work, among other factors, and end up looking for immediate happiness in the consumption of goods. The shortage is temporarily met by the purchase, by the extraordinary experiences provided by the experience industries and the shopping centers, that present themselves as spaces for abstraction and fun at any time. Consumption becomes the way of showing the condition of happiness provided by new experiences. The author brings the idea of “Homo Consumericus”, whose main motto is “I suffer, so I buy!”.

In this nostalgic and emotional society, which seeks pleasure in consumption and finds the feeling of unconcern in childhood, a hyperindividualist individual seeks to “live forever”, to remain rejuvenated. According to Lipovetski (2010, p. 73), there is no mutation of the human species: putting aside extreme cases of what he called Peter Pan syndrome, it is only a matter of rediscovering, in part time, happy sensations experienced in childhood, to recreate a universe of satisfaction and pleasure, of not giving up anything, juxtaposing both adult and child consumption. The hyper consumer, according to the author, does not only buy high-tech products to communicate in real time, he also buys affective products, making childhood emotions travel through time. The latter are now systematically developed by 'retromarketing', whose objective is to promote affective brands playing with the nostalgia of consumers. This is how, in addition to 'adulescents', nostalgic experiential consumption has become a vast market. Thereafter, Lipovetski points out that individuals seek to rediscover the impressions of their childhood through the offer of the market; they play without inhibition with the past, surf the marks of the past and all ages of life. That is why we see that “regressive consumption” is above all the sign of a hedonistic, playful and youthful culture, of a time when purchases are made with a view to subjective experiences. nostalgic experiential consumption has become a vast market. Thereafter, Lipovetski points out that individuals seek to rediscover the impressions of their childhood through the offer of the market; they play without inhibition with the past, surf the marks of the past and all ages of life. That is why we see that “regressive consumption” is above all the sign of a hedonistic, playful and youthful culture, of a time when purchases are made with a view to subjective experiences. nostalgic experiential consumption has become a vast

market. Thereafter, Lipovetski points out that individuals seek to rediscover the impressions of their childhood through the offer of the market; they play without inhibition with the past, surf the marks of the past and all ages of life. That is why we see that “regressive consumption” is above all the sign of a hedonistic, playful and youthful culture, of a time when purchases are made with a view to subjective experiences.

The Consumer Society is frustrating because HomoConsumericus is encouraged every moment to consume, but finds in the goods only a temporary refuge for his frustrations, since they carry programmed obsolescence. Cinema, with its heroes, adventures and love stories, represents the individual as a way to seek redemption from his own troubled relationships, permeated by the constant search for consumption and practically devoid of affection and human warmth. Edgar Morin (1956, p. 31) argues that the technique of cinema allows the viewer to identify with the characters in the films and with the soul of the scenes, that is, with the affection present in them. Thus, the spectator projects himself / herself with the objective of living what cannot be experienced in reality, satisfying what he calls “double”, which is a fundamental image of the individual,

The entertainment cinema would function, then, as an escape from the frustrations triggered by the frustrating coexistence in a society of consumers. Individuals look for sensations that provide them with a return to childhood, when things were simpler, when they felt more protected by “heroic” parents and the world did not seem so demanding. Franchises like "007-James Bond", "Mission Impossible", "Harry Potter", "Pirates of the Caribbean", "Batman" and so many others, give the feeling that simple times have returned, or that it is possible to be, even for for a few moments, the heroic protagonist, who lives so many adventures during the film.

The cinema, with adequate lighting, comfortable seats, pleasant cooling and appropriate audio regulation, facilitates the work of the “double”: it is the sensory experience of cinema collaborating for this apparent refuge. However, the entertainment film industry has further accentuated advertising. Even in the escape from frustrating reality, the individual would find elements that led him to seek such an escape present in the apparent refuge. It can be seen that large cinema chains, such as Cinemark and Playarte, in Brazil, are located in Shopping Centers or in large market chains, which are nothing more than temples of consumption. Several products, such as popcorn, famous soft drink brands and others, are advertised in the cinema along with trailers from other productions. However, such products are not simply advertised: the advertisements bring the idea that their consumption brings immense pleasure, adventure and escape

from "sameness"; that is, not only the merchandise is sold, but also the feeling that consumption is intended to provide to consumers. The films, in turn, from this perspective, would also carry symbolic forms of the consumer society, while legitimizing and reinforcing such ideological values, since the symbolic forms transmitted would reach viewers in the form of pure and simple entertainment, without leading to further questions about the situation of domination in which they find themselves. Therefore, entertainment cinema would reinforce the consumerist ideology, legitimizing and naturalizing the subordinate relationships of individuals to the consumer market. It is one more of the mechanisms of power of the Control Society,

A practical analysis

To illustrate the relationship between entertainment cinema, consumerism and control, I return to a practical analysis made in my master's dissertation², in which I point out the entertainment cinema as a product and reproducer of the consumer society, having as ideology the legitimation and naturalization of hegemonic discourses favorable to consumerist practices, which allows control of individuals who do not question their submissions to the consumer market.

Initially, based on readings taken by several important intellectuals, I highlighted ten characteristics that I consider most striking in today's society:

Table 1: The main characteristics of the Consumer Society

Name	Characteristics
Emblematic figures	People who associate their images with products in order to make them more attractive for individuals to consume.
Consumption as competitiveness	Consumption can be seen as a place of social differentiation and symbolic distinction between classes or between individuals belonging to the same class.
Ownership of merchandise as a central element of prestige	The commodity came to occupy a central position in the lives of individuals and became a central element of prestige.
Scheduled obsolescence	The products carry a message with an expiration date, which is only for the coming months, and gives total conditions for the appearance of a new beginning.
Consumption as a refuge	Consumption works as an escape from a disappointing reality, since the act of consuming

² Available at www.biblioteca.ufabc.edu.br/php/download.php

for frustrations	becomes something extremely lonely and fleeting.
Consumption as an individualizing spectacle	Contemporary society is heir to all the weakness of positivist thinking that began to exalt appearance, having and seeing, and thus led to the transformation of men into competitive individuals.
The consumer society creates the sub-class	This category consists of elements unable to consume. These individuals are seen as a burden on a society that constantly encourages consumerism.
The materialization of affective relationships	The skills needed to talk and seek understanding are diminishing. Thus, in situations of disagreement, love materializes, buying objects capable of bringing the expected excuse.
Advertising as fundamental maintenance of consumer values	The function of advertising is to sell goods, therefore, it seeks to convey aesthetic, symbolic and social norms that reaffirm the current market logic.
Hedonistic Consumption	THEThe merchandise presents, in advertising speeches, the promise of a great adventure, which, in turn, provides a quick escape from reality.

Source: Table prepared by the author himself

The cinematographic productions analyzed were:

Table 2 - Films analyzed

#	Year	Movie	Box office(US \$)
1	2009	<i>Avatar</i>	2,782,275,172
2	1997	<i>Titanic</i>	2,185,372,302
3	2012	<i>The Avengers</i>	1,510,617,210
4	2011	<i>Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows - Part 2</i>	1,328,111,219
5	2011	<i>Transformers: The Hidden Side of the Moon</i>	1,123,746,996
6	2003	<i>The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King</i>	1,119,929,521
7	2006	<i>Pirates of the Caribbean: The Chest of Death</i>	1,066,179,725
8	2010	<i>Toy Story 3</i>	1,063,171,911
9	2012	<i>Batman the Dark Knight Rises</i>	1,058,259,444

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

10	2011	<i>Pirates of the Caribbean: Navigating Mysterious Waters</i>	1,043,871,802
----	------	---	---------------

Source: http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anexo:Lista_de_filmes_de_maior_bilheteria. Date: September 19, 2012.

For the analysis of the films, two different methods were used: the “Depth Hermeneutics” method, presented by John Thompson in the book “Ideology and Modern Culture” (2002), which was used to verify the symbolic forms transmitted in the films, and the method of “Film Analysis”, proposed by Manuela Penafria in the article “Film Analysis: Concepts and Methodology” (2009).

Depth Hermeneutics is a theoretical and methodological tool that allows analyzing the context socio-historical and temporal space of the object of study. This tool provides several options, such as discursive, content, semiotic or any other standard analysis. Ideology, in turn, can be analyzed through the interpretation of symbolic forms. However, it surpasses traditional forms of ideology, as it brings as innovation the need to propose meanings and discuss them, being able to interpret them as ideological. It is about making a qualified analysis of the reality presented by symbolic forms. According to Thompson (2002, p. 363), such methodology, in short, is “the study of the significant construction and the social contextualization of symbolic forms”. Depth Hermeneutics follows some steps, which can be summarized as socio-historical analysis, which consists of the analysis of space-time situations;

The method of film analysis proposed by Manuela Penafria (2009), in turn, complements Thompson's hermeneutic method and aims to make an internal analysis of the film. For this, it proposes four steps. The first stage refers to the presentation of information, such as Title, year, country, gender, duration, distributor and other relevant data. The second step is to decompose the film based on the dynamics of the narrative. The procedure adopted in this work was to decompose the film by selected scenes that present symbolic forms loaded with ideological consumerist characteristics such as those highlighted in chapter two. These scenes were analyzed from the speeches present in the dialogues of the scenes in question, as well as scene plans, soundtrack and other factors that accompany the transmission of these symbolic forms will also be described.

The films were analyzed in this work by the ideological sense, in order to verify if the symbolic forms carry the consumerist ideology, as mentioned previously. The last stage of the film analysis proposed

byPenafria (2009) is the selection of a main scene in the film. The criterion adopted in this research to select the main scene of the film was to choose the final battle between the “hero” of the film and the antagonist “villain”, since the films of the entertainment cinema normally create high expectations for the confrontations between the “good and evil”, which constitute the great climax of these productions.

Finally, I present the collected results below:

Table 3 - Results of Film Analysis

Transformers 3 - The hidden side of the Moon	10 features
Batman - Dark Knight resurfaces	09 characteristics
Avengers	09 characteristics
Lord of the Rings - The King's Return	08 characteristics
Avatar	08 characteristics
Pirates of the Caribbean - Navigating dangerous waters	10 features
Pirates of the Caribbean - Death Chest	09 characteristics
Titanic	09 characteristics
Harry Potter The Deathly Hallows - Part 2	08 characteristics
Toy Story 3	10 features

Source: Table prepared by the author himself

The data found allows us to verify that the entertainment cinema, at least in the films studied, represents important symbolic forms that express the discourse of the consumer society, that is, they seek to legitimize and value the ideology of consumption as a way of life and social organization, maintaining an ideological control that allows the understanding of “being a citizen” directly linked to the possession of consumer goods and being a consumerist.

Final considerations

In this article I pointed out the Weberian conception of power and its different categories, the Foucault's power in what he calls the Disciplinary Society, the transition to the Control Society, pointed out by Gilles Deleuze, and the new types of exercise of power and the collaboration of Manuel Castells, who added to this discussion the relationship between communication and power . Next, I discussed the role of entertainment cinema in today's society, pointing it as another control mechanism that disseminates consumerist ideals, legitimizes and naturalizes the relationships of submission of individuals to the interests of the consumer market. Finally, I presented a practical film analysis carried out in my master's dissertation as a way of illustrating the relationship between entertainment cinema, power and control in contemporary society.

I argue that entertainment cinema is a control mechanism as, from the discourses it disseminates, it modulates individuals, perpetuating the maintenance of the market logic and making it hegemonic in a society where there are multiple consumption options, but which excludes all those who do not identify with the market consumerist logic. People are citizens only as consumers and the symbolic forms transmitted by the cinema work in a subtle way in order to keep this citizen trapped in this web of meanings of the Consumer Society. In this way, entertainment not only amuses, but submits; what at first has no ideology transmits ideas that support market power in an apparently innocent way, but which obeys a logic of naturalization and legitimation, which modulates discourses, minds and actions and keep society organized and controlled in order to obey the commands of advertising appeals and the perpetuation of the substitution of being in having. The entertainment cinema show, finally, is at the service of the logic of the Control Society.

Claudio Luis de Camargo Penteadó

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8279-3643>

Universidade Federal do ABC, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Santo André (SP), Brasil.

PhD in Social Science / PUC-SP

E-mail: claudiocpenteadó@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

ALCEU (Rio de Janeiro, online), V. 21, Nº 44, p.257-280, mai./ago. 2021

Bruno Novaes AraujoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0956-3358>*Universidade Federal do ABC, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Santo André (SP), Brasil.**PhD in Human and Social Sciences (UFABC)**E-mail: bnovaisaraujo@yahoo.com.br*

Received on: November 27, 2019.

Approved on: March 4, 2020.

References:

AMBRÓZIO, Aldo. RAMOS, David Fernando. **Max Weber e Michel Foucault: uma análise sobre poder.** 55^o Revista Universo Administração, v. 1, Ano 1, p. 54-64, jun./dez. 2006.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Vida para consumo.** Rio de Janeiro: Editora Zahar, 2008.

BLOG "O FILME QUE VI ONTEM". **O cigarro no cinema: 1897-2009.** Disponível em: <http://ofilmequevontem.blogspot.com.br/2010/01/o-cigarro-no-cinema-1897-2009.html>. Acessado em 20 de Dezembro de 2017.

CASTELLS, Manuel. **Communication Power.** Oxford University Press in: New York, 2009.

_____. **O Poder da Identidade.** 5^o edição. São Paulo: ed. Paz e Terra, 1999.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Post-Scriptum sobre a Sociedade de Controle.** Conversações: 1972-1990. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1992, p. 219-226. Tradução de Peter Pál Pelbart

FOUCAULT, Michel. **A ordem do discurso:** aula inaugural no Collège de France, pronunciada em 2 de dezembro de 1970. Tradução de Laura Fraga de Almeida Sampaio. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2006.

_____. **História da sexualidade I: a vontade de saber.** Rio de Janeiro. Trad. Maria Thereza da Costa Albuquerque e J.A. Guilhon Albuquerque. Edições Graal, 1988.

_____. **Vigiar e Punir.** Editora: Vozes. São Paulo, 1997, 15^a edição.

LIPOVETSKY, Gilles. **A Felicidade Paradoxal.** São Paulo: Editora Schwarcz, 2010.

_____. **A sociedade da decepção.** São Paulo: Editora Tamboré, 2007

MORIN, Edgar. **O cinema ou o Homem imaginário.** Lisboa: Relógio d'água, 1956.

PENAFRIA, Manuela. **Análise de Filmes: Conceitos e Metodologia** (s). 2009. Disponível em: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/bocc-penafria-analise.pdf>

REIS, Ronaldo Rosas. **Cinema, Multiculturalismo e Dominação Econômica**. 2006. Disponível em: <http://www.unicamp.br/cemarx/criticamarxista/critica20-A-reis.pdf>

THOMPSON, J. B. **Ideologia e Cultura Moderna**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.

WEBER, Max. **Os Três Tipos Puros de Dominação Legítima**. Tradução de Gabriel Cohen. Rio de Janeiro: VGUedes Multimídia, 2010.

Abstract

This article aims to discuss the relationship between entertainment, power and control films in contemporary society, using as a methodology a bibliographical review of authors that discuss concepts fundamental to this work as power, control and consumer society or hyperconsumer. I will present as a result film analysis made during the preparation of my master's dissertation, in which I established the relationship between entertainment cinema and Consumer Society, adding to this recent reflections that I have pointed out links of these consumerist discourses to the present control in what Gilles Deleuze calls "Control Society." Finally, I argue that entertainment cinema is a mechanism of control as, from the discourses it diffuses, it modulates individuals, perpetuating the maintenance of market logic and making it hegemonic in contemporary society.

Keywords: Trend Entertainment Cinema. Power. Control.

Resumo

Neste artigo tenho como objetivo discutir a relação entre cinema de entretenimento, poder e controle na sociedade contemporânea, usando como metodologia uma revisão bibliográfica de autores que discutem conceitos fundamentais a esse trabalho como poder, controle e Sociedade de consumo ou hiperconsumista. Apresentarei como resultados análises fílmicas efetuadas durante a elaboração de minha dissertação de mestrado, na qual estabeleci a relação entre cinema de entretenimento e Sociedade de Consumidores, acrescentando a isso reflexões recentes que fiz apontando ligações desses discursos consumistas ao controle presente nessa que Gilles Deleuze denomina "Sociedade de Controle." Por fim, defendo que o cinema de entretenimento é um

<https://doi.org/10.46391/ALCEU.v21.ed44.2021.255>

ALCEU (Rio de Janeiro, online), V. 21, Nº 44, p.257-280, mai./ago. 2021

mecanismo de controle à medida que, a partir dos discursos que difunde, modula os indivíduos, perpetuando a manutenção da lógica de mercado e tornando-a hegemônica na Sociedade contemporânea.

Palavras-chave: Cinema de Entretenimento. Poder. Controle.

Resumen

En este artículo pretendo discutir la relación entre el cine de entretenimiento, el poder y el control en la sociedad contemporánea, utilizando como metodología una revisión bibliográfica de autores que discuten conceptos fundamentales de este trabajo como poder, control y sociedad de consumo o hiperconsumo. Presentaré como resultados los análisis fílmicos realizados durante la elaboración de la disertación de mi maestría, en la que establecí la relación entre el cine de entretenimiento y la Sociedad de Consumidores, añadiendo a estas recientes reflexiones que señalé los vínculos de estos discursos consumistas con el control presente en lo que Gilles Deleuze llama " Finalmente, sostengo que el cine de entretenimiento es un mecanismo de control ya que, a partir de los discursos que difunde, modula a los individuos, perpetuando el mantenimiento de la lógica del mercado y haciéndolo hegemónico en la sociedad contemporánea.

Palabras clave: Cine de entretenimiento. Poder. Control.

Este artigo é publicado em acesso aberto (Open Access) sob a licença Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial (CC-BY-NC 4.0), que permite que outros remixem, adaptem e criem a partir do seu trabalho para fins não comerciais, e embora os novos trabalhos tenham de lhe atribuir o devido crédito e não possam ser usados para fins comerciais, os usuários não têm de licenciar esses trabalhos derivados sob os mesmos termos.