



An Essay on the Psychosociology of Consumption through the Perspectives of Control Society and Liquid Modernity

**Fred Tavares^{1,2}, Giselle Gama Torres Ferreira^{3*}, Gabriel Grego Fialho⁴
and Jefferson Fernando Gonçalves Guedes da Costa⁵**

¹*Institute of Psychology (EICOS Program - Psychosociology of Communities and Social Ecology), Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.*

²*School of Communication, Institute of Psychology (EICOS - PPG) and Institute of Economics, Research Groups Rhizome Green and PSYCCON, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.*

³*EICOS Program (Psychosociology of Communities and Social Ecology), Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Brazil.*

⁴*Department Social Communication (Journalism), Estácio de Sá University (UNESA), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.*

⁵*Research Group PSYCCON, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Authors FT, GGTF and JFGGC designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author GGF managed the analyses of the study, managed the literature searches and reviews. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJARR/2018/v2i329759

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Choon Wah Yuen, Senior Lecturer, Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Reviewers:

(1) SrinivasaRao Kasisomayajula, Madanapalle Institute of Technology and Science, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, India.
(2) Marzanna Farnicka, Zielona Góra University, Poland.

(3) Sergey A. Surkov, International Institute of Management LINK, Russia.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/27327>

Original Research Article

**Received 09 September 2018
Accepted 13 November 2018
Published 20 November 2018**

ABSTRACT

Reflecting on a psychosociological analysis of consumption requires an epistemological challenge that breaks with metaphysical ideological traditions and, to a certain extent, provokes philosophical discussions about the construction and validity of its theoretical thinking, especially when contextualised under the aegis of the perspective of the control society and liquid modernity. This

*Corresponding author: Email: giselletorres.com@gmail.com;

study investigates the relations of consumption in liquid modernity (postmodernity), through the psychosocial bias, revealing the liquid, plastic, fluid and changeable subjectivity of the consumer in a globalised context of a control society, which values "having" to the detriment of "being". Through the theoretical assumptions traced by Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Zygmunt Bauman. How to reflect the study of consumption through psychosociology, according to the view of the society of control and liquid modernity, in the production of a rhizomatic, plural, fragmented, schizophrenic and anthropophagic subjectivity entangled by the desire to consume, configuring and deconstructing pret-a-porter identities as ways of being regulated by the market, according to the logic that to "be" you must "have"? To answer this question are adopted as theoretical foundation complementary authors and works that dialogue with the object defined by the conceptual bias established for investigation. The exploratory research is used as an investigative methodology, through the technique of bibliographic survey. It is not intended, in this work, to draw a map of these differences. The pretension is simply to reflect how the philosophical thoughts of Deleuze, Guattari and Bauman contribute to the field of psychosociology.

Keywords: Liquid modernity; control society; psychosociology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Reflecting on a psychosociological analysis of consumption requires an epistemological challenge that breaks with metaphysical ideological traditions and, to a certain extent, provokes philosophical discussions about the construction and validity of its theoretical thinking, especially when contextualized under the aegis of the perspective of the control society [1] and liquid modernity [2].

This is because when a new look is revealed as a challenge of the order of complexity, an attempt is made to sketch an argument with the purpose of bringing to the discussion a theme that brings consumption, psychosociology, control society and liquid modernity, not as a definitive answer, but above all a problematization in the search for new provocations and concerns.

Therefore, the statement of this essay is aesthetic and provocative. So, it works with a central question in this analysis. Faced with postmodernity, and with a consumer whose subjectivity is plural, shifting, fragmentary, and *flaneur*, the consumption theories, which are related to the thought of modernity, need new theoretical perspectives to understand this individual who chooses trademarks as a psychosocial, through revocable, temporary and floating identities.

Consumption is a field with many possibilities for research. In the context of a control society, it is seen as the commodification of life, however, always reflected in a paradoxical situation, in which the lines of domination and liberation,

control and escape, command and resistance, as an inconclusive debate. Many clues, looks and paths, but no certainty.

In this sense, the understanding of consumption, according to the look of liquid modernity [2,3], is associated with several cuts and theoretical perspectives that lead to a "single truth": uncertainty.

In the light of the control society, and in the field of liquid modernity, it faces multiplicity, with the "liquefied", with the volatility of identities, with the endless production of subjectivities, with "being" and "not being", with "having" and "seem", with freedom and pleasure, with becoming, with resistance and agency, with the complexity of networks and, fundamentally, with life.

This study investigates the relations of consumption in liquid modernity (postmodernity), through the psychosocial bias, revealing the liquid, plastic, fluid and changeable subjectivity of the consumer in a globalized context of a control society, which values "having" to the detriment of "being". Through the theoretical assumptions traced by Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Zygmunt Bauman

In this way, How to reflect the study of consumption through psychosociology, according to the view of the society of control and liquid modernity, in the production of a rhizomatic, plural, fragmented, schizophrenic and anthropophagic subjectivity entangled by the desire to consume, configuring and deconstructing Pret-a-porter identities as ways of being regulated by the market, according to the logic that to "be" you must "have"?

To answer this question are adopted as theoretical foundation complementary authors and works that dialogue with the object defined by the conceptual bias established for investigation. The exploratory research is used as an investigative methodology, through the technique of bibliographic survey.

Inquiring the perspective of consumption, according to the looks of control and net modernity and its theoretical perspectives, its contours and nuances, constitutes an epistemological challenge. It is not intended, in this work, to draw a map of these differences. The pretension is simply to reflect how the philosophical thoughts of DELEUZE, GUATTARI and BAUMAN contribute to the field of psychosociology.

Following in the footsteps of DELEUZE and GUATTARI [4], one must meet a philosophy that does not obey law and reason, but rather a perversion for the purpose of traversing the unthought in thought.

1.1 The Field of Psychosociology

To understand the concept of consumption through an interdisciplinary approach capable of reflecting the plastic subjectivity of the contemporary consumer, in light of a postmodern condition, psychosocial knowledge is a good clue. Thus, the dimension proposed here is that of the psychosociological nature or the field of social psychology as the episteme that, in postmodernity, allows explaining the changing behaviour of a subject, whose consumption occurs in a psychosocial way.

To clarify the question proposed here, we go to a brief definition of the field of social psychology through Nasciutti [5], with the cutouts subjectivity and interdisciplinary to launch the first clues to the discussion presented.

In Nasciutti:

The complexity of the subject in his environment does not allow it to be studied under a single angle and it is this conviction that led me to an interdisciplinary position, where I see the place of Psychosociology, whose bases are the relations that the individual maintains with the social, the way they are structured and the effects of the interaction of these determinants on the individual [5. p.54].

It can be emphasised that the proper domain of psychosociology appears in the interaction of social and psychic processes at the level of concrete behaviours, as well as in the interaction of people and groups within everyday life. And in this varied fabric of interpersonal ties, and the recognition of the study of the human being, through the interdisciplinary approach that integrates subject and social, there is a possible way with which to direct the reasoning to be constructed.

Liquid modernity can be considered a "background" touting psychosocial vectors. Since subjectivity, under this prism, is regulated both by the social symbolic system, which is of the order of the collective and by the individual drives, both in a "liquid state". In the case of a mobile subjectivity, it has the desire to consume the perpetuation of its volatility and the consumption of trademarks as an alibi of this transformational, ephemeral nature [6], which represents and inscribes the subject in the civilisation of brands or the consumer society.

The view of Nasciutti by social-psychology is revealing for further reflection:

This collective is still crossed by an image that itself is continuously built, through which society designates its identity and is represented. The society does not simply act on individual behaviour, but it is part of it, it is inscribed in the body, in the deeper psyche, in the representation that the individual makes of himself and others in the relations he maintains with the world outside him. (...) this social is regulated, symbolised and idealised by psychosocial a process that surpasses the psychic problem of the subject, although it originates from it" [5. p.52].

The psychosocial view also contributes to reflect the continuous and incessant flow of commercial brands (as objects of an unfeasible desire for consumption), under the aegis of a rhizomatic capitalism [7], that crosses and constructs the consumer's imagination, continually producing subjectivities, which are revocable identities, liquid and transformed by desire and the freedom to deconstruct themselves as subjects of consumption, fantasy and unfinished pleasure.

In the words of Deleuze and Guattari, 'desire constantly unites the continuous flow and

partial objects which are by nature fragmented and fragmented'.

In view of the intrinsic volatility and instability of all or almost all identities, it is the ability to 'go shopping' in the supermarket of identities, the genuine or supposedly genuine degree of freedom to select one's identity and to maintain it as desired, which becomes the true path to the realization of the fantasies of identity. With this capacity, we are free to make and undo identities at will. Or so it seems [1. p. 97-98].

Bauman warns that the idea of "liquid subjectivity" is sublimated, also, through sharing, in which the subject and the social are interconnected (and producing each other) and mediated by a collective that crosses them.

Deepening the reflection, what role does consumption play in the psychosocial context and in contemporary society?

1.2 Consumption in Liquid Modernity

Consumption, historically, represents one of the foundations of the conception of society [1] [8]. It has been expressed and interpreted in multiple dimensions, such as, for example, politics, economics, psychological, socio-cultural, environmental, and others [9,10,11,12,13]. Thus, the importance of consumption has been discussed for many centuries, as a condition of the interrelations of individuals in a society [14,15].

Therefore, consumption plays a significant role in contemporary society. It produces political and social relations, creates cultural and symbolic links. And mainly produces subjectivities [16] and "pret-a-porter identities" [17,18], in which the social and psychological dimensions are constructed and traversed in market networks.

Through the look of the production of subjectivities and identities, according to the prism of psychosociology, and in the dialogue between liquid modernity and control society, the field of consumption in this work is thought [19]. The look of consumption, through liquid modernity, reflects the state of the consumer's mobility and insatiability, of his endless pursuit of fluid and volatile wants [2].

For BAUMAN [3], contemporary society is understood as a society of consumption, while

modern society, in its founding or industrial phase, is considered a "society of producers". According to the postmodern view [20], the author describes that present-day society shapes its citizens to play the role of consumers. That is, consumption becomes understood more as a right or a pleasure, but as a duty as a citizen.

However, a central question in the analysis of consumer society for BAUMAN is desire. Mark Taylor and Esa Saarinen [3] summarise: "(...) desire does not desire satisfaction. On the contrary, desire desires the desire" (p.91). The prospect of the dissipation of desire, of being left with nothing to resurrect it, or in a world without anything desirable, is seen by Bauman [3] as a nightmare. This thought refers to the idea of the insatiability of desire.

In this society, consumers are continually exposed to new temptations, excited, and also in a state of perpetual and ready dissatisfaction. Likewise, consumers want to be seduced and are in charge: "They are the judges, the critics and the ones who choose" [3. p. 92]. Consuming is a duty, a compulsion, an obsession. However, the desire is regulated by the conditions of credit power and not more of the purchase [1].

The understanding of this view is based on a postmodern logic, of a "light and fluid capitalism" [2]. While modernity operates in Fordism "heavy capitalism" as "(...) self-consciousness of modern society in its 'heavy', 'bulky', or 'immobile' and 'rooted', 'solid' phases" [2. p.69], postmodernity is associated with a de-territorialized, mobile, borderless capitalism, recognized as a "rhizomatic capitalism" [21] of the control society [1,9]; "The post-Fordism world, 'fluid modern', of the individuals who choose in freedom" [2. p.73].

Bauman portrays consumer society as postmodern (or liquid modernity), emphasising the importance of the permanent achievement of new goals, not the search for means to ends.

Living a world full of opportunities – each more appetising and attractive than the previous one, each 'compensating' the previous one, and paving the way for the change to the next – is a fun experience [2. p.74].

In the consumer society, few things are predetermined, and still less irrevocable. Consumption is seen as ephemeral and fleeting. The political role of brands in this society is not to complete, not close, is to promote life under an

eternal compulsive obsession for the best, for the best, unfinished [16]. At this point, Bauman needs: "(...) for the possibilities to remain endless, none must be able to petrify into reality forever. Rather than remain liquid, fluid (...)" [2. p.74].

The world full of possibilities, for BAUMAN [2], is like a bountiful buffet table. In this metaphor, he points out that consumers are the diners, and the dishes the choices, so varied, that make all the tests difficult. What bothers the consumer to make a choice, dispense some options, and give them up. The anguish of the consumer is in choosing, faced with so many options, what is going to be consumed.

Bauman [8] also points out that the secret of perpetual non-satisfaction of desire is in the impetus to consumption, such as the impulse of freedom, makes satisfaction itself impossible. After all, the sense of freedom is inexhaustible, and consumption operates in the pleasure of that individual choice.

For Bauman [3], the consumer of today is postmodern (contemporary), different from the consumers of modern society. This lifestyle is based on the ability and willingness to consume as a free exercise of freedom in which consumers feel in control. The same author [20] adds that the consumer society is ruled by the freedom of the search for pleasure and desire, for destiny and for individual choices. Especially desires that, in turn, are ephemeral, elusive, volatile and perpetual.

Today's consumerism, according to Bauman [2], does not seek satisfaction of the needs (solid, inflexible and finite), but, if it turns to desires: much more volatile, fluid, ephemeral and infinite. For the author, consuming becomes a compulsion, a vice in postmodernity. Thus, "wanting" is the liberation of the pleasure principle, as the motivating force of consumption. "Organized life around consumption (...) should suffice without standards: it is driven by seduction, by ever-increasing desire and volatile wants" [2. p.90].

The consumer then lives in search of a desire, in a state of "aptitude", with the flexible, compulsive, absorbing and adjustable body ready to live new sensations, the search for pleasure, plunged in uncertainty and insecurity.

The common interpretations of compulsive buying as a manifestation of the postmodern value revolution, the tendency to represent

shopping addiction as an open manifestation of dormant materialist and hedonistic instincts, or as the product of a 'commercial conspiracy' (...), the pursuit of pleasure as the ultimate purpose of life (...) another part (...) is that the compulsion – transformed – into an addiction to buy is a fight up the hill against acute and unnerving uncertainty and against a feeling of insecurity, uncomfortable and stupid [8. p.95].

The understanding of consumer society, through the psychosocial view, requires a deep dialogue with the societal perspective of the control to understand the existing relations to the production of subjectivity.

1.3 Control Society: Biopower, Consumption and Subjectivity

To reflect on the concept of control society, it is important to start from a genealogical look at the formation of society, based on the notion of Disciplinary Society. This is because the term control society, addressed by Gilles Deleuze [1], to designate contemporary society, is an outgrowth of the concept of Disciplinary Society, described by Michel Foucault [22] as the societal model between the XVIII and XIX centuries, reaching its apogee in the XX century.

Deleuze, in Conversations, states that: "It is the control societies that are replacing disciplinary societies. 'Control' is the name that Burroughs proposes to designate the new monster, and which Foucault recognises as our near future" [1. p.220].

This "monster" emerges in opposition to the discipline, whose logic is based on the confinement, the molds, the idea that the individual has a position in the mass, as a number, a signature. The disciplinary society portrays an environment in which the market is "(...) conquered either by specialisation, sometimes by colonisation, or by reduction of production costs" [1. p.223]. If in the discipline capitalism is directed to production, in control it is for consumption.

For Hardt [23] to understand the Control Society is to think of it from a new paradigm of power: Biopower. "Power is thus expressed as a control that extends through the depths of consciousness and the bodies of the population – and at the same time – through the totalities of social relations" [9. p.43-44].

The logic of Biopower is, according to an "Empire", as the new world order.

On the one hand, according to ancient tradition, the Empire is the universal power, the world order, which may be realised today for the first time. On the other hand, the empire in the form of power that aims at human nature, hence bio-power. What I would like to suggest is that the social form taken by this New Empire is the World Control Society [23. p.358].

This new world order, recognised as "Empire" [9], is built in the undulating wake of capital, transnational institutions and the global market. In this sense, the spaces are obliterated, there is no longer "the outside", and consumption regulates social relations and life. For Foucault [9. p. 43], "Life has now become an object of power." Along these lines, PELBART [21] states that:

It is in this sense that life has become an object of power, not only to the extent that power tries to take charge of life in its totality, penetrating it from end to end and in all its spheres, from its dimension cognitive, psychic, physical, biological, even genetics, but especially when this procedure is reformed by each of its members. What is at stake in this regime of power, however, is the production and reproduction of life itself [21. p.82].

This Biopower becomes an integrating and vital function that each individual incorporates and reactivates of its own volition. The domesticated, trained, and useful bodies of the discipline give way to consumerist souls, indebted to the control society, or as SIBILIA [17. p.30] points out, "From producer-disciplined to consumer-controlled."

In the control society, the world market operates according to the logic of deterritorialized capitalism, as described by HARDT [23]

With the Control Society, we have finally arrived at this point, the point of arrival of capitalism. As the world market, it is a form that has no outside frontier, or else has fluid and mobile boundaries. To retake the title of my exposition, the Control Society is already, immediately, a World Control Society [23. p.372].

According to Hardt [23], in the context of the "world control society", consumption becomes the postmodern social control device that transnational corporations adopt through brands and their strategies of production in the way of being, articulating and reproducing the new social orders. Reaffirming this view, SIBILIA [17] mentions that:

"While the citizens of the globalised world are incorporating the role of consumers, the logic of the company begins to permeate the entire social body, imposing its model on all institutions. Formerly, this function was the prison, which operated as an analogue model of the factory and other institutions of confinement. In the transition to the post-industrial era, therefore, a transition from the disciplined producer (the subject of the factories) to the controlled consumer (the subject of the companies) is observed" [17. p.36].

Thus, in the control society (and in "control capitalism") the demands of individuals are no longer met, but rather, demands and markets are created, based on the deep knowledge of individuals. Man is no longer the confined man, but the man in debt. And through frantic consumption and the ease of contracting debts, it begins to give value to use as a form of social insertion.

In the control society, which is conceived according to a postmodernist view as a consumer society, it starts from a rhizomatic perspective [7], that is, from an agency (and a crossing) through the multiplicity of senses, values, concepts and knowledge. Thus, contemporary society is built through a self-deforming molding, in permanent change, whose meshes, processes, vectors and networks are in continuous transformation and deconstruction. Everything and everyone is producing and controlling.

From the control and its synoptic movement [3], a fluid and changeable society is built, in which brands and products are thought and produced, through the strategy of setting up the Biopoder regime [9], which inscribes consumption as a phenomenon of inclusion, in the logic of an "Empire", where there is no longer the separation between what is "inside" or "outside."

If the control society reflects the profile of contemporary society, it can be said that "Our

society is a consumer society". With this aphorism, BAUMAN [3] portrays the global contemporaneity, described as liquid modernity, in which the act of consuming is the passport to belong to a social context and to have secured the status of "consumer".

Thus, the way contemporary society shapes its individuals is dictated, first and foremost, by the duty to play the role of consumer. The standard that this society places on its members, is the ability and willingness to play this role [3. p.88].

Consumption is a form of social regulation of control, sublimating the idea that to be must be. Otherwise, the deletion is left. Contemporary capitalism reaffirms this position, according to DELEUZE [1]. Marketing is thus the instrument of social control for such purpose.

In Deleuze's view, the control society turns consumption into a "password" of belonging, to be "in". In the postmodern world, there is no longer the dialectic between "the outside" and "the inside." The notion of consumption implodes the separations between public and private. Everything is unified and diffused, in such a way that it is impossible to distinguish the "inside" and the "outside". It is also to look at the transformation of man into an indebted being, living in an eternal consumerist moratorium of brands and new lifestyles, produced by the logic of world market consumption [24]

According to the perspective of control and starting from the idea of immanence, Deleuze and Guattari [7] explain that this plan is not transcendent (discipline), but imminent (control) as the world in which one lives. "(...) the essential is no longer a signature and not a number, but a figure: the cipher is a password (...) individuals become *individuals*, divisible (...) data, markets, or 'banks'" [1. p.222], in the plane of immanence.

The plane of immanence is not related to an aprioristic view. It is an incessant influx of punctualities of all orders, whose only common feature among them is that they are random and unrelated. Under this regime of chaotic information, of "data," immanence deals with life as perpetual activation of sensorimotor schemes, that is, these data have utility because they are crossed by a screening and then used by the new capitalism.

Immanence, in turn, must be thought through a slipping of things without the obligation to recognise what arrives, but rather to provide the means to follow its becoming. That is, the question at stake is the possibility of creating, in chaos, new possibilities, if we act with mobility, be capable of deterritorialization. If once the capitalism of production in transcendence was immobile and fixed, it is now mobile and liquid in immanence, through the logic of agency.

In the sense of Deleuze [25] [7], this agency is both *machinic* (content) and collective (enunciation) expression. On the basis of transnational corporations, they operate in both territorialized and deterritorialized ways. In this last way, in becoming according to an immanent plan, from which the subjectivity is produced incessantly because of assemblages variables, social and retaskable.

Thus, individuals in the market participants in the reproduction of these social assemblages, which depend on local and "molecular" assemblages [26] [7], in which the individual himself models his existence according to the codes in force, but in an unbalanced way.

In this way, the desire of the individual (as a consumer) is agitated or produced: "(...) there is an only desire that is agitated or machined. You cannot learn or conceive a desire outside of a given agency, on a plan that does not exist, but which must itself be built" [25. p.115].

Therefore, consumer brands act, for example, in the management of desires. For DELEUZE and GUATTARI [27], "(...) if the desire produces, it produces real (...) be the goal of desire is the real itself" (p.34). Desire is not given previously, it is exploratory and it mobilises individuals for singularities, not for the direction of an object (possession), but for the simple fact of being able to desire, in a movement of insatiability and infinity.

Thus, desire is a production, an incessant experimentation, an experimental setup, no longer functioning as a representation of an absent or missing object. Desire is a becoming, according to *Deleuze-Guattarian* perspective.

The thought of *Deleuzian* subjectivity is outside the presuppositions of psychology, which, in this case, remains attached to concepts of the imaginary [28]. DELEUZE and GUATTARI [7]

[29] propose to think of subjectivity as production, a subjectivity in movement and continuously produced, in combating the primacy of the verb to be and defending its uprooting.

Make rhizome and not root, never plant! Do not sow, chop! Be not one, not multiple, multiplicity! Make the line and never point! Speed turns to point in line! Be quick, even stopped! The line of chance, game of waist, line of escape (...) Make maps, never photos or drawings (...)

A rhizome does not begin, nor does it conclude, it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo. The tree is filiation, but the rhizome is alliance, uniquely alliance. The tree imposes the verb to be, but the rhizome has as a fabric the conjugation. 'And ... and ... and ...'. There is in this conjunction sufficient force to shake and uproot the verb to be. Where are you going? Where do you come from? Where do you want to go? They are useless questions (...) to seek a beginning, a foundation or imply a false conception of travel and movement"[7. p.37].

Deleuze and Guattari [7] [29], influenced by Foucault, think of this subjectivity as the identity of multiplicity, not by the logic of being, but by the logic of "and" (rhizome). After all, the generation of subjectivities is not in the demarcation of the boundaries of a self, confined and inner, but in the idea Through this psychosocial logic, understanding of *Deleuze-Guattarian* subjectivity goes through an infinite mobility status of "I", the displacement of the flows, the rhizome, of becomings, of assemblages of enunciation, of being affected and effect, the fold which unfolds and refolds, of an endless and unfinished metamorphosis.

In this way, as discussed, subjectivity is thought of as a fold, in the sense of Deleuze and Guattari. Silva [30] reveals a good measure of this reflection to look at the consumer:

By the process of subjectivation, the subject falls apart in multiplicities. By the heterogeneity of their physical, biological, psychic, verbal, economic, aesthetic, ethical, and political supports, subjectivity is a cultural product like any other. As a process, emerging subjectivity relates to the world by the boundary, by the neighbourhood: it individuates itself in the relations of

otherness and collectivises itself in the multiplicities, for "beyond the individual" and for "below the person" [30. p.175].

The conception of subjectivity, through the psychosocial bias, according to TAVARES [31], also implies the configuration and production of an infinite field of identity, above all by the influence of consumption and the logic of rhizomatic capitalism.

1.4 The Human being to Human having and the Logic of the Pret-a-porter Identities

Decentralised capitalism and its mobile and rhizomatic strategy [7] invades the instinctual drives and the collective producing the idea that the question is no longer "to be" but "being/having". The mutability of identity refers to mobile subjectivity consumption as regulated by production methods to be through "pret-a-porter identities" produced by the market [17].

The being is immutable and concrete, the "having" is changeable, it is fluid, it is becoming. Thus, using philosophy to understand this opposition, being can be understood in various ways: substance, existence, essence, being-in-itself, being-in-the-world, being of reason. In a sense that appears in Greek philosophy, the being is opposed to becoming. JAPIASSU and MARCONDES [32] offer good clues about this reflection:

It is in this sense that in Greek philosophy, becoming is always identified as non-being, non-being is not the absence of being, nothingness, but that which is not being, that which is changeable and diverse, while the unchangeable being is unique" [32. p.246].

Through the eyes of Deleuze and Guattari, through the process of subjectivation, we seek to reflect the human being and his psychosocial and cultural transformations, through a new approach: that of the "human". Not as a metaphysical conception of human nature, but above all from a perspective of becoming, that is, in the fluidity and mutability of the individual as a strategy of a virtual of identity.

Focusing also on BAUMAN's thinking [2] [33] in the context of consumer society the debate on identity issues is broadened. The fixed and solid identities of modernity are replaced by the mobile

and fluid identities of postmodernity. In a consumer society, individual freedom is the freedom to "have identity", or as Bauman [2] points out, can have multiple identities. In a world where everything is deliberately unstable, identities are produced in the light of globalised capitalism. They are, therefore, continuous oscillations, malleable by the freedom of individual choice, tensioned in the desire to consume, regulated by the market, as "kits of identities".

Rolnik [34] reaffirms Bauman's view and mentions that identities are reconfigured by the logic of the market and global consumption, producing new consumer subjectivities.

With this, identities are very rapidly pulverised, which may lead one to suppose that the identity model in the construction of subjectivity would be suffering similar pulverisation. But this is not so: at the same time that identities are dissolved, standard figures are produced according to each market orbit. The subjectivities are led to reconfigure themselves around such figures outlined a priori (...). Fixed local identities disappear to give way to flexible global identities. They follow the hallucinatory rhythm of the market, but they do not cease to operate under the regime of identity. [34. p.454].

The vision of SIBILIA [17] converges to ROLNIK's view [34] when describing that these identities are organized according to the logic of "light capitalism" [2] or rhizomatic [1]:

Assisted by the power of digital instrumental processing, the new capitalism metabolises vital forces with unprecedented voracity, launching and relaunching constantly new forms of subjectivity that will be acquired and immediately discarded by the various targets to which they are directed, feeding a spiral of consumption of modes of being in increasing acceleration. Thus, the illusion of a fixed and stable identity, characteristic of modern and industrial society, is giving way to the 'standard profile kits' or 'pret-a-porter identities', according to Suely Rolnik's denominations (...), they are ephemeral, disposable and always linked to the proposals and the interests of the market" [17. p.33].

Thus, these "pret-a-porter identities" or "kits of subjectivities" [35] operate under the regime of

disposability. As Bauman points out, "the consumer market rejoices, filling sheds and shelves with new symbols of identities, original and tempting (...) discarded identities" [33. p.88].

For the author, these identities represent choices of "ways of life", and thus, a characteristic of consumer society. They are identities produced individually or collectively, regulated by consumption, as strategies of psychosocial belonging, but disintegrated, at any moment, by unsatisfied desires, in the society of liquid modernity.

Returning to Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy, the understanding of the concept of subjectivity can also be reflected as an anthropophagic principle, according to Rolnik, through which a hybrid constitution is observed in individuation, due to the permanent individual, collective and impersonal assemblages under the prism of incorporating the values of an "other."

Extended to the domain of subjectivity, the anthropophagic principle could be thus described: swallowing the other, especially the other admired, so that particles of the universe of this other are mixed with those that already populate the subjectivity of the cannibal and in the invisible chemistry of that mixture, a true transmutation takes place. The resonance with the ideas of Deleuze and Guattari is notorious: subjectivity, according to the two authors, is not given; it is the object of a relentless production that overflows the individual on all sides. What we have are processes of individuation or subjectivation, which are made in the connections between heterogeneous flows, of which the individual and his outline would be only one resultant. Thus the figures of subjectivity are ephemeral in principle, and their formation necessarily presupposes collective and impersonal assemblages [34. p. 452-453].

The ephemeral and fragmented character of this subjectivity – and its production – is notorious in the displacement of individuals, in the era of globalized and flexible capitalism, for example, with commercial brands having a strategic role to function as a postmodern world control device in order to sublimate the idea of the "other admired", flowing in the field of the immanence of a malleable and perversely unrealizable desire [36].

At the same time, the consumer, in postmodernity, is *chamegaroo* (chameleon + kangaroo) subjectivity [37]. An individual understood as a hybrid being, who changes at every moment and moment, in permanent and infinite transformation, and who decides his choices of consumption in an ecosophical way [38]. Therefore, it is seen from the Guattarian point of view, in As 3 ecologies [39], as a changeable subjectivity that is influenced by the paths of social, environmental and economic relations. That is, the relation of human subjectivity to its externality is the key to verifying this individual and collective tension.

Hardt and Negri in *Empire* reaffirm GUATTARI's thinking and further add that these business organisations are producers of subjectivities, manipulating consumption (and consumers), but also being influenced by the consumers themselves.

In the process of subjectivation, the business organizations produce brands, which are rhizomatic representations that entangle the desires of each individual, metamorphosing, for an end of endless consumption.

Trademarks are ontophoretic entities that support the structure of being and the group, under the principles of adhesion, belonging, appreciation and recognition, and seek to (re) position, restate (and modulate), semiotically, flexibilising their codes and linguistic discourses, but seeking to maintain a sense of common sense, through a knowable principle of individual and collective at the same time. These brands produce subjectivities, which are revocable and fluctuating identities to the pursuit of frantic, endless consumption, and a desire that is not fulfilled (to be kept in a state of unceasing excitement and ready dissatisfaction); which perpetuates a pathology of subjection, but as voluntary servitude.

The brand produces the fluid subjectivity of the consumer, through the concept of immaterial labour [40], through the creation of ideas and values of consumption in a psychosocial way. This plastic subjectivity is organised by a powerful marketing operation, which makes the individual believe that to be a "being" one has to belong and consume, reconfiguring himself to the various spaces/territories travelled in search of a circumstantial acceptance, in the condition of "human having".

2. CONCLUSION

The thoughts of Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Zygmunt Bauman point to equally relevant perspectives for the study of consumption. The understanding of the individual and the process of his subjectivation in the field of consumption, in a psychosocial way, should not be thought through a priority (transcendence), but of production (immanence), rhizome, becoming and the production of desires, in which its creation operates beyond the imaginary, but is driven by market movements (consumption).

In the control society, there is the deterritorialization of individuals and social groups, the non-place of powers, agency, and the condition in which there is no "outside" (consumption is the "inside"). Schizoanalysis, from which DELEUZE and GUATTARI depart, is a conceptual basis for capturing the psychosocial idea, through this rhizomatic capitalism, of the mobility of things, of multiplicity, of lines of flight, of nomadism, of semiotic, material, and social flows. And, moreover, not more of a human being, but of a "human having" that is inscribed in the rhizome of life, in the infinity of thought, in micropolitics, in desires, in uprooting the concreteness of the verb to give place to the verb have and their fluidity.

The knowledge of Deleuze and Guattari, without the enlightenment and positivist pretension, bring a philosophical restlessness, a transgression to the thought, a perversion. Thus, in the psychosocial view, subjectivity must be reflected in plateaus, in dimensions, in molecular revolutions; "(...) I'm on the edge of this crowd, on the outskirts, but belong to her, to her I am bound by one end of my body, a hand or a foot" [7. p.42]. Be thought of in the logic of the crowd ride, in the liquid, and not in the solid. The Deleuze-Guattarian psychosocial look points to the multiplicities of subjectivities and their infinite production of "pret-a-porter identities" 'or' "subjectivities kits".

The understanding of the production of subjectivity, in contemporaneity, passes through the psychosocial look. That is, by the logic of the complexity of intersubjective human instances and suggestive instances. Moreover, subjective processes must be reflected in the collective (not socially exclusive) and individual tensions of a mutual meta-production, both molar and molecular, in psychosocial terms, in the development of rhizomatic multiplicities, in the subjective individuation that certainly subsists, is

worked through collective assemblages of enunciation. In the case of consumption, the process of this subjectivation occurs through the influence of a network, which operates according to the logic of the market.

After all, each individual, each social group conveys its own system of subjectivity modelling, as Guattari [1] explains, and all this occurs in an ecosophical way, through "capitalist culture" and deterritorialized or connectionist capitalism, according to market logic, in an environment that is in permanent liquefaction, as Bauman warns.

If control society corresponds to the axiomatic logic of capital, the conception of consumption (and its parasitic and immaterial expansion) is the very metamorphosis of a deterritorialized, mobile and life-producing capitalism. In this society, a new capitalism marked by new digital modalities, continuous, fluid, wavelike, open, mutant, flexible and self-deforming, which are moving intensely by the social body, is metabolized: "It does not know the boundaries; spaces and all times, swallowing the outside"[17. p.28].

Bodies docile and useful to the consumerist souls, therefore, new subjectivities are produced and fed according to a consumer spiral of *ways of being*, always ephemeral and disposable, linked to market interest.

Consumption is the perspective psychosociological a *way of being* fluid, is provided a new allegory of capitalism of liquid modernity, eager for authenticity / difference and producer of desires, and the idea of being "inside" as psychosocial belonging strategy. This psychosociological view comes as much from the consumer's individual freedom of choice with the goal of being accepted and recognised by the collective (being equal, but also being different) as by the pleasure of consuming (and consuming) himself at the same time. And sometimes it is also ambivalent because the individualism of the consumer is crossed by gestures and fleeting moments of solidarity. But, above all, of a hedonistic "human being" that has in the consumption of the marks a strategy of subjective value, because in order to "be" one must have or at least seem.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Deleuze Gilles. Dialogues. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34; 1992.
2. Bauman Zygmunt. Liquid Modernity. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar; 2001.
3. Bauman Zygmunt. Globalization: The human consequences. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar; 1999.
4. Deleuze Gilles, Guattari Félix. What is philosophy? Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34; 1992.
5. Nasciutti Jacyara. Reflexões sobre o espaço da psicossociologia. Série Documenta Ano V nº 7. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ / IP / EICOS; 1996.
6. Lipovetsky Gilles. The empire of fashion dressing modern democracy. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras; 1989.
7. Deleuze Gilles, Guattari Félix. A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34. 1995;I.
8. Bauman Zygmunt. Consuming life. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar. Ed.; 2008.
9. Hardt M, Negri A. Empire. Rio de Janeiro: Record; 2001.
10. Canclini Nestor Garcia. Consumers and citizens: Globalization and multicultural conflicts. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ; 1999.
11. Featherstone Mike. Consumer culture and postmodernism. São Paulo: Studio Nobel; 1995.
12. Tavares Fred, Irving Marta. Consumo verde no Brasil: Uma investigação psicossocial e rizomática. Rio de Janeiro: Revista Comum. Vol 10, nº 24. OHAEC/FACHA; 2005.
13. Tavares Fred, Irving Marta. Consumo verde no Brasil: Rizoma, sustentabilidade e pós-modernidade. 2ª CADMA. Niterói – RJ: UFF/ FGV; 2006.
14. Barbosa Lívia. Sociedade de consumo. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed.; 2004.
15. Campbell Coline. The romantic ethic and the spirit of modern consumerism. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco; 2001.
16. Tavares Fred. O consumo na pós-modernidade: uma perspectiva psicossociológica. Rio de Janeiro: Em pauta – Revista Comum da OHAEC, vol. 9, nº22; 2004.
17. Sibilia Paula. O homem pós-orgânico: corpo, subjetividade e tecnologias digitais. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará; 2002.
18. Rolnik Suely. Despachos no museu: Sabe-se lá o que vai acontecer... In RAGO, Margareth et al. Imagens de Foucault e

- Deleuze: Ressonâncias nietzschianas. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A; 2005.
19. Ferreira GTG, Tavares Fred. Natureza líquida: As modelagens marcárias e a publicidade verde. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Appris; 2017.
 20. Bauman Zygmunt. Postmodernity and Its discontents. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed.; 1998.
 21. Pelbart Peter Pál. Vida capital. Ensaios de biopolítica. São Paulo: Iluminuras; 2003.
 22. Foucault Michel. Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. Petrópolis / RJ: Vozes; 1987.
 23. Hardt M. The global society of control. In: Alliez E. (org). Gilles deleuze: Uma vida filosófica. São Paulo, Ed. 34; 2000.
 24. Ferreira GGT, Tavares F, Fernando J, de Almeida EM. Social business in the logic of capitalism rhizomatic: Alternative of resistance or trademark modeling? Open Journal of Social Sciences. 2018;6:318-332.
 25. Deleuze Gilles, Parne T. Claire. Dialogues. São Paulo: Escuta; 1998.
 26. Guattari Félix. Molecular revolution: Psychiatry and politics. São Paulo: Brasiliense; 1981.
 27. Deleuze Gilles, Guattari Félix. Anti-oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia. Rio de Janeiro: Imago; 1976.
 28. Domènech M, et al. A dobra: Psicologia e subjetivação. In: Silva TT. (org). Nunca fomos humanos – nos rastros do sujeito. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica; 2001.
 29. Deleuze Gilles, Guattari Félix. A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1995ª;2.
 30. Silva Nilza. Subjetividade. In: Strey Marlene, et al. (orgs). Psicologia social contemporânea. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1998.
 31. Tavares Fred. Sustentabilidade líquida. O consumo da natureza e a dimensão do capitalismo rizomático nos platôs da sociedade de controle. In: Revista Sinais Sociais. 2014;9(26):71-95.
 32. Japiassú Hilton, Marcondes Danilo. Dicionário básico de filosofia. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed.; 1996.
 33. Bauman Zygmunt. Identity: Conversations with benedetto vecchi. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar; 2005.
 34. Rolnik Suely. Esquizoanálise e antropofagia. In Alliez Éric (org). Gilles Deleuze: Uma vida filosófica. São Paulo: Ed. 34; 2000.
 35. Rolnik Suely. Toxicômanos de identidade: Subjetividade em tempo de globalização. In Lins Daniel (org.) Cadernos de Subjetividade. Campinas: Papirus; 1997.
 36. Tavares Fred, et al. The “green consumption” and the rhizomatic capital strategy: Ads and reports in the Brazilian media. Advances in Applied Sociology. 2017;7(02):35.
 37. Tavares Fred. O marketing pós-moderno nas sociedades midiáticas e temporais. Em pauta - Revista Comum da OHAEC, Rio de Janeiro. 2001;5(16):81-118.
 38. Pontes Fernando, Tavares Fred. Ecosofia das marcas: As três ecologias na publicidade verde. Rio de Janeiro. Editora Appris; 2017.
 39. Guattari Félix. The three ecologies. Campinas – SP: Papirus; 1991.
 40. Lazzarato Maurizio, Negri Antonio. Immaterial labor. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A; 2001.

© 2018 Tavares et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/27327>*