

## **Propagandas, alienação e sedução: o rompimento ontológico homem-trabalho como fundamento do protagonismo social das imagens**

## **Propagandas, alienation and seduction: the human-work ontological break off as a foundation of the social protagonism of the images**

Marsiel Pacífico<sup>1</sup>

Luiz Roberto Gomes<sup>2</sup>

**Resumo:** *A análise do capitalismo feita por Marx constituiu ferramentas fundamentais para o diagnóstico da estrutura e do funcionamento do capital. Todavia, pertencente a seu tempo histórico, tal análise suscita a atualização para um sistema fortemente determinado pela sua dimensão subjetiva. Para compreender esse movimento, por meio de uma revisão bibliográfica, apontaremos na ruptura da dimensão ontológica do trabalho propiciada pelo trabalho alienado típico do capitalismo a condicionante de esvaziamento subjetivo que possibilitou o avançar da imagem, mediada pelas propagandas, como potência da forma contemporânea do capital.*

**Palavras-chave:** *propagandas; capital; imagem; alienação; ontologia.*

**Abstract:** *The analysis of capitalism, made by Marx, constituted fundamental tools for the diagnosis of the structure and functioning of capital. However, belonging to its historical time, this analysis raises the update to a system strongly determined by its subjective dimension. To understand this movement, through a bibliographical review, we will point out the rupture of the ontological dimension of work, propitiated by the alienated work typical of capitalism, the condition*

1 Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa (UEPG). Ponta Grossa, PR, Brasil.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2013-2073>. E-mail: marsiellp@gmail.com

2 Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar). São Carlos, SP, Brasil.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8867-7897>. E-mail: luizroberto.gomes@gmail.com

*of subjective emptying that allowed the advancement of the image, mediated by advertisements, as a power of the contemporary form of capital.*

**Keywords:** *propagandas; capital; image; alienation; ontology.*

## Introduction

Advertising flooded our daily lives through image. The means of this process has its social and historical conditions rooted in our culture, which determines the almost organic acceptance of the relationship of consumption of images. Not only advertising, but even the way we communicate among subjects tends, contemporarily, to the imagery modality. Such findings must be understood not only through the centrality of them in our symbolic relationships with products, but, especially, in the way and intensity we receive them and bond with them. To understand the centrality of image goes through the observation of the spaces it fills in our subjectivity and, consequently, what is the origin of these spaces. Thus, the observation of the spectacle as the center of social life demands a profound analysis of its paths. If we had to map the conducting wire that guide us historically from the diagnosis of Karl Marx to the actualizations proposed by Guy Debord and Cristoph TÜRCKE, we could say that the images detain the centrality of this process. The centrality of images, which path begins in advertisement as a secondary ornament to the merchandize, by competition pressure of the market itself and a series of historical convergences, as the failure of the Fordist Keynesian model, the technological development and, especially, the popularization of photographic cameras, a vast and productive field to develop itself, to the point of affirming: “This aestheticization adhered to capitalism: it is its skin, not its packaging (TÜRCKE, 2010, p. 11).

Thus, this article aims to present, through the dynamic of historic relations, how advertisement gain power, procedurally, in the cultural field, determining not only the relationship of value of merchandise, but establishing their relationship with the man through an ontological dimension, replacing the broken relation man-work, voided in its symbolic value through the capitalist means of production.

The verification of this historical process of inversion, in which the social spirit detains the priority over its materiality, arrogate subjective characteristics that, in larger or smaller extent, reaches every subject immersed in this historical context.

However, and as already exposed by Debord, the imperative domination of the aesthetic dimension of capital over its material forms has as fundamental origin the specific configurations of the work relationship imposed by the system itself. As the author explains:

The worker does not produce itself, it produces an independent force. The success of its production, its abundance, goes back to the producer as abundance of dispossession. With the accumulation of its alienated products, time and space of its world become strange to him. The spectacle is the map to this new world, a map that corresponds exactly its territory. The forces that escaped us show themselves in all their vigor (DEBORD, 1997, p. 24).

The man subjectified by the hypnotic power of his products is a historic stage whose fundamental predecessor is the progressive dismantling of ontological bonds of men with the products of his work. Only by the semiformative forces of alienation the spiritual conditions come about so they could replicate forms of domination, something that, a priori, should be of use of the men, according to his plans.

Thus, the analysis of subjective strengthening of the imagery of spectacle is circumscribed to subjective depreciation of the identity dimension of work, in which the man would build signs of value to himself and the thing - when he alienates himself from the thing, he alienated from himself. It is in the historical time of the loss of relation man-work that the image gains strength to impel us to the spectacle that detains the priority over our private lives.

If the premise of priority of images seem to sustain itself through the observations of our time, such inversion occurs on the basis of social infrastructure and objective implications of sophistication of the capitalist way of production. To understand these processes, we have to consider the dialectic relationship between two fields of force: the relation man-work and the relation between concrete and abstract in merchandise. Such conjugation allow us to establish the bonds of the social dynamics that imposed new parameters on one hand and culminated in the current stage of capital, society, and, especially, culture.

Thus, we observe, in the first section of this article, as the model of typical work of capital, analyzed by Marx, broke the ontological relationship man-work, creating a space in human spirit that began, little by little, to be sublimated by the symbolic relationships of the production of desire of consuming a merchandize in the aestheticization of advertising.

In the second section, we will show how such logic determines a new understanding of relations of value of merchandize, which, beyond the model of quantum proposed by Marx, demands new and urgent subjective factors to the understanding of our days.

### **Ontology of work and alienation: the production of frailties of subject**

As the premise of his analysis of capital, it lies in Marx the understanding that the relationship between man and work has fundamental importance, not only on the way it organizes itself and the development of labor, but also while dialectic process, product and producer of the historical subject. The ontology of work in Marx refer to the capital the primitive stage of our species, in which the man, as an animal, and like any other animal, always had his survival linked to the conditions of physical existence in relationship to the world. Its eternum continuum between the frail extremity of living and dying is, and always will be, inflexible in the constitution of human nature.

Exercising its will over such relationship means to create positive conditions of combat to the adversities for extending its material existence in individual and collective sphere. Thus, our species was created and prospered on Earth in proportion to their capability of intervention over nature. There is, still, in the horizon of historical future, the certainty that the work will always be the way of transforming nature by humans to satisfy their needs and to constantly recreate themselves in the relationship of its material and symbolic production in the world.

Humans establish a deep dialectic relationship with work that, beyond the objective materiality of work and its products, allow them, in the exercise of modifying nature, to establish processes of subjective re-signification of themselves. As Marx explains:

Before everything, work is a process between humans and nature, a process where the man, through his own action, mediates, regulates and controls its metabolism with nature. He himself is confronted with the natural matter as natural force. He puts in motion the natural forces belonging to his corporality, arms and legs, head and hand, in order to appropriate himself of the natural matter in an useful way to his own life. While acting, through this movement, over Nature external to him and while modifying it, he modifies, at the same time, his own nature (MARX, 1996, p. 297).

Beyond the resolution of urgent matters of our existence, observing the genealogy of our species, we can point how related is our social development with our capacity of work. As we got to develop more complex works and tasks, humanity blossomed since its evolutionist transition of our hominid past to what we now consider the modern human. In this sense, we cannot lose track that it was over the cognitive adaptation of our peers to complex activities that we've developed our more dense abstractions and that such relationship was propelled by these symbolic mediations of work exercised by the human being. As Engels demonstrates:

Thanks to the cooperation of the hand, the language organs and the brain, not only in each individual, but also in society, humans learned to execute operations increasingly more complex, when proposing to -Reach increasingly higher objectives. The work itself was diversified and enhanced from generation to generation, extending itself even further to new activities. After hunting and fishing, came agriculture, and, later, spinning and weaving, the creation of metals, pottery and navigation. Besides trade and the crafts that appeared, finally, the arts and sciences; from tribes, arise nations and states. Appeared the law and politics, and, with them, the fantastic reflection of things in the brain of humans: the religion (ENGELS, 1990, p. 29).

In the beginning of more rudimentary social organizations, the intentional and methodical intervention of nature happened in a way of attending physical and spiritual needs of the man. Food, shelter, garments for rites and cults: everything had a purpose, that was the priority of work as an instrument of satisfaction of personal and group needs. In this sense, we observe work as a *modus operandi* of humanity to reach their goals and defend themselves from external forces. Thus, the product of human work aimed to fill the immediate or socially constituted needs by cultural productions. Even so, such productions had the goal of equating demands of objective character, as in the spiritual intervention of nature as a form of domination and human defense against processes where he didn't had control over.

In this relation, we also have to consider that the Marxian perspective understand that the work exercises the priority of dialectic movement. Every human labor had an end allocated outside its essence; the work would be a servant of human needs and only as such it would exist. Beyond that, regarding the individual relationship, the product of work was, in general, a direct demand of its worker.

In this primitive configuration of work, there was still the dimension of freedom, included in the abstract exercise of determination of "what" and "how" the final product of the work would be created - determination that is directly linked to will and the technical dimension of the worker.

With the arrival of capitalism, the bond established between men and work is re-signified through new relations. The interventions and mediations over the exercise of will and the creation of the worker over his work enabled the formation of a relationship sickened in its ontological potentiality. If the specific modes of production of its historical time determine the relationships between subject and work, we have to consider the peculiarities of capital, whose system is, in the dialectic historical materialistic analysis, grounded in antagonistic relationships of social classes.

ARTIGO

That way, new characteristics were determined in the productive process. Among them, we can highlight the expropriation of the final product of work to the worker, the alienation of the fragmentary work, the control of access and the regimen of work empowered by the capitalist and the transformation of product in merchandise; but, overall, and what concerns our object of analysis, we highlight the dimension of fetish of merchandise and the subjective production of necessity of consumption, inaugurated by historical peculiarities in the process of developing capital.

Contrary to what we observe in the pinnacle of development of capitalism, about which Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels write about, the rescue of the ontologic dimension of work demonstrates that the human essentiality is realized in the extent where the subject is linked to the work. However, the alienation and the subjective expropriation inherent to capital made that precisely the process that turns the self-determined historical subject human into its main agent of historical degradation.

When the relationship between human and the product of its work is ruptured, every subjective bond of creation and expression of self, the load of absolute exteriority starts to determine a character of strangeness in the relationship subject-object. The objective moment that allowed the personal manifestation dissolves in the mode of production of capital, giving way to a model whose work refers solely to its objectivity, to “doing” without “conceiving”.

The deterioration of this bond happens by the rupture of the bond of belonging that was natural to other work relationships. In the capitalistic model, something that was produced by the worker does not belong to him; it is destined to another subject that will employ another use, completely exterior to the subject who produced the merchandise.

Thus, the practice of domination is voided completely from its original sense. If the intervention of humans in the world allows the domination of this for that, such relationship only unravels itself due to the destination and intention of its final product. However, when the final product of a work is marginalized from this relationship, the

product is absolutized in relation to the subject, giving the product an autonomous character of merchandise in simultaneity with the process of objectification of the subject. Such inversion determines the lack of possession of homo faber, whose products of his work would serve his means. In the context of development of capital, to the subject alienated from its work is left the role of intermediation, a necessary component of the productive step - and as such, it must serve and guide by the paths of merchandise, of stage of social life in which things are, in itself and to itself, external to the man, and, therefore, are alienable” (MARX, 1996, p. 212). This process of inversion promoted by the capital, in which men are objectified and things gain exclusively human characteristics and are absolutized, is explained by Jacob Gorender:

We unravel the alienated character of a world where things move like people and people are dominated by the own things they created. During the process of production, merchandise is still the matter that the producer dominates and transforms into an useful object. Once taken to sale in the process of circulation, the situation gets inversed: the object dominates the producer. The creator loses control over his creation and his destine becomes dependent from the movement of things, which assume enigmatic powers. As things are animized and personified, the producer is objectified. Men live, then, in a world of merchandise, a world of fetish (GORENDER, 1996, p. 34).

The intervention over nature enabled the man to impress himself subjectively over nature through his product. This process is based on the capital through another logic, as demonstrated by Marx:

Whoever produces an object for his personal and direct use, to consume it, creates a product, but not a merchandise. As a producer who maintains himself, he has nothing to do with society. But, in order to produce a merchandise, not only have to create an article that satisfies any social necessity, but also the work incorporated in it will present an integrant part of the global sum of work inverted by society. It has to be subordinate to the division of work within society. It is nothing without the other sectors of work, and, in turn, is called to integrate them (MARX, 1996, p. 92).

Such inversion produces a symbolical void of dimension of work, whose new locus will be central in the analysis of transnational capitalism so we could understand the historical core of spectacularization.

Despite the possibility of the contemporary social stage of spectacle demands an update in the ontological analysis of the man, it is popular the advent of the image as a social weave found a prolific field through the alienation of the subject original from the capitalist way of working. Exposed by Marx, this model maintains its basis of alienation and expropriation. Voided, the modern man suffer for having lost his bonds, that would ultimately ground the basis for the constitution of a singularity. If these bases would come from the exercise of autonomy and the critical spirit, they could resist the ample process of spectacular massification we live in.

### **From materiality to subjectivity: the production of desire of consumption as a determining power of quantum of merchandise**

The structure of work in the capital, beyond the ontological ruptures of the relation man-work, provide the historical arrival of an intercepting subject of this relationship: the bourgeois, the one who you sell the productive force. To the extent the productive process is intercrossed with a new historical subject, the determination of the need of the product is not, in any way, linked to its producer, but it is recognized within the economist logic that, in Marx, would conceive the merchandise as a way of satisfying human needs, from body and spirit (MARX, 1996, p. 165). The order of factors exposed by Marx responds to its time. However, we have to notice that, historically, the process of production of subjective necessity of consumption gained a dimension of centrality in the body of contemporary capitalism. In a historical moment where Marx associates, in a direct and unrestricted manner, the value of use of a product to its material properties (MARX, 1996, p. 166) the course of history showed how the virtual dimension of products and human relations reinvented

this logic and reorganized capital in a way the author would not have historic conditions to suppose.

As an observation of this process, we can observe the analysis that the intellectual makes about the relationship of exchange value between merchandise. For Marx, what is left in the end and as a unit of measurement between different objects is the human work employed in the confection of that merchandise. Although Karl Marx considers that, in this moment of merchandise, the exercise of work is in abstract character, yet, such abstraction is, in fact, the loss of the objective footprint of work, which is phantomized in merchandise, but, in its nature, is concrete. The analysis of value of merchandise in these parameters is below the framework necessary so that we could understand how, currently, the companies constitute their market value. Phenomena like big corporations that sell their products to exorbitant profit margins, or big virtual portals, like Facebook and Twitter, which, initially weren't directly related to the production or sale of merchandise, do not find justifiable explanations for their values in anything material; their worth is directly associated to the capacity of producing the symbolic strength of their brand to their customers, and, in these specific cases, the capacity they have to offer strategic spaces to other advertisers to strengthen their brand.

Thus, if the common value that determines the exchange value between merchandise was, in the beginning of the development of capital, associated to the employment of strength in human labor, it seems to us that, historically, such process was reconfigured and would be plausible to say that, currently, this mediation is less related as employment of human work over merchandise. The imperative of merchandise became its image. There is still, under this modern scenario, a new inversion: if the concrete work would be phantomized in the value of merchandise, now, it is the image that objectifies in its value.

Let's see, then, which are the methodological strategies exposed by Marx to understand the mathematic determination of value of

merchandise in his time. Such logic is exposed in its thesis by the concept of quantum:

It is, therefore, only the quantum of work socially necessary or the time of work socially necessary for the production of a value of use that determines the greatness of his value. The individual merchandise works here only as a medium exemplary of its species. Merchandise that contain the same quantities of work or that may be produced at the same time of work have, therefore, the same greatness of value (MARX, 1996, p. 169).

It seems that the quantum of merchandise will always be, to some extent, linked to the material characteristics of its production, as the average social time of production and its costs, the value of raw materials or the cost of labor, among others. Such peculiarity can be observed, for instance, in the migratory flow of big industries for Asian countries, in which these variables are more favorable to corporations. It is also the composition of these determining factors that explains, to a great extent, the elevated growth rates reached recently by China, whose internal regulations allow big corporations to explore the material aspects of production in inhumane levels.

Still according to Marx, the determination of quantum has as fundamental dimension aspects like the time and the workforce:

Generically, the bigger the productive workforce, the smaller the time of work demanded for production of an article, and smaller the mass of work crystalized in it, the smaller the value. Inversely, the smaller the productive workforce, the bigger the time of work necessary for the production of an article, the bigger its value. The greatness of value of a merchandise changes in the direct reason of quantum, and in inverse reason of the productive workforce performed in it (MARX, 1996, p. 85).

However, in itself, the handling of this tension does not resolve the equation of *quantum of contemporary merchandise*.

The physical aspects of production of a merchandise have increasingly less relation with the determination of its value. The production as image assumes such role. As Marcuse (1981, p. 21) illustrates:

In the process of automation, the value of the social product is determined in an increasingly smaller degree for the time of work necessary for its production. Consequently, the real social necessity of productive labor declines, and the void has to be filled by unproductive activities. An increasingly large amount of work effectively performed becomes superfluous, dispensable, without meaning. Although these activities may be sustained and even multiplied under a total administration, it seems to exist a ceiling for its increase. This ceiling, or superior limit, would be attained when the added value created by the productive work is no longer enough to compensate the non-productive labor.

In this sense, we can observe how the products whose brands have bigger reach are not necessarily what better balance the relationship of productive workforce and time of work demanded. Brands that have a bigger index of work mass crystallized in its product and still exercise a flexion of profit that becomes the cheapest product than a second brand operationalized in an inversely proportional manner tend to be overlooked by customers if they don't have equal or better image projection than the second option.

Going back to our analysis of the production of value of a product, it seems evident that the employment of the same effort and cost for the manufacture of competing products of the same nature will generate a different market value, in which the one who will obtain the most profit will be the brand with bigger expression among their customers. Therefore, it is necessary to think at the sensorial quantum of a product, in other words, which ideas, symbols, feelings and social codes are associated to this product in relation to its consumers. To do so, the competition pressure impels the imagery ferocity of capital, in which the aesthetic game of seduction is the engine of profitability.

In the criticism of capitalism, Marx exposes the understanding that the determination of value of a merchandise is marked by the peculiarities of a specific historic-cultural context:

The product of labor is in every social situation an object of use, however, only in a historically determined time of development - which is presented in the work spent in the production of an object of use as its "objective"

property, in other words, as its value - transforms the product of work into merchandise. Then, it follows that the simple form of value of a merchandise is, at the same time, the form of simple merchandise of product of work and that, therefore, also the development of the merchandise coincides with the development of value (MARX, 1996, p. 189)

However, what characterized the social use of merchandise in his time was a different scenario from our contemporaneity, and, therefore, demands a refreshed look. Although every social significance is, to a certain extent, grounded by symbolic forces, like culture, their values and habits, the essentially aesthetic character of capital produces a new set of vectors that will guide the process of social determination for the determined convergence of reification and perpetuation of the current logic. The symbolic reproduction is, thus, the aesthetic sophistication of the travestied relations of social antagonism.

The constant invention of new demands of consumption, the system's strategy of survival, no longer allows the direct association between merchandise and its purpose. In the context of a society excited by imagery stimuli, the need highlighted by Marx for the transformation of product into merchandise, which essentially goes through the creation of a value of social use for a product, demands that such process gets constituted in its aesthetic dimension. It is important to create not only the merchandise, but also the desire of consuming it; in order to do that, the cultural industry spends an arsenal of semiotic arguments that will compose the scenario of necessary irrationality to blossom the compulsion for consumption. The relationship between the capacity of social production of consumption is directly related to the capacity of justifying the profitability of merchandise.

It is here inaugurated the stage in which money, objectified capital, stops being the only and absolute mediator of merchandise. The substantiation of being into looking requires, by the competition logics of a predominantly aesthetic capitalism, that the product appears. Establishing a meaning appealing to the audience can, on its own and without any justifiable materiality, lead to consumption.

In its book, *For god, country and coca-cola*, Mark Pendergrast relates the success of Coca-Cola with their pioneerism in the observancy of this modern aspect of merchandise. According to the author, the big investment in advertisement around 1890 enabled that this product, whose total cost of production was less than ten cents, was sold for a dollar (PENDERGRAST, 1993, p. 28)

Pendergast also observes an important characteristic of the commercial phenomenon of Coca-Cola:

In addition, they knew that without a lot of publicity, few would buy medicine, that weren't essential products. He had to be a salesman. Because of that, it is not shocking to see that the merchant of panaceas would dominate the expenses with publicity, at the Golden Age. The manufacturers of these medicine were the first American businessmen to recognize the power of an eye-catching word of sentence, of identifiable brand and logo, celebrities recommendation, appeal for social status, necessity of keep "always using it". Out of necessity, they were the first to sell image, rather than product (PENDERGRAST, 1993, p. 28).

This pioneer spirit reveals the necessity of updating the classic concept of quantum of product. With the historic example of Coca-Cola, it is evidenced the imagery that would come to rule the modern capital. At the same time, the observation that a certain product would not attend any objective demand would generate the conclusion that such demand can and must be produced - as Pendergast concludes when quoting the letter of the advertiser William C. D'Arcy, in 1942, where he says: "Coca-Cola is not an essential item, as we would like to be. It is an idea - a symbol - a brand inspired by the genius (PENDERGRAST, 1993, p. 8). Therefore, what stands out is the dislocation of advertisement from its place of bad rep for the centrality of constitution of merchandise and its value.

The point of fundamental convergence of this historical process, which will reflect in the determined constitution of a new identity of semi-culture, is the reconfiguration of the relation of value established

by merchandise. Karl Marx analyzed the following way the relationship in its time:

However, the individual form of value goes through itself to a more complete form. Through it, the value of a merchandise is certainly expressed only by a merchandise of another type. Which one, however, the species of this second merchandise, if it is a coat, an iron, wheat, etc... is totally irrelevant. Thus, as it enters in a relationship of value with this or that other species of merchandise, arrive different simple expressions of value of the same merchandise. The number of possible expressions of value is only limited by the number of species of merchandise unlike them. Its individualized expression of value is converted, therefore, in a series of constant expansion of its different simple expressions of value (MARX, 1996, p. 189).

Thus, the author categorized value through relational mediations expressed in an objective mathematic quantification. However, the composed historical process that originated the current form of transnational capitalism demanded identity and market forms that, beyond the type of product, established values for the brands. Thus, it gradually consolidates the economic process that takes out the value of the nature of product to delegate it to the symbolic power of the brand. Due to that, abstract and general comparisons lose meaning in this context. The dimension of relationship of value stops orbiting one product to another and begins to establish bonds between the spirit of products and consumers. As this process heated its immaterial character, the determination of values will be given by the capacity of reproducing, in an ideological meanings, in the subjectivity of the interlocutor. Gradually, this process impresses in the subject a specific linguistic form and finds, in another extreme of its dialectic relation, a man weakened by the fierce and sparkling apparatus of cultural industry.

You have to consider that the general character of advertisement in the work of Karl Marx is a reflection of how the author understood contemporary capital confronting with the embryonic process of advertisement in his time. Still today, his exercise brings up controversies

amongst intellectuals affiliated to the classic Marxist school, having in mind that, if they point, on one hand, to the importance of the development of advertisement in the constitution of a logic of the productive process and the modern capitalism, as Joan Robinson does, there are analysis like Jacob Gorender's, pointing towards marketing as the one who fills a character of less relevance to merchandise, representing a symbolic device regulated by competition pressure. Scientific research seem to detain a bigger importance in the constitution of merchandise, how it gets determined by differentiation of what was productive work against the unproductive work of advertisement. The exterior dimension of objective demand the production of merchandise is considering advertisement as a form of unproductive work, as it gets evident in the excerpt:

[...] In the advanced capitalism of today it would be wrong to stop qualifying scientific research and the development of projects like productive project, whereas marketing and advertisement get in, without a doubt, in the field of unproductive work, because its use is not raised by anything rather than the market and competition nature of the mode of capitalist production (GORENDER, 1996, p. 40, our highlight)

## Final considerations

The shattering of the ontological bond of men with work ends up generating not only the alienation in relation to the product of his work, but also the alienation of himself, to the extent in which the self-realization can no longer be effected at work. The technical development of the contemporary work to Debord maintained his power of destitution, even though such process did not destitute the nature of identity of proletariat:

In this complex and terrible development which led the time of class struggle for new conditions, the proletariat of industrial countries lost all the affirmation of his autonomous perspective and, ultimately, their illusions, but not their being. It was not suppressed. It remains irreducibly

ARTIGO

exiting in the intensified alienation of modern capitalism (DEBORD, 1997, p. 81).

If there is, in the dialectic movement of alienation, a component of irreducibility of identity of proletariat, the modern conditions point towards a damping of the perception of any conditions based by the autonomy and the construction of a collective identity. In a direct form, the rupture of the ontological bonds between man and work conditioned the subject to the process of destitution of its identity. Thus, the symbolic emptiness of the exercise of work seem to have found here another centrality: the centrality of its construction begins to be exercised by advertisements. The condensation of the social moment of capital enables the complexification of the confusion observed by Adorno and Horkheimer, in which merchandise was fused with advertisement: "Culture is an oxymoronic merchandise. It is so completely submitted to the law of exchange that it is no longer traded. It so blindly confuses itself with the use that it can no longer be used. That is why it fuses with advertisement" (ADORNO; HORKHEIMER, 1985, p. 151). Thus, the product is no longer a consequence of a human need of the worker that makes it, in general, its necessity is socially produced by the ideologic, sensory, spectacular and image machinery of advertisement. This substitution acts regulated by a new logic, an aesthetic ontological condition resulting from a social context in which boils the imperious advance of spectacle and the degradation of means of formative experience:

And as the force of integration of market never was only an economic force or never only determined the possibility of having or not having a job, but always determined the acceptance or rejection and, therefore, to be or not to be, this ontological pressure, under the general conditions of pressure to issue is transformed in an aesthetic form, at the same time the aesthetic receives, as it never previously occurred, an ontological weight (TÜRCKE, 2010, p. 64).

To categorize advertisement as something that does not directly produces profit, being a mere expense inherent to merchandise, it seems

to be a perspective that is mismatched with the productive core of contemporary capital. It would be possible to say that, to a certain extent, the materialistic dialectic seem to find difficulties to apprehend movements of a capital whose spirit became predominant over matter. The direct comparisons used as metaphor in *Capital*, magazines today, would be always mediated by the strength of the symbolic character of merchandise. To compare linen to coats or wheat to coffee would also go through the same question: What type of coat are we talking about? What brand of coffee and what type of wheat? There is also the necessity of considering the value imposed to its products by a brand with bigger advertisement impact is not, in any measure, an objective outcome of any characteristic of its production. The quality of the material, the mode of production and payment paid to employees, the time and costs necessary - none of these aspects is safeguarded by the value by the value paid by the product.

This quantum must be thought, then, in the modern configuration of capitalism, through a product and its differentiation; its objective intention and its desirability or subjective production. Synthetizing, we have to think about the necessity of wearing trainers and the necessity of wearing a Nike; the necessity of buying a car and the necessity of buying a Ferrari. Corporations gain a dimension beyond their own product, in which the capacity of production of the desire of consuming this specific brand grounds the equation that defines the quantum of the product.

The forms of resistance of the process of alienation must comprehend the necessity of creating new forms, humanizing and recovering forms, of giving humans an ontological meaning, either by new models in the relation men-work, or by replacements that are in other spaces, but, contrary to the force applied by advertisement, move subjects towards a more critic understanding of the world, enabling new forms of confrontation of the current model.

## Referências

- ADORNO, T. W.; HORKHEIMER, M. *Dialética do esclarecimento*: fragmentos filosóficos. Trad. Guido Antonio de Almeida. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1985.
- AGUIAR, J. V. Do material e do simbólico. *Revista do Departamento de Sociologia da Flup*, v. 20, n. 1, p. 85-108, 2010.
- DEBORD, G. *A sociedade do espetáculo*. Trad. Estela dos Santos Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 1997.
- ENGELS, F. *O papel do trabalho na transformação do macaco em homem*. São Paulo: Global, 1990.
- GORENDER, J. Apresentação. In: MARX, K. *O capital*. v. I. livro primeiro. Lisboa: Editorial Progresso, 1996.
- MARCUSE, H. *Eros e civilização*: uma interpretação filosófica do pensamento de Freud. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1981.
- MARX, K. *O capital*. v. I. livro primeiro. Lisboa: Editorial Progresso, 1996.
- PENDERGRAST, M. *Por Deus, pela Pátria e pela Coca-Cola*. Rio de Janeiro: Ediouro, 1993.
- TÜRCKE, C. *Sociedade excitada*: filosofia da sensação. Trad. Antonio A.S. Zuin, Fabio A. Durão, Francisco F. Fontanella e Mario Frungillo. Campinas: Unicamp, 2010.

## About the authors

*Marsiel Pacifico* – PhD in Education (UFSCar), professor in the Department of Methods and Techniques (Ufam).

*Luiz Roberto Gomes* – PhD in Education at the Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp), professor at the Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar) and permanent professor at the Post-Graduation program in Education at Universidade Federal de São Carlos (PPGE/UFSCar).

---

Data de submissão: 16/06/2018

Data de aceite: 26/01/2019