

The Downtown Review

Volume 4 | Issue 1

Article 4


2017

Postmodern Social Control: Dividuals and Surveillance

Ernest M. Oleksy
Cleveland State University

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/tdr>

 Part of the [Business Commons](#), [Civil Law Commons](#), [Common Law Commons](#), [Constitutional Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), [Legal Theory Commons](#), [Medicine and Health Commons](#), [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), [Social Statistics Commons](#), and the [Sociology of Culture Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Oleksy, Ernest M.. "Postmodern Social Control: Dividuals and Surveillance." *The Downtown Review*. Vol. 4. Iss. 1 (2017). Available at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/tdr/vol4/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Downtown Review by an authorized editor of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

To be born is to be controlled. This reality inspired French philosopher Gilles Deleuze's essay entitled *Postscript on the Societies of Control*. As man navigates through social constructs and apparatuses around him, a zero-sum game ensues where The System gradually deindividuates the one in the interests of the many. For such an endeavor to be fecund, it is necessary for organizational control to forge organic solidarity (Lincoln & Guillot, 2004, p. 6). Deleuze's somber analysis of society, collective supremacy, and surveillance operationalizes what it means to live in postmodernity.

Disciplinary Societies and Societies of Sovereignty

Before discussing societies of control, disciplinary societies and societies of sovereignty must be understood (Deleuze, 1992, p. 3). Disciplinary societies can be understood as an ultra-orderly system where "life style" is moving from one enclosure to another (Foucault, 1975, p. 193). Additionally, societies of sovereignty are characterized by ascending individualism where the populace prostrates itself to the legitimacy of a centralized agent of control, often one who rose *vis a vis* violence (Naseem, 2014, p. 27). Societies of control, thus, are those establishments which are physical and metaphysical enclosures (Virilio & Redhead, 2005, p. 34).

Take hospitals, for instance, as an example of an enclosed institution, beginning with physical enclosure. Clearly, patients are enculturated with victimization due to their maladies and due to physicians' domination of expert control (Chriss, 2013, p. 103). Individuals defer to their self-in-sick-role to integrate into a meaning paradigm: the "what is" is their illness, the "what should be" is their recovery, and the "how I should act" is deferentially to the medical sovereigns (Goffman, 1959, p. 6; Peterson, 1999, p. 28).

Dividuals

While patient enclosure is most directly caused by medical control, hospital employee enclosure, containing a metaphysical component, is the result of organizational control. When officialdoms are in the “factory-stage” of development, their manageable size permits mechanical solidarity and employee retention of self in the eyes of the administrator (Delbridge & Barton, 2002, p. 686). Such intimacy is shibboleth in the age of the corporation, where the massiveness of personnel proliferates the amount of and the styles of social interactions to a boiling point where groups must be regarded as homogenous unities to be actuarially managed, resulting in the eve of the dividual (Deleuze, 1992, p. 5). Viewing individuals as dividuals leads to one-size-fits-all decision-making, perpetuating a dromotropic society (Virilio & Redhead, 2005, p. 34). This sentiment is materialized in the FaceTime-esque medical app Maven, where entire doctor’s appointments can take place on a smartphone (Maven Clinic Company, 2017, p. 1). This move towards organic solidarity is accompanied by handling the organic as numeric with the assignment of passcodes and identification numbers in order to function within a system while enabling panopticism (Foucault, 1975, p. 195).

Surveillance

Obsession with data and metadata on the public creates a kind of *structuralistic analytics*, engineered by scopophilia, in the name of effective management (Theus, 2013, p. 10-15). *Physical scopophilia* and panopticism are reified in the criminal justice system. Correctional facilities, for instance, have begun adopting the new-generation jail layout where institutional corrections are physically oriented into a podular unit to create a *bona fide* panopticon (Clear, Cole, & Reising, 2013, p. 81). Increased surveillance cameras result in catching more crimes; with corrections and courts already strained with their workload, *few-watch-the-many-*

scopophilia can actually be counterproductive and further exacerbate the carceral society (Dawson, 2013, p. 102). Omnipercipience also leads to flagrant abuse, as demonstrated by the harassment charges filed against Tuscaloosa PD in an open-letter for using surveillance cameras to gawk at the curvature of female passersby (The Surveillance Camera Players, 2003, p. 1). Notably, the aforementioned open-letter is an example of the public using countersurveillance to revolt against unjust and, arguably, unconstitutional surveillance (Chriss, 2013, p. 129).

Scopophilia

Moving on, scopophilia is not just physical, but can also refer to a craving for data and metadata on dividuals, leading to organizational policies that satiate this desire. Though deleterious and unintended consequences have been previously critiqued, it must be noted that *data-driven scopophilia* has its benefits. Returning to corrections, ever since the Crime Control Era hampered progress for the rehabilitative model, criminologists have made efforts to propagate evidence-based programming and the ideology of New Penology (Cullen, Myer, Latessa, 2009, pp. 209-210). Since *data-driven scopophilia* collineates with scientization, this element of a society of control has considerable utility to social order.

Though it may be necessary for businesses to use heightened surveillance, the responsabilization that the *lifeworld panopticon* manufactures remains a separate issue. A record 77% of Americans currently own a smartphone (Smith, 2017, p. 1). Due to this uptick, the majority of civilians have the potential to deputize themselves and perform governmentality by maintaining the peace *via* “granny patrols” and police civilianization (Chriss, 2013, pp. 229-232).

In circumstances like the Fruitvale Station Shooting, civilian responsivity to police brutality results in professionals properly heeding to justice (Blaisdell et al., 2015, p. 1). However, this *many watch the many* style of surveillance flirts with the practically disastrous dogma of radical postmodernism: polymorphous perversity of meaning (Chriss, 2013, p. 120). The *lifeworld panopticon* effectively deprofessionalizes policing, allowing for the first point of contact that a deviant interacts with to be an untrained yet highly-opinionated layperson. Deleuze worried about how institutions of authority would become societies of control with improved surveillance and tracking, thus repressing individualism (Deleuze, 1992, p. 4). Ironically, though, the biggest threat to personal liberties may be precipitated by individuals, empowered by technology, asserting their hermeneutics of justice and morality onto other individuals.

Conclusion

Societies of control, dividualization, and surveillance are all vital cogs to the operation of postmodernity. Back in 1992, Deleuze already sensed the changing tides of civilization and how the impending flow of social control would impose strictures of identification that would ultimately abate the individual. His biggest fear was that powerful collectives would encroach on the liberties of their constituents, leading to oppression and to deindividuation-minded work socialization. Upon further scrutiny, much of the quantification and bureaucratization that Deleuze is so trepidant of actually greatly benefits persons since it allows for more efficient and consistent decision-making. Nonetheless, when factoring in the ominous direction of police civilianization, the admonitory words of Founding Father Benjamin Franklin ring out: “Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety.”

Works Cited

- Blaisdell, K., Glen, E., Kidd, C., Powers, W., & Yang, R. (2015, April 27). Race, Place, and Police: The 2009 Shooting of Oscar Grant. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from <http://hjaap.org/race-place-and-police-the-2009-shooting-of-oscar-grant/>
- Chriss, J. J. (2013). *Social control: An Introduction* (Second ed.). Maiden, MA: Polity Press.
- Clear, T. R., Cole, G. F., & Reisig, M. D. (2013). *American Corrections* (Third ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Cullen, F.T., Myer, A.J., & Latessa, E.J. (2009). Eight Lessons from Moneyball: The High Cost of Ignoring Evidence-Based Corrections. *Victims & Offenders*,4(2), 197–213. Retrieved from http://researchguides.csuohio.edu/ld.php?er_attachment_id=834397.
- Dawson, M. (2013). *Late Modernity, Individualization and Socialism: An Associational Critique of Neoliberalism*. Houndmills, NH: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Delbridge, R., & Barton, H. (2002). Organizing for Continuous Improvement. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*,22(6), 680-692.
doi:10.1108/01443570210427686
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the Societies of Control. *October*,59, 3-7. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=01622870%28199224%2959%3C3%3AP-OTSOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T>
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

- Lincoln, J. R., & Guillot, D. (2004). Durkheim and Organizational Culture. *Institute for Research on Labor and Employment*, 108(4), 1-29. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from <http://irle.berkeley.edu/files/2004/Durkheim-and-Organizational-Culture.pdf>
- Maven Clinic Company. (2017). Maven – Health & Wellness Designed for Women. Retrieved May 02, 2017, from <https://www.mavenclinic.com/>
- Naseem, M. (2014). *Education and Gendered Citizenship in Pakistan*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peterson, J. B. (1999). *Maps of Meaning: The Architecture of Belief*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith, A. (2017, January 12). Record Shares of Americans Now Own Smartphones, Have Broadband. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/01/12/evolution-of-technology/>
- The Surveillance Camera Players. (2003, September 17). A Sarcastic Open Letter Dated 17 September 2003 and Addressed to all those Involved in or Ultimately Responsible for the Recent Scandal Involving Egregious Abuses of a Government Surveillance Camera in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from <http://www.notbored.org/tuscaloosa.html>
- Theus, T. A. (2013). Hitchcock and the Material Politics of Looking: Laura Mulvey, Rear Window, and Psycho. *Communication Honors Theses*, 1-62. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=communication_hontheses

Virilio, P., & Redhead, S. (2005). *The Paul Virilio Reader*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.