

Research Article

In Search of Social Control: Conceptual Tools for Control in the Sociologies of Erving Goffman, Pierre Bourdieu, and Michel Foucault

Juan Sergio Quesada Aguilar¹

1. Independent researcher

The theoretical framework provided by the works of Erving Goffman, Pierre Bourdieu, and Michel Foucault on social control through discipline, Symbolic Violence, and Total Institutions offers us conceptual and methodological tools for a broader study of the social realm. These tools were and continue to be indispensable for understanding situations of social domination, discipline, and the maintenance of order. However, to the traditional use of these frameworks, we must now add broader social spaces resulting from globalization and technology, making a deep understanding of their theoretical and conceptual contributions necessary. This knowledge allows us to explore classic mechanisms of power and control, but also the new challenges posed by the use of technologies. From Goffman's microsociology, with his exhaustive analysis of techniques for securing compliance and subjugating personality, to Bourdieu's opening of spaces through fields and different forms of capital that constitute the basis of *habitus*, or Symbolic Violence, shared by Foucault, who also provides us with models of discipline, I have sought to assemble a conceptual toolkit. This toolkit can serve to deepen the study of both classical and new variants of social control.

“The most traditional and humanistic branch, and the least business, even anti-business, of sociology [...] aims to make human behavior less predictable, activating internal and motivating sources of decision, which provide human beings with more than enough knowledge of their situation to thus expand the sphere of their freedom of choice”^[1].

Introduction. Thinking about the total Institution.

These pages are the result of other previous works carried out on the Civil Guard, and which was based on the basis of considering this institution as a Total Institution in line with the concept devised by Erving Goffman in his classic work *Boarding Schools. Essays on the Social Situation of the Mentally Ill*^[2] where he establishes a set of characteristics common to a type of social groupings such as military barracks, prisons, or religious orders^[3] to name the most significant, but not the only ones. If these proposals of Goffman, typical of his microsociology, refer to a physical place, as the author defined it: a “place of residence or work, where a large number of individuals in the same situation, isolated from society for an appreciable period of time, share in their confinement a daily routine, formally administered”(Goffman, 1961: 13) and that in their works we clearly identify with prisons, psychiatric hospitals or military barracks...

"symbolized by the obstacles that oppose social interaction with the outside world and the exodus of members, and which usually take material form: closed doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, rivers, forests or swamps" (Goffman, 1961: 18).

They are also tools applicable to other types of groupings whose boundaries are more diffuse, if not directly intangible. Technology has made Goffman's tangible spaces, which unfortunately remain abundant and common, transcend other ethereal ones and yet have consequences as real as those described by the author in his works. Through the analysis of the existing theory and added to the fieldwork carried out, it can be concluded that the model of social control, which we find in the Total Institution, fits well with broader social models and in line with the other authors treated, Bourdieu and Foucault, clearly affects an almost total control of current societies. where all facets of our lives are monitored, especially in virtual spaces, being in these where their incidence is even more decisive than in tangible ones^[4]. In Goffman (1961: 19–20) the constituent characteristics of Total Institutions are:

1. All dimensions of life take place in the same place and under a single authority.
2. All stages of the daily activity of each member of the total institution are carried on in the immediate company of a large number of other members, who are treated equally and who are required to do the same things together.

3. All daily activities are strictly scheduled, so that the activity that is carried out at a given time leads to the next, and the whole sequence of activities is imposed hierarchically, through a system of explicit formal rules and an administrative body.
4. The various mandatory activities are integrated into a single rational plan, deliberately created to achieve the institution's own objectives.

These fundamental characteristics, typical of the rational plan carried out to achieve the objectives of the Institution, participate in aggressions to the ego of those involved, the constant mobility, thus the need for displacement through the career is recurrent in the reports of the interviewees, mobility that contrasts with social immobility, there being a clear hierarchy, ostensible in the military, more silent in other institutions, for example in convents, in any case the inmates remain in a clear subordinate position. Adequacy, "preparation" or "programming" in Goffman's words, molding, reification in Marxist terminology, in the end transformation, that is, the loss of individuality, begins with homogenization, which is the goal. There are many examples, the shaved to zero, or the obligatory nature of the uniform, the greeting... On the other hand, incorporation into any institution involves trauma, an emotional and cultural shock, and without the possibility of support given the forced isolation and social disconnection that is sought and that Goffman^[2] expressed concisely:

"Translated into the exact language of some of our older total institutions, it means that a series of depressions, degradations, humiliations, and desecrations of the self begin for him. The mortification of the self is systematic, though often unintentional."

These strategies respond to the aforementioned rational plan, and with them it is achieved that the inmates comply with and accept, that the individual becomes part of the "administrative machinery of the establishment, to transform it gradually, through routine operations"^[2]. Faced with the dilemma, there are only two alternatives, either acceptance or rebellion. The latter meaning punishment or expulsion, an affront. Clothing, from the quality or measure, and its lack of adequacy is another tool in the search for the assumption of inferiority and the new status of the inmate, contributing to the fact that his motivations and attitudes towards the required tasks are assumed in a constant maintenance of control and forced submission, the full acceptance of the status quo through symbolic violence, reinforced by the fact that everything around him ostensibly reminds him of his belonging and his duty to it, disassociating the inmate from the signs that linked him to the immediate past, while he is constantly supervised, laminating any hint of individuality.

Separation seeks to create the feeling of belonging, of acceptance, of inevitability in the face of the outside world, replacing the family with the community, denying individuality. In the words of Goffman^[2]: "In some institutions there is a kind of slavery, whereby the entire schedule of the inmate has been established according to the convenience of the staff." This alienation affects the capacity for work, discipline prevails over any productivist criterion or economic rationality, with normativity, constant mobility and uniformity it is intended to break the will, responding to a rationality that only seeks one end, obedience. On the scale of obedience, compliance has its rewards, the misfits, the rebels... they are expelled or get the worst jobs or postings.

In the rationality sought by the institution, a system of rewards and punishments is established. Beyond the discretion presumed to hierarchical superiors by the mere fact of being hierarchical superiors, the system is fully regulated. In addition to the exams that we will develop in Foucault, an example can be the points system of the Civil Guard Academy, which we have already studied in another work (Quesada, 2023), where obedience is rewarded more than intelligence. Goffman typifies other characteristics common to Total Institutions that we will not necessarily find, such as the poor quality of the food, the presence of dirt or deteriorated facilities, I think that in these cases the absence of dirt has to do with how the Institution presents itself to society. Thus, an institution that is based on order, the ultimate concept of its *raison d'être*, cannot offer an image of dirt or deterioration due to the direct relationship in the symbolic between cleanliness and health in line with the studies of Mary Douglas^[5].

The institution as habitus

Differentiation and exclusion are part of the formative process, which can cause "the permanent mortification of not having intervened (and of this being known)"^[6] of the classmates and which is part of the rationality of discipline. This mortification, which in civil society would tend to disagreement and resistance, in institutions is expressed through small resistances such as bad moods, slowing down of chores, omission of expressions of respect, murmurs, slander, expressions of spite, irony, or sarcasm, all of which seek unquestioned compliance, the loss of individuality, of subjectivity in the search for an objectified subject. Other techniques would be the obligation to greet, the need for authorisation for any type of innocuous activity, smoking, going to the bathroom, talking on the phone... this achieves emotional stress due to the fear of breaking these rules and the

consequences that derive from such non-compliance, which contribute to thoughtless obedience along the lines of the experiment carried out by Milgram^[7].

These characteristics, extracted from direct observation or verifiable testimonies, presented by Goffman, respond to a theoretical corpus that starts from the construction of reality, of everyday life as something derived from the socio-historical context where it is framed and with its intrinsic characteristics, following what Schütz^[8] expressed, that the assumption of social reality as something natural, one's own, in the face of its condition as something constructed, is at the basis of compliance without questioning, the locus by which obedience is most easily reached:

"'World of common sense', 'world of daily life', 'everyday world', are various expressions that indicate the intersubjective world experienced by man within what Husserl calls the 'natural attitude'. We believe that this world existed before we were born, that it has its history and that it is given to us in an organized way. It is primarily the scene of our actions and the locus of resistance to action; We act not only within the world, but on it. And our initial purpose is not so much to interpret or understand it but to effect changes within it; we try to dominate before we try to understand. Consequently, the world of common sense is the scene of social action; in it men enter into a mutual relationship and try to understand each other, as well as with themselves."

It is in this search for social action that we link up with Pierre Bourdieu^[9] in the passage from a micro-analytic perspective, Bourdieu's tools are also applicable, but they allow us to address social situations from a broader perspective, through the concepts of field and habitus, which as a working tool help to increase the framing framework of the Total Institution. Bourdieu proposes in contrast to the functional gaze a symbolic gaze, which connects with the emotional life of people and with the way we relate to other subjects, creating identifiable links between people beyond the meaning they may have for a greater social grouping, we would say that it goes from the minimum level of action, the subject, up to the upper strata, although each level generates its own meanings. In these frameworks, the value of what is represented prevails over the ways in which it is represented or the ways in which it is used to convey the message, the assumption as something proper to the messages of others. These tools are initiated from his work with works of art and developed later in *The Distinction*. He argues that in order to make a critique of a work of art we would first have to do the opposite, ask ourselves what social use has been made of that work, what perceptions exist at different

historical moments, -he highlights here the important value given to comparison- and how historical perceptions vary with tastes. In the case of an institution, total or not, it would be to ask ourselves why one model of education is chosen and not another, some rules are followed and not others, certain services are provided and not others, and what is the logic of these actions, for what purpose they are carried out, and why not, who benefits from this way of acting.

Bourdieu builds a theoretical and conceptual apparatus to give a scientific response to the work and research he carries out, it is constantly evolving, and its concepts can be used beyond the original conceptions as he himself explains in his work *Practical Reasons*. That is why he differentiates in the study of cultural works between three levels of analysis, namely, that of the position of the cultural field within the social field and its historical evolution; that of the internal structure of the field, its laws and the structure of the objective relations between the positions occupied by individuals in terms of economic and symbolic competition; and the genesis of the habitus of the people who occupy the positions, why there are certain practices or systems of dispositions that justify their position in the field. By means of these central concepts in his sociology, and the aforementioned logics of analysis, we can understand and explain multiple social phenomena, linked to different areas of production and consumption of symbolic goods. In the study carried out, when analysing the Civil Guard as an institution, we find that it had a central role during the dictatorship in the social control of Rural Spain, but in constant evolution, responding to the different internal resistances that were also changing, only explainable within the process of modernisation that Spanish society was undergoing. As an example of institutionalization, in its microsociological variant, the period of instruction in the Academy for the Civil Guards, which also conforms to the Goffmanian characteristics, but since they leave the Academy, we would enter a second level where it is easier to apply Bourdieu's tools by constituting, the troop, a field with its internal logics and habitus, which are acquired, in addition to the training already indicated, by the internal logics to which they are subjected by the totalizing preponderance of work in their lives. And on the third level we will see how much of the work described above is based on a social habitus acquired in the context of coercion in which Spanish society unfolds during the dictatorship, and which lasts throughout the period of the dictatorship, although with differences in terms of levels of intensity. but without losing validity at any time, as Professor Juliá^[10] pointed out.

In effect, Bourdieu transcends his structuralist basis to arrive at an objectivist vision that allows for a greater and more complete interpretation of social processes, with an analysis that goes beyond the

relations of production by including the processes of consumption. In his analysis of the market for symbolic goods, he distinguishes three modes of production: the bourgeois, middle and popular, with their respective audiences: bourgeoisie, middle class and popular, and the nature of the works produced, and the political-aesthetic ideologies they express. But all systems are included in a capitalist society that organizes the unequal distribution of material and symbolic goods. Since the same goods are consumed indistinctly by different social classes, the difference is not so much the appropriation of the good, as the way of consuming it, of using it. In the ethnography carried out following the theoretical postulates that I develop, that is, life stories of Civil Guards active during the Franco regime, if by their own perception the Civil Guard troops tend to be framed as middle class, due to their income levels and living conditions they are closer to the popular classes of the time, but if we go beyond their socio-economic framework, -nothing else is what Bourdieu proposes-, due to their consumption of material and symbolic goods it seems indisputable that they belong to the popular classes, because as the author points out, social origin and level of education mark cultural practices and preferences, and we can consider valid in our case the distinction he makes between "serious" and "popular" art. which is reached through the discrimination that consumption entails, through decipherment, the decoding that involves the practical mastery of a code. If in *Practical Reasons*^[9] he warns us of the danger of determinism:

"It is necessary to avoid transforming into necessary and intrinsic properties of a group (the nobility, the samurai, and also the workers or employees) the properties that concern them at a specific moment in time due to their position in a given social space, and in a given state of the supply of goods and possible practices. With which intervenes, at each moment in each company, a set of social positions that is linked by a relationship of homology to a set of activities (the practice of golf or the piano) or of goods (a secondary residence or a listed painting), in turn characterized relationally".

It is also true that this code functions as a cultural capital that grants benefits of distinction. These shared codes are what Bourdieu defines as habitus, which we will analyse later. First, we will deal with other key concepts in Bourdieu's sociology. Bourdieu's analytical categories help us to understand social reality. Countryside, capital, illusion, belief, habitus, strategy... are constant in his work to explain the varied domains of production, distribution and consumption of production goods at different times and contexts of production. The concept of field refers to a social space of action and influence where a set of social relations converge within a network of objective relations originating in

different positions. The aforementioned positions base their existence on different determinants conferred on them by those who occupy them, at the present time or at a potential moment, within a structure of power or capital and by the objective relations they maintain with the other positions. This leads us to see how the field is based on relations that are defined by the possession or reproduction of a specific form of capital, each field has its own form and autonomy, and thus the dominant or dominated position of the participants of a field is determined by the specific rules of the field. The structured set of fields, their reciprocal influences and the relations of domination between them make up the social structure.

The search for an instituted gaze

In my work on the Civil Guard in the late Franco regime, I found that there was a field of its own compared to other institutions or security forces, such as the Armed Police or the Local Police, or the disappeared Carabineros corps, within the framework of the Franco dictatorship, but there were also camps in the different military units that make up the army. The reference to the army is based on the hybrid nature of the Guardia Civil, that is, police and military, which differentiates it from the aforementioned police institutions, although it shares functions, and makes it have its own characteristics closer to other foreign militarized police forces such as the French Gendarmerie or the Italian Carabinieri. The hierarchical differences between the guards go beyond those imposed by the institution, and are delimited by other codes such as seniority-seniority, geographical determinism, north-south, by the importance of the post, by its location within it, the possibility of promotion, recommendations... The set of capitals that allow mobility or immobility within the countryside and between them is confirmed in the ethnography carried out, life stories of Civil Guards, throughout specific moments of their work and life itineraries and also in reference to specific concepts, clearly identifiable with the habitus. This vision of the countryside presents us with a clearly autonomous universe. In the genesis of the concept, Bourdieu starts from Weber and his sociology of religions, as in *The Rules of Art* (1988: 108) he defines them as: "historically constituted spaces of play with their specific institutions and their own laws of functioning".

These fields are part of larger spaces, the fields of power or fields of struggle, which are symbolic structures, which can be art, the educational system... In them, individuals develop activities in which they use the resources at their disposal to obtain the goods that this field can offer them. Its origin is in the Marxist concept of class struggle, although Bourdieu goes beyond economic materialism

considering that they are structured relationships with different roles within production, distribution and consumption that interact and influence until they mutually determine. This determination is reached through rules or principles of the field. The field of power or struggle, as a major space of competence in the case of the Guardia Civil, would be made up during the Franco dictatorship, by the different police forces by the Armed Police or the Local Police, or the disappeared Carabineros corps, and the army, with a predominance of the military over the civilian throughout the period. and today on the one hand by the police forces: National Police, Local Police, Regional Police, and on the other by the army, depending on the functions assigned in each case. A macro analysis of the police and/or military fields from this perspective would be a very interesting work to address the power structures within security and defense.

The countryside is compared, in the tradition of Huizinga, to play, although it is not a deliberate creation or responds to explicit rules. Within the fields we find a hierarchy of forms of capital, this hierarchy of capital varies between the different fields, but also within the same field, giving an important value to the diachronic. Bourdieu links the value of a capital to the existence of a field to use it, as well as the power relations between the players that define the structure of the field, so that the overall volume that each player has in the capital structure, and their temporal evolution define their strength in the game, their position and the strategies to follow. Competition and conflicts are typical of the game, as well as triumphs, as well as their own strategies whose power varies according to the game. In the case of capitals, which we will see below, they have different values depending on the field on which they are played. Struggles seek to preserve or transform current and/or potential forces. The above makes it impossible to understand a field, its struggles, without history.

Another key concept is that of capital, which is not only limited to the economic perspective, but is made up of currency, real estate or exchangeable goods. And within economic capital we cannot consider everything monetary capital, we cannot understand the altruism of the agents of a field, for example, and the backgrounds that are hidden behind this apparent altruism only from a chrematistic interest, which does not allow an accumulation of other types of capital such as symbolic capital that manifests itself in the form of honesty, solvency, competence, honour...; it is an internalized or incorporated cultural capital typical of belonging to a family or a specific institution, linked to status, or as objectified cultural capital, that which is ostensible by the accumulation of extraordinary objects; institutionalized cultural capital, which derives from degrees and diplomas, or social capital, which comes from the network of relationships woven between the different agents that interact in the field.

All this type of capital can be transformed into economic capital, just as economic capital is susceptible to being transformed into the different types of capital shown, although we do not perceive these capitals in a tangible way, being immaterial and therefore promoting the belief in the impossibility of their economic quantification.

Capital within the field is explained by the fact that rules are developed in it that define the activities that take place in it and that allow it to function as a market in which the specific benefits of that field are competed for. Competition is defined by the objective relationships between the actors, by the volume of capital they contribute, by the life trajectory in the field and by the ability to apply the rules of the field. These resources are the adaptation of the habitus, which we will deal with later, to the field in which it is competed. Thus capital is everything that can be used to gain advantage, it is a product of the countryside and is not understood outside of it. It is an efficient factor that allows the possessor to exercise power or influence in a given field. There are different types of capital that act in different fields, these being defined by the relations of force sustained by capital and by the actions of individuals to conserve and acquire capital..

Once the fundamentals of the field have been conceptualized, let's see the relationship that exists with the conception of power. Bourdieu considers the countryside as a system of social positions structured in power relations, where the struggle for the appropriation of one of the classes of capital takes place. The organization of the field is both horizontal and vertical, and each field is an independent and autonomous space within the social game. They do not correspond exactly to the a priori conception of classes, being independent and autonomous spaces, producing within them horizontally the social game and the struggles that make possible the type of exchange of cultural, symbolic or physical capital between fields. The field is defined by the position of social agents and their different relationships. Thus, fields can be autonomous or interrelated, and the greater the complexity of societies, the more fields and the more relationships between them. Its operation is very similar to a market where you compete for specific profits of the market. Competition is the basis of objective relationships based on the volume of capital contributed by the participants, their trajectory or their ability to adapt to the regulations within the field. Working capital is the resources used to obtain advantages, linked to that specific field, not existing outside of it, hence there are different types of capital as well as fields linked to the balances of power exercised by capital. Power is linked to competition, to the capital that is generated in each field and to the strategies that the different agents use in order to increase their capital, which gives rise to the creation of hierarchies as well as to

revolutions that try to alter the established order, that is, to the conflict, between the agents who intend to maintain their capital and/or increase it and those who intend to acquire more capital and/or altering hierarchies, in a succession that is diachronic but also synchronous, reconsidering the concept of struggle, which includes classes, individuals, and ideologies in the search for the conservation and increase of some capital. Fields are built from nemes, habits or customs of social and political, socially and historically constructed behavior, they are not only explicit laws, but also those rules and forms that people use in their day to day. It is synonymous with order, applicable to those who are under its jurisdiction. Like beliefs, opinions, points of view are social constructions.

The underlying nomos of one field is different from that existing in another, since different capitals are valued, cultural, economic, etc. The performance of agents on a field does not respond to an explicit logic, but rather to practical knowledge, to plasticity when playing. This game where what is necessary to belong to the field is defined, which results in the increase or decrease of players, in their power and in the competition within it is what is known as social illusion. The illusion or actions that are carried out to obtain benefits in the different fields in which individuals participate are transformed into goods that can be applied to other fields, the refined culture results in a higher status, so there is a correlation, although it has indirect effects by shaping the habitus of those involved in the field altering the regulatory principles of the same. The prevalence of economic capital in the class struggle is the result of its intrinsic value within survival, but that does not mean that there are not a multitude of fields, as many as there are interests of individuals.

Legitimacy affects the necessary, regulated characteristics to belong to a field, or what is the same, specific capital. The benefits of the countryside are manifested in symbolic capital, the recognition by the members that there are people who dominate because they possess the goods on which their domination of the field is based, the dominant habitus, which sets the rules and imposes them on the participants, tending to reproduce themselves, since the dominated who want to compete for goods have to recognize that the means of the dominant are those accepted by all. The power granted to the dominant is symbolic violence, which we will analyse later in more detail, by which the dominated tend to accept and exercise relations of domination over themselves, without recognising their existence as such. Struggles within the field affect the redefinition of what is legitimate, or in other words, groups of different origins and with different capitals can fight to alter or redefine the norms for their own benefit.

The participants in the field are often unaware that their actions are objectively marked by the rules of the field, although the habitus imposes a strategy adjusted to the objective conditions, aimed at preserving or subverting the established order based on their positions in the structure of the field, the distribution of specific capital and their own perceptions. But the individual agent is conditioned by the most reflective and conscious actors, perceivers of the directives of the field, conditioned in his individual action by the invisible social force. This conditioning is nothing other than habitus, which is understood as the dispositions or schemes of acting, thinking and feeling associated with social position. In a homogeneous social environment, people share similar lifestyles and their ways of understanding the world are very similar when sharing resources, strategies and ways of analysing situations. The concept is not new, it has its origin in Aristotle, hexis, and is taken up by scholasticism, Thomas Aquinas and Boethius, differentiating between act and potency on the one hand and exterior and interior on the other. Bourdieu uses it from a sociological perspective to overcome the opposition between the concepts of objectivity and subjectivity, between a supposed free will conferred by the resources one possesses and the constraints imposed by the social position one occupies. Habitus tells us that, in the face of similar or similar resources, without the existence of coercion, the way of acting between people of the same social position, their strategies and expectations are very similar, without this meaning that there is any type of determinism. As reflected in the scheme made by Bourdieu to explain social space and social practices^[11], habitus are the generative schemes through which people perceive the world and act in it. These schemas or "structured structuring structures" are socially structured by their conformation throughout the life of each agent and their incorporation into the social structure, in a specific field of social relations that make up the personality of the social agent. They are structuring because they are the basis of the agent's thoughts, perceptions and actions. The structuring function is maintained thanks to the processes of differentiation in the conditions and needs of each class, the social practices that derive from the habitus have a structural relationship between them.

We learn the habitus through the body, in a practical way without going through consciousness, through the unconscious acquisition through socialization we assume the schemes that regulate the appropriate practices in a situation and in the face of a given event within the different social, work, cultural, political fields... Each social position has its own universes of experience, spheres of practice, and categories of perception and appreciation that through habitus the individual assumes and considers part of his class. As an example, the assumption of the aesthetic and refined enjoyment of

art as belonging to the bourgeois class serves as something personal, and not as the result of an apprenticeship that distinguishes it from other social classes. Each social stratum has its habitus and its objectivity is manifested through the particular subjectivity of the different forms of life typical of each social class. The habitus is the bond of the incorporated class, the body, the transubstantiation of the social class into the body. In contrast to the objectified class, or in other words, the position on the scale of social relations based on the volume and type of capital – economic, cultural, social or symbolic – that is possessed, the habitus reflects the experiences and social practices derived from these objective positions. We can speak of a class habitus essential to understanding social reproduction, generator of social conditions and that manifests itself in the body, unconsciously, the schemas and distinctions of its own, in addition to allowing its continuous reproduction through constant and continuous updating. These conditions, schemes and distinctions are very well observed in the limits of the habitus, between what can or cannot be done, the limitations that the agent imposes on himself, since with the habitus one excludes oneself from what is excluded.

The institution as a relationship of power

This conception of the social carried out by Bourdieu allows a compartmentalization of the social network that facilitates social control as much as possible, an understanding of classes and their fields, of symbolic capital, supposes a great economy of means extrapolating the control that we saw in Goffman to strata, fields, broader of the social fabric. These possibilities of control are magnified by the effects of Symbolic Violence. This concept, which was shaped during the seventies, can be defined as the social relationship, in which the dominator exercises indirect violence, as opposed to the direct violence that physical violence would entail, against the dominated, and here is the novelty of the vision, the dominated are not aware, they do not assimilate, that they are being dominated, being therefore co-participants in their own domination. With this concept we can go beyond the studied effects of indoctrination and propaganda, although when they are inextricably linked to it, such is the case of Nazi Germany presented by Claudia Koonz^[12] and which can easily be extrapolated, with their own characteristics, to Francoist Spain or any other model of totalitarian dictatorship. Within asymmetrical schemes of power, and in the search for social control, symbolic violence is a strategy for the reproduction of the existing system, understood as the status of classes, gender domination, intra and outside class, roles and social position, as well as cognitive categories (very well analyzed in works such as *Distinction* or *Homo academicus*). where power and the mental structures that justify it

merge, to maintain a reproduction of the social system in a veiled way, which is understood as natural, normativized and therefore just. The lack of visibility, its implicit assumption by the dominated is at the base of social structures, and Bourdieu proposes it, in the tradition of a hermeneutical school of suspicion, Paul Ricoeur's School of Suspicion, and which included Marx, Nietzsche and Freud, in which a way of making the invisible visible is pursued. The concept, which starts from Gramsci and his cultural hegemony, is developed after his work in Algeria on Kabyle society, and which, for the scope of interest of this work, he develops in *Male Domination*, on the one hand, and on the other in his studies on the educational system embodied in *The Heirs: students and culture*. In both cases it shows us that the imposition of a cultural model and reproduction is done through the naturalization of ideological postulates, and that symbolic power and by extension symbolic violence cannot be exercised without the necessary participation of the dominated:

"symbolic power is, in effect, that invisible power that can only be exercised with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they suffer it or that they exercise it"

[13].

The internalization and naturalization of existing power relations make us see them as evident and unquestionable, in all fields, and by all social segments, but fundamentally by the dominated, which limits to each field the possibilities of thinking and perceiving reality, which is still socially constructed. The hidden nature of symbolic violence does not mean that its effects are less harmful than active violence, just as its effects are real and tangible on people, with its consequent burden of pain and fear. The aim is not to question the existing social models. To conclude and as a complement and/or reinforcement of the theoretical concepts on social control, it is necessary to add the works of Michel Foucault, an author known for his in-depth study of the mechanisms of power and symbolic violence that we have already dealt with from Bourdieu's perspective. In his case, Foucault, in *Discipline and Punish*^[14] suggests that control is manifested at all levels of modern society with the existence of a type of "continuous prison", from maximum security prisons, social workers, police, teachers, to our daily work and in our daily lives. Everything is connected through the surveillance (deliberate or not) of some human beings by others, in search of a generalized 'normalization'. This "continuous prison" is explained from the concept of the control society, where society is compared to a surveillance system with a panoptic format originating in Bentham. This feature is characteristic of modern societies, Foucault^[15].

"a form that is exercised over individuals in the manner of individual and continuous surveillance, as control of punishment and reward and as correction, that is, as a method of training and transforming individuals according to certain norms."

This system of surveillance and power, which significantly reminds us of Pierre Bourdieu's notion of symbolic violence, is exercised on individuals who, in response to this constant and continuous surveillance, assume and internalize psychically as their own and normalize it, beyond the codes established for this purpose – the correlation with Bourdieu seems evident-. This vision of the panopticon adapts very well to the broad vision of Total Institution that we follow in this work, where the Institution exercises surveillance and power over individuals, through pedagogy, in the institutions in charge of the transmission of knowledge, such as schools, orphanages or training centers; correctional facilities, such as prisons or reform schools; or those that combine correctional and therapeutic uses, as in the case of hospitals or psychiatric hospitals, responsible for the correction and normalization of inmates.

In conclusion, everything seems like control, but it is more than that

This system of surveillance and control of the body is related to the concept of biopower, which he develops in his work History of Sexuality. Volume one, The Will to Know, from 1976, originating in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and dealing with the functioning of sexuality in relation to the emergence of biopower, namely, the "total control over living bodies", that is, all the economic, geographical and demographic policies that power establishes for social control. Power is diffuse, fragmented, delocalized, ubiquitous, and permeates all social relations. With the design of public policies, the different states seek to normativize individuals regardless of their position within the social structure, and here we also see how Bourdieu's concept of field adapts well to what Foucault wants to mean when explaining how the state through institutions normalizes each one within the social order. whether in the factory through a production process, in the school through a process of transmission of knowledge or in the hospital and/or prison through the correction and/or normalization of the inmates. The institutions mentioned, "institutions of sequestration" in the words of Foucault^[15] have the following common characteristics/functions:

1. To contemplate the control and responsibility over the totality of the time of individuals.

2. Control the body of individuals
3. Creation of a new type of power: polymorphous and polyvalent. Where economic, political and judicial power are hybridized, giving micropowers within the different institutions.
4. Epistemological power, which crosses and animates others, "the power to extract knowledge from and about these individuals already subjected to observation and controlled by these powers". Extraction of knowledge, observation and classification of individuals, of the recording, analysis and comparison of behaviors in search of a knowledge of observation retranscribed and accumulated in new norms that allow new forms of control or their assumption as their own, symbolic violence. The games of power and knowledge, which transform the force of time and its integration into production, in the case at hand, surveillance and control, making all the time of life work time, causing indifferenciation between life and work, announcing the self-exploitation typical of today's society of fatigue.

But returning to the control of the body and the field of institutions, Foucault^[14] tells us how from the eighteenth century onwards new techniques of body control were used to impose docility and how these were included in regulations. These norms, which we could include within what Foucault calls disciplines, are characterized by the existence of hierarchical surveillance, buildings are accommodated to this purpose, where power is indiscreet, controls everything, while discreet, does not allow itself to be seen. Likewise, the existence of a disciplinary punishment that is also a penal mechanism, with its own codes, sanction norms, punishments. And by the punishment of deviations, so punishments are to respect both the regulations, the artificial order, and the natural, social order, defined by natural and observable processes, such as the time of learning or the level reached.

Given the same characteristic of deviations, punishment seeks to correct the deviation, to redirect them on the right path, seeking to qualify not so much actions as individuals, with which discipline rewards by granting promotions or degrades by punishing, seeking not atonement but normalization. The characteristics discussed can be applied to a large number of institutions and in the case of the field study carried out on the Civil Guard they are fully acceptable. An example of how this discipline is sought and achieved is through the exam^[14]:

"The exam combines the techniques of the hierarchy that monitors and those of the sanction that normalizes. It is a normalizing gaze, a vigilance that allows us to qualify, classify and punish. It establishes a visibility over individuals through which they are

differentiated and sanctioned. That is why, in all disciplinary devices, the examination is highly ritualized."

The examination is based on mechanisms that alter the traditional conception of power, so that disciplinary power becomes invisible while those who exercise it are the visible protagonists, something that we already saw in symbolic capital and power struggles in Bourdieu's fields of action. The exams, from the first entrance exam, are a chain to which links are added through a system of registration and documentation, a bureaucratic file, which constrains the individual to the normativity of the institution, where the individual is objectified as a describable, analyzable, patterned object, both individually and in groups. By making each individual a case we are making description a means of control and domination.

I have concluded with the example of the exam because it is perfectly suited to other institutions in which the recipients of this work participate, the educational community, and which perfectly shows the versatility of the tools presented for institutional study and by extension the control mechanisms used by institutions in their broadest sense. both public and private, to normalize their users-customers.

Tools may have changed, enhancing greater control with the development of technologies; institutions have expanded, which beyond nation states respond to other supranational entities, multinational companies,... But the use of the tools of social control is still as present today as in the origins of modernity, from the most opprobrious versions of totalitarian states to the apparently more acceptable versions of democratic models, in all cases the ultimate goal of the search for compliance and obedience underlies.

References

1. [^]Bauman Z (2014). *Para qué sirve realmente un sociólogo*. Barcelona: Espasa.
2. ^{a, b, c, d}Goffman E (1970). *Internados. Ensayos sobre la situación social de los enfermos mentales*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
3. [^]Anta Félez JL (1998). "La carrera hacia el sacerdocio. Los seminarios como institución total". *Gazeta de Antropología*. 14: artículo 07.
4. [^]Quesada Aguilar JS (2024). "Los asideros de lo intangible: Las redes sociales y el control social". *Encuentros Multidisciplinares* n° 76.

5. [^]Douglas M (1998). *Estilos de pensar*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
6. [^]Goffman E (1970). *Estigma. La identidad deteriorada*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
7. [^]Milgram S (2016). *Obediencia a la autoridad. El experimento Milgram*. Madrid: Capitán Swing.
8. [^]Schutz A (1974). *El problema de la realidad social*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
9. ^{a, b}Bourdieu P (1997). *Razones prácticas. Sobre la teoría de la acción*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
10. [^]Juliá S (dir) (2000). *Violencia política en la España del siglo XX*. Madrid: Taurus.
11. [^]Bourdieu P (1996). *La Reproducción. Elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza*. México: Fontamara.
12. [^]Koonz C (2005). *La conciencia nazi*. Barcelona: Paidós.
13. [^]Bourdieu P (2000). "Sobre el poder simbólico". *Intelectuales, política y poder*. Buenos Aires: UBA, Eudeba.
14. ^{a, b, c}Foucault M (2003). *Vigilar y castigar. Nacimiento de la prisión*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
15. ^{a, b}Foucault M (1983). *La verdad y las formas jurídicas*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.