

## **Creativity, Body-Design and Contemporary Fashion: The Deconstruction of the Luxury**

**Žarko Paić**

University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Textile Technology  
Department of Fashion Design  
Trg Republike Hrvatske 14, 10000, Zagreb, Croatia

### **Abstract**

*In the article author's attempt is to open the problem why the fashion as body-design in the contemporary world of shifting identities has emerged a key factor in the success of the cognitive and digital economy. I am trying to explain why the early 21st century encompasses the whole area of overlapping impacts of technologies and art sets in terms of cultural and creative industries. The cultural industries encompass creativity, production and commercialization related to the problem of intellectual property protection in the press, publishing, multimedia activities, audiovisual and cinema production; Creative industries, on the other side, comprise preferably understanding of design as the construction of a new world of life in the interaction of art and technology. Since the entire global economy of services and products has associated today with innovations in the digital sphere, it becomes obvious that fashion nowadays significantly has determined from different theoretical and practical perspectives. The activities of applied arts and technology are no more result of emergence a new product, but the creative design of the body, which means that global economy has an integrative role of creating the new values. Visual code of life itself designed the process of creative shaping in the society and culture. Finally, it should be able to present in very broad strokes the paradigm shift from cultural to creative industries based on recent studies in the sociology of communications and media, and interdisciplinary fashion studies in close connection with a new role of luxury today. From the perspective of sociological investigations performed by Gilles Lipovetsky, I have the intention to articulate some basic assumptions on the level of theoretical approach to brand new luxury in the global consumer societies. Instead of disappearance the desire for luxury, there is the massdemocratization of the desire for haute couture regarding the all-embracing diversity of luxury today.*

**Keywords:** fashion, design, body, culture, creative industries, digital economy, deconstruction, luxury

### **Introduction**

In one of the most important book of fashion in the horizon of postmodern theory as an open field of diverse orientations, directions and disciplines, Elizabeth Wilson, *Adorned in Dreams: Fashion and Modernity*, claims that "in all societies the body is dressed, and everywhere dress and adornment play symbolic, communicative and aesthetic roles" (Wilson, 1985/2003: 3). At first glance, it becomes clear that fashion is setting a new "value" order in the modern society. Unlike traditional societies with an agrarian type of production, modern shaping appears to change the body. Starting from the freedom of his individualization of fashion, fashion no longer adorns the "natural" body but constructs the cultural order of meaning by entry into the garments of identity signs. Therefore, the clothes in an aesthetic sense cannot be understood without regard to the historical development of the freedom of the body. What matters here is quite a comprehensible situation, and Wilson is not out of the mainstream theory-games when she accepts an interdisciplinary approach to the fashion theory based on cultural studies, feminism, theoretical psychoanalysis and anthropology. Since the beginning of scientific research in the works of sociologists Thorstein Veblen and Georg Simmel, fashion theory has been trying to understand the core factor of social development in the rise of modern capitalism (Paić, 2007: 54-97). At the outset, however, 20th-century fashion has emerged unexpectedly by dividing the traditionally understood society into class-social understanding and postmodern deployment of the notion of "society" in the network of fluid cultural identities. The problem of theoretical "founding" a fashion as a creative body design emerges from the fact that fashion cannot be reduced to the social dynamic of power, nor even to cultural differentiation in lifestyle. Why?

The reason should be looked in uniqueness and singularity of fashion that is determined as an experiment of the existence an individual, rather than as a mere dressing of a social group, just like objectified phantom body which Sigmund Freud called the superego activity area. Anyway, the true residence of fashion lies in the space of the body's identity structure beyond the "nature" and the "culture". In all research that has been done recently, we notice the space of experimental games directed towards the transformations of bodies in the contemporary art and design, with the greatest aesthetic achievements in the works of fashion designers such as Alexander McQueen, John Galliano, Hussein Chalayan, Martin Margiela and Jean-Paul Gaultier. So, I would like to develop an analysis quite different discipline named the visual semiotics of the body. If the language according to the Roland Barthes opinion was the fundamental signifier of fashion change (Barthes, 1983), which is repeated as fashion returns to its origin in the phenomenon of retro-futurism, then for contemporary fashion the sign of the reign of new information-communication technologies and interactive media transcodes the language into image or a visual code of social forms the spectacle (Paić, 2007: 217-262). Explaining how the image now takes "the logic of language" can be only possible when we a trying to discussing the definition of visual semiotics. It is a post-discipline beyond the distinction between semiology and sociology. The ability of visual semiotics was only created with the introduction of visual studies and visual culture at the end of the 20th century. The sign implies the meaning of fashion as visual information. That's why the meaning of fashion thus becomes the event of interactive communication of networked bodies as aesthetic objects.

The fundamental assumptions of consideration that I would carry out here in the two parts are as follows:

(1) The design signifies today the emergence of creative thinking and shaping the body in aesthetic and bio-cybernetical sense of the complexity the system.

(2) The fashion has established in the global perspective as the creative design of the body through the social, cultural and environmental worlds. Only from that viewpoint entire tradition of dressing and clothing could enter in the fashion system. This order has been maintained stable meanings in permanent world crisis and societal transformations.

(3) Contemporary fashion is going on therefore as a media formation of life itself through the labyrinth of "styles" and "tendencies" in the field of development of design ranging from cultural to creative industries. All that bestows a quite distinctive approach to the concept of culture and meaning of visual imagery (visual-iconic turn) reflected in completely new conception of the fashion.

(4) Thus, the fashion is no longer considered as "applied art", such as the design is no longer addicted to the so-called beauty immersed in industrial environment of modern society wherein the aesthetic object (readymade) means creation beyond the boundary lines. Instead of that we are thrown into development of techno-genesis the new worlds of creativity. The consumption of time did not apply anymore to passive reception, but rather approaching into the space of interactive intervention and creating some new contexts and situations in which the human body coexists with others in the global and the local areas.

(5) The transition from the paradigm of "industry" as a finished product into an "industry" as a system of changing and emerging "smart applications" leads to the establishment of order of the creative economy in the information society. So, the consequences of these changes are far-reaching. Primarily, they are related to the education system in all spheres. Thinking that unites "inventiveness" and "creativity" became the basis of new cognitive or creative-emergent global world order. Now the techno-sphere should be the main force impacted on the limits of productivity "work" and the methods of use the surplus value to the purpose of capital reinvestment.

(6) The fashion design as the construction of the body becomes a creative and inventive practice which has a deep impact to the aestheticization of life-world. Therefore, its essential characteristics derived from the very figures that embody the "creative" individuals in the information-cognitive world of speed, control and transformation of (a) a synthesis of ideas; (b) hybrid styles and (c) implementation the eclecticism.

(7) The transformation of the body, ranging from changes in gender/sexual identity, figuration lifestyle of managers, entrepreneurs, entertainers and stars of mass culture to the post-human "creature" (robots, cyborgs, androids) introduced the fashion in the new knowledge economy. I would like to say that anything could be once more rearranged; all that has been produced in the new constellations, and the whole was stirred with the completely different regime. It is reliable evidence that the meaning of fashion no longer lies in the theatre of social roles or, still, in the media world of changing cultural identity. Quite the contrary, the "society" as a techno-scientific framework and the "culture" as the driving power of changing the life itself derived from the genesis of techno-aesthetic produced worlds (Paić, 2016).

(8) The design is no longer even "function", nor mere "ornament" in the favour of the fundamentally constructed world made by technoscience. It just belongs to the logic of contingency and emergency. Therefore, we need to break decisively all that historically obsolete binary oppositions which governed and mapping the cognitive architecture of modern sciences and arts. The era in which we operate is determined by a set of hybrid concepts and new events. Thus, the event has been marked the performativity of the creative body in the society, politics, economy, and culture.

So, the term "new" assumes all that characterizes a postmodern paradigm shift: the restoration, the revival of the past, present redirection of "progress" in the "development" as opposed to identity, pluralism of ideas, and hybridity as a guiding principle of creation. In the following discussion, I will try to show how the concept of a democratized luxury has taken place through differentiation of modern and postmodern ways of creating the symbolic power. Now, in fact, we are witnessing the process of transition from a period of "cultural industries" to the era of "creative industries". The contemporary fashion becomes the creative body-design, which means that instead of the traditional "rational" accumulation of luxury associated with high classes just now arises a paradigm shift. Gilles Lipovetsky convincingly argues the thesis that we are faced with the change in the manner of representing the power in post-industrial society (Lipovetsky& Roux, 2003). Investing the "emotional capital" that recognizes the increasing need for the transformation of supply and transformation logic of demands for brand "new" styles dramatically caused so many unexpected consequences. Hence it might be said that expensive work no longer exists as it has been perfectly clear for sociologist Thorstein Veblen. It's well known that he has criticized all aspects of conspicuous leisure, consumption, and waste incorporated in the modern fashion (Veblen, 1961). Instead, it was created a new kind of social and cultural distance towards a way of lifestyle, especially against of subversive subculture that promotes ideas of modesty and functionality in everyday clothing.

## I.

In the societies with leading competition ethics built on the transfer market conflict between corporations in the discursive field of culture, we can observe the changes in the understanding of the symbolic form of the fashion. In contrast to the classic theory of class-social distinction, trickle-down theories (Veblen-Simmel-Sapir), according to which fashion cannot be understood independently because it precisely displayed and performance the social relations of modernity, the fashion becomes an indicator of tremendous socio-cultural changes (Davis, 1992). When the post-industrial society at the end of 1960 rising to rule tripartite form of information-media-communication, the culture picks in their hands shaping relations between groups and elites (Barnard, 2002, Kawamura, 2005, Paić, 2007).

How can we comprehend the fashion from the viewpoint of the cultural industry? Speaking directly by the language of modern communications theory, its existence represented the way in which should be more important to set the limits of reproduction facilities in the digital technology. More specifically, a fashion needs to be regarded as a technique at the level of discourse the whole postmodern economy (supply-economy). Within of that model, it represented the specific product or so-called brand. For instance, the French haute couture must be legally protected as "national fashion canon". Coming into a world of high fashion, therefore, is a true proof to witnessing a new entry to the elite's exclusivity. Precisely, in that manner, we can testify the process of dialogue and discourse in formal democratized culture on the outcome of modernity. To be emphasized the cultural differences, mass reproduction replaces the refined style elite. They're wrong those who think that luxury vanished to score the trends of anti-fashion just like the street styles. However, just like ever before we are detected so many requests for luxury goods as nowadays. In doing so, we must keep in mind that the difference between the *belle époque* period which characterized the late 19th century and our contemporary culture of aestheticization again brought to the throne the rich and famous (celebrity culture). It is perfectly reflected in the constant transformation of "taste" (Lipovetsky& Roux, 2003). One can credibly demonstrate that in modern western societies we have reliable signs of effectiveness according to the scheme which provides evidence of three-pronged model the fashion industry as a culture: *high fashion*, *anti-fashion* and *new traditionalism* (Paić, 2007: 161-216). It is not difficult to conclude that the coexistence of the three forms of social ways of articulation of fashion discourse perfectly responded to changes in Western societies in the age of globalization.

Therefore, a fashion could appear in the form of innovation and productions the trends in dressing and clothing. As a comprehensive concept that includes the totality of art, design, architecture, entertainment and everyday life the fashion becomes the posthuman design of the new body for the challenges of post-industrial society.

The fundamental problem remains the same as it was during a modern period when the close connections between class and social stratification with the dissemination of luxury goods determined the whole complex of power distribution. Through an intensive process of immersion in the virtual reality, the fashion in the field of collective tastes of society tries to show its real societal power. Scopes of body-design ultimately has been reflected in the circulation of fashion news without vertical diffusion considering the class and social stratification. However, the high elites create a new flavor. It innovates a fashion for known users as a hybrid alliance of high-class and customers including the other classes and strata of the modern society. But the new society is not based on a strict separation of the elite and the masses. It can be said with confidence that the haute couture is not the cultural elite of strong exercise the power, but above all high-society elite develops an inner affinity with "the latest expressions of modernity" (Blumer, 1969: 280).

The fashion as a "cultural industry" belongs to the utopian horizon of a "new". We should be able to remind ourselves of some famous fashion styles just as a "New look" and Japanese deconstruction from the early 1980s. Their fields of action bounded by social and cultural identities emerging from anti-fashion and street styles marked by rebellion against the ossified values of our stubborn tradition. In the age of contemporary fashion that was engaged in the 1990s when the rule of "society of control" completely has a strong impact to performance-conceptual events on the border of the spectacle and provocation. But the fashion industry very soon has been almost transformed into the most important sector of contemporary culture and the economy in general – "creative industries" (Hartley, 2005). What kind of difference and the peculiarity of this new paradigm belongs to the fashion as creative body-design?

We can, therefore, clearly carried out how the process of technological innovation in the culture in the era of social networks taken place as a process of culturalization of "new economy". It appears in three leading ways of articulation:

- (1) libidinal or information economy offers facilities to such structural changing of reality (semiotic-sphere);
- (2) psycho-political order of elite rule in which the equality of all member of the society has been replaced some competence and their specific expertise necessary for decision-making (oligarchy and meritocracy);
- (3) transformation of language in view of the spectacle, which comes to the immediacy of the relationship between the user and the subject of circulation of capital as a culture in the global market information (media-sphere).

According to John Hartley already mentioned in the introductory study in the book on the creative industries, the concept of creativity becomes obvious keyword/concept of development research in the 21st century. In the areas of social and human sciences (sociology, economics, culture theory, cultural anthropology) is almost completely mastered (Hartley, 2005: 1). If according to the sociologist Manuel Castells, the end of the 20th century determined the concept of the information society, the facts are that now deploying in the direction of creativity is crucial to understanding the essence of what will determine our fate in the times to come (Castells, 2009). The very economy instead features an information or digital mode of production-distribution-exchange-consumption becomes a "creative economy". The question arises how in that respect we should be able to determine what do fashion want? Is it still possible to continue with the illusion of clothing the body that predetermined their socio-cultural role of creating a versatile identity in an environment information service economy? There is no doubt that contemporary fashion encompasses itself something truly autonomous within the new creative industries. It's task now has been reduced to the creative design of the body. This means that the body is not just a surface on which are written signs the passing of each epoch when history leaves a trail of uniqueness and non-recurrence. Instead of that, the body should be considered as the transformation of life in a creative event of selection the identity in the tripartite form of discourse: (1) *high fashion*, (b) *anti-fashion* and (3) *new traditionalism*. Since the "creative industries" resulting compound of "creative arts" and "cultural industries" in the era of globalized economy-world to borrow a phrase used by Immanuel Wallerstein, their dual nature pervades all that what determines consumer and citizen, and finally the society of the spectacle and public displays of freedom in the times of uncertainty and risk.

If the logic of this new economy set until 1960-1970s a paradigm shift from labour to consumption, it is not difficult to note that this facility has been focused on the rule of design regarding of the new visual expression induced by the introduction of cybernetic management system and environment.

Creativity, therefore, means undoubtedly the core of design feature. Starting from that viewpoint of the world that becomes the aesthetic design of the product ready-to-use (*ready-mades*), digital code can only further expand run directly into infinity. The implosion of digital designs in the new globalized world economy rests on the conjunction of ideas as the embodiment of "brand" in the aesthetic objects (Mau, 2005). It does not matter what the corporation as such includes the implementation tools of the new products on the market. It becomes only important that behind the "smart" - "creative" marketing stands perfectly designed product. Seducing the desire of consumers by being a user produces a real illusion that occupied its speciality in interactively creating brand "new" things. It should be going to shift in the understanding of the possibilities of free choice. But, the choice is no longer a pre-selected. It is a feature of the ideology of the "society of the spectacle" before the advent of the creative industry applications. Fashion theoretician Ted Polhemus coined for ready-to-wear fashion standardized consumption in large department stores suitable term - *supermarket of lifestyles* (Polhemus, 1996). But now the choice has become a complex web multitude of options that are available to the self-conscious interactive consumer. Everything has changed, and our choice is no more homogenous as it used to be in the past.

Let us not forget that fashion in the classic sociology performed by Veblen, Simmel and Sapir from the late 19th and early 20th century just running as a very "social phenomenon". All together comes from a superior concept of industrial society. From the top to the bottom there are a strict hierarchy of roles and firmly-class social differentiation. The fashion has been derived, of course, from the authority of stability changes, and not vice versa. In this way, the pyramid form is scaping the relationships from elite fashion to the middle and lower classes through one-way communication line. Mock of the power ruling by high-class elite, rather than the creative appropriation and development of its own "style", remain the leading characteristic of the modern paradigm of fashion (Paić, 2007: 39-117; Davis, 1992: 3-18; Kawamura, 2005: 20-26). It can be said that the whole becomes so uniformly and standardized, though the shift towards individualized consumption heralded as a major step awakened "creativity". Sociologist and fashion theoretician Gilles Lipovetsky called that condition the "age after hyper-consumption". What is happening now it could be called truly innovation in choice strategies the multitude of products offered in the market of services and information. It is a distinctive way to enjoy the benefits and limits of "cultural industries". Of course, it can be used to the core a relationship between the hierarchy of values and "post-consumer democracy" (Lipovetsky, 2006). Who's talking now about contemporary fashion in the categories of innovation, creativity and experiment, it must keep in mind all that changes in the structure of the whole patterns of production that took place in the digital age. This reversal has been related primarily to the understanding of design as "creative industries". Without that all remains ineffective. In that sense it seems very acceptable to take over assumption performed by Shalini Venturelli as a step towards understanding the new digital or information economy in very changed understanding of the culture. If the three traditions of culture are coming from: (a) the aesthetic canons of the West from Aristotle to Heidegger; (B) modern social sciences and cultural anthropology in which the symbolic understanding of the world is transferred into the ways of life and becomes a specific difference in the formation of social identity and, finally, (3) the industrial and commercial sectors in which economic institutions themselves become culturally, than there is no doubt that we are entering into a period when culture in the broadest sense becomes distinctive a new "industrial product". Of course, it could be noted that culture isn't the product of mechanical reproduction, but an emerging set of creativity and knowledge in complex network design (Venturelli, 2005: 391-398).

Let's see, finally, the manner how fashion as "creative industries" should be articulated in the context of the current state the rule yet mentioned three paradigms:

- (1) modern society as the rule in the form of class and social stratification;
- (2) the rule of postmodern culture in the form of figuration lifestyle subculture of rebellion against the authority of the dress canon;
- (3) the rule of contemporary creative body-design in the construction of fluid identities.

Creative industries are spread to all areas of the information society at the beginning of the 1990s. As part of the growing digitization of life in the various systems and the environment, and without it there is no possibility of globalized economy-world, they are intended to the elimination of differences between societies and cultures. Only a society that becomes a network communication, and the culture of humanistic set of values that becomes a sign of identity of a group or an individual, could establish a strong set of "social networks". This simply means that the terms of technology or culture as "industrial products" with the leading role of design accepted self-evident event facility. It might be too radical claim that the "culture" outdated concept and communication, as well as the media. The reason we can find lies in the notion of "creativity" in conjunction with "inventiveness".

Broadly speaking, we should try to make out that the self-organizing network operators/stakeholders represent a basis of far-reaching changes discussed here.

And it is obvious that it should be to leave the position of the "values" and "canon" which we undertake its perseverance tradition. Nothing doesn't more have its place nor did the time if it is not juxtapose in a set of relations things that are provisional and accidental. Contingent choice overwhelms what was already permanent and unchanging. Since the term "creative industries" entry into a new "creative economy" based on marketing ideas-as-desire for consumption of things, the following folders activities in the traditional sense of "sector" are included in the new "cluster". Great Britain since 2004 is legitimized action "creative industries" within the occupational standards to guide them to the Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Finance. These are advertising, film and video, architecture, music, art and antiques market, performing arts, computer and video games, publishing, crafts, software, design, television and radio, fashion design.<sup>1</sup>

## II.

„Creative industry" products not only surplus value added to what is the value of goods in an economic sense. If it was so, then it could not make out what the essential difference of this concept of what the economists and sociologists of the Chicago school set up as "human capital", and particularly what in the sociology of culture has developed by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu in its fruitful analysis "of the symbolic and cultural capital" (Bourdieu, 1984; Paic, 2007: 107-114). What is added as a value to create new is the "symbolic value" materialized in economic share ideas, experiences and pictures. The question, however, is that unless dystopia enterprise self-organized individual to the new emerging markets of creative labour/capital and possible total change "values" that the new economy demands. What applies to the transformation of three forms of culture — humanistic, anthropological and semiotic — reflected in the transformations of contemporary fashion. We can imagine a continuation of these cognitive-creative games in the coming period in which the techno-sphere become provided opportunities with every further development of fashion as a creative body-design. What remains it might not be quite reducible more not to "society" nor the "culture". It was clearly for the most radical fashion designer Alexander McQueen when contemporaneity in his last performative event called *Plato's Atlantis* staged set of digital technologies, experiment with the transformation of the human body ("third skin") and a new aesthetic object such as women's shoes with high heels beyond the so-called everyday life. Trauma and shock beyond normally comprehended fashion as a service for beautifying reality become a new sign in creative research of contradictions in making of lifestyles. It can no longer be avoided.

In the atmosphere of techno-fetishism as creatively individual with himself, beyond all existing rules and norms of society and culture, contemporary fashion should be emerging as an interactive communication without unnecessary intermediaries (Fernbach, 2002: 135-181). Only the body becomes an object of aesthetic economy whose essence is not more in production facilities. That glorious era has gone. The age of creative industries indicates the imperative rule of designers. Lev Manovich, a theoretician of new media, once it was announced by the saying that "designer is the prototype of our time." The only problem is that it could be the time as frame and just as techno-genesis of worlds and that will be dizzying and accelerates innovation in their spirals. The acceleration seems as inevitable process of disappearance the stable values. That's the obvious reason why the fashion will become "superfluous" coil of own bizarreness embodied in the aesthetic object of universal emptiness. Now the only thing that matters for the last step in our life should be construction the total design as artificial life (*A-life*). Brand new and creating ("inventions" and "creativity") are ultimate imperative requirements. Therefore, we must not ignore the community of those who live and die for their ideas, images and illusions. But it requires more than the old forms of intervention in adaptation to new conditions. There be no actual state nor society for that freaks in the development of creative genius in favor of false equality and control of their dreams as perfectly recorded in Wim Wenders movie *Until the End of the World*. All what remains in that intervention could be reduced to the openness of the network conditions and creativity should become a game over the coming worlds of fantasies. Towards a transformation of life itself the creative design of the body passing through the final stages. There is no doubt, the era of total fashion has yet to come. The development and global expansion of the creative industries established a fashion design as a crucial place for new paradigm of creative society.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: [www.culture.gov.uk/what\\_we\\_do/Creative\\_industries/](http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/Creative_industries/)

Since the consumption of products of creative industries individual actively involved in the use of new knowledge and skills in the media area of digital technology, there is a process of cultural exchanges of diverse practices of contemporary fashion. It applies not only to dress in the world of mass fashion, but also to interactively design permeating the body with technology and lifestyles. In this way, creating a new market that is highly specialized represented the globalizing network of economic and political decisions. It is no doubt that contemporary neo-Lacanian psychoanalytic theory has attempted to show how fashion design in the age of globalization creatively encourages the formation of a community of aesthetic taste and styling the environment. In general, a fashion as a creative industry managed to lead the leading role of the creative designer. Without its projects and experiments and using new materials and forms, but now in an entirely new situation of a single world space of tradition and modernity, the fashion industry cannot be dynamic and adaptable to risk new challenges. Some examples of the most important international fashion "brands", whereas just the world's leading fashion designers give an aura of top quality and aesthetic code of modernity (Karl Lagerfeld, John Galliano, Martin Margiela, Hussein Chalayan, Vivien Westwood, Alexander McQueen), could confirmed our basic tenets of fashion design as a new creative identity of the individual, the nation-state and culture in general. Globalization process opens limitless possibilities and at the same time bring up-to-date a host of negative consequences for those who do not build a cultural identity in the modern principles of pluralism, strengthening of cultural capital and the creative industries in everyday life. The challenge is how to creatively construct a new identity as a cultural power respecting the traditional and modern values to nature conservation in the environmentally sustainable development. Hence, the fashion design can no longer be considered simply decorating the bodies of humans and superficial aestheticization the society of the spectacle. These are only the outward manifestation of fashion in its distorted media representation as something extravagant and eccentric, which belongs to the making fashion for new high society elites.

What might be called in that context the emotional luxury as Lipovetsky has determined the paradigm shift from modern to postmodern constellations isn't quite evidently in real process of supply-economy today. Although interventions in the idea of luxury as complex of aspirations and motivations connected with hyper-consumption include some similarities if we compare previous epoch of investment and the current situation in the entire global creative economy. The problem arises from further specification between luxury and semi-luxury as characteristic of democratic exchange the goods involving in the requests for equal distribution of taste networked all around the neoliberal agenda in economy and societies. Some quite restrictively determined features of semi-luxury as personal consumption, simplicity, discretion, and affordability seems to indicate only the transition from Veblen's sociology of leisure class into a new paradigm of restraint and ascetic hedonism. My proposition should be regarded as an attempt to get an idea of luxury in the age of creative economy completely freed from the compulsion to be the restoration of social inequalities, or, put in another way, the strategies of oligarchic power pervading with formal democratic rules in the societies of great aspirations. In summary, as Lipovetsky performed, it might be said that

“the reign of the hyper-commercial society is far from entailing a complete annihilation of values and sentiments. The taste for sociability, volunteerism, moral indignation, the value invested in love, all is perpetuated, even reinforced. The threats on hyper-consuming society do not lead to completed nihilism, the devaluation of all ideals. It is mostly the decline of the lightness of being, the vulnerability of personalities, psychopathologies, and the spiral of a difficult existence. We still consume more, but joy no longer exists as a part of the equation” (Lipovetsky, 2012).

### ***Conclusion***

If according to the sociologist Manuel Castells the end of the 20th century has determined the concept of the information society, then we are faced now with deploying in the direction of creativity crucial to understanding the essence of what will determine our fate in the times to come. The very economy instead features an information or digital mode of production-distribution-exchange-consumption becomes a "creative economy". And the meaning of the term includes originality, entrepreneurship, innovation. Culture is to be read as "the mechanism for the production of innovations under uncertainty" (Hartley et al, 2015: 5). Some authors suggest that a set of artistic professions ("no-collar workplace") replaced the traditional system of hierarchy which Michel Foucault has called "disciplinary society". Instead, that, what Gilles Deleuze set a new paradigm "societies of control" in the digital age becomes effective for the notion of culture as a creative practice in terms of entropic effects (Deleuze, 1992: 3-7).

Control does not apply to the power of command to subvert the other as a mere object of some external will. In lieu of, it might be called the management model of the system with its environment.

The new conception of culture includes not a narrow area of artistic activity but encompasses the full range of cultural practices such as design aesthetic that permeates the structure of commodity production. Although the term "creative industries" might be a relatively new conceptual framework in the social sciences and humanities it is consistent with the new global economy and very dynamic quaternary sector. This term covers traditional and contemporary visual and performing arts, media production and distribution, audio-visual industry and ultimately all forms of contemporary design. Since the 1990s we have seen that luxury has moved to a marketing sector. It has far-reaching consequences for supply economy and financial logic at all. Firstly, the luxury cannot avoid the fate applying to the democratization of consumption; in addition, there are simply growing industries of luxury (fashion design, product design, body-design) as a brand-industries. The quality has spread throughout the limits of modern consumption restricted to high-class entrepreneurs. We are witnessing today that emotional consumption goes along with tendencies the growth of the creative economy.

Elitism undoubtedly remains a lasting proof that fashion could not get away from a luxury. However, changes must be regarded in the fact that now we can easily discern how the creation of new differences are no longer the product of class and social inequality, but they arise from cultural preferences. In that sense, luxury should be considered as a symbolic necessity to establish a new order as the fine distinction between society, culture, and aestheticization the body. If a fashion establishes clear figure of belonging to a modern complex of ideas, then it's superficial and glamorous status in the light of fast disappearance means social recognition, but not in the sense of hard marking the class and social differences. Quite contrary of that, the luxury should be considered as a function of aesthetic production the differences in the age of creativity and techno-sphere. If we look at things on that way, one can understand why a close connection between creative industries, body-design, and contemporary fashion crossing the boundaries of luxury from anthropological viewpoint to recent investigations performed by cultural and visual studies. Anyway, no one wants to be unrecognized in the society of hopes and expectations.

## References

- Barnard, Malcolm (2002) *Fashion as Communication*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Barthes, Roland (1983) *Fashion System*. Princeton-New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Blumer, Herbert (1969) Fashion: From class differentiation to social selection. *Sociological Quarterly*. No 10, pp. 275-291
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Castells, Manuel (2009) *Communication Power*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Davis, Fred (1992) *Fashion, Culture, and Identity*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1992) Postscript on the Societies of Control. *OCTOBER*. Vol. 59 (winter). No. 1. pp. 3-7.
- Fernbach, Amanda (2002) *Fantasies of Fetishism: From Decadence to the Post-human*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hartley, John (2005) Creative Industries in Hurlley, John (ed.), *Creative Industries*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 1-39.
- Hartley John et al. (2015) *Creative Economy and Culture. Challenges, changes and futures for the creative industries*. London: SAGE.
- Kawamura, Yuniya (2005) *Fashion-ology?* New York: Berg Publishers.
- Lipovetsky, Gilles & Roux, Elvete (2003) *Le lux eternele: De l'âge du sacre au temps des marques*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lipovetsky, Gilles (2006) *La bonheur paradoxale: Essai sur la sociétéd'hyperconsommation*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lipovetsky, Gilles (2012) The Anthropological Nature of Luxury: Interview with French Essayist Gilles Lipovetsky. <https://parisiangentleman.co.uk/2012/02/03/the-anthropological-nature-of-luxury-interview-with-french-essayist-gilles-lipovetsky/>
- Mau, Bruce (2005) *Life Style*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Paić, Žarko (2007) *Fashion Vertigo: Towards a Visual Semiotics of the Body*. Zagreb: Altagama.
- Paić, Žarko (2016) Technosphere – A New Digital Aesthetics? The Body as Event, Interactivity and Visualization of Ideas, in Paić, Žarko& Purgar, Krešimir (eds.), *Theorizing Images*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 121-143



Polhemus, Ted (1996) *Style Surfing*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Veblen, Thorstein (1961) *The Theory of Leisure Class*. New York: Random House.

Venturelli, Shalini (2005) Culture and the Creative Economy in the Information Age in Hartley, John. (ed.), *Creative Industries*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. Pp. 391-398.

Wilson, Elizabeth (1985) *Adorned in Dreams. Fashion and Modernity*. London: Virago Press.

Žarko Paić is Associate Professor at the University of Zagreb, where he teaches courses in Aesthetics, Social Sciences, Fashion and Media Theory. He holds a PhD in Sociology from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. He is chief editor of TVRĐA – Journal for Theory, Culture and Visual Arts, and has authored more than twenty books in philosophy, aesthetics, political sciences, art theory, and fashion theory.

*Postmodern Game of the World*, Durieux, Zagreb, 1996

*Politics of Identity: The Culture as a New Ideology*, Editions Antibarbarus, Zagreb, 2005

*Picture without the World: The Iconoclasm of Contemporary Art*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2006

*The Power of Disobedience: An Intellectual and Biopolitics*, Editions Antibarbarus, Zagreb, 2006

*Fashion Vertigo: Towards Visual Semiotics of the Body*, Altagama, Zagreb, 2007

*Visual Communication: An Introduction*, Center for Visual Studies, Zagreb, 2008

*Posthuman Condition: The End of Man and Possibilities of Other History*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2011

*Freedom Without Power: The Politics in the Networks of Entropy*, White Wave, Zagreb, 2013

*The Third Land: Techno-sphere and Art*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2014

*Totalitarianism?* Meandarmedia, Zagreb, 2015

*Theorizing Images* (ed. with Krešimir Purgar), Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016

*Refugee Cities: From Ethics of Hospitality to the Politics of Friendship* (Lévinas-Derrida), IEGS, Zagreb, 2016

*The Spheres of Existence: Three Studies on Kierkegaard*, Matrix Croatica, Zagreb, 2017

*The Age of Oligarchy: From Information Economy to the Politics of the Event*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2017

*The Angel of History and the Messiah of Event: Art-Politics-Technology in the Work of Walter Benjamin*, Faculty of Media and Communications, Belgrade, 2018