

43570216

Clementine Vanderkwast

43570216

‘The Object: An Investigation into Luxury’

2016

The Department of Media, Music, and Cultural Studies

Professor Catharine Lumby

Master of Research

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Catharine Lumby, for her guidance, assistance, and support. I would like to recognize Macquarie University for awarding me with a Higher Degree Research scholarship. I would like to express my heartfelt thankfulness to Jackie Mifsud who piqued my initial interest in semiotics.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	5
1.1 Chapter One: Introduction.....	5
2.1 Chapter Two: Object.....	13
2.2 Establishing Scope.....	13
2.3 Locating the object.....	14
2.4 Counterpoint.....	7
2.5 Authenticity and object.....	20
2.6 Conspicuous and inconspicuous consumption.....	25
3.1 Chapter Three: Luxury.....	30
3.2 Luxury as an overarching concept.....	32
3.3 Democratisation and luxury.....	34
3.4 Globalisation and Luxury.....	36
3.5 Global and Local	37
3.6 Luxury for others.....	43
3.7 Luxury and time.....	44
3.8 Luxury and money.....	45
3.9 Luxury, and fashion.....	50

4.1 Chapter Four: Counterfeit.....	52
4.2 Real and fake	52
4.3 The counterfeit.....	54
4.4 Counterfeit consumption practices.....	63
4.5 Inviting the counterfeit.....	64
4.6 Louis Vuitton.....	68
5.1 Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	71
6.1 Reference List.....	77

Abstract

We live in a culture flourishing with objects. These objects – pervasively powerful in their proliferation – demand critical analysis and investigation. This thesis, through an interdisciplinary textual analysis, interrogates the object in the consumer society. The authentic luxury object is analysed through application of the early work of Jean Baudrillard.

By positing luxury as a concept, and a macroeconomic sector, this field of cultural and economic production is investigated from an interdisciplinary cultural studies perspective. The distinction between authentic, and inauthentic object is addressed in this thesis. This is shown through an investigation of the luxury sector, as well as the counterfeit sector. This thesis utilises a Baudrillardian perspective to analyse the rigid macroeconomic sector of luxury.

Chapter One: Introduction

This thesis interrogates the authentic luxury object within the luxury market. I investigate the authentic luxury object by analysing it as both a disputed concept, as well as being part of a macro-economic sector (Kovesi, 2015). By applying an analysis of the kitsch object as the counterpoint to the authentic luxury object, I argue that consumption is organised in between these points of distinction (Baudrillard, 1970). Through the positioning of the kitsch object as inauthentic, I interrogate the methods in which authenticity is created and maintained in luxury objects. The early work of Jean Baudrillard acts as the lens in which I investigate the authentic luxury object. Pierre Bourdieu acts as a complementary theorist to Baudrillard,

informing the investigation of inauthenticity and authenticity. Distinction and distinctive value are posited as key principles in the debate between inauthenticity and authenticity (Bourdieu, 1984). The concept of taste is integrated into this debate, illustrating the manner in which taste, alongside inauthenticity, and authenticity, are socio-cultural phenomenon. Informed by both Baudrillard and Bourdieu, this thesis investigates conspicuous consumption through an application of Veblenian economic philosophy. I re-contextualise conspicuous consumption as being not a purely economic act, but a socio-cultural act which relies heavily on the consumption of signs (Yeoman, 2015). To further this analysis, I introduce the concept of inconspicuous consumption to illustrate the complex, sociocultural sign consumption that occurs when authentic luxury objects are consumed in particular social stratum (Baudrillard, 1970). I posit inconspicuous consumption as the height of contemporary consumption practices (ibid, 1970). I theorize that the authentic luxury object is the exclusive product of a macroeconomic market.

I concede that the concept of luxury is problematized due to its use and misuse by many disciplines and schools of thought. I use an interdisciplinary approach consisting of texts from marketing, economics, philosophy, and cultural studies to manifest my own critical definition of luxury as a concept. I argue that luxury is a commodity framed as being rare, precious, opulent and being made from a position of precision, skill, expertise, and a substantial investment of money and time (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984; Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015; Kovesi, 2015). This definition underpins my argument that luxury is both a concept, and a key player in the macroeconomic sector. To further my interrogation of luxury, I integrate the perspectives of Immanuel Kant, David Hume, and Adam Smith to illustrate the manner in which the concept has always inspired critical analysis.

By understanding that luxury as a concept is problematized and misused, I apply a close analysis of the luxury macroeconomic sector. This is informed by the body of work of Jean-Noel Kapferer, Giles Laurent and Vincent Bastien, alongside other complimentary theorists. Through examining the luxury market with a focus on Louis Vuitton, Chanel, and Hermes, I explore the concepts of authenticity and inauthenticity. I also investigate the way the luxury market resists globalisation through a policy of production predominantly occurring in country of origin. The debate between the global, and the local, is analysed with the lens of Baudrillard's (1970) inauthenticity and authenticity applied upon this critical debate. I posit authenticity as being created through a distinct policy of localised production method, or, a distinct aversion to globalised production methods. To complement this analysis I interrogate three central concepts that are key to critically analysing contemporary luxury markets: social stratification, democratisation, and globalisation. I explore the interaction of the global and the local through a close study of some selected luxury brands, investigating the way localised production and globalised distribution operate. (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009).

I propose that the authentic luxury object possesses symbolic-value, which outweighs the common economic principles of use-value and exchange-value. Symbolic-value is posited as the consumption of signs (Yeoman, 2015). To further elaborate upon symbolic-value, I include an analysis of Toyota and Lexus to show the distinction between authentic luxury and premium. The integration of this example allows for an exploration of the importance of heritage, mythology, history, and time in the authentic luxury brand to be included. These four principles are used as critical values in authentic luxury brands which allow for authenticity to be created and maintained.

I posit the contemporary counterfeit market as the counterpoint to the authentic luxury market. By positioning the contemporary counterfeit market as an extremely globalised phenomenon, the concepts of authenticity and inauthenticity are applied to counterfeit luxury objects. I use an interdisciplinary approach to interrogate contemporary counterfeit culture. By perceiving the counterfeit object as existing between the 'real' and the 'fake' I apply a cultural studies perspective upon this burgeoning global industry. I explore the manner in which counterfeit luxury objects are increasing their authenticity due to the speed and technical skill of global technologies. This raises myriad issues for the authentic luxury market. I use examples of emerging luxury consumer cultures – China, Taiwan, and Japan – to illustrate the way in which counterfeit objects have maximum exposure in these environments. To further propound this cultural dichotomy, I make reference to the fact that these consumer cultures are also avid consumers of authentic luxury brands. This allows for an interrogation of authenticity and inauthenticity within these consumer cultures.

As my primary methodology in this thesis I utilise a cultural studies textual analysis. This has allowed for me to cast a wide net on the theorists, concepts, and debates which I utilise in this thesis. This has allowed for an interdisciplinary approach to be integrated into the methodology which has allowed for the concepts of luxury, object, authenticity, and counterfeit to be explored in a multi-faceted way. The choice to rely on textual analysis as my central methodology is due to the fact that this thesis is primarily focused on abstract concepts. Due to the interdisciplinary textual analysis that I utilise throughout this thesis, I draw conclusions and raise debates about the central concepts that are informed by critical theorists from varying disciplines. To further add to my own critical analysis, I use contemporary scholars, as well as key historical scholars. I apply the critical insight of early

Baudrillard and Bourdieu to the key concepts in this thesis, whilst referencing the works of Marx, Veblen, and Kant to illustrate the enormity of the field.

Due to my choice of cultural studies textual analysis as my primary methodology within this thesis, I have decided not to include a chapter dedicated to a literature review. The literature review is integrated throughout this thesis. I critically analyse theorists and their arguments, transposing concept upon concept, and re-appropriating ideas to our contemporary consumer culture. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of this thesis, the literature review is integrated throughout and includes texts from philosophy, sociology, marketing, economics, and cultural studies.

Kovala (2002: 2) defines cultural studies textual analysis as a research methodology which focuses on opposing, and complementary, text-centred analysis. This methodology has allowed for me to utilise very disparate texts within my research, with theories and concepts which are contextually different to my own. I find this methodology to be effective for my research as it has allowed for my thesis to be far-reaching, in a disciplinary sense. I find this methodology to be the most effective for my own cultural studies research as it allows for the study of large concepts – like luxury, counterfeit, and kitsch. Through using cultural studies textual analysis as my methodology, I have been able to analyse different disciplines or practical phenomena by applying theory, and concepts. I find this methodology to be the most academically rigorous for my own research as it exposes my chosen topics to a diaspora of theory, theorist, and concept. As a researcher this methodology has allowed for my thesis to take a number of conceptual and theoretical changes.

The scope of this thesis includes contemporary Western interaction with authentic luxury brands and objects. To explore the distinction between authenticity and inauthenticity, I explore a brief analysis of counterfeit technology and culture. This analysis focuses on the counterfeit markets of China, Taiwan, and Japan. The scope of this thesis is limited to authentic luxury objects which I define as objects with readily understood luxury signs. Therefore, I refer to very classical examples of luxury brands and objects within this thesis. The central examples are Chanel, Louis Vuitton, and Hermes. These central examples are complimented by my analysis of the Bugatti Veyron, Lexus, and Martell cognac. I use these examples of authentic luxury objects and brands due to the overwhelming consensus within literature that these represent traditional luxury brands. Non-Western authentic luxury objects are not within the scope of this thesis, but present a wealth of ideas at a PhD level. Accordingly, commodities like silver, gold, and diamond are not within the scope of this thesis at this level of research. Whilst I do make mention of historical authentic luxury objects, pre-Industrialisation, they are not within the scope of this thesis. In terms of critical theorists within this thesis I rely on Jean Baudrillard and Pierre Bourdieu to inform my own analysis. Whilst I refer to Kant, Veblen, and Marx within the central argument they are posited as complementary theorists, assisting in my own interrogation using the lenses of Baudrillard, as well as Bourdieu, I also only explicitly refer to Baudrillard's earlier body of work within the central argument, particularly *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* (1970). I acknowledge that Baudrillard's understanding of the object changed immensely in the latter part of his oeuvre, seen in the *The Ecstasy of Communication* (1988). Whilst Baudrillard employed a critical analysis of disparate literary fields in his later work as a method of examining culture, this is outside the scope of this thesis. My use of Baudrillard's early body of work is used as a method of obtaining a guiding tone and style for my own interrogation of the authentic luxury object.

There exists a gap in the field of marketing and economics in the manner in which the concepts of authenticity, luxury, and counterfeiting are addressed. Opinions stretch from the far-left- advocating creative commons and those dismissive of intellectual property; to the far-right which posits counterfeiting as a nefarious and subversive alternative to the authentic luxury brand. The field also relies heavily on traditional methodologies – qualitative and quantitative alike – which does not allow for a multi-faceted analysis of the luxury market, and the counterfeit market. By applying Baudrillard, Bourdieu, and Benjamin to explore economic phenomena and marketing strategies, this thesis ‘opens up’ two static and fixed fields – luxury and counterfeit. I argue that an interdisciplinary cultural studies analysis of the macroeconomic sectors of luxury, and counterfeit, provides greater insight into contemporary consumer societies.

There also exists a significant disparity in the manner in which the concept of luxury is defined in the fields in which I conduct my research. This is a pertinent point to address in this thesis and will be addressed through creating a hybrid definition which will be informed by Baudrillard, Bourdieu, Kapferer and Bastien, and Kovesi. This will allow for my hybrid definition of luxury to become both a conceptual definition, as well as a definition which can be applied to the practice of luxury consumption and production. To advance this working definition of luxury, I use pertinent examples within the field of marketing and economics to illustrate the points of distinction. The points of distinction relate the premium object and the authentic luxury object, as well as the kitsch object and the authentic object.

The central argument of this thesis is important due to the intense proliferation of objects which surround humans in our contemporary consumer economy. Whilst Baudrillard’s (1970) early body of work is used as the foundation of my own analysis, I apply his critical

voice to contemporary socio-economic phenomena. I come to the conclusion that the distinction between luxury and counterfeit, in our globalised world economy, is becoming blurred. This thesis hypothesises that luxury and counterfeit are extremely similar, and attempts to address the duality of discourse which exists around these two concepts. By understanding the inherent relationship between authenticity, and inauthenticity, the luxury and the counterfeit can be seen to be intrinsically related.

This thesis consists of three chapters. The first chapter titled 'Object' acts as a conceptual background for the remainder of the thesis, introducing the guiding theorists that inform my research. This chapter illuminates the philosophical dimensions of my analysis, effectively guiding the critical tone of my argument. Within this chapter, I will explore the principle that all objects have a distinct economic reality. The second chapter, titled 'Luxury', applies the conceptual and theoretical groundwork from 'Object' within the practice-based fields of marketing, advertising, and economics. 'Luxury' allows for my argument to illuminate effective practical examples of the luxury market, with insight into luxury object, brand, and consumption. This chapter also includes a brief analysis of the philosophy of luxury, and money, with key scholars informing this argument. The third chapter, titled 'Counterfeit', poses contemporary counterfeiting practices as a contemporary example of the debate between authenticity, and inauthenticity. China, Japan, and Taiwan are posited as examples of counterfeiting cultures, as well as bonafide markets for authentic luxury objects. This chapter poses counterfeiting culture as being similar to luxury culture, due to status as disputed concepts, and vibrant macroeconomic sectors.

Chapter Two – Object

Establishing scope

This thesis is informed by the early body of work of Jean Baudrillard, particularly *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* (1970), alongside the complimentary texts *The System of Objects* (1968), and *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981). My choice to focus on Baudrillard's early body of work is due to his theoretical advancement of classical Marxism, creating a distinct post-Marxist semiotic school of thought. Baudrillard in the early stage of his oeuvre advanced upon traditional Marxist concepts of exchange-value and use-value, and located symbolic-value. Baudrillard's extreme focus on the semiotic nature of the consumer society and the objects which it produces has been the lens through which the central concepts and principles of this thesis have been interrogated. I acknowledge that Baudrillard's conceptualisation of the object, and the consumer society, changed immensely in the latter part of his body of work. Baudrillard employed an ironic and aphoristic perspective about the consumer society, seen in the texts *The Ecstasy of Communication* (1988), and *America* (1986). In these later texts Baudrillard exemplified a crucial analysis of literary fields and subjects as methods of examining culture. In *America* (1986), Baudrillard interrogated the hyperreality of the United States and the supreme ecstasy of communication. I explicitly utilise Baudrillard's early work in this thesis to maintain the scope. At the PhD stage of this project, I would incorporate the latter part of his oeuvre to allow for a multifaceted interrogation of the authentic luxury object.

Locating the object

In our world there exists “a kind of fantastic conspicuousness of consumption and abundance” (Baudrillard, 1970: 25). We live amongst the multiplication and proliferation of objects, goods, and services (Baudrillard, 1970; Belk, 1995). “From the complex organisation of the household, with its dozens of technical slaves...” (Baudrillard, 1970:25 to the “symbolic psychodramas fuelled by the nocturnal objects which come to haunt us even in our dreams” (ibid, 1970:25), we live in a world covered with objects. “This pullulation of objects is no odder, when we come to think about it, than that to be observed in countless natural species” (Baudrillard, 1968: 1). Baudrillard (1970: 28) defines the object as “something that is neither a flora, nor a fauna”. The world of objects opens up within this critical definition. Objects, in their proliferation and profusion (Baudrillard, 1970), organise the world of consumption. They make demands upon the consumer: to savour them, to desire them, to acquire them, and to possess them wholly (Belk, 1995). Objects exist within the consumer society, posing as natural and organic elements of human life.

Baudrillard (1970: 29) warns us in *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* that objects “in their splendour are the product of a human activity and are not dominated by natural ecological laws, but by the laws of exchange-value”. Marx (1971[1867]: 87) recounts in *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* the sight of objects for sale in a London street. They “display all of the riches of the world, Indian shawls, American revolvers, Chinese porcelain, Parisian corsets, furs from Russia and spices from the tropics...” (ibid, 1971[1867]). This is the splendour of objects which Baudrillard (1970) refers to when he defines the object. Marx

(1976[1867]: 87) notes this splendour, and then acknowledges that all “these worldly things bear odious, white paper labels with Arabic numerals and the laconic symbols £. s.d.”. This, Marx (1976[1867]) argues, is how commodities present themselves in the market: with a price. Baudrillard (1968; 1970; 1984), in his early oeuvre, reiterates Marx’s argument in *Capital* (1976[1867]) showcasing that the object always has a price, which is at the forefront of all its interactions. I argue, conceding with Baudrillard and Marx, that objects always have a distinct economic reality.

I use Baudrillard’s (1970) concept of ‘object-time’ to illustrate the manner in which consumers live their lives dominated by the perceived ‘naturalness’ of objects. “We live at the pace of objects, live to the rhythm of their ceaseless succession” (ibid, 1970: 25). Baudrillard (1970: 25) notes that “today, it is we who watch them as they are born, grow to maturity and die...”. Referring to past civilisations, Baudrillard then says that: “in all previous civilisations it was timeless objects, instruments or monuments that outlived generations of human beings” (1970:25). The post-Industrialised society – both Baudrillard’s contextual milieu at the time of writing *The Consumer Society* (1970), as well as our own social landscape – does not produce objects which are made to last forever. Objects are disposable – they have short life spans. They are locked in a world of planned obsolescence. Consumers upon purchasing a “new technical slave” (ibid, 1970: 25) for their laundry or kitchen, often enquire about how much time they can potentially get out of their washing machine, dish-washer, oven, dryer, toaster, ad. infinitum. We, as consumers, witness an object’s life as well as its death. This is a key and reified feature of the contemporary post-Industrialised society. Object-time can be seen to be directly applicable to our own contemporary consumer society, even perceived as somewhat heightened, and perverted, with the surge of online and digital technologies. I would like to

note that when I am referring to the state of object-time, I am referring to a Western context. Naturally, a person from Sub-Saharan Africa has an entirely different relationship with objects than a person from the West. For the moment, at least.

Object-time, Baudrillard (1970) noted, results in the proliferation of objects. I argue that the proliferation of objects can be seen to be a direct result of the Marxist principle of surplus of supply (Marx, 1976[1867]). This surplus of objects can be seen to exist by the fact that the majority of objects are not offered singularly, with a clear use-value (Baudrillard, 1970). “Few objects today are offered alone, without a context of objects which ‘speaks’ them” (ibid, 1970: 27). Baudrillard (1968: 13) noted that in the home the “arrangement of furniture offers a faithful image of the familial and social structures of a period”. “The pieces of furniture confront one another, jostle one another, and implicate one another in a unity that is not so much spatial as moral in character” (ibid, 1968: 13). This object-culture illuminates the increasing difficulty in isolating a distinct use-value from an object, or group of objects (Baudrillard, 1970). A washing machine, dishwasher, microwave, and toaster infer an entirely different message to a consumer when consumed collectively (ibid, 1970). Together they create unlimited meaning: they can refer to newly-weds starting their first home together, they can imply socio-economic mobility with a home renovation, or can reference second-wave feminism where women were no longer tied to the household drudgery. Together they create depth and resonance, inferring the “caesura between inside and outside” (Baudrillard, 1968: 14) and the complex structure of interiority. The “technical slaves” (Baudrillard, 1970: 27) of the interior home are one example of the proliferation of objects which surround us in the consumer society. The proliferation of objects creates a proliferation of meaning (Baudrillard, 1970; Belk, 1995).

Counterpoint

This thesis is focused on the authentic luxury object. However, the authentic luxury object cannot be investigated until, as I will argue, it is isolated through using the kitsch object as its fundamental counterpoint. The definition of the kitsch object that I use in this thesis is informed by Baudrillard (1970: 110) – it is part of an “army of ‘trashy’ objects, made of plaster of Paris or some such imitation material”. It is the “gallery of cheap junk - accessories, folksy knickknacks, ‘souvenirs’, lampshades or fake African masks...” (ibid, 1970: 110). Berger (1995: 76) argues that kitsch objects - “phenomena such as wigs, dyed hair, elevator shoes, imitation foods...” - all involve “lying with signs”. The kitsch object, similarly to Sontag’s (1964) camp object, relies on artifice to penetrate consumer societies. Sontag (1964) referred to camp as being disengaged and depoliticised. The kitsch object is a representation of something which already exists – it lacks the “moment of creation” and “traces of creation” (Baudrillard, 1968: 81) which breed authenticity. By referring back to an indistinct past representation of itself, it can be perceived as a simulacrum, or when in a collection, simulacra (Baudrillard, 1984). By relying on representational artifice, the kitsch object creates a state of what Umberto Eco (1995) refers to as ‘authentic fakeness’. The kitsch object, Baudrillard (1970) argued, can be perceived as the physical equivalent of the cliché in speech.

Due to their lack of a “moment of creation” (Baudrillard, 1968: 81) and subsequent inauthenticity, the kitsch object illustrates the point wherein the distinction between reality and representation vanishes (Baudrillard, 1984). The kitsch object, in its disengaged and depoliticised state, is extremely seductive to consumers (Sontag, 1964; Baudrillard, 1970). As the “army of trashy objects” (Baudrillard, 1970) they make up a vast section of the proliferation of objects in the consumer society. They often require little economic consideration and are easily accessible. They also function as jokes, due to their apparent vulgarity, when given as

gifts. However, the kitsch object when gifted as a joke purchase, illustrates the manner in which their inherent depoliticised and disengaged state can become politicised and engaged. I argue that this illustrates the manner in which the hierarchy of objects, and the order of consumption, is always a sociological construction. The kitsch object “should not be confused with any particular real object” (Baudrillard, 1970: 110). Baudrillard (ibid: 110) positions the kitsch object as the pseudo-object, “or, in other words, as simulation, a copy, an imitation, a stereotype, as a dearth of real signification...”. The kitsch object within culture refers back to a past version of itself, each time weakening the transient hold it has over that “moment of creation” (Baudrillard, 1968: 81). The kitsch object simulates, and “to simulate is to feign to have what one doesn’t have” (ibid, 1968: 3).

I argue that Walter Benjamin’s essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1936) can be seen to be applicable to my positioning of the kitsch object as pseudo-object. Benjamin (1936: 1) wrote: “Man-made artefacts could always be imitated by men. Replicas were made by pupils in practice of their craft, by masters for diffusing their works, and, finally, by third parties in the pursuit of gain”. I note that the third part of Benjamin’s (1936) treatise can be seen to be applicable to the kitsch object. The kitsch object – as Baudrillard’s (1970) pseudo object – has an undeniable goal - “the pursuit of gain” (Benjamin, 1936). Both Baudrillard (1970) and Benjamin’s (1936) arguments enforce my central principle that objects always have a distinct economic reality.

Due to the kitsch object’s position as the pseudo-object, or a simulacrum, it can be seen that they possess an anti-aesthetic function (Baudrillard, 1970). By relying on artifice to simulate

a “moment of creation” (Baudrillard, 1968: 81) which it did not experience, the kitsch object is in opposition to the aesthetics of originality and beauty. The anti-aesthetic function in the kitsch object “reproduces objects smaller or larger than life; it imitates materials (in plaster, plastic etc.); it apes forms or combines them discordantly; it repeats fashion without having been part of the experience of fashion” (Baudrillard, 1970: 111). An example of a kitsch object is the feather boa. The feather boa fulfils the requirements of the kitsch object due to the fact that it can be reproduced in differing materials, aping an indistinct past form of itself (ibid, 1970).

The boa “feigns to have what one doesn’t have” (Baudrillard, 1968: 3). When the boa is worn – as an almost obligatory object at fancy dress parties – it transforms its wearer into a state of simulation (ibid, 1970). The boa is the simulacrum, and the wearer actively engages with the simulacrum in the simulation. It is also important to note that Benjamin’s (1936) assertion that man-made replicas are always in the pursuit of gain is also applicable to the example of the boa. The feather boa, I argue, is an explicit example of the kitsch object as it is worn often in a state of irony or in parody, showcasing the wearers vague knowledge that it is a kitsch object. A more implicit and evasive kitsch object could be the chianti-bottle-turned-candle. This kitsch object is wily in the manner in which it presents itself in circulation: it apes itself discordantly, encouraging consumers to believe it is ‘quaint’, ‘rustic’, and a marker of authenticity. The feather boa and the chianti-bottle-turned-candle, are two examples of the “great army” and “cultural category” (Baudrillard, 1970: 111) of kitsch. The saturation of kitsch within culture also marks a decisive turning point in the consumer society. There is a profound difficulty in isolating true, from false, and the authentic object from the authentic fake (Baudrillard, 1970; Eco, 1995; Hegarty, 2004).

Authenticity and object

The analysis of the kitsch object allows for the authentic object to be interrogated. I will refer to principles of the kitsch object throughout the analysis of the authentic object. The primary principle of the kitsch object – and the most obvious counterpoint to the authentic object – is its lack of authenticity, due to no “moment of creation” (Baudrillard, 1968: 81). Baudrillard in *The System of Objects* (1968: 81) notes that authenticity is “an obsession with certainty – specifically, certainty as to the origin, date, author and signature of work”. This obsession with certainty of origin, date, and author, I argue, indicates the fact that authenticity is a constructed phenomenon. It is the “moment of creation” (ibid, 1968: 81) which cannot be reproduced and this creates a perceived rarity and preciousness (Baudrillard, 1970; 1981). I argue that the luxury object is understood in our contemporary Western milieu as the authentic object.

Between them, the kitsch object and the authentic object, “organise the world of consumption” (Baudrillard, 1970: 111). This is due to the “logic of distinctive material” (ibid, 1970: 111). It is important to note that although Baudrillard (1970) implies a hierarchy of objects, he does not favour either pole of object consumption. “We live with the mute gaze of mesmerizing, obedient objects” where “all men are equal before objects as use-value” (ibid, 1970:90). I concede with Baudrillard (1970) who posits consumption as an inalienable fact of Western existence. As Karl Marx wrote in *Early Writings (1843-1844)*: “man is initially posited as a private property owner (1975[1843/4]:44)”. Private property, Marx (1975[1843/4]) argues is seen as a humans distinguishing essential existence. Therefore, the consumption of the kitsch object and the consumption of the luxury object are part of both Marx’s (1975[1843/4]) distinguishing essential existence, as well as Baudrillard’s inalienable fact of Western existence.

By adhering to Baudrillard's (1970) assertion that the world of consumption is organised between the kitsch object and the authentic object, it can be seen that there exists various levels of distinction in the two cultural categories. These levels of distinction are created by distinctive value (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984). Distinctive value can be seen to be an effect of an object's apparent authenticity or inauthenticity (ibid, 1970; ibid, 1984). The kitsch object has a weak distinctive value, which is informed by its propensity to reproduce itself, and reappropriate itself (Benjamin, 1936; Baudrillard, 1970). However, the kitsch object's lack of distinctive value allows for it to create a maximal amount of profitability, due to the ease in which it can be reproduced in "pursuit of gain" (Benjamin, 1936: 1). The kitsch object's lack of distinctive value also allows for it to be a cultural category of object that is widely dissimulated and consumed (Baudrillard, 1970). Baudrillard (1970: 111) notes that kitsch object encourages "entire classes (to) seize on it". Due to the kitsch object's lack of distinctive value, it can be classified as an inauthentic object. However, its lack of authenticity allows for it to be a cultural category of object which promotes maximal profitability. The lack of authenticity, due to no defining "moment of creation" (Baudrillard, 1968: 81), results in a semiotic message that can connote many things at once, or nothing at all (Baudrillard, 1970).

Authentic objects have a maximal distinctive value, due to their position as defined as being rare and precious (Baudrillard, 1970, 1984; Bourdieu, 1984). The authentic object as the luxury object evokes "notions of preciousness, opulence, and rarity and involves innovation, the extraordinary, precision, expertise, skill, and a substantial investment" (Kovesi, 2015: 45). A kitsch counterpoint to the authentic object is the feather boa. Baudrillard (1970) argues that the authentic object is not necessarily a beautiful object. The authentic object is an object which

Kovesi (2015: 45) defined as being precious, rare, opulent, innovative and precisely made with expertise of skill and time. These principles act as signifiers of the authentic objects maximal distinctive value. Distinctive value is a sociological construction as are the people who define the value of the same objects (Bourdieu, 1984). Baudrillard (1970) and Bourdieu (1984) argue that objects – either kitsch or authentic – can be classified hierarchically. This classification, Baudrillard (1970: 111) argues, is due to their “statistical availability, on their more or less limited supply”. Therefore, I argue that distinctive value is a construction that is formed by a consumer’s understanding of an object’s availability and supply. Distinctive value functions like a fulcrum: the easier an object is to produce, the less distinctive value it holds; and the harder it is to produce, the more distinctive value it gains.

The sociological function inherent in distinction functions continuously, actively informing a consumer as to what object holds more distinctive value (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984). Consumers learn what objects hold more value both ‘for themselves’ as well as ‘for others’ (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). By adhering to this premise, the distinctive value of objects can be seen as a way for consumers to understand the sign-value of an object’s worth (Bourdieu, 1984). Baudrillard (1970, 1984) and Bourdieu (1984) note that when a broader social strata of people relate to an object – the signifier – those who see themselves as having an ‘authentic’ aesthetic decide that they do not want to consume that sign en masse. Fundamentally, if an object proves to be exceedingly popular with a large group of people in society, the smaller group will distance themselves from this object. This illustrates the essential ‘social-ness’ of distinctive value. Distinctive value and the act of distinction do not occur within a vacuum: they involve an active engagement with culture, and an interaction with society. Bourdieu (1984) posits the smaller group of consumers as distancing themselves in two spheres. They

actively disengage with the mass-produced object removing themselves from the culture associated with its sign (ibid, 1984). They also – more pervasively – disengage and distance themselves from the group of people who consume the mass produced sign (ibid, 1984).

Distinctive value categorises objects, as well as those who consume them (ibid, 1984).

This distance and disengagement from mass produced objects is also achieved by the consumption of objects which are rarer and precious – authentic objects (Baudrillard, 1970). The active consumption of objects which are rare and precious distances the consumer via the sociological function of distinction. To be able to consume the rare and precious object tells the rest of the world that you have the required capital to pay the price (Bourdieu, 1984).

Baudrillard (1970: 111) illustrates the counterpoint to mass produced objects as “paintings or authentic antiques, or luxury editions or custom-built cars”. Baudrillard (1970) postulates that these objects - being rare, precious, and opulent – fulfil the requirements of authenticity. The authenticity of these objects is solidified as they do not have potential for unlimited multiplication (ibid, 1970). They are also not pseudo-objects. An authentic Monet is not a pseudo-object. It is rare, precious and opulent; and its creator possessed skill and expertise (Kovesi, 2015). However, this authentic object – the authentic Monet painting – inspires inauthentic objects. I received a gift of a ceramic vase which was digitally printed with a ‘Monet-esque’ design. It was difficult to isolate which work in Monet’s oeuvre this design was inspired by, but it presented itself as ‘in the style of Monet’. This vase was a kitsch object: it was a simulacrum of Monet’s style, but re-produced into a mass-produced object. This

showcases the fact that whilst the authentic Monet is the real object, the vase I received is its kitsch counterpart. Authentic objects, like the Monet, inspire reproduction. I will explore this concept in depth in the third chapter.

I have also argued that distinctive value is hinged – literally – in a fulcrum effect. This is typified by the fact that if an object is easy to produce, it holds less distinctive value; and if it is difficult to produce, it holds more distinctive value. Baudrillard (1970:111) argues that the inauthentic object is the mass produced object prone to “multiplication in ever greater quantities”. The kitsch object fulfils this principle. Whereas, objects that hold more distinctive value are fewer in number, and “are revived in becoming rare” (ibid, 2011: 111). Rarity creates authenticity.

Distinctive value as a sociological function relies on a complex hierarchical social and cultural order to work (Bourdieu, 1984). Baudrillard (1970: 90) argues that this hierarchy is all encompassing: from the deceptively simple act of purchasing coffee, “to the nonchalance of high-class clothing, all these marginal differences mark out the most rigorous social discrimination....”. Distinction works due to objects possessing signs (Baudrillard, 1970; Baudrillard, 1984; Bourdieu, 1984; Berger, 2010). The signs that objects possess are inherently at work within the sociological function of distinction (Bourdieu, 1984). Baudrillard (1970) postulates that distinction works not due to the nature of the object or good, but on the basis of the inherent difference between each object. To be able to understand the signs of two near identical objects – a Hermes handbag and a Coach handbag – signals a complex, embodied and hierarchical knowledge of their signs. To be able to note the difference between the two – a difference that functions primarily due to signs – signifies the sociological function of

distinction at work. It also signifies that the person viewing the Hermes and Coach handbag's, understands the implicit nature of 'Hermes-ness' and 'Coach-ness'.

The example of the consumer being able to recognize the difference between a Hermes handbag and a Coach handbag illustrates the complex way in which distinction works. Distinction can be seen to be at work when looking at the kitsch object and the authentic object, yet it is at the peak of its hierarchical sociological function when it deals with purely authentic objects (Baudrillard, 1970, 1984; Bourdieu, 1984). Thorstein Veblen's *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) adds to this argument due to its analysis of conspicuous and inconspicuous consumption. Veblen (1899) concedes with Marx (1861): people consume objects for other people to see. The principle of conspicuous consumption implies that objects are consumed to visibly differentiate people from each other (Marx, 1861; Veblen, 1899). Bourdieu (1984) in *Distinction* notes that the very act of consumption is a public process.

Conspicuous and inconspicuous consumption

I argue that distinction is a sociological function. This has been informed by the work of Baudrillard (1970; 1984) and Bourdieu (1984). As a sociological effect, distinction and distinctive value are very public phenomena. Consumption, as a public function, has a conspicuous effect. Conspicuous consumption can be seen to be the act of consumption where objects are consumed to visibly differentiate consumers from one another (Berger, 1995).

Veblen in *Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899: 29) argues that "it becomes indispensable to accumulate, to acquire property, in order to retain one's good name". Trigg (2001) notes that a

hierarchy is built within consumer societies: a hierarchy where some people own property, and others do not. Trigg (2001: 100) then lends a sociological dimension to this Veblenian hierarchy of conspicuous consumption: “to own a property is to have status and honour, a position of esteem in this hierarchy: to have no property is to have no status”. Veblen’s (1899) understanding of conspicuous consumption can be largely seen to equate to the Industrialised notion of property ownership. Trigg (2001) equates conspicuous consumption as the consumption of signs; whereas Veblen saw that the conspicuous acquisition of property and goods as being the main indicator of wealth.

However, Trigg (2001) elaborates upon Veblen (1899) illuminating the inherent sociological function of conspicuous consumption. Belk and Wilson (2015: 45) appropriate Veblen’s theory of conspicuous consumption as “the purchase of expensive goods to wastefully display wealth rather than to attempt to satisfy more utilitarian needs of the consumer, for the sole objective of gaining or maintaining higher social status”. Belk and Wilson (2015) note that the act of purchasing expensive goods is what defined conspicuous consumption. I argue that this is far too simplistic an appraisal. I concede with Berger’s (1995) semiotic analysis of conspicuous consumption. The act of conspicuous consumption, Berger (1995), argues is the consumption of conspicuously branded objects that hold readily understood signs. Belk and Wilson (2015) fail to note the social dimension of consuming expensive goods: you are signifying your ability to purchase this expensive conspicuous object (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). The expensive conspicuous object signifies a complex and authentic sign-value (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). I argue that the price of the object is not as important as its socially understood sign which signifies authenticity.

The counterpoint to conspicuous consumption is inconspicuous consumption. Inconspicuous consumption, Baudrillard (1970) posits as a super-differentiator. As a super-differentiator conspicuous consumption works at a meta-social level. It can be seen as a progression of Bourdieu's (1984) concept of distinctive value. Inconspicuous consumption preaches "discretion, sobriety and self-effacement" (Baudrillard, 1970: 90). In relation to the authentic luxury object (ibid, 1970) inconspicuous consumption can be seen be an effective element of its sign dissemination. Naturally, Veblenian (1899) conspicuous consumption is also present within the dissemination of the authentic luxury object. However, the interaction between the authentic luxury object and inconspicuous consumption is far more paradoxical and nuanced. Being discrete and subtle, inconspicuous consumption acts as the highest method of achieving distinction (Baudrillard, 1970). Objects which utilise inconspicuous consumption "represent a further degree of luxury, an added element of ostentation..." (ibid, 1970:90). The authentic luxury object when inconspicuously branded creates a subtle, and brutally effective, sign value for itself. Berger (1995) defined conspicuous consumption as being the consumption of readily understood signs. Informed by Berger (1995) I argue that inconspicuous consumption allows only a select few to understand and consume the signs. Louis Vuitton – famous for its conspicuous LV logo – has a position as the most-recognised international luxury brand (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). When they do not use the LV logo in a new range, thus becoming inconspicuous and subtle, they appeal to a higher strata of consumers than they did with the logo range. To successfully consume the inconspicuous LV bag, you must be aware of the history, heritage and mythology of the brand (ibid, 2009). The inconspicuous LV bag also has a sociological dimension related to distinctive value (Bourdieu, 1984). Only other people who are aware of the history, heritage and mythology of the LV brand will be able to see you actively

consume (wear) the bag. Baudrillard (1970: 90) declares inconspicuous consumption as “the very ultimate in consumption”.

Inconspicuous consumption, as “the very ultimate in consumption” (ibid, 1970:90), is innately tied to Bourdieu’s (1984) concept of ‘taste’. Bourdieu (1984) posits taste as forming along the boundary lines of difference. These boundary lines of difference are formed by distinctive value (ibid, 1984). Bourdieu (1984: 258) paraphrases Aristotle: “...it is because bodies have colour that we observe that some are a different colour from others: different things differentiate themselves through what they have in common”. Taste, Bourdieu (1984: 259) argues is a reflexive concept: “...taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier”. I argue that taste – as a reflexive concept (Bourdieu, 1984) – is extremely similar in its function as inconspicuous and conspicuous consumption. Taste is also a sociological function like distinctive value (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984). A person can possess a ‘natural’ element of good taste; or they can have abhorrent bad taste. The value judgement of having a glut or lack of taste is created within the socio-cultural landscape. It is in no way an organic phenomenon. It is a taught phenomenon - understood through subtle mimicry and through aping others. Bourdieu (1984: 289) argues that taste is “an acquired knowledge”. Immanuel Kant (2006 [1798]: 148) equates taste as “an acquired disposition to ‘differentiate’ and ‘appreciate’”. Kant (2006 [1798]) in *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* can be seen to equate taste to many different spheres – poetry, rhetoric, art, human interactions, ad infinitum. – which allows the concept of taste to become over-arching and omnipotent. However, his simple focus on the features of taste – differentiate and appreciate – can be easily applied to this thesis’s argument about taste. Taste – as a mode of differentiation and appreciation – can be seen to be an overarching element of distinctive value, as well as inconspicuous and conspicuous consumption (Kant, 2006 [1798]; Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984).

The introduction of taste, distinctive value, and inconspicuous and conspicuous consumption all serve as this thesis's key conceptual principles. However, in order to situate the authentic luxury object within our contemporary context I will undertake an analysis of the importance of the brand. The notion of the brand – and the branded object – can be seen to be a relatively contemporary phenomenon (Kotler, Bowen and Makens, 2006). Kotler et al. (2006) argue that the rise of branding started at the conclusion of the American Civil War due to national unification. National unification allowed for a socio-cultural unification (Kotler et al, 2006). Due to the growing homogeneity of America after the Civil War, distinct unified national companies grew – which led to advertising campaigns which were designed to be understood across the United States (ibid, 2006). Kotler et al (2006: 45) define a brand as “a name, term, sign, symbol, design, or combination of these elements that is intended to identify the goods and services of a seller and differentiate these from those of their competitors”. Brands from the period after the American Civil War still enjoy notoriety, market growth and expansion in our contemporary socio-cultural landscape (ibid, 2006). Kotler et al. (2006) define the brand name as the part of brand that can be vocalised.

I will argue that Kotler's et al. (2006) definition can be improved by integrating the concepts of taste, distinctive value and inconspicuous and conspicuous consumption (Kant, 2006 [1798];

Veblen, 1899; Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984). I agree with Kotler's et al (2006) assertion that the brand name is the part of the brand that can be vocalised, but re-hypothesize this definition into: the brand name is the part of the brand that can be recognized. Brand names

and brands communicate themselves to consumers through a complex semiotic process – it is not as simple as a vocalisation (Kotler et al., 2006).

. In our contemporary socio-cultural landscape, Lury (2004) argues, brands are everywhere: in your kitchen, in the shopping centre, transmitted through online technologies. Baudrillard (1970: 25) noted that we live amongst “a proliferation of objects”: and yet we also live amongst a profusion of branded objects (Lury, 2004). Objects with little distinctive value – the kitsch object – still have a brand. The power of the brand of kitsch object is minimal, as a reflection of its weak distinctive value (Baudrillard, 1970). As its counterpoint, the authentic luxury object is the creation of the authentic luxury brand and commands an impressive distinctive quality within the luxury market. I argue that within our contemporary Western society the authentic luxury object can only exist if it is the creation of the authentic luxury brand.

Chapter Three – Luxury

This chapter interrogates the authentic luxury object in closer detail, through a close analysis of the authentic luxury brand, and its macroeconomic sector. The early work of Jean Baudrillard – in particular *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* (1970)- acts as the lens through which the authentic luxury object is examined. I argue within this chapter that Baudrillard’s early work opens up a deeper understanding of the nature of the authentic luxury object. I apply Baudrillard’s (1970) definition of the object - something that is “neither flora nor a fauna” - to the authentic luxury object, whilst noting the maximum distinctive qualities of the luxury object due to its rare and precious nature (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984; Kovesi, 2015). This chapter uses the fields of marketing, advertising, and economics to explore the authentic luxury object. By also applying the lens of Baudrillard’s early understanding of the object (1968; 1970) in this chapter, the authentic luxury object is

interrogated in a new and effective method. Distinction and distinctive value (Bourdieu, 1984) are also explored through examples in this chapter. I argue that in our contemporary socio-cultural landscape the authentic luxury object cannot exist without the authentic luxury brand (Lury, 2004; Kotler et al., 2014). This chapter elaborates upon this argument through a close analysis of the luxury market. The landscape of the luxury market is interrogated through the use of the body of work of Jean-Noel Kapferer and Vincent Bastien. Both Kapferer and Bastien are scholars within the field of luxury marketing and economics, as well as well-versed executives within the field. The texts *The Luxury Strategy* (2009) and *Kapferer on Luxury* (2015) act as our fundamental texts within this chapter. Baudrillard's early work in *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* (1970) is applied throughout. The choice to use Baudrillard's early body of work about the object and the consumer society, rather than his more modern work, is due to the essential nature of the authentic luxury object. The authentic luxury object for Kapferer and Bastien (2009) is the object which possesses immense time established through heritage, history, and mythology. Heritage, history, and mythology act as the drivers of the authentic luxury object. These three principles, Kapferer and Bastien (2009; 2015) purport do not translate effectively in the age of the internet. Kapferer (2015) notes that since the emergence of the internet, the luxury sector has had a cautious, conservative, and even, fearful relationship with it. Kapferer (2015) argues that the characteristics of the internet - speed, expansion, and connectivity - do not function well with the long-standing principles of the authentic luxury brand. The emergence of the internet also symbolises a loss of control for the authentic luxury brand (ibid, 2015). Although some luxury brand's do dare to have an active online presence, this is outside the scope of this thesis. I refer to very traditional luxury brands within my argument, conceding with Kapferer and Bastien (2009), Kapferer and Laurent (2010), and Kapferer (2015) who

argue they exist in a state of shallow internet exposure. Due to this shallow internet exposure, I use Baudrillard's early work as it was created in a time of pre-internet exposure.

As a progression from my initial study of the authentic object, which was informed by Baudrillard (1970; 1984) and Bourdieu (1984), the concepts of luxury and authenticity can be investigated. Kovesi (2015: 28) argues that the luxury object “evokes notions of preciousness, opulence, and rarity, and involves innovation, the extraordinary, precision, expertise, skill, and a substantial investment...”. I have created my own understanding of the authentic luxury object by creating a synthesis of Baudrillard (1970), Bourdieu (1984), and Kovesi's (2015) definition of the authentic luxury object. Kovesi (2015) notes not only the characteristics of the authentic luxury object, but more importantly refers back to the place in which it was created. I argue that objects always have a distinct economic reality. I elaborate upon this statement, noting that when analysing the authentic luxury object, it is important to note that they are part of a distinct macroeconomic sector. Kapferer and Laurent (2010: 332) argue that “luxury is both a concept and a macroeconomic sector”. I argue that the concept of luxury is reflexive in nature, referring back to the macroeconomic sector to establish power, and create meaning, wherein “luxury as a concept feels no brand” (Kapferer, 2010: 45). I investigate practice-based examples in this chapter, applying theory from Baudrillard (1970) and Bourdieu (1984) to illuminate luxury, as a concept and a macroeconomic sector.

Luxury as an over-arching concept

For this thesis, I forgo any in-depth ancient history-cultural analysis of luxury. This is not due to it being irrelevant; the opposite is true. The limited scope of this thesis and its word limit, however, does not allow this historical dimension of the luxury market to be analysed.

Therefore, I limit my analysis of the luxury market to including the point of Late Industrialisation (19th C) to our contemporary socio-cultural landscape. However, this chapter focuses mainly on contemporary Western examples to maintain the limitations of the scope of this thesis.

Luxury, as a concept and macroeconomic sector, inspires far-reaching disciplines to engage in active debate about its very nature. These include marketing, advertising, communications and media, and economics. It is also a concept which has commanded attention from ethicists and philosophers throughout history, like Aristotle and Plato. Immanuel Kant in *Lectures on Ethics* (1794 – 1804: 294) argues that “luxury makes us dependent on a multitude of things which afterwards we cannot readily procure, and whereby we are subsequently thrown into all kinds of distress, for we may even proceed to do away with ourselves”. Similarly to Kant, David Hume (1752) in his essay ‘*Of Luxury*’ explored the dichotomy of luxury and morality, arguing that these two concepts are “mutually irreconcilable (2009 [1752]: 9)”. Hume (1752) argued that it was not possible for a person to act in a morally correct manner and still enjoy the spoils of luxury, just as Kant (1794 – 1804) believed it was inherently unethical for a person to engage in luxury consumption. As a counterpoint, Adam Smith promoted liberalism within his economic treatise *The Wealth of Nations* (2015[1776]), wherein trade would provide growth to specialty markets and become the main driver of the economy. Smith’s (2015[1776]) new ‘free market’ provided the first “rationale for luxury as the means for creating wealth for all” (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 9). I argue that the perspectives of Kant

(1794 -1804), Hume (1752) and Smith (2015[1776]) illustrate the importance of the interrogation of luxury as a concept, as well as a contemporary macroeconomic sector.

Luxury as a concept is a contested and socio-culturally loaded phenomenon. It draws many debates and incites opinions from many academic and practice-based sectors.

Democratisation and Luxury

Smith's (1776) 'free market' provided a levelling-out effect upon Western societies, allowing access to objects, goods, and services which were held captive by the dominant strata (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). This is referred to as democratisation (ibid, 2009).

Democratisation, like the concept of luxury, can be seen to be both a concept and a macroeconomic effect and consists of two driving principles (ibid, 2009; Kapferer and Lauren, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). Democratisation is a key driver of contemporary luxury markets in our socio-cultural landscape (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015; Kovesi, 2015).

The first principle of democratisation is that "it implies that everyone has access to luxury, which is why the client base has grown so exponentially (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 11)". Democratisation as a manner of providing access to luxury has changed the traditional signs of luxury (Yeoman, 2010). Traditional signs of luxury prior to democratisation include caviar, rare spices, perfumes, champagnes and cognacs, and furs (ibid, 2010; Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The 'opening up' of luxury as a macroeconomic sector has allowed for more objects to appear with a 'luxury' sign meaning. Yeoman (2010) argues that the authenticity of the luxury object is strained as the luxury market is democratised. This is due to the emergence of counterfeits and upper-premium objects which lead to a diffusion of the more

traditional signs of luxury (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Yeoman, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). I agree with

Yeoman's (2010) argument that the signs of luxury have changed due to the opening up of the luxury market. The signs of luxury have changed, but also the luxury market "is no longer the embrace of the Kings and Queens of France but the mass marketing phenomenon of everyday life" (ibid, 2010: 24). Yeoman (2010) equates the consumption of authentic luxury objects with the consumption of mass-marketed objects. This perspective, I argue, is far too expansive. Contrary to Yeoman's (2010) notion that luxury consumption has become an almost convivial practice with the middle-to-upper classes, I argue that the authentic luxury market remains an over-arching force within our socio-cultural landscape. Luxury is both a concept – a mass-marketed concept I will concede – but, it is also an incredibly powerful macroeconomic sector. (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015).

The second principle of democratisation is a return to social stratification (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Social stratification, Kapferer and Bastien (2009) note, can be perceived as a product of the pre-Industrialised era. Social stratification as a principle and effect of democratisation works within the authentic luxury market as a manner of organising consumption (ibid, 2009). "The offspring of social stratification in inegalitarian societies, luxury has become its father in democratic societies" (Kapferer and Bastien, 2012: 11).

Fundamentally, luxury in the pre-democratised world was only available to the upper-classes; within the democratised world luxury objects have a certain amount of fluidity resulting in their being consumed by more people. Luxury – as both the concept and as the

macroeconomic sector – organises consumption due to its social fluidity. Luxury objects are no longer only privy to the upper-class as they organise consumption among social stratum.

Globalisation and Luxury

I will now explore the role globalisation plays in the proliferation of luxury objects.

Globalisation has an intrinsic relationship with luxury, particularly seen in the expansion of world-markets after 1990. Globalisation, similarly to luxury, is a difficult concept to define due to the breadth of disciplines which engage in its debate and critical analysis. Disciplines which actively engage in the study of globalisation include communications, the histories, economics, finance, commerce, applied mathematics and philosophy. I define globalisation as an effect wherein the perception of the world gets smaller due to advances in all industry, making communication, trade, and economics exhibit a ‘real-time’ effect (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). Globalisation can be seen to work with democratisation to become one of the driving principles of luxury (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kovesi, 2015).

I argue that whilst globalisation can be seen to be a late modern phenomenon (late-20th to 21st C) it can be seen to be a product of the 17th C (Brook, 2007). Brook (2007) argues that the growth in trade and exploration can be seen to be due to advances in navigation and shipbuilding technology. Brook (2007) posits the Netherlands as one of the central starting points of globalisation in the 17th C. Objects within Dutch culture at this time exhibited fantastic cosmopolitanism (ibid, 2007). Brook (2007) in his text *Vermeer’s Hat* uses close analysis of Johannes Vermeer’s body of work to illustrate the fact that globalisation started in

the 17th C. In an analysis of *Girl Reading a Letter at an Open Window* (1657 – 1659) Brook (2007) notes objects which exhibit Dutch interaction with a burgeoning globalised world economy. There is a Turkish carpet and a Chinese porcelain bowl. The paints which Vermeer utilises in his body of work also illustrate the rapidly globalised world – minerals from the Far East and from Africa all make up the basic composition of his paints.

Kapferer and Bastien (2009) argue that globalisation has been crucial as a driver of luxury to open up new markets. “For the French fine leather craft trade of the 1970’s, Japan was the key to development on a considerable scale (ibid, 2009:12)”. Japanese cutting-edge technology assisted the French fine leather industry which was stagnant and localised before this (ibid, 2009). I refer back to my argument that globalisation is not the late-modern phenomena which so many disciplines posit it as. In the late 19th C in France the growing middle-class and upper-class were under the spell of ‘Japonisme’. Japonisme refers to a passion and obsession for anything Japanese (ibid, 2009). The fact that Japonisme was a craze maintained by the growing middle-class and upper-class illustrate to us that this obsession with all things Japanese – objects, customs and services – is indeed the practice of luxury.

Global and Local

Globalisation, like democratisation, can be seen to have the same paradoxical effect upon luxury, as a concept and macroeconomic sector (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). I argued that contemporarily luxury acts as a driver of social stratification – consumers are aspirational and luxury objects incite them to generate the required capital to consume them. However, globalisation implies a growing world culture due to the ‘real time’ effects of improvements

in trade, communications and economics (ibid, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). I argue that in order to retain its authenticity, the authentic luxury object must not be a wholly globalised object. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) concede with this argument as they posit the fact that the luxury object is an object which is rooted in a local culture as one of its most important features. Therefore, the authentic luxury object is always a localised object. Due to the fact that it is buoyed in one culture – it's authentic heritage culture – this allows it to command high prices. The concept of distinctive quality can be seen to be crucial to the localised nature of the authentic luxury object. For instance, when you buy a piece of Chinese silk you are also buying a piece of China as well (ibid, 2009). When you purchase the authentic luxury object, you are also purchasing its sign (Yeoman, 2015). The sign gains its maximal distinctive quality through an authentic heritage. As soon as a luxury brand admits to moving its production outside of place of origin, it ceases to hold the luxury cachet. I concede that whilst some authentic luxury brands do occasionally gain access to distinct and niche skills from other countries, this can be viewed as an entirely different practice than delocalised production. This will be explored further.

The authentic luxury object only gains and maintains its authenticity due to a policy of local production (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). This creates legitimacy about the authentic luxury brand. “By remaining faithful to its origins the luxury product offers an anchor point in a world of cultural drift, trivialisation, and deracination (ibid, 2009: 13)”. Globalisation is a seductive and powerful counterpoint to the legitimacy of localised production. Many brands which used to sell authentic luxury products have yielded to the seductive promise of globalised distribution, relocating their modes of production to places where tariffs, wages, and taxes are lower. I am not talking necessarily of

sweat shops; but of relocating products to places where the same product can be produced at a lower margin for the brand. This also draws a line between the luxury object and the premium object. The premium object welcomes globalisation; it aims to be the best by producing a perfect object every time, whilst keeping the binaries of consumer and producer happy. The luxury object creates value from authentic and localised production. For instance, Martell cognac was bought by Louis Vuitton Moet Hennessey (referred to as LVMH) as it was flailing in the premium market. This was due to Martell's poor management which focused on delocalisation as a method of cutting costs. Martell's object – a cognac – had a very limited distinctive value due to it not being made in its authentic place of origin. Upon LVMH acquiring this brand, production was brought back to Cognac and the price was raised, and ultimately sales were higher. By maintaining this authenticity of origin, there is a legitimacy to the price that one can charge for an object. A cognac which was made wholly in Cognac is a true and authentic object. It has a maximal distinctive value. Luxury objects are more than the object – they bring with them a whole world (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The world which they bring with them is created by heritage, time, and brand mythology (ibid, 2009). The only way in which they can transport this entire world with them is if they are consistently made within that world. The case of Martell is intriguing due to the fact that upon the brand being brought back to Cognac, the original value was reinstated. Martell cognac always had the required cachet to be a contender in this luxury market; yet they had dismissed the value of local and authentic value, in favour of a globalised delocalised production method. Kapferer and Bastien (2009:83) argue that creating value is the luxury sectors main goal. This creating value is not from cost-reduction, as when Martell was a delocalised premium cognac, but creating value when it was brought back to Cognac. Cognac, as a region, reinstates the value to Martell; it is this that can warrant the high price, not delocalising and cutting costs.

Delocalisation can work for the luxury brand only if the ‘trade off’ is of higher value than the original local offer. For instance, access to rare craftsmanship in another country (a localised and authentic skill creating localised and authentic objects) is worth the risk of delocalisation. Kapferer and Bastien (2009:79) note that Hermes utilising the craftsmanship and artisanal skill of wool-makers in Kashmir. This is a valuable and authentic delocalisation strategy. To go elsewhere than your country of origin when creating the luxury object must mean that the skills you acquire are valuable and necessary. Whilst outside of the scope of this thesis, the process of artification – the transforming of non-art into art – is an interesting look at an ‘trade off’ between the field of luxury and art. The work of Louis Vuitton and Takashi Murakami is an effective example of this.

Objects by Chanel and Hermes are predominantly manufactured in France – the whole value chain lies there, with the brand instrumenting complete control at all points. This makes them examples of true luxury products – and also, authentic objects. This notion that luxury objects are produced in controlled and localised environments applies to not just products as conspicuous as a cognac made in Cognac, or brands as well-known as Chanel and Hermes. BMW also follows a localised and authentic luxury strategy. BMW builds the vast majority of its cars in Germany, which is its country of origin. The 3-series is marketed as their entry level object. BMW creates the 3-series all over the world – in America, as well as Thailand. These 3-series models are not luxury objects, but act as markers to entry where a consumer can be inducted into BMW lore and tradition (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009) They will one day consume an authentic BMW – the German made one (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009).

The authentic luxury brands' focus on creating a localised object could be perceived to be a problematized principle in our globalised contemporary socio-cultural landscape. If the authentic luxury brand perceives its local heritage as being a 'non-negotiable' element of their brand structure, how then do they market their object in the globalised economy? I argue that it is the localised element of the authentic luxury object which incites globalised consumers to purchase it. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) and Kapferer and Laurent (2010) note an important fundament of luxury economics: a consumer of luxury has the necessary capital to pay its price. Authentic luxury objects are not presented in the same manner as convivial objects. Authentic luxury objects have complex and depth sign-values which entice international consumers to purchase them (Yeoman, 2015). They act as windows into the authentic luxury brands history and heritage (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015; Kovesi, 2015). Therefore it can be seen that the localised nature of the authentic luxury object appeals to a vast amount of high net-worth individuals who live in a globalised world.

I argued that luxury, according to Kapferer and Bastien (2009), indicated a return to social stratification in the democratised and globalised world. "Our need to know our place" (ibid, 2009: 17) has been evident in Western socio-cultural diasporas throughout time.

Globalisation and democratisation may imply Smith's (1776) 'free market' and an increasingly open world, but it can be seen that luxury aims to reinstate the hierarchical codes of social stratification (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). Kapferer and Bastien (2009) note that the luxury market allows for every consumer within that market to indulge in elevation and pleasure. They further note: "We can imitate the signs of wealth, without being wealthy: this is the case of clothing in particular, and accessories, if they exhibit the requisite seal of the brand. Thus doing, everyone can look rich" (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 87). I

argue that Kapferer and Bastien (ibid) may be limited in this statement. Not everyone can pay the price to consume luxury: it is a costly socio-economic practice. I refer here to my own statement, which was informed by Baudrillard (1970) and Marxist economic principles: objects always have a distinct economic reality.

Yeoman (2015) noted that luxury objects have a complicated and intricate sign value, which are changing rapidly due to democratisation and globalisation. Through adhering to Yeoman's (2015) assertion that luxury consumption is the fundamental consumption of signs it can be seen that social stratification is an important part of contemporary luxury. Alongside the price of the authentic luxury object, the consumer buys a complex socio-semiotic message which is indicated to the wider public through the act of consumption, and active consumption (wearing) (ibid, 2015). Through consuming the authentic luxury object, you are engaging in a sociological instruction that indicates who you are to the general public (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Conspicuous and inconspicuous consumption (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984) are at work when luxury signs are consumed. You either engage in conspicuous consumption – showcasing explicitly who you are to the world through the visibility of your luxury consumption – or you are inconspicuous in your consumption, relying on implicit and delicate signs to signify a message to only consumers who are 'in the know' (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984; Yeoman, 2015). Inconspicuous consumption, which Baudrillard (1970) referred to as the ultimate act of consumption, can be seen to be amplified when the authentic luxury brand is being consumed.

Luxury for others

I argue that luxury consumption is a socio-semiotic process due to contemporary social stratification (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015; Yeoman, 2015). Consumers of luxury abide by the codes of luxury to create and indicate markers of where, and who, they are in their life. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) refer to this as luxury for others. Luxury for others implies that the consumption of authentic luxury objects is always a public act. Luxury for others, I argue, can be seen as a contemporary appropriation of the potlatch. The potlatch is a highly complex ritual ceremony practised by the indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest of America and Melanesia (ibid, 2009). The aim of potlatch is to give an extravagant gift to a person to over-awe them with your generosity (ibid, 2009). The recipient of the gift does not have the capital required to ever repay the gift and is put at a social disadvantage; in a place of socio-cultural indebtedness. The gifting of contemporary luxury for others works in a similar way; yet, there is not usually an expectation that the other party will reciprocate the offering. Advancing from Kapferer and Bastien (2009) I would argue that rather than a reciprocal offering, the other party being aware of the brand of object the person is using fulfils the requirement of the potlatch. When another person recognises your new authentic luxury object, they are placed into a socio-semiotic process where they extrapolate the signified meaning and draw their own conclusions. It is conspicuous consumption. For instance, if no one knows you are wearing a Cartier watch are you actually wearing a Cartier watch? Luxury for others also refers to the great cost that people go to fulfil the criteria of these markers (Bourdieu, 1984). At dinner parties people often go to great lengths to bring the ‘right’ bottle of wine. Bringing a bottle of sparkling wine to a dinner party, then referring to it as a champagne can often have sociocultural repercussions. The notion of taste – and

more importantly, of possessing ‘good taste’ – works here (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984).

Luxury and time

Baudrillard (1970) argued that in our contemporary world we are subject to ‘object-time’ – wherein we witness the birth, life and death of objects. Objects, according to Baudrillard (1970), have a life-span and are not expected to live forever. Baudrillard (1970) was referring to ‘every-day’ objects when he discussed ‘object-time’. I argue that the authentic luxury object exists outside of Baudrillard’s (1970) object time. Firstly, the authentic luxury object is the ‘lived in’ object (ibid, 2009). It is different to the utilitarian and undistinguished mass produced objects (Kapferer, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015; Yeoman, 2015) due to its maximal distinctive value. Authentic luxury objects are rarely replaced as they age. Their age is celebrated, and in some cases, their distinctive value increases due to their age. Louis Vuitton trunk sets from the 1800’s have a competitive and vibrant marketplace; they command astronomically higher prices than their contemporary counterparts. Their age increases their value, and the fact that they still exist, increases the distinctive value of Louis Vuitton, the brand, immeasurably (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). There also exists a valid market for 1950’s Chanel tweed jackets (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The authentic luxury brand creates an object which “is technically designed to resist wear, uses choice starting materials that time only serves to enhance (the patina of old furniture, vintage-wine grape varieties, etc.), and is of a design that also stands the test of time (such as Ferrari) (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 78)”. Therefore, the luxury

object differs greatly from the industrially manufactured object – which is designed to wear out, and then, inevitably be replaced (Baudrillard, 1970). It is also important to note that the industrially manufactured object differs greatly from the luxury object due to the manner in which it was constructed. The industrial society implies a society with a growing, partial, or extreme reliance on machines for methods of production. Production is quicker with machines than it is with people as the primary form of labour. The luxury object is not the industrialised object – whilst elements may be made in the factory, it has a human element to it. This human element is the fact that it is wholly or partially made by skilled artisans, craftsman or, even, artists (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009).

Luxury and Money

“Luxury is so often taken as a synonym for ‘money’ that to confuse the two ends up seeming natural... (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 25)”. To quote Simmel in *Philosophy of Money* (2004[1900]: 518): “money is the hypostasis of trade between human beings”. Simmel ([2004]1900: 518) elaborates: “...if the economic value of objects lies in the exchange value that they form, money is the expression of this relationship which has achieved autonomy”. I contend that money, or price, is not the defining feature of the authentic luxury object (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). Some brands claim that their product is an authentic luxury object due to it being the most expensive in their range, or in a vertical chain of objects. Toyota learnt this lesson with Lexus which was originally positioned as a luxury car (ibid, 2015). However, it was quickly noted that Lexus did not possess two crucial principles in its luxury strategy: it did not have time or history

built into its brand, and it did not have a heritage and mythology that bred distinctive value (ibid, 2015; Kapferer, 2015). In comparison to a brand like Louis Vuitton which can boast a history spanning from 1854, or a brand like Cartier which was founded in 1847, Lexus paled in comparison. Toyota also forgot that the authentic luxury brand has a heritage and mythology; they poorly tried to create heritage and mythology in an object which was extremely contemporary. Louis Vuitton as a counterpoint to Lexus can rest back on their expansive brand heritage and mythology. Louis Vuitton was the personal layetier for Emperor Napoleon's wife; and Cartier also has an intricate history of jewellery design for Royal families (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). Cartier also has close ties with the history and mythology of aviation due to the fact that Louis Cartier created the first men's wrist watch for aviator Alberto Santos-Dumont in 1904 (ibid, 2009; ibid, 2015). Both Louis Vuitton and Cartier's links with aristocracy, power and aviation technology create immeasurable cachet and allow these brands, and their objects, to be authentic (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984). The Lexus is a decidedly premium offering – it aims to be the best in its field from an engineering and automotive perspective. However, it lacks the time, heritage and mythology to propel it into the luxury sector.

Kapferer and Bastien (2009) note that in non-Western countries with emerging luxury markets, price is often considered the fundamental principle of luxury. China, India and Brazil are all nations with emerging luxury markets, yet according to Kapferer and Bastien (2009), Kapferer and Laurent (2010), Kapferer (2015, and Yeoman's (2015) they lack the knowledge of the complex semiotic codes of luxury. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) note that in China – the third biggest consumer of luxury objects in the world – it is a commonplace act for a consumer to leave the price-tag on their luxury purchase. The price of the object is the

main objective here for the consumer. However, this a practice which is noted only in the non-Western consumption of Western authentic luxury objects (ibid, 2009). These countries have their own localised luxury markets, but this is not the focus of this thesis. Even in established Western nation states the price of a luxury object can still be a key driver within consumption (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). For example, Jean Patou's 'Joy' perfume and the Bugatti Veyron both advertise as being 'the most expensive in the world'. This is largely an ungrounded claim: for any producer of the luxury object can effectively raise the price. For the authentic luxury brand to admit that the price is their main selling point is to admit a fundamental weakness (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The authentic luxury object aims to be consumed for its distinctive value and authenticity, not for the sheer fact that it is expensive (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984). The high price of the authentic luxury object can only be commanded upon the creation of authenticity, and maximum distinctive value (ibid, 1970; ibid, 1984).

I argue that there exists a problematized relationship between luxury and money, in both a conceptual sense as well as within the macroeconomic sector (Kapferer and Laurent, 2010). Berry (1994) notes that the emergence of luxury into contemporary Western consumer societies can be seen as a form of social stratification. Luxury, Berry (1994) argues, adds colour to money. Simmel, in (1990: 518) referred to money as "the hypostasis of trade between human beings". Therefore, by adhering to Simmel (1990) and Berry's (1994) postulations about luxury and money, it can be seen that contemporary luxury adds colour and dimension back into the exchange of money. A person, Kapferer and Bastien (2009) argue can have more or less money. The consumption of authentic luxury requires a knowledge of the signs of luxury and an acute awareness of distinctive value: this an entirely

different form of consumption. To quote Simmel (2004[1900]: 518): “Monetary affairs have a democratic levelling effect”. I ascertain that authentic luxury affairs have the effect of social stratification. Engaging in authentic luxury object consumption can have an elevating effect.

There is, of course, a strong connection between luxury and money conceptually. This connection can be seen as existing prior to Western Industrialisation, when those who had access to money were in a position of power (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Socially, those with money and who were in a position of power, also had access to the luxury of their time. Bourdieu’s (1977; 1986) notion of cultural and economic capital can be seen to exist within these pre-Industrialised Western societies. Whilst, democratisation and globalisation preach a levelling out effect upon all sectors of trade and industry, luxury consumption still remains a highly-elitist and ‘in-the-know’ cultural and economic field (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu, 1984). Contemporarily, luxury is an emotive and disputed concept, as well as a powerful and over-arching macroeconomic sector (Kapferer and Laurent, 2010). Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 26) argue that “money is a unique and universal measure because it is the collective and unidimensional abstraction of value”. Luxury, as the counterpoint to money, is a rich and vibrant sector: “the abstract, semantic void of money is opposed to the concrete, semantic richness of luxury (ibid, 2009: 27)”. I argue that if money can be understood as a sentence, luxury can be seen as the grammar that assists the arrangement of the sentence. Your knowledge of grammar, or your knowledge of luxury, allows you to represent your sentence, or yourself, within the world (Berry, 1994). Money, by itself, is not luxurious. It is the objects which can be attained with money which are luxurious.

Through understanding the relationship between luxury and money as both intrinsic and problematized, I introduce the example of the Bugatti Veyron – ‘the world’s most expensive car’ (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Volkswagen-owned Bugatti creates the Veyron for €4 million, and is subsequently sold for €1 million (ibid, 2009). This was admitted by Volkswagen, much to the chagrin of other premium car manufactures. To the premium car manufacturer this defies basic economic logic, but to the luxury sector this is a necessary effect which parlays the Veyron’s immense luxury quotient into shifting numerous other lower priced cars (ibid, 2009). Price is not the main factor here at the manufacturers end: they get the prestige of manufacturing the most expensive car in the world, subsequently sell it at a huge loss, but attain huge value that seeps down into their lower ranges of cars. where the ‘real’ profits are made. Luxury allows for other non-luxury goods to attach themselves to their innate value. The relationship between luxury and money here is important. The money spent to create the authentic luxury object is not important; the importance is the distinctive value created which has a ‘trickle down’ effect (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009).

The Bugatti Veyron serves as an example to introduce symbolic-value and brand-capital. Authentic luxury objects, like the Veyron, or the Hermes Birkin, or the Cartier Santos watch, possess a distinctly different value to the premium object, like the Lexus (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 29) note that “the use-value of a product being a non-monetary value, and the exchange-value being representing its price, the luxury-value of a product is its symbolic value, also non-monetary, emanating not from work or exchange but from social stratification (ibid, 2009: 29”. Objects gain their authentic luxury quotient through symbolic value: they do not rest on exchange-value and use-value. Symbolic value, Kapferer and Bastien (2009) is what compels a consumer to purchase the object. I

equate Kapferer and Bastien's (2009) assertions regarding symbolic value to equate to Bourdieu's (1984) concept of distinctive value. The concepts of conspicuous and inconspicuous consumption (Baudrillard, 1970) are also innately tied to symbolic value. For a consumer to purchase the authentic luxury object with explicit symbolic value, they are engaging in conspicuous consumption (ibid, 1970). However, symbolic-value when concealed (inconspicuous consumption) adds force to the symbolism of your consumption, as you are only signifying your ability to purchase the luxury object to those who are 'in the know' (Baudrillard, 1970; Bourdieu, 1984).

Luxury, and fashion

The relationship between luxury and fashion is as problematized as the relationship between luxury and money. Many people naturally refer to luxury as being part of fashion. I argue that the authentic luxury brand is rarely a fashion brand. This has been informed by Kapferer and Bastien (2009), Kapferer and Laurent (2010), Kapferer (2015), and Kovesi (2015). Whilst, some authentic luxury objects can be fashion objects, there is a crucial difference in the way production occurs, and the way these objects present themselves in the socio-semiotic process. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) take a critical perspective on fashion, both as a concept and a macroeconomic sector. Fashion would like to be thought of as luxury due the shared characteristics of not being essential and both representing a certain air of social display (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The shared characteristic of not being essential does not translate into an object being a luxury object.

Objects which exist within both the field of fashion, and the field of luxury, are common examples of authentic luxury objects – LV steamer trunk sets from 1890, or 1950's Chanel jackets (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). These objects increase their distinctive value as they age.

Haute couture, Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 31) argue has virtually collapsed, where it used to straddle the fields of luxury and fashion effectively. Haute couture works as an investment by a luxury brand that showcases the innate distinctive value of the brand (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2010). Haute couture, I argue, works in a similar way to the way in which the Volkswagen-owned Bugatti functions. Like Volkswagen leverages the distinctive value of the Veyron to sell their lesser-priced models, haute couture acts as a way of tempting customers into the brand universe (ibid, 2009; ibid, 2015). For instance, upon seeing the Chanel show in Milan a consumer is in awe at the creations which are on offer. However, these objects may be for sale at an unattainable price, or may not be for sale at all. To consume into the Chanel brand, the purchase of a 'this season' Chanel bag may be a viable alternative to a consumer: "The business model of major capitalist luxury groups is to sell for mass consumption products that are labelled by a luxury brand but are no longer themselves a luxury, hoping that this edifice will survive, and that the halo of luxury will continually be regenerated through communication and exceptional products. It is necessary to maintain a very high brand status to support this large-scale use of brand capital (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 100)".

Chapter Three - Counterfeit

This chapter explores the counterfeiting of authentic luxury objects. Counterfeiting is posited as a genuine threat to the luxury sector, particularly due to the countries in which it occurs (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2015). Counterfeiting is posited as an industry which is growing in power due to the technical skill which has been noted in the object's produced (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The central concepts of this thesis – authenticity, inauthenticity and distinctive value – are used as lenses to interrogate the counterfeit sector, alongside a reliance on Bourdieu, and Baudrillard. I also utilise some selected theory by Walter Benjamin to explore representation and reproduction within counterfeiting, with a particular focus on Taiwan, Japan and China's Silk Markets.

I argue that counterfeiting poses a great threat to the luxury sector, due to the skill, expertise, precision, and substantial investment that has been involved in the creation of counterfeit luxury objects (Kovesi, 2015). I posit counterfeiting as both a concept, and as a growing macroeconomic sector, which is ripe for theoretical engagement and critical analysis.

Real and Fake

I would like to explore the relationship between authenticity and inauthenticity; or as Archer (2015: 18) refers to “between real and fake”. Archer (2015) argues that between the real and the fake, or the authentic and the inauthentic (Baudrillard, 1970), there emerges a synthesis – the counterfeit. Archer's (2015) assertion that the counterfeit is a hybrid of real and fake has been crucial to my understanding of the contemporary counterfeit sector. It is also indicative of the progressions within the counterfeit sector. Chang (2004) noted that Taiwanese counterfeits of authentic luxury object had reached a 95% authenticity rate with some

counterfeit dealers renting 6- star hotels to sell their product. The popular misconception that counterfeit luxury objects are poor ‘copies’ will be explored. I also echo Archer’s (2015) argument that the distinction between real and fake, or authentic and inauthentic, is becoming increasingly difficult to locate.

The dialectical relationship between real and fake, Archer (2015: 18) argues results in the counterfeit as its synthesis. The authentic (real) object and the inauthentic (counterfeit) object, I argue are implicitly linked. Archer (2015) refers to Zizek (2010) who comments on the relatively benign practice of purchasing a cup of coffee. Consumers, Zizek (2010) notes, are often faced with the decision regarding whether to buy fair-trade coffee or to buy non fair-trade coffee. Fair trade coffee drinking is noted to be a bourgeois practice; wherein a consumer is recognized as having the cultural and economic capital to be able to perform the act of fair trade coffee consumption (Archer, 2015). It is done as an elevating social performance. Zizek (2010) notes that fair trade coffee is precisely more expensive due to the fact that its price includes its opposite. When you buy the more expensive fair trade coffee, you are also purchasing the cheaper priced non-fair trade coffee. “Contradictions like this define the so-called logic of contemporary capitalism (Archer, 2015: 18)”. Both Archer (2015) and Zizek (2010) note that when you consume an object with a higher price, within that price you are also paying for its lower-priced counterpart. I argue that this can be seen within authentic luxury objects, and their counterfeit doubles. When you purchase an authentic Louis Vuitton handbag, you are also passively consuming a multitude of counterfeits (Archer, 2015; Zizek, 2010). The sheer fact that you have the social, cultural, and economic capital to consume the authentic Louis Vuitton bag, places you in a place of

passive consumption where you have distanced yourself from its lower priced counterparts (Bourdieu, 1984).

The counterfeit

The concept of the counterfeit, similarly to the concept of luxury, is socially and culturally loaded. There exists a vast interdisciplinary pool of literature around the idea of the counterfeit. Disciplines such as economics, marketing, communications, art, fashion, and international studies all take part in the critical analysis of counterfeiting. This includes both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. McCarthy (2004: 223) defines counterfeiting as the “act of producing or selling a product containing an intentional and calculated reproduction of a genuine trademark”. Chang (2004: 222) defines counterfeiting as a result of contemporary technology, which “helps to make reproduced ‘analogous’ copies virtually indistinguishable from the ‘original/official’ ones...”. Baghi and Gabrielli (2015: 453) define the counterfeit as being the result of the “illegal reproduction of genuine products” which has “serious economic implications”. McCarthy (2004), Chang (2004), and Baghi, Gabrielli and Grappi (2016) all have the same fundamental claim: counterfeiting is intentional and calculated, it makes copies, and is illegal with serious implications. Scholars (McCarthy, 2004; Chang, 2004; Baghi and Gabrielli, 2016) tend to consider counterfeiting as having a detrimental effect on the luxury sector. This being due to an assumption that counterfeiting is a pervasive competitor to luxury brands, because it allows for a proliferation of luxury objects and leads to a dilution of a brands capital (Jugessur and Cohen, 2009; Baghi and Gabrielli, 2016).

I argue that counterfeiting is not only the nefarious ‘copying’ of genuine products, which so many scholars (McCarthy, 2004); Chang, 2004; Jugessur and Cohen, 2009; Baghi et al. 2016) posit it as. Hieke (2010) and Nia and Zaichowsky (2000) note that the value of an authentic luxury brand is not affected by the profusion of counterfeits. Baghi et al. (2016) note that the wide availability of counterfeit luxury objects in no way decreases a consumers’ intent to purchase an authentic luxury object. Hieke (2010) and Nia et al. (2000) note that counterfeits rarely change the public perception towards the authentic luxury brand. My close analysis of luxury as a macroeconomic sector was used as a way to showcase the expansive might and longevity of the authentic luxury brand. Academics (McCarthy, 2004; Chang, 2004; Jugessur and Cohen, 2009; Baghi et al. 2016) who posit counterfeiting as a genuine threat to luxury brands have failed to investigate closely the history, heritage and mythology of the luxury brand. I believe this to be due to their focus on traditional qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and not applying an interdisciplinary approach to the changing field of counterfeits.

Therefore, when discussing the authentic luxury object – the Martell, Louis Vuitton, Chanel or Hermes object specifically – globalisation is an important driver, but only when dealing with the powerful localised object. As the counterpoint to the authentic luxury object, the counterfeited object can be posited as an extremely globalised object.

Chang (204:222) argues that the “emergence [of counterfeiting] as a prevailing economic and cultural phenomenon is chiefly boosted by advanced duplication technology and restructured

economic system[s]”. Counterfeiting, according to Chang (2004) and Archer (2015), can also been to be a simulation of global capitalism as it adopts agile, precise and global tactics to evade international law enforcement bodies. The counterfeiting sector is a “flourishing and ever-growing market” (Baghi et al., 2014: 452). Within this growing market, counterfeits both simulate the authentic luxury brand, as well as simulate the mannerisms of global capitalism (Chang, 2004; Baghi, et al., 2014).

“The European Commission states that in 2013, customs authorities opened almost 87 000 detention cases for a total of nearly 36 million counterfeit articles, with a growth of 10 percent from the 2010 level (Baghi et al., 2015: 452)”. This was a growth of 10 percent from the 2010 level of counterfeit detention cases, and counterfeit articles (Baghi et al., 2015). The domestic retail value of the counterfeit articles of the 36 million counterfeit objects which were detained reached €768 million (ibid, 2015).

The Report on European Customs Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights (European Commission, 2013) noted that whilst counterfeiting occurs to branded products, luxury branded products were the most likely to be counterfeited (Baghi et al. 2014). Handbags and wallets were the most commonly counterfeited within the luxury branded products, reaching US \$ 500 million of seizures worldwide (World Customs Organisation, 2013). The International AntiCounterfeiting Coalition (IACC) has postulated that counterfeiting is the cause of a yearly loss of \$200 billion in jobs, taxes and sales (Furnham and Valgeirsson, 2007; Phau and Teah, 2009).

The counterfeit sector, whilst globalised, can be seen to be situated throughout Asia, with a saturation within China (Hung, 2003). The saturation of counterfeit production and consumption in China can be seen to be due to the many discrepancies in the way in which they conduct intellectual property laws (Phau and Teah, 2009; Archer, 2015). The size of China, coupled with its growing consumer class, also inhibits anti-counterfeiting methods and practices (Phau and Teah, 2009).

The way in which China enforces intellectual property laws – or does not – is indicative of their new status as emerging consumers of luxury. Many scholars (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2015; Kapferer, 2015) argue that Asian luxury consumers do not have the cultural capital or brand knowledge to perform the consumption of luxury ‘correctly’. Routinely, Kapferer and Bastien (2009), Kapferer and Laurent (2010, and Kapferer (2010) posit Asian consumers as not understanding the complex semiotic value of authentic luxury brands, often using the high-price of an authentic luxury object to be the main reason to purchase. Whilst China has the potential to become an authentic consumer base of luxury, they lack the knowledge and understanding to consume correctly (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015).

It is important for me to note at this point that when I mention Chinese consumers performing luxury consumption in an incorrect manner, I refer to their consumption practices not being in line with white luxury consumption. This has been a contentious point for me throughout this investigation as it is an observation blatantly noted – or evasively implied – by myriad scholars. It exists as a cruel mythology – an inalienable truth. However, this is outside of the scope of this thesis but is a poignant observation on the state of opinion within the body of literature.

The above statistical observations enforced the mammoth proportions of the counterfeit luxury market. Counterfeiting was posited as a phenomenon that was driven by globalisation; thereby contradicting, and almost taunting, the strict and localised authentic luxury market. Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 163) refer to counterfeiting as a “danger for the luxury brand”. They postulate that the brand, whence in a counterfeit form, penetrates into social strata’s which, organically, it never would be found in (ibid, 2009). The brand capital is effectively diluted by counterfeiting which cheats the traditional methods of luxury object marketing. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) also refer to the changing milieu of the luxury sector, wherein haute couture is designed as an advertisement that can lead the sale of accessories with higher margins for luxury brands. This positioning of the creations of haute couture as an indicator of the rest of the brand universe is becoming typical of a luxury market, increasingly prone to the stretch of globalisation. This was also illustrated through the example of Volkswagen owned Bugatti and their Veyron, which costs \$ 4 million euro to manufacture, but is sold for \$1 million euro. Volkswagen leverages the mammoth cachet of the Veyron in order to sell their mass-manufactured industrial objects – the Volkswagen Polo and Golf models.

Luxury brands leverage their iconic objects – the Bugatti Veyron, for Volkswagen; the essence of Chanel No. 5; the mystique of the Hermes Birkin- to sell their access objects (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Chanel No. 5 is an interesting object to look at: it is the perfume object, but it is also an authentic luxury object.

Access objects aim to satisfy the need of luxury ‘day-trippers’. Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 157) introduce an interesting comparison between the luxury brand, as a religion. “If it does not extend the number of its loyalists, the luxury brand does not create a religion; it remains a

sect. If it is accessible to only its loyalists, it can even become an obscure, even threatening sect (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 158)”. The ominous point is uttered: “The church doors must be open to all who wish to enter... (ibid, 2009: 158)”.

However, this reliance on accessory objects within the contemporary luxury market has also benefited the counterfeit luxury market immensely. As I noted previously, according to the *World Customs Organisation* handbags and wallets were the most commonly counterfeited within luxury counterfeited goods, reaching US \$ 500 million of seizures worldwide (World Customs Organisation, 2013). In comparison, haute couture would be nearly impossible to counterfeit (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). However, by positing the production of counterfeit luxury objects as mimicking the speed and efficiency of global capitalism (Chang, 2004) it can be seen that authentic luxury object is becoming increasingly more prone to being counterfeited. Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 164) note that “since these accessories are externalised and require no specific know-how, they are very easy to copy”.

Kapferer and Bastien (ibid, 2009) also note that conspicuous accessories are mainly consumed by young people, or people with little knowledge of brand capital. “This is why they like big logos” (Kapferer, 2015). Ralph Lauren, with his eponymous Polo Ralph Lauren line, capitalises upon peoples love of conspicuously branded objects with his signature pony motif featuring on his products. Ralph Lauren, aware of the markets need for conspicuous objects, then creates the Big Pony line. This results in a brash object – the brand amplified almost to the point of a vulgar farce. However, consumers who have a need for conspicuous branding and super-conspicuous logos, do not necessarily require the authentic accessory (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer, 2010; Kapferer, 2015). That is why counterfeits are

reproductions of conspicuously branded luxury objects. Their conspicuous nature almost invites the counterfeit to take place.

An interesting conundrum is posed: if someone copies a Picasso, then sells it positioned as a real Picasso to a non-expert, this is surely intellectual property theft (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Yet brands like Pierre Cardin or the super-conspicuous Ralph Lauren lend themselves to numerous licenses, attributing their brand name to myriad objects within vastly disjointed sectors. Pierre Cardin has 800 licensed products (ibid, 2009) and Ralph Lauren lends itself to homewares, stationary, haute couture, high fashion, accessible fashion and interior decorating, to name a few. When a brand allows itself to become so diluted it is almost as if they are counterfeiting themselves: they allow the various objects to become parasitic off the brand name, allowing for constant reproduction. Kapferer and Bastien (2009) refer to this as an extreme level of dematerialisation. It is the absence, I would argue, of a distinct lack of brand capital. In the case of more authentic luxury brands – Chanel, Louis Vuitton and Hermes – counterfeiting their objects signals a significant gap in the way in which they preserve the integrity of their brand capital.

Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 165) argue that those who actively and consciously consume counterfeit luxury objects do so not for the object itself, but largely for the brand name. I argued that the authentic luxury brand name was as important as the authentic luxury object (Lury, 2004).

The majority of counterfeit objects are conspicuously branded, and increasingly are being produced at higher levels of quality. Naturally, the more traditional counterfeit object exists –

adding two n's to Chanel, creating the Channel, or thwarting the eponymous LV logo.

However, counterfeits are being made in industrial factories that bear extreme likeness to the original and authentic object. "Counterfeits are perceived by clients who know they are buying fakes as a better deal than buying the original product (counterfeits may represent less value, but for a lower cost, or they are seen as amazingly good-looking products at a lower price than the genuine article)" (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 165). Counterfeit production is no longer the illegal production of 'copies' of registered trademarks and brands (McCarthy, 2004; Chang, 2004; Baghi et al., 2016), but a swift and technologically advanced macroeconomic.

Yoo and Lee (2012: 1507) argue that "counterfeits create enamour problems for the global society". Many scholars (Wilke and Zaichowsky, 1999; McCarthy, 2004; Chang, 2004; Baghi et al., 2016) note that counterfeits endanger legitimate markets and undermine economic growth. I find this assumption to be limited: it posits the authentic luxury brand in a position of the utmost seniority, and discounts the growing counterfeit sector. I argue that counterfeits endanger social stratification, which was posited as a feature of contemporary western luxury markets (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). Counterfeits effectively disrupt the consumption practices within the luxury sector (ibid, 2009). Authentic luxury brands are hyper-aware of the type of customer consuming their objects. Consumers of authentic luxury objects also are aware of the distinctive value of the brand they are consuming (ibid, 2009). Kapferer and Bastien (2009) and Kapferer (2015) refer to luxury consumption as having an element of performance to it. Consumers, they (ibid, 2009; ibid, 2015) argue, often toy with the idea of purchasing the authentic luxury object for a fair amount of time before they purchase it. Luxury involves a lengthy, and intimate, initiation period (Kapferer and Bastien,

2009). This lengthy initiation period is often enforced by the authentic luxury brand to create longing and desire. Ferrari has a two-year waitlist for their vehicles and only manufactures 6000 a year (Kapferer, 2015). Louis Vuitton often has ‘limited release’ collections, and Hermes has the iconic waitlists for the Birkin (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009).

This musing period for the luxury consumer results in them visiting the authentic luxury retail environment – the flagship store. The authentic flagship store represents an immense part of the grooming process that consumers willingly step into when consuming luxury. The luxury store is an immensely powerful tool used in the proliferation of luxury objects, yet this is outside of the scope of this project. The place in which counterfeits are sold is immensely different to the luxury store: they are turned into industrial objects found in backrooms of markets, objects found in the back of a car, objects which are actively spruiked, and objects which are found in immense counterfeit catalogues. Counterfeits disrupt the dual emotions of longing and desire which are involved in the initiation period before the authentic luxury object is purchased. Counterfeits create simulacra – which are “models of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal (Baudrillard, 1981: 1). The “precession of simulacra” (ibid, 1981: 1) draw the authentic luxury object back into the realm of the industrial object, where use-value and exchange-value trump symbolic-value.

Through use of an interdisciplinary approach, counterfeited objects can be perceived as a representation of the sheer enormity of the authentic luxury brands global presence. Counterfeiting, through application of Baudrillard’s (1970; 1981) notion of the simulacrum, can be posited as models of real things, which are in a state of hyperreality. It can also, according to Baudrillard (1970), be seen as a natural progression of the kitsch object – as a representation of something which already exists. By taking an interdisciplinary approach to

counterfeit production of authentic luxury objects, counterfeiting can be seen to be a sociocultural phenomenon and not simply the mercenary, illegal ‘copying’ which so many scholars perceive it to be.

Counterfeit consumption practices

I argue now that there are multiple reasons for people to consume counterfeit luxury objects.

This was informed by Kapferer and Bastien (2009), Kapferer and Laurent (2010) and Kapferer (2015). Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 166) note that some consumers engage in counterfeit consumption due to their being high in the need for status, and low in wealth.

They demand access to the brand culture; they require access to the unique signified meaning of the luxury object, yet they lack the financial ability to consume in the authentic manner.

Kapferer and Bastien (ibid, 2009) also posit this particular counterfeit consumer as a traditional luxury consumer – they consume luxury objects with clear semiotic messages.

They also may have the intent of consuming the authentic luxury object when their finances allow them too (ibid, 2009: Kapferer, 2015). This manner of counterfeit engagement is not to be scorned.

The second type of counterfeit consumer may buy fakes due to their opinion that “the price is not at all justified by the quality (they believe that a Louis Vuitton bag is just ‘a plastic bag with a symbol’), yet they are brand sensitive” (ibid, 2009: 166). Whilst this particular consumer shuns the authentic object as they perceive it not to be worth the designated price, their brand sensitivity shows their inclination towards branded objects. A logical conclusion to the consumption practices of this particular person would be for them to not engage in any type of luxury object, counterfeit or not. However, their brand sensitivity shows that they care

very deeply. An extension upon this type of consumer is the person who holds negative opinion about a brand and actively consumes counterfeits as a way of exercising their consumer power. The licensed accessory industry holds an interesting example, particularly in the case of Real Madrid and their accessory t-shirts costed at €85. “Certainly a young boy will want to pay the price to have a real one, so that the aura of his beloved heroes can fall on him, by magic tactile contagion, when he wears the T-shirt” (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009: 166). The parents of the young boy may be appalled by the price, and justifies the counterfeit object as having made in a similar setting – the industrial factory – as the authentic. This is another way of an attempt to thwart brand dominance and capital.

The third type of consumer of counterfeit luxury objects aims for a performative deception via gift giving (ibid, 2009). They knowingly purchase a counterfeit, then gift it to a friend or family member, where it is represented as authentic object (ibid, 2009). This deception adds value to the giver of the gift as they receiver perceives them to hold an impressive amount of cultural and economic capital. However, it is important to separate the two people in this gift giving exchange. Kapferer and Bastien (2009: 166) note that “people wearing a fake but who are think they are displaying the real article are brand lovers”. Whilst they have been deceived and are wearing a counterfeit object on their person, they are potential real and valued clients of the brand.

Inviting the counterfeit

Earlier I referred to counterfeit objects being mainly objects which are conspicuously branded. This being due to the type of consumer who engages in counterfeit culture – they demand visible markers and signs on objects. As well as due to the relative ease counterfeit manufacturers can create these simulation objects, in both near-perfect and perfect forms. I would like to introduce the concept of ‘superlogo’ – coined by Hsiao Chang (2004: 222). Chang (2004: 224) defines the superlogo as “the top among logos, a ‘symbol’ that is world famous and presents privileged social status”. The superlogo can be seen to be the logo of the authentic luxury brand, or the logo which features on an iconic and authentic luxury object. The joined ‘CC’ symbol for Chanel, the ‘LV’ monogram for Louis Vuitton, and the Hermes horse and carriage, are all the ultimate examples of a superlogo. They are not necessarily conspicuous, but can easily move into the territory of conspicuous consumption – similarly to the Ralph Lauren Big Pony collection, which is authentic, but excruciatingly conspicuous. Chang (2004: 225) postulates that “fake fashionable superlogo is different from ordinary fake brand names”. It is like the difference between a counterfeit Chanel watch, a counterfeit iPod, and counterfeit batteries (ibid, 2004). As mentioned earlier, consumers buy counterfeit objects with superlogo’s for a very different reason than they would when purchasing ‘knockoff’ batteries.

Chang (2004: 227) introduces Japan as enamoured with Louis Vuitton, starting from the emergence of “affluent consumerism that was proudly being formed after Meiji Restoration”. The opening-up of Japan created a “longing for western taste and heritage that can be cultivated only through the purchase of products imported from the cradle of European history and tradition (Chang, 2004: 226)”. Chang (ibid) notes that this longing for the signs of Western consumerism can be traced back to the Meiji Restoration, in 1876, where the effects of modernisation took place. It can also be likened as a return to Japonisme – the 19th C

French obsession with everything Japanese (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009) – but a reverse of the process, or seen as a cyclical ebb and flow between the two intertwined cultural spheres (Chang, 2004). The Louis Vuitton superlogo – the joined LV symbol with diamonds and petals – was founded by Georges Vuitton in 1896. “Louis Vuitton’s eponymic founder was born in 1821 in Anchay, France, near the Swiss border. He moved to Paris as a teenager and eventually found work as an apprentice to a box-maker. Vuitton’s socio-temporal situation was fortuitous, as the early decades of the nineteenth century experienced a rise in international travel, necessitating innovation in luggage and travel” (Archer, 2015: 21). Travel, Archer (2015) duly notes, was an entirely bourgeois practice – to be able to travel signified your membership to a rising middle-class. “The LV monogram, introduced in the 1890’s, satiated this bourgeois hunger for a sign to distinguish themselves from the working class” (Archer, 2015: 21). It was a direct and conspicuous representation of a particular Japanese aesthetic, due to the Japonisme effect taking place throughout France at that time. The Japonisme aesthetic represented in Louis Vuitton’s logo has undoubtedly added to it being prevalent in the consciousness of Japanese consumers (Chang, 2004). “It exemplifies exactly the ‘French-Japanese style’, which satisfies the double cultural imagination of ‘European superlogo’ and ‘Japanese nostalgia’” (ibid, 2004: 227). Chang (2004: 226) refers to the phenomenon of ‘Miss Hanakos’ in Japanese socio-luxury spheres. “‘Miss Hanakos’ created their own consumer identities with their extraordinary ability to buy European superlogo’s such as LV, Chanel, Tiffany, Hermes became the symbols of their postmodern consumer identities (such as ‘Miss Chanel’ as a somewhat denigrated nickname for the office ladies who wear Chanel commodities from head to toe” (Chang, 2004: 226). This mania for logos became the trademark for Japanese consumers high on a new Westernised consumer practice.

Chang (2004: 228) recounts Japanese tourists lining up in front of the Louis Vuitton flagship store in Paris. They engaged in an authentic black market, where multiple people would go in and purchase the same object to evade the policy of limited purchase (ibid, 2004). The policies of limited purchase and limited supply allows for Louis Vuitton to garner free publicity, where the site of lines of consumers waiting in front of your flagship store creates allusions to a place of worship. Wang (2001:1) refers to this “as the extravagant sight/site of Vanity Fair”.

Limited supply and limited purchase practices compound the exclusive element of the brand. Authentic luxury brands already carry a limited supply of their objects; for instance, Ferrari makes only 6000 cars a year (this is a non-negotiable brand hallmark); Hermes destroys any object which has sold too much; and Louis Vuitton discontinues lines to create demand (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009). The spectacle of a line of avid consumers out the front of the flagship Louis Vuitton store in Paris compounds the exclusive, and authentic nature, of the objects. This also illustrates to us the instrumented way limited supply is practised: the limited supply of authentic luxury objects creates a manufactured scarcity.

Asia, as an emerging market for luxury objects, offers many case-studies and examples which illustrate interactions with luxury brands. As mentioned previously, a contentious point for myself as author, was the sentiment expressed within a large amount of literature: that the Asian market consume luxury in an incorrect way. This has resulted in China being the “most notorious country for counterfeiting, where all sources of counterfeiting can be traced” (Phau and Teah, 2009: 15; quoting, Hung, 2003; Forney, 2005). China’s present status as the cradle

of counterfeit civilisation also has its counterpoint. Ernst and Young China (2005), Chadha (2007) and Phau and Teah (2009) all note that China is the third-largest consumer of luxury goods in the world. “The market is recorded as generating more than \$2 billion in sales a year and is projected to continue growing by an estimated 25 percent annually” (Phau and Teah (2009: 15); quoting data collected by Ernst and Young China (2005) and the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China (2005).

Louis Vuitton

China straddles both the luxury goods market, and the counterfeit luxury goods market. It is a ravenous consumer of both authentic objects and inauthentic objects. Objects, which in their authenticity hold maximal distinctive value; but when posed in a binary, become inauthentic, where they are prone to re-production. I would like to introduce an anecdote recounted by Archer in *‘Benjamin in China, or the Silk Market Project: On the Changing Nature of Commodity* (2015). Archer (2015: 18) uses the poignant example of a counterfeit Louis Vuitton bag he purchased in the Silk Market in China, for US\$49 “to explore the aesthetic perception of value and the changing nature of commodity, and commodification more generally as an object sign process”. The bag that Archer purchases is the counterfeit – and inauthentic – Keepall Bandouliere 60, which is advertised for \$1 680 in authentic Louis Vuitton purchasing channels (ibid, 2015). Authentic Louis Vuitton objects utilise advertising in an almost fantastical way. For instance, “modern Louis Vuitton ads feature celebrities like Bono and his wife Ali Hewson carrying Louis Vuitton duffels through the deserts of Africa, and politicians like Mikhail Gorbachev, sitting stoically in the back of a car beside a Louis

Vuitton bag” (Archer, 2015: 19). Whilst canny in their marketing expertise, the bag attaches itself like a succubus to situations and people, where it can be elevated to being almost a spectator of history. The Louis Vuitton advertisement featuring Gorbachev viewing the graffiti covered

Berlin Wall allows for the bag to take on elevating qualities. “Here, time is compressed and the phantasmagoric historicity associated with the Berlin Wall – from its fall back through the Cold War to Nazi Germany, and perhaps back even further to the rise of authoritarianism and the development of Western civilisation... (Archer, 2015: 21)”. The bag exists within a certain time, but also exists outside of time.

This bag is on the lower price side of Louis Vuitton object’s, yet exhibits all the tropes of the authentic Louis Vuitton object. It demonstrates its superlogo in a conspicuous fashion.

Repeated continuously, the LV logo is resplendent with additional diamond and flower motifs (reminiscent of the Japonisme effect). I would argue that the superlogo – particularly appearing on the Keepall Bandouliere 60 – actively invites its counterfeit to take place. To refer to Baudrillard’s (1970) notes on the kitsch object, the Louis Vuitton Keepall

Bandouliere 60 object, starts to take on the features of the kitsch object. Archer (2015:19) notes that the “iconic LV monogram is printed in gold on brown plastic or canvas...Louis Vuitton successfully advertises this monogram as representing centuries of *quality*”. “The advertisement is the ruse by which the dream forces itself on the industry” (Benjamin, 2002: 171). The Louis Vuitton bag, even when in its authentic form (with its authentic price), evolves into the kitsch object.

Archer (2015: 23) argues that the “value of the counterfeit bag arises from its reference to the luxury of the “real” bag”. Archer’s (2015) argument here can be seen to directly be applied to Baudrillard’s (1981) definition of the simulacrum, as well as the kitsch object with the weak distinctive quality (1970). The real signifiers of the authentic Louis Vuitton bag – the Keepall Bandouliere 60 – are represented in the advertising campaigns featuring Bono and Ali Hewson, as well as Mikhail Gorbachev. Upon purchasing the authentic Keepall Bandouliere 60 you are engaging in “particular bourgeois notions of style and fashion” (Archer, 2015: 23). You are also representing yourself, through the sheer act of purchase, as a person like Gorbachev – “a person who understand power and hegemony in the capitalist world ...” (ibid, 2015:23). These qualities, Archer (2015: 23) argues, are represented only upon purchasing the authentic Louis Vuitton bag. The counterfeit bag is a representation of the qualities of the original bag. It refers back to the original, which Hofstadter (1979) notes allows some element of consciousness to emerge. “Similarly the counterfeit Louis Vuitton, with gold LV’s emblazoned on its brown plastic-coated canvas, refers simultaneously to its “real” counterpart and to itself...” (Archer, 2015: 23). It resembles the Louis Vuitton Keepall Bandouliere 60 almost perfectly, except for the toxic and cheap smell of its origin: the industrial factory in Southern China (ibid, 2015). Archer (2015: 23) notes that upon inspecting the counterfeit bag and remarking on its noxious smell, the shop clerk assures him: “The smell will go away when you use it”. This assertion from the shop clerk illuminates the lived-in characteristics of the bag. Upon using the bag and allowing it to pose as the authentic fake (Eco, 1995), its counterfeit qualities disappear.

I argued that the counterfeit Louis Vuitton bag represents the qualities of the authentic Louis Vuitton bag. However, this works only in a very linear manner – counterfeits can turn into

second-and-third-order counterfeits. That is, counterfeits are prone to becoming counterfeited. Chang (2004) notes that in Taiwan there exists differing levels of counterfeit products which span from D range counterfeits, to super A counterfeits. A super A counterfeit can reach a 95% similarity level of the original, and is nearly indistinguishable (ibid, 2004). Counterfeits of lower levels are more recognizable, often giving themselves away by their noxious chemical fumes (Chang, 2004; Archer, 2015). Chang (2004) also refers to Taiwan's 'belated modernity' – wherein whilst they have a Western craze for luxury objects, this craze is directly informed by Japan's craze for Western luxury objects. Taiwan mimics the Japanese obsession for luxury objects. Chang (2004) also notes that counterfeit Louis Vuitton objects were available on the market – at different levels of quality – before the arrival of authentic Louis Vuitton objects. "This anachronism certainly made the counterfeit an alternative advertisement for the 'original/ official' ones" (Chang, 2004). This Taiwanese phenomenon illustrates that the reproduction of authentic objects into inauthentic objects is never a singular, linear process. Objects are prone to be being reproduced continuously; they explode as if a supernova in a multi-linear way. Debord (1983: thesis 53) in *The Society of the Spectacle* theorises this as "where the commodity contemplates itself in a world it has created". "In the case of the counterfeit bag, there is no precession of simulacra that defines the real: there is instead a precession of simulacra that merely define other simulacra" (Archer, 2015: 24).

Chapter Five: Conclusion

This thesis investigated the objects that exist within the luxury market. Through my application of the Baudrillardian (1970: 29) definition – "an object is something that is

neither a flora nor a fauna” – I investigated the nature of the object within the macroeconomic luxury market. The “proliferation of objects” (ibid, 1970: 29) demands our critical interrogation: to both observe consumers’ interaction with objects, as well as to note the methods in which value is created and maintained by objects.

A central principle of this thesis was that the object, which even in its splendour and profusion, always possesses a distinct economic reality (Baudrillard, 1970). This was informed by close study of early Baudrillard, as well as my interpretation of classical Marxist principles. Through understanding the object as being “dominated by exchange-value” (ibid, 1970: 29), I applied an analysis of the sociological phenomena that exist within the consumer society. The sociological phenomena noted included distinction and distinctive value, authenticity and inauthenticity, and inconspicuous and conspicuous consumption. I argued that these phenomena exhibit the fact that the object presents itself in a hierarchy of consumption, posing as possessing a ‘natural’ element of value. This argument was informed by Baudrillard (1968; 1970; 1984), Bourdieu (1984), and Marx (1961[1867]), alongside Berger (1995), Benjamin (1936) Veblen (1899) and Kant (2006[1798]).

I argued that the kitsch object is the authentic luxury object’s fundamental counterpoint. Adhering to Baudrillardian (1968; 1970; 1984) notions of the simulacrum, simulation, and pseudo-object, I explored the manner in which the kitsch object presents itself in the consumer society. I argued that the kitsch object “presents itself in circulation” (Marx, 2006[1798]:87) as an authentic object. The kitsch object was shown to be fundamentally inauthentic, lacking a “moment of creation” (Baudrillard, 1968: 81) to instil authenticity. The kitsch object being posited as the luxury object’s fundamental counterpoint shows the manner

in which the distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic is becoming increasingly blurred. To further reinforce my argument that the object always has a distinct economic reality, I utilised Benjaminian (1936) philosophy to propound this critical point.

To elaborate upon this principle, I argued that luxury can be perceived as both a concept and a macroeconomic sector (Kapferer and Laurent, 2010). This was explored through a close analysis of the luxury macroeconomic sector, as well as creating a working definition of contemporary luxury - as an object which evokes feelings of preciousness, rarity, scarcity, and opulence, and being made from a position of precision, skill, expertise, with a substantial investment of time and capital (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009; Kapferer and Laurent, 2010; Kapferer, 2015; Kovesi, 2015). This definition acknowledged that the luxury object comes from a conceptual setting, as well as from a macroeconomic sector. This definition reinforced my argument that the object always has a distinct economic reality.

The economic reality of the object has been crucial to this thesis, however, the sociological phenomena that inform the value of the object demand interrogation equally. By applying the concepts of authenticity and inauthenticity, conspicuous and inconspicuous consumption, and distinction and distinctive value to the luxury sector, a contemporary critical contribution to the field of cultural studies has been made.

I argued that symbolic-value (Kapferer and Bastien, 2009), which the luxury brand creates and maintains, can be perceived as an entirely manufactured phenomenon. The rarity, preciousness, and scarcity which the luxury brand manifests within its chosen objects, I argue, can be perceived as manufactured rarity, constructed preciousness, and inauthentic

scarcity. This enforced the objects essential economic reality, illustrating the way sociological phenomena instruct the creation of symbolic-value.

I introduced an analysis of the counterfeit sector to exemplify the increasingly blurred distinction between authenticity, and inauthenticity. I adhered to the principle that the counterfeit object is a synthesis between the real and the fake (Archer, 2015), which was in disagreement with the majority of counterfeit scholars (McCarthy, 2004); Chang, 2004; Jugessur and Cohen, 2009; Baghi et al. 2016) who perceived counterfeiting as an illegal and nefarious phenomenon. I applied my interdisciplinary cultural studies perspective upon the counterfeit – as well as the many fields which engage in its study – finding that it is a huge, and shifting macroeconomic sector.

Through my analysis of the counterfeit sector I illuminated the dichotomy of the authentic and inauthentic – or the real, and the fake (Archer, 2015) – that occurs in countries with developing luxury economies. The examples of Japan, Taiwan, and China were used in this analysis. I noted that China is an extremely active consumer of both authentic, and inauthentic luxury objects, with locations to purchase both often in close proximity. I noted that the counterfeit sector is experiencing phenomenal growth and development, dismissing the emotive call that they produce ‘fakes’.

The methodology used in this thesis was a cultural studies textual analysis, with an integrated literature review. The aim of this methodology and literature review, I note, was to allow for an integration of Baudrillardian conceptual definitions to be applied to the fields of marketing, advertising and economics. The integrated literature review would allow for a

concise and in-depth investigation of three topics, which would then form the basis of the three chapters. I noticed that there were limitations in both the methodology and integrated literature review in this thesis. By relying on cultural studies textual analysis as my central methodology, the scope of my research widened incredibly. I remedied this by primarily using Baudrillard as my central theorist, and then focusing on three works in his early oeuvre. This assisted my research as it gave me a central tone to the interrogation of the authentic luxury object, and a far-greater appreciation of early Baudrillardian thought. I also noted that having an integrated literature review also had a contradictory effect on the scope of my thesis. It enlarged the fields from which I conducted my textual analysis, but also limited my ability to solely focus on one field of research. In a similar way to the manner in which I addressed my limitations with my chosen methodology, I referred to Baudrillard's early work to establish certainty in the literature in which I used. Through using Baudrillard as a theoretical and conceptual starting point, I was able to naturally procure theorists whom complimented the Baudrillardian principles evident in my argument. These included Pierre Bourdieu, Walter Benjamin, and Karl Marx.

This thesis offers a valuable contribution to the field of interdisciplinary cultural studies as it applies a critical gaze upon the luxury sector, and the counterfeit sector. The luxury sector, which is commonly analysed in extremely complimentary marketing and advertising texts, was subject to an interdisciplinary Baudrillardian analysis. By also using a textual analysis as methodology, the luxury sector was interrogated in a multifaceted manner – far different to the traditional qualitative and quantitative methods which are pervasive through the literature. I transposed the concepts of authenticity, and inauthenticity, upon luxury objects analysing the manner in which these concepts are gained, and maintained, by luxury conglomerates.

This thesis contributes to the field of counterfeit analysis as it utilises cultural studies textual analysis as its central methodology. This has allowed counterfeiting to be presented in a multifaceted way due to interaction with key concepts. By moving away from traditional qualitative and quantitative methodologies, I was able to create a far more critical perspective of counterfeiting culture, and counterfeit objects. I noted that the distinction between the authentic, and the inauthentic, is becoming difficult to locate as counterfeit objects simulate the hallmarks of authentic luxury objects.

The central principles that I have presented in this thesis possess so much potential for critical analysis at a PhD level. I believe that an analysis of authentic luxury objects from prior civilisations would be crucial to the field of cultural studies, particularly as they can be perceived as possessing a bonafide scarcity and rarity. I would transpose this against luxury objects of our contemporary society, which I believe are prone to manufactured scarcity and rarity. The concepts of authenticity and inauthenticity would be investigated in greater depth, with a larger selection of Baudrillard's oeuvre utilised to create a multifaceted contemporary approach to the object.

This thesis explored the object in the static macroeconomic luxury sector, as well as the counterfeit sector. By using luxury and counterfeit as inevitable counterpoints, this thesis investigated the manner in which authenticity, and inauthenticity are gained and maintained in both sectors. The application of Baudrillardian (1968;1970) thought about the object offered insight into the manner in which consumers succumb to contemporary object cultures.

Reference List

- Agha, A. (2012) *Commodity Registers*, Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, Vol. 21, No. 1, 22-53
- Archer, M. (2015) *Benjamin In China, or the Silk Market Project: On the changing nature of commodity*, Semiotica, Vol. 205, 17-35
- Baghi, I; Gabrielli, V; Grappi, S. (2015) *Consumers' awareness of luxury brand counterfeits and their subsequent responses: when a threat becomes an opportunity for the genuine brand*, Journal of Product and Brand Management, Vol. 25, No. 5, 452 - 464
- Barthes, R. (1957) trans. Cape, J, *Mythologies*, London, UK, Random House
- Baudrillard, J. trans. Benedict, J. (1968) *The System of Objects*, London, UK, Verso
- Baudrillard, J. (1970) trans. Chris Turner, *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*, Nottingham Trent University, Sage Publications
- Baudrillard, J. trans. Glaser, S.F. (1981) *Simulacra and Simulation*, Michigan, USA, The University of Michigan Press
- Baudrillard, J. trans. Schutze, B & Schutze, C. (1987) *The Ecstasy of Communication*, Los Angeles, USA, Semiotext(e)
- Belk, R. (1995) *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, London, Routledge
- Belk, R; Wilson, J (2015) *The Rise of Inconspicuous Consumption*, Journal of Marketing Management, Vol.31, No. 7, p.807-826
- Benjamin, W. trans, Eiland, H & McLaughlin, K, (2002) *Arcades Project*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press
- Benjamin, W. trans. Jennings, M. (1936[2010]) *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility*, Grey Room, Vol. 2, No. 39, 11-37
- Berry, C.J. (2004) *The idea of luxury: a conceptual and historical investigation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Berger, A.A. (2013) *Semiotics and Society, Symposium: Signs, Symbols, and Semiotics*, published online (22/11/13)
- Berger, A.A. (2010) *The Objects of Affection*, New York, USA, Palgrave Macmillan
- Berger, A.A. (2011) *The Branded Self: On the Semiotics of Identity*, The American Sociologist, Vol. 42. 232 -237
- Berger, A.A. (1995) *Essentials of Mass Communication Theory*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications
- Bhabha, H.K (1994) *'DissemiNation: time, narrative and the margins of the modern narrative*, The Location of Culture, Routledge, London, 139-170

- Bian, X; Veloutsou, C. (2007) *Consumers' attitudes towards non-deceptive counterfeit brands in the UK and China*, Journal of Brand Management, Vol. 14, 211-222
- Boero, M. (2015) *The language of fashion in postmodern society: A social semiotic perspective*, Semiotica, Vol. 207, 303-325
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) trans. Nice, R, *Distinction: A Social Critique on the Judgement of Taste*, President and Fellows of Harvard College; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Brook, T. (2009) *Vermeer's Hat*, London, Profile Books
- Cervellon M-C; Coudriet, R. (2013) *Brand social power in luxury retail: Manifestations of brand dominance over clients in the store*, International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, Vol. 41, No. 11/12, 869-884
- Chang, H. (2004) *Fake logos, fake theory, fake globalisation*, Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, Vol. 5, No. 2, 222- 236
- Danziger, P.N. (2005) *Let them eat cake: marketing luxury to the masses as well as the classes*, Dearborn Trade Publishing, Chicago
- Debord, G (1983) *Society of the Spectacle*, Detroit, MI, Black and Red
- Eco, U. (1979) *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*, Midland Books
- European Commission. (2013) *The Report on European Customs Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights*, European Commission, Bruxelles, UE.
- Featherstone, M. (2014) *Luxury, Consumer Culture and Sumptuary Dynamics*, Luxury, Vol. 1, No. 1, 47-70
- Fernandez, K.V; Lastovicka, J.L. (2011) *Making Magic: Fetishes in Contemporary Consumption*, Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 38, 278 – 297
- Furnham, A; Valgeirsson, H. (2007) *The effect of life values and materialism on buying counterfeit products*, Journal of Socio-Economics, Vol.36, No. 5, 677-685
- Gao, L; Norton, M.J.T; Zhang, Z; Kin-man Tjo; C. (2009) *Potential niche markets for luxury fashion goods in China*, Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management, Vol. 13, No. 4, 515-526
- Grossman, G.M; Shapiro, C. (1988a) *'Counterfeit product trade'*, American Economic Review, Vol. 78. 59-75
- Grossman, G.M; Shapiro, C. (1988b) *'Foreign counterfeiting of status goods'* The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 29, 79-100
- Hegarty, P. (2004) *Jean Baudrillard: Live Theory*, London, New York, Continuum
- Hieke, S. (2010) *Effects of counterfeits on the image of luxury brands: An empirical study from the customer perspective*, The Journal of Brand Management, Vol. 18. No. 2, 159-173
- Hofstadter, D. (1979) *Godel, Escher, Bach: An eternal golden braid*, Basic, New York
- Hume, D. (1752) *Political Discourses: of Luxury*, Edinburgh, Sands, Murray and Cochrane

- Hung, C.L. (2003) *The Business of Product Counterfeiting in China and the post-WTO membership environment*, Asia-Pacific Business Review, Vol. 10, No. 1, 58-77
- Jugessur, J; Cohen, G. (2009) *Is fashion promoting counterfeit brands?* Journal of Brand Management, Vol. 16, No. 5-6, 383 -346
- Kant, I. trans. Loudon, R. (2006[1798]) *Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Kant, I. trans. Heath, P (1997[1794-1804]) *Lectures on Ethics*, New York, Cambridge University Press
- Kapferer, J-N. (2015) *Kapferer on Luxury: How Luxury Brands Can Grow Yet Remain Rare*, London, UK, Kogan Page Publications
- Kapferer, J-N; Bastien, V. (2009) *The Luxury Strategy: Break The Rules of Marketing to Build Luxury Brands*, London, UK, Kogan Page
- Kapferer, J-N. (2012) *Abundant Rarity: The Key to Luxury Growth*, Business Horizons, Vol. 55, 453 – 462
- Kapferer, J-N; Laurent, G. (2015) *Where do consumers think luxury begins? A study of perceived minimum price for 21 luxury goods in 7 countries*, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 69, 332-340
- Ko, E; Megehee, C.M. (2012) *Fashion Marketing of luxury brands: Recent research issues and contributions*, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 65, 1395-1398
- Koolhaas, R; (1997) *Delirious New York: A retroactive manifesto of Manhattan*, Monacelli, New York
- Kovala, U. (2002) *Cultural Studies and Cultural Studies Textual Analysis*, Comparative Literature and Culture, Vol. 4. No. 4.
- Kovesi, C. (2015) *What is Luxury?: The Rebirth of a Concept in the Early Modern World*, Luxury, Vol. 2, No. 1, 25-40
- Kotler, P; Makens, J.C, Bowen, J.T. (2006) *Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism*, New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall
- Lury, C. (2004) *Brands: The logos of the global economy*, London, Routledge
- Marazzi, C. (2010) *The violence of financial capitalism*, Semiotext(e), Los Angeles, California
- Marx, K. trans. Fowkes, B. (1976 [1867]) *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, London, Penguin
- Marx, K. trans. Livingstone, R & Benton, G. *Early Writings of Karl Marx*, London, Penguin
- Mathieson, M.; Blair, J. (2008) *Achieving luxury status through delivering a culture of uncompromising quality*, Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol. 40, No. 3, 145-151
- McCarthy, J.T. (2004) McCarthy's desk encyclopedia of intellectual property, 3rd ed., Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, DC,

- Mendes, S; Rees-Roberts, N. (2015) *New French Luxury: Art, Fashion and the Re-Invention of a National Brand*, *Luxury*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 53-69
- Mortelmans, D. (2005) *Sign values in processes of distinction: The Concept of luxury*, *Semiotica*, Vol. 157, No. 1, 497 -520
- Murray, J.B (2002) *The Politics of Consumption: A Re-Inquiry on Thompson and Haytko's (1997) "Speaking of Fashion"*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 29, 427 - 439
- Nia, A; Zaichowsky, J. L. (2000) *Do counterfeits devalue the ownership of luxury brands?* *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 9 No. 7, 485- 497
- Nickel, P.M. (2015) *Haute Philanthropy: Luxury, Benevolence, and Value*, *Luxury*, Vol.2, No.2, 11-31
- Nunes, J.C; Dreze, X, Han, Y.J. (2011) *Conspicuous consumption in a recession: Toning it down or turning it up?*, *Journal of Consumer Psychologist*, Vol. 21, 199- 205
- Phau, I; Prendergast, G. (2000) *Consuming luxury brands: the relevance of the rarity principle*, *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 122 -138
- Phau, I; Teah, M. (2009) *Devil wears (counterfeit) Prada: A study of antecedents and outcomes of attitudes towards counterfeits of luxury brands*, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 26, No. 1
- Rod, A; Rais, J; Schwarz, J; Cermakova, K. (2015) *Economics of Luxury: Counting probability of buying counterfeit goods*, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 30. 720 -729
- Romani, S; Gistri, G; Pace, S. (2012) *When counterfeits raise the appeal of luxury brands*, *Springer Science and Business Media*, Vol. 23, 807-824
- Sloterdijk, P. (2013) *In the world interior of capital: For a philosophical theory of globalisation*, Polity, Cambridge
- Smith, A. (2015[1776]) *The Wealth of Nations*, United Kingdom, Cambridge University Press
- Solomon, J.D. (2010) *Learning from Louis Vuitton*, *Journal of Architectural Education*, 67-70
- Sontag, S. (1964) *Notes on Camp*, accessed online: 20/10/16
<http://faculty.georgetown.edu/irvinem/theory/Sontag-NotesOnCamp-1964.html>
- Simmel, G. trans. Bottomore, T & Frisby, D. (2004[1900]) *The Philosophy of Money*, Taylor and Francis
- Tan, D. (2010) *Differentiating Between Brand and Trade Mark*, *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies*, 2010, 202-210
- Veblen, T. (1899) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, in public domain, accessed online 20/10/16
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfX>

zEwMzU3MDBfX0FO0?sid=55c70957-fa45-4f99-9b04d12725e13ee6@sessionmgr4009&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1

Vigneron, F; Johnson, L.W. (2009) A review and a conceptual framework of prestige seeking consumer behaviour, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, accessed at: www.vancouver.wsu.edu/amsrev/search.htm

Wang, L. (2001) *The Extravagant Sight/site of Vanity Fair*, United Daily News, 2001

Wang, Y. and Song, Y. (2013) *Counterfeiting: friend or foe of luxury brands? An examination of Chinese consumers' attitudes toward counterfeit luxury brands*, *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 4, 173-187.

World Customs Organization. (2012) *Customs and IPR*, WCO, Bruxelles.

World Customs Organization. (2013) *Customs and IPR*, WCO, Bruxelles.

Wilson, E. (2014) *Luxury*, *Luxury*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 15-21

Wilke , R; Zaichkowsky , J . L . (1999) *Brand imitation and its effects on innovation competition, and brand equity* , *Business Horizons*, Vol. 42 , No. 7 , 9 – 19 .

Yeoman, I. (2010) *The Changing Behaviours of Luxury Consumption*, *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 47-50

Yoo, B; Lee, S.H (2009) *Buy genuine luxury fashion products or counterfeits?* *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 36, 280 -286

Yoo, B; Lee, S.H. (2012) *Asymmetrical effects of past experiences with genuine fashion luxury and their counterfeits on purchase intention of each*, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 65. 1507 -1515

Zaichkowsky, J.L. (2006) *The psychology behind trademark infringement and counterfeiting*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. Publishers, New Jersey

Zizek, S. (2010) *First as tragedy, them as farce*, accessed online (www.youtube.com/watch?v=cvakA-DF6Hc 16/01/15)