

A streetcar named consumption, an object named desire

Um bonde chamado consumo, um objeto chamado desejo

Maria Luiza Zenobio de Assumpção Villar Laufhütte¹

Alberto Cipiniuk²

Abstract: *The focus of the present article is the Design Field inserted into the Cinema Field and its intervention in the production of props for Hollywood movies, which are desired by consumers after. The Nike Air Mag sneakers, for example, worn by the character Marty McFly in the movie Back to the future part II, created a sort of countdown by viewers for its launch. In 2011, Nike launched it on the market in a limited number of only one thousand and five hundred units in a virtual auction whose initial bid was five thousand and five hundred dollars. All pairs were sold quickly. Our goal is to understand the consumption of such props based on the theory of symbolic exchanges developed by Pierre Bourdieu.*

Key words: *design; props; desire; consumption; Pierre Bourdieu*

Resumo: *O foco de interesse presente artigo é o Campo do Design inserido no Campo do Cinema e sua intervenção na produção de objetos cenográficos para filmes de Hollywood que, posteriormente, são desejados pelos consumidores. O tênis Nike Air Mag, por exemplo, usado pelo personagem Marty McFly no filme De volta para o futuro II, criou uma espécie de contagem regressiva pelos telespectadores para seu lançamento. Em 2011, a Nike lançou no mercado em um*

1 Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio). Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1910-9412> E-mail: lullyvillar@hotmail.com

2 Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio). Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4640-0646> E-mail: acipiniuk@gmail.com

número limitado de apenas mil e quinhentas unidades em um leilão virtual cujo lance inicial era de cinco mil e quinhentos dólares. Todos os pares foram vendidos rapidamente. Nosso objetivo é compreender o consumo destes objetos com base na teoria das trocas simbólicas desenvolvida por Pierre Bourdieu.

Palavras-chave: *design; objetos cenográficos; desejo; consumo; Pierre Bourdieu*

Introduction

According to the theoretical aspect which we use to our research and to such article, the Design Field begins its constitution dating from the second half of the 18th century, more specifically from the Industrial Revolution, which offered the conditions of possibility for the development of a new field of professional activity for a set of technological innovations, as well as to the new social needs which emerged during this historical period, as described by Adrian Forty (2007) in the book *Objects of Desire*.

Forty (2007) reported that, regarding industrial artifacts, the word design could assume two main meanings. The first referred to the appearance or to the shape of the objects which was determined under judgments related to notions of beauty. The second sense was related to the preparation of rationalization instructions for the production of manufactured goods, i.e., the first referred to the aesthetic dimension and the second to the utilitarian dimension of the industrial object. According to such meanings, it is clear that it would be a huge mistake to separate them, because the word design shows, in a broader sense, that the appearance of the objects is a consequence of the conditions of their production, that is, their material dimension cannot be detached from its symbolic dimension. It is not, therefore, a question of opposing one and the other, but of understanding them as complementary of each other.

At the same time, one of the important aspects brought by Forty in *Objects of Desire*, was the historical situation where the phenomenon design first occurred, by establishing it as an integral part of the production system of manufactured goods which is native from the capitalist system, it was implicit that the manufacture of industrial objects aimed for profit for the manufacturer and that the design not only had the objective of making them beautiful or functional, but also give them the production of added value. Forty emphasized that this is what design is, therefore, it is a social practice in charge of creating or producing objects, mainly industrial ones and also the “desire” of consumption itself

by such objects. Besides, this is the title of Forty's book who generally asked us: who actually produces desire for this or that object? This notion was very important for the approach about design, because it was clear that the industrial production mode builds not only the object itself, but also the desire of its acquisition – its necessity –, as well as other symbolic notions that surround it.

By symbolic notions are meant the processes used by designers in order to win over the consuming public for something or anything that has or does not have use value. Such as, for example, the important contribution of design for the construction and legitimation of abstract social value as was the case of extreme cleanliness (FORTY, 2007). This notion was built or produced at the same time as such industrial objects related to personal hygiene of people and maybe this is the most important content of the book *Objects of Desire*, in which it would be possible to think about the Design Field. Vacuum cleaners with freaky shapes, for example, were produced in abundance from 1920 as soon as the industry realized that they could be the biggest opponents against what people called dirty. The vacuum cleaner besides being important, is emblematic, because an abstract cultural arbitrary, such as the “cleanliness” or the “hygiene” is embodied in an industrial object which presents itself as a tool to “eliminate” or to suck the “dirt” from a place called “dirty”. Furthermore, and by the way, the organization (rationalization or ordering of spaces) and the hygiene were considered the origins of beauty. Thus, it is possible to observe that hygiene exaltation was expanded with extreme force by the market, i.e., by manufacturers of vacuum cleaners and, consequently, the housewives have come to consider that it was of the utmost importance do not allow the dust to accumulate. The demonized notion of accumulated dust was a symbolic notion brought forth by the producer market itself of hygiene products, including the vacuum cleaner. As highlighted by Forty (2007), the rise of capitalism is unavoidably linked not only to the production of industrial objects, but also to the ability to “innovate” and sell the products. Moreover, innovate or the concept of the production of the “new” for

commercial purposes was also a product or a social technology produced by the Industrial Revolution to legitimize the production of values or to transform the old symbolic values into those which were interested in the production of added value. So, the design needs to be understood more broadly, not only restricted to the objective aspects of the product, i.e., technical aspects, but also in relation to the production of symbolic notions which helps in order to build it, because they have substantially changed the way we perceive the goods. There is something far beyond the function and utilitarian purposes of industrial objects to be investigated. That is, the value of use can be examined from its meanings, their functions and their visual aspects.

With time, houses were filled with industrial objects that are currently sold in thousands on a daily basis. Design field theorists have observed that the objects constitute the surroundings and the environment itself of each individual. In the last paragraph of *Objects of Desire*, Forty (2007, p. 330) has written: “Such book [...] intended to show the ways in which design transforms ideas about the world and social relations in the shape of objects”. It is obvious that the design cannot be understood as something independent, something in itself, but as a social practice which was performed to meet social demands. It is a way of working, of producing objects inserted into the capitalist industrial society. When we understand the revealing design phenomenon of the economic system of industrial society, we will conclude that it is also determined by cultural values that emulate this production method. At the same time, the demand for the design phenomenon can be understood as a social practice which produces pieces that operate as a code of social distinction of different groups of society.

We note that, as Gustavo Bomfim explained (2014), the design is translated into a representative activity both of the objects of use and of information systems which materialize through themselves the ideals, the archetypes, the convictions and also the contradictions and the inconsistencies of a society, incorporating a portion of the values and cultural events which compose it. In addition, the design is part of the

cultural creation of a society and, as such, it is also a social practice of the aforementioned society, expressing or even denouncing their perfections or imperfections.

The consumer society is evidenced primarily by the socially constructed desire for possession of what exceeds the necessary and it is frivolous. The constant insatiability for purchasing something “new”, which is preliminarily satisfied soon, generates other necessity with something automatic which is inserted in an endless cycle of consumption.

If developed especially with the Industrial Revolution, the consumer society gains greater agility throughout the second half of the 20th century, when consuming comes to mean economic development and element of mediation of the various relations which are established in societies.

It is perceived that the objects have become members of our frequent activities. The new relations established between objects and social subjects are based on the practice of consumption, in which the importance of the objects is increasingly valued by people. A wide range of objects was developed and it was available to the consumer, extrapolating the full purchase needs. In fact, it turns out that there is no longer the prospect of simply buying an object only for its intended use without the possibility of its power of choice. In view of this, the election of a specific object becomes significant, because the choice personalizes its owner. Such subject is inserted, above all, into a group of a particular economic order, joining their peers and differentiating itself from the other social classes.

The goods establish the basis of the existence of consumption, constituting endless creations which will soon be destroyed and replaced, as well as the desire for this or that commodity. However, for what reason people started to wish for themselves an object which is in a movie? It is considered necessary for this paper to understand the Production Design of the movie for the development of such complicated social demand. Objects of various Hollywood movies are found for sale in auctions, galleries, stores and even in American museums. The goal of the

present article is to understand the consumption of such objects based on the theory of symbolic exchanges developed by Pierre Bourdieu.

Among cars flying and other wonders of the year of 2015 pictured in the movie *Back to the Future II*³ broadcasted in 1989, one of the items created a sort of countdown by viewers for its launch until that exact year. The *Nike Air Mag sneakers* used by the character Marty McFly, played by Michael J. Fox, besides seemingly comfortable, automatically adjusted to the feet. Before the expected, in 2011, Nike put it on the market. Even without such automatic adjustment technology, the item was released in a limited number of only one thousand five hundred units in a virtual auction whose initial bid was five thousand five hundred dollars.⁴

Consumption practices occur within a symbolic universe. From Pierre Bourdieu on, the notion of field can be identified as, for example, in the Field of Literature or in the Field of Fashion and, therefore, it is believed that it can also be used for the movie industry. In dealing with this article, our focus of interest is the Field of Design inserted in the Field of Cinema and its intervention in the production of props, which are subsequently desired by consumers.

Objects act as mediators of human relationships, or still, as intermediaries among man, his wishes and his desires. And it is to that extent that we will approach the relations between consumers and some props of the Hollywood movies.

The consumption of props

Until the first half of the 20th century, especially Hollywood credits, the work of Production Design was called Art Direction.⁵ However, such productions and even American independent productions currently

3 *Back to the future part II [feature film]*. Dir. Robert Zemeckis. Amblin Entertainment, 1989. 108mins.

4 <http://www.cinepipocacult.com.br/2012/10/objetos-mais-cobicados-do-cinema.html> Available in: Accessed on: June 20, 2017.

5 We note that Art Direction credit often and currently appears as a function subordinate to Production Design.

present the credit of Production Design which refers to the design or election of environments, furniture and props. The Production Design embraces so in addition to scenography (including furniture and props), costumes, make-up and special effects. Under this article, the intention is to approach both props, and objects, and costumes used by the actors.

Vera Hamburger (2014, p. 46) described that props are called the fundamental elements for the conduct of the action and also the objects of personal use of the characters and figuration, such as a travel bag, for example.

The work of the production designer surpasses the function of being a mere interpreter of the director of the movie. Vincent Lobrutto (2002) disclosed that the process of the Production Design presents the script with visual references, color palette, texture options, architectural and time details, the selection of furniture and objects. The production designer creates a visual set that supports history and intends to communicate with the viewer. Ward Preston (1994) discloses that the production designer has visual tools to induce emotions and this is its ability to manipulate visual associations which define the style of a well-designed movie. We agree.

With hair tied back and wearing a black dress, Holly Golightly character from the movie *Breakfast at Tiffany's*⁶(1961), played by Audrey Hepburn, walked through the streets of New York carrying a cigarette holder and elegant sunglasses.⁷ The film was not only a Hollywood hit but also led in popularizing the model of sunglasses when it was not yet widely known. The character of Holly Golightly caused quite a stir and is thought to aid in changing views of women at the time. Holly has a free spirit, she knows what she likes, and she is very stylish. From the enormous sunglasses to the pearls and cocktail dress, Holly's look is timeless and still copied today. The sunglasses, as well as Holly herself, synthesize the cultural arbitrary that it is now considered fashionable. Are these constituent factors of consumer desire for such an object? The

6 *Breakfast at Tiffany's* [feature film]. Dir. Blake Edwards. Jurow-Shepherd, 1961. 114mins.

7 We can not help but wonder why the glasses are considered "elegant".

Manhattan, by Oliver Goldsmith, is still on the market today for sale now for three hundred and sixty dollars.⁸

The black leather jacket worn by Johnny Strabler, leader of the “Black Rebels Motorcycle Club”, character played by Marlon Brando in the movie *The Wild One*⁹(1953) has become a symbol of a generation, meaning rebellion and freedom. Maybe, that is the reason why almost everyone needs a biker jacket still nowadays, sixty-five years after Brando donned one. If you’re looking to follow suit and ride away on the biker trail, where do you start? Officially known as Perfecto, the jacket was used as a garment by James Dean and by Bruce Springsteen. Its original manufacturer was Schott, which was the first company to apply zippers in jackets and currently selling them for something between seven hundred and nine hundred dollars.¹⁰

Since 2001, the virtual store Premiere Props¹¹, with the slogan “Bring Hollywood Home”, sells numerous objects and costumes. Weekly, the store does virtual auctions and each item includes a certificate of authenticity in order to ensure its integrity. The store has partnership with several movie studios, such as Paramount Pictures, MGM, 20th Century Fox and Universal, and the main independents, such as Spyglass and Constantin Film, among others.

Inside The Forum Shops, in the city of Las Vegas, it is located the store Antiquities¹² which sells, among its various articles, props and costumes of Hollywood movies signed by some directors, actors or even by the whole cast. The jacket used in *Rocky II*¹³ and signed by Sylvester Stallone, for example, was sold for four thousand, ninety-five dollars. However, we ask again for what reason people started to wish an object which is in a movie? How did this process begin?

8 <http://www.eyegoodies.com/Oliver-Goldsmith-c-372.html> Available in: Accessed on: April 20,2016.

9 *The wild one [feature film]*. Dir. Laszlo Benedek. Columbia Pictures, 1953. 79mins.

10 <https://www.schottnyc.com/search.cfm?searchterm=perfecto> Available in: Accessed on: April 20,2016.

11 <http://www.premiereprops.com> Available in: Accessed on: April 20,2017.

12 <http://www.antiquitieslv.com> Available in: Accessed on: April 20, 2016.

13 *Rocky II [feature film]*. Dir. Sylvester Stallone. United Artists, 1979. 120mins.

Hollywood movies have a major impact on material culture of the United States and Britain since, at least, the 1920s, described Anne Massey (2000, p. 2), author of *Hollywood beyond the screen: design and material culture*. Through the scenography and props used in movies, it was possible to define a direction for what we call tendencies, influencing and inspiring millions of Americans, as well as thousands of other citizens from different countries, as happened with the author herself who is from England. Massey (2000, p. 3) reported that her book blends into the stories of the generations of her own family, in particular from both writer's grandmothers. Massey's paternal grandmother, Violet Green, was born in the town of Consett in England in 1913. For several years, Violet, a big fan of Hollywood movies, had gone to the movies at least twice a week and, like many other women of her social class and age, copied the clothes and hairstyles from Hollywood movie stars. Sarah Johnson, Massey's maternal grandmother and also from England, was born in 1911 and shared the same enthusiasm for Hollywood movies. Sarah desired to resemble Clara Bow in the 1920s and Olivia de Havilland in the 1930s. Massey's parents were equally influenced by fashion and behavior of Hollywood movie stars. Massey reported that herself was later deeply affected by Hollywood movie's lifestyle also she witnessed her daughters watching *Titanic*¹⁴ several times in the late of 1990s. As fans of Hollywood movies, this was the common element among the generations of her family.

We note that for the proposal of her book, Massey (2000, p. 4) defined material culture "as the study of how people have used objects to cope with and interpret their physical world". In this way, material culture becomes a kind of key to understand the impact of a movie on the viewer during and after watching it.

In parallel, one of the aspects described by Gabrielle Esperdy (2007, p. 199), author of the article *From introduction to consumption: architecture and design in Hollywood movies of the 1930s*, was that one of the most convincing ways to transmit social messages is through scenography

14 *Titanic* [feature film]. Dir. James Cameron. Paramount Pictures, 1997. 195mins.

and props. The scenography of Hollywood movies promoted the vision of the American society, becoming even more convincing after technological advances in the 1920s.

With two hundred units only in Manhattan in 1907, the first movie theaters were popular and synonymous of mass entertainment. It was also when women of audience began to adore movie stars (MASSEY, 2000, p. 21-22). Fan magazines were introduced in the United States like *Photoplay* and *Motion Picture*, both released in 1911, and stamped what was called the “American way of life”. These magazines were powerful supporters of social ascent aspirations for a luxury life generated by modern industrial society.

Massey (2000, p. 22) mentioned that until the early 1920s, the United States dominated movie productions on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. In 1920, the creation of luxurious scenography and rich costumes for Hollywood movies collaborated grandiosely as a reference for increasing the consumption. This period was one of the most economically expansive in the nation’s history. In 1922, the United States Department of Commerce made the slogan “trade follows the motion pictures”. Complementing Massey’s thoughts, Esperdy (2007, p. 199) described that the press was talking about the growing film industry in the United States. Magazines, such as *The American Architect*, *Pencil Points*, and *The Architectural Record*, advertised movies as an ideal field for architects because of spatial characteristics and advantages about aesthetic knowledges. Through architecture and design observed from scenography, it was believed to be possible to implant values and beliefs that would become the realization of the “American dream”. Movies really have become one of the most powerful ways to form opinion of a civilization. Such configurations were dictated by movies, promoted by press and applauded by audience. The United States has taken the global lead in creating a consumer culture.

In the movie *Our Dancing Daughters*¹⁵(1928), there are two important characters: Diana Medford, played by Joan Crawford, and Anne, played by Anita Page. The popularity of the movie and its impact as a vehicle for representing a particular lifestyle, could be verified in interviews for the book *Movies and Conduct* written in 1933 by Herbert Blumer. In an interview, a sixteen-year-old girl admits wanting a dress exactly like that Joan Crawford wears in a scene. Indeed, Blumer found that in a total of 458 autobiographies of high school students, sixty-two percent copied some aspect of the Hollywood movie stars dresses. In another interview, a seventeen-year-old girl tells about repeating the behavior of her favorite actress, Anita Page, after seeing her performing in the same film (MASSEY, 2000, p. 29-30). The interviews reinforce the idea that movies have been influencing consumption habits of several generations. Massey (2000, p. 35) revealed that in 1928, the secretary of the most significant trade organization for the motion picture industry, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, gave a speech at a conference about people watching movies as animated catalogs for ideas of dressing, decorating and living.

Allen W. Porter, quoted as an expert because of his position as a movie curator in the Museum of Modern Art in New York, noted that movies were a form of mass “education” of Interior Design. The middle class duplicated in their homes the scenography they had seen in the movies. Film studios received a huge number of letters from fans indicating the scenography of movies was, in fact, serving as pattern for their homes. Through letters, viewers asked for photographs, sketches and specifications of smallest decorative details. How many fans actually changed the décor of their homes because of scenography is uncertain. However, the desire of audience to imitate scenography from movies can be seen as a symptom of the way American taste in houses was trending (ESPERDY, 2007, p. 206).

15 *Our dancing daughters [feature film]*. Dir. Harry Beaumont. Cosmopolitan Productions, 1928. 85mins.

Applications of the social theories of Pierre Bourdieu

In accordance with the theoretical guidance we have used, we consider that we purposely imprint to objects certain meanings through their social use, what is already legitimized by the *habitus*.

We assume that some aspects of Pierre Bourdieu's proposal, such as for example, the notion of *habitus*, are appropriate in terms of consumption. This would be, according to our point of view, a system of symbolic representation in which relations of power and distinction are fully diluted.

Reexamining the foundations of sociology, Bourdieu intended to discuss power relations and, therefore, also existing domination in their theoretical assumptions regarding social structures, conceiving certain notions, being the most relevant the notions of "*habitus*" and "field".

Bourdieu took up the notion of *habitus* and developed it as an organization of provisions in our ways of thinking, feeling and acting. Bourdieu (1983) has explained that the term "disposition" seems particularly appropriate to express in effect the notion of *habitus*, it is understood as "disposition systems", because it firstly expresses the consequence of an organizing action, exposing thus an approximate meaning to words like structure, for example. From another perspective, the term indicates "a way of being, a habitual state (of the body in particular) and, in particular, a predisposition, a trend, a propension or an inclination" (BOURDIEU, 1983, p. 61).

Such dispositions or *habitus* are socially structured and mentally structuring for each subject that makes up a particular society. They were analyzed by Bourdieu as flexible, that is, conditional on social structures, i.e., they are located in time and space, becoming dynamic. Thus, which is as an example in a certain place does not fit for another. The *habitus* seems something rooted in our daily lives, which emerges randomly in our actions and in behaviors that we do not perceive rationally. Do we think before acting or simply act? It is a process supposedly "natural" of which we are often no longer conscious and it seems routine in our lives. We simply reproduce it.

Bourdieu (1983) has explained that the *habitus* produces both individual and collective practices. A system of provisions and cohesive discourse is set up to provide and ensure the symbolic dominion of the principles practiced by those dominated by each social class and such speech is also noted in Hollywood movies which produce the sense that objects are socially necessary through the affirmation of its symbolic value. Thus, the objects related to the characters that aim to synthesize the understanding of what is elegant, beautiful or ugly, for example, are inserted in the same social structure as those who designed them, the production designers themselves. Bourdieu has observed that we belong to social structures, that is, we are all agents of such structures. Thus, we came to consider that the use of sunglasses similar to those of Holly Golightly make us elegant. Note, for example, that Massey mentioned that in the first decades of the 20th century, thousands of women used to go to the movies at least twice a week, which was common among those who belonged to the same social class. Therefore, these women were inserted in same *habitus*. The *habitus* reproduces the peculiar practices of a given class¹⁶ of the social structure, creating particular codes for this specific class and designing a logic for social behaviors such as, for example, the way we behave in a certain ceremony or our table manners or even regarding our mental and intellectual operations and all the practices that surround us all the time, simply through actions.

By Bourdieu (1983), the notion of field presented is clarified as a conflict space structured by dominant and also by dominated, whose structure is strengthened by the participants and active agents on it. The field should not be understood as a fixed structure. The specific interests demarcate the set, such as economic ones for example, of agents who are owners of the same *habitus*. The *habitus* is structured by the field and the field consists of the *habitus*. What is copied from Hollywood movies by the viewers was already legitimized or consecrated previously by the circulation agents through the American collective *habitus* itself.

16 We note that, in fact, Bourdieu prefers to use the term “social place”, rather than “social class”. He considers that the term “class” is more widely used among Marxists, but often he uses the term “class” or “social place” as synonyms.

Or is this *habitus* influenced by the prior validation of what is “elegant” in Hollywood?

Before we move forward, it is essential to understand the position of agents within the field, because their operation is limited to the domination of the participants who determine what is inside and what “should” be outside the field. What would that be that demarcates the monopoly of the authority of these agents to affirm that this is design and that it is not? The field is a consequence of the categorization system operated by such individuals who at the same time work, and who are also objects of this social action, suffering the results of this action, i.e., the social agents are at the same time subjects and objects of the social actions taken by them. For example, the same person who designs or proposes the use of the sunglasses Manhattan (the production agents), as examples of elegance, also uses them. Thus, the power relations promoted by agents and institutions, fighting each other inside the field to the legitimacy of this or that cultural arbitrary, organize it and generate its internal structure, i.e., their reference codes, the values to be respected.

Other important agents in the field are agents of circulation, who are responsible for establishing the bodies that operate after the production agents invent or create the sunglasses, for example. They operate in the consecration and legitimation of such objects. Who states that the props of a Hollywood movie must and may be for sale by a particular price at an auction or store? Besides, who decides whether the glasses model “x” or “y” are elegant or not? Why is Hollywood a world reference for movies considered to be good for the majority of the public? For Bourdieu, the agents of legitimacy or consecration are the ones who operate in the circulation, i.e., in the definition of what is a good movie in Hollywood and throughout America and also what is elegant or not. The field is a social convention and a process of social differentiation, based on values established by peers, founded by rules and consolidated by hierarchies. Therefore, almost all, if not all the conceptions conveyed in our culture, have meanings that emerge from these relationships built by the field. It is the field that gives the role played by the films in the formation of the

people in audiovisual societies such as ours. Thus, if you want to look elegant, use the same sunglasses as Holly Golightly.

Our “competence” to watch a movie is not restricted to simply seeing what is on the screen, but it is circumscribed in the social and cultural universe of individuals, in what Bourdieu called a prior disposition which precedes not only the movie, but what we mean by ontological reason for our existence.

As well as in design practice, we understand that the practice of cinema is understood as a social practice, because the meaning of a movie depends on the context or field in which it was produced and in which it is watched. There must be an appropriate atmosphere for it to exist as a form of social representation. In this sense, the movies present varied conventions and social standards in an attempt to generate some meaning for the public.

From there, we think of the production of meanings generated in symbolic exchanges and we believe that the study of Production Design is also capable of showing such meanings. Using Bourdieu’s notions, we understood that the props began to participate in the practice of producing symbolic exchanges and, thus, became themselves producers of symbolic codes of consumption. The props introduced in the films become, besides a cultural and symbolic production, a commodity to be financially traded. Thus, we are faced with issues such as: for what reason does a prop become the target of consumption by certain social groups? In what ways do certain objects produce symbolic meanings, becoming symbols of distinction between the social classes?

The importance of consumption is fundamental to the development of capitalism, with the need to create new strategies to achieve ever-increasing profit margins and, even if it cannot be effectively put in practice, this is present in the beliefs and desires existing in societies. Consumption is a constituent part of contemporary culture, establishing itself as a practice greatly encouraged by the capitalist system, through which the various socio-cultural groups are related to each other owning

or wishing to have certain products that act as dispute and distinction elements.

Bourdieu (1983, p. 80) reported that “Since the history of the individual is never more than a certain specification of the collective history of their group or of their class”, it is possible to observe in the systems of dispositions of each individual structural arrangements of *habitus* for a specific group belonging to a social class. From this point of view, so the *habitus* is the generator of the taste of social class and it is also understood as the cause of all practices. Thus, there would be a possible taste for each social position and such taste is not free from the impositions of life in society.

Bourdieu (1983, p. 84) explained that social groups tend to invest in everything that contrasts them when compared to other groups, wishing to express a particular identity, “I mean, its complete difference”.

In many cases, it is easy to identify socio-cultural groups, because they are differentiated by the desire to possess certain objects in terms of their predominant symbolic values considered representations of social inclusion in a given group and status for the others.

It is observed that the socio-cultural groups that exercise the same consumption practices permanently reproduce the same behavior, which is based on characteristic representations of that determined set of members. Simultaneously, the goods operate not as functional elements, but of social distinction, causing the desire of the social classes to possess what has the power to highlight them in a certain way and we return to the consumer case of the Nike Air Mag from the movie *Back to the Future II*, for example. Therefore, the irrationality of appropriation of the symbols inserted in differentiated socio-cultural groups is established through the desire to become a standard element included in a set by acquiring the same object considered symbolically superior.

Bourdieu (1983, p. 83-84) referred to the set of “properties”, term used in a double sense, of individuals or groups – “houses, furniture, paintings, books, automobiles, alcohols, cigarettes, perfumes, clothing” – and in the practices in which its distinction is evidenced – “Sports,

games, cultural distractions” – because they are inserted in the *habitus*. The taste, preference for material and / or symbolic appropriation of a particular category of objects, is the generative formula that lies at the beginning of the lifestyle. The Lifestyle translates it into a set of distinctive preferences which are expressed, among others, in furniture and clothing.

The rarer, “newer” and / or more luxurious, the more distinctive the object is. Consuming reveals itself as a process of mediation of social relations and revealing social distinctions, producing symbolic values through objects, including the props of Hollywood movies.

Conclusion

Having the notions of Bourdieu prolonged, we humbly understand that design is expressed in objects designed by designers, but what produces such process is instilled through the *habitus* of the social context in which such designers are inserted and so do production designers and the props of Hollywood movies. Thus, it seems to be a mistake to believe that the symbolic value is in the object. Would it then be in the back of each spectator individually, in the subjectivity of the consumer? We conclude that meanings are in social structures and are reproduced by the social agents inserted therein. The presence of the props in the auctions and in the stores, confirms that the design process is in the social context where it appears.

Auctions and stores are the legitimation of the Hollywood movie industry exalted through the props consecrated also by the agents of the Field of Cinema. And why not to say that it is also by the Field of Design?

The props reflect the movie Hollywood dominance as a symbol of power, ideologically symbolizing patriotic nationality and the pride of possessing something that represents the idealized America of Hollywood movies. Hollywood is consecrated by the Americans who are influenced by this great industry and by its circulation agents who work there. Hollywood is at the same time the cause and effect, structured

and structuring, of the social representation of the American nation as sovereign and the affirmation of this social structure.

The *habitus* of the American social structure, both collective and individual, is constituted also of this exacerbated patriotism, of this feeling already imposed through a process of inculcation to belong to this great influential nation and such *habitus* is reaffirmed at every moment through each object exposed in the auctions and in the stores and in the Hollywood movies themselves. The props are heavily traded, because the “need” of the individual to be part of something it is verified, even if it is due to the obligation to feel adequate to a social structure, participating in the symbolic exchanges that other people are participating in, that is, consuming and this fact could be verified from the beginning of the 20th century.

The oil can belong to the character Tin Woodman from the movie *The Wizard of Oz*¹⁷(1939) which was signed by the actor, whose value at the Antiquities store was two thousand four hundred and ninety-five dollars, when the store’s website was accessed on April 20, 2106, it was no longer on sale. The second access to the website was made on April 26, 2016, less than a week later.

References

- BOMFIM, G. A. Coordenadas cronológicas e cosmológicas como espaço das transformações formais. In: NOVAES, L. (Org.). *Formas do design: por uma metodologia interdisciplinar*. Rio de Janeiro: Rio Books, 2014. p. 13-28.
- BOURDIEU, P. *A sociologia de Pierre Bourdieu*. ORTIZ, R. (Org.). São Paulo: Ática, 1983.
- BLUMER, H. *Movies and conduct*. New York: Macmillan & Company, 1933.
- FORTY, A. *Objetos de desejo*. Cameron Books, 1986. São Paulo: Cosac Naify, 2007.

17 *The Wizard of Oz* [feature film]. Dir. Victor Fleming. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1939. 101mins.

- HAMBURGER, V. *Arte em cena: a direção de arte no cinema brasileiro*. São Paulo: Senac-Sesc, 2014.
- LOBRUTTO, V. *The filmmaker's guide to Production Design*. New York: Allworth Press, 2002.
- MASSEY, A. *Hollywood beyond the screen: design and material culture*. Oxford / New York: Berg, 2000.
- PAPANEK, V. *Design for the real world*. New York: Batam Books, 1973.
- PRESTON, W. *What an Art Director does: an introduction to Motion Picture Production Design*. Los Angeles: Silman-James Press, 1994.

Sobre a autora / sobre o autor

Maria Luiza Zenobio de Assumpção Villar Laufhütte – Doutoranda em Design pela PUC-RJ. Mestre em Design PUC-RJ (2016), possui graduação em Cinema e Audiovisual pela Universidade Estácio de Sá (2005) e graduação em Design de Interiores pela Universidade Estácio de Sá (2010).

Alberto Cipiniuk – Licenciatura com Habilitação Plena em História da Arte pela UERJ (1978), mestrado em Filosofia Estética pela UFRJ (1985) e doutorado em Filosofia e Letras – Université Libre de Bruxelles (1990). Professor Associado e aposentado do Departamento de Teoria e História da Arte do Instituto de Artes da UERJ. Atualmente, é Professor Associado da PUC-Rio. Líder de grupo de pesquisa registrado no Diretório do CNPq.

Data de submissão: 06/09/2017

Data de aceite: 10/09/2018