

5-2018

The Commodity Club: Commodity Fetishism in Modern Art and Tattoos

Shelby Maiden

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/honors>

 Part of the [Contemporary Art Commons](#), [Graphic Design Commons](#), [Modern Art and Architecture Commons](#), and the [Theory and Criticism Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maiden, Shelby, "The Commodity Club: Commodity Fetishism in Modern Art and Tattoos" (2018). *Undergraduate Honors Theses*. Paper 467. <https://dc.etsu.edu/honors/467>

This Honors Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

The Commodity Club: Commodity Fetishism in Modern Art and Tattoos

Shelby Maiden

Thesis Advisor: Andrew Scott Ross

Thesis Readers: Kelly Porter and David Dixon

Thesis Advisor:

 4/24/18

Thesis Reader:

 4/24/18

The Commodity Club: Commodity Fetishism in Modern Art and Tattoos

The idea of modern art as a commodity is nothing new. Neither is getting a tattoo. As both parallel forms of art exist, so too does their infinite opportunity to be reduced to a price tag. The current culture of commodity fetishism that surrounds both modern art and tattoos are disproportionately a part of the perpetuation of an artificial sense of society and community. It promotes the notion that by simply inking the deeper layers of your skin or by spending millions on a painting that somehow one becomes elevated and enters an elite space, or club, of people like them. Yet, these elite spaces do not exist physically; they only survive in the subconscious thanks to the societal provocation that we must strive to reach a certain level of consumerism. There is a bar that we must reach in terms of our consumerism to be considered above the masses, whether that level of consumerism takes the form of a full sleeve of detailed tattoos or a storage space full of expensive modern art both inherently abide by the unspoken social ideologies of commodity fetishism.

By using the anthropological definition of fetishism which is the belief that objects can be magical or even inhabited by gods themselves (Felluga, 1), it offers a connection that both modern art and tattoos have become inhabited the powers of gods. We, as members of the herd, kneel at the altar of Rothko and Mr. K, because if we can spew our knowledge or even own a work of theirs either on our walls or on our bodies, a massive color field painting and an extremely detailed tattoo respectively, then we are elevated. It's the core notion of ideologies that you initiate yourself into this group of the 'other' and you mark yourself as more aware and more ready to look the 'unknown' in the eye. However, we commodify the spirit and

fetishize our commodities. There is no question that art is business and that very phrase is the center of one of my show flash art pieces. Art, including tattoos, are bought and sold as easily as stocks as they, to the generalized eye, hold no real use-value. Art, based on general societal standards, is only worth as much as it is commodified, which in turn enables the markets to work on a basis of fetishism. If a work is not desirable in the eyes of the masses then it will not sell, it will not be inked into someone's skin and it will not hold any intrinsic value. Karl Marx wrote that, "the mystical character of commodities does not originate in their use-value," (Pilling, 3) rather it is in their perceived value that makes an object a commodity. We take the notion of commodified art at its value in our everyday consumerist culture and it is only in moments with the subconscious that we fully rationalize that commodification is a product of our confined society rather than a work with inherent use-value. It is the societal expectations that are placed upon a work, paintings or tattoos, that elevate it to the level in which it is commodified on a mass scale.

My BFA show, "The Commodity Club" highlights the commodification of both art and tattoos by blurring the lines between the two. By portraying pieces of modern art history and classic iconography from American traditional tattoos, it further brings to light the ease in which both tattoo and art are perceived as mere commodities: they are only things to be bought and sold and those who buy and sell them identify themselves to be a part of something elite and higher. After all, they are the ones who had a tattoo done by a famous tattoo artist or purchased a much talked about painting from an auction so they must be more than the common man. As a personal anecdote, I can remember when I got my first tattoo (art history themed, of course) while in London last year: as soon as the tattoo artist was finished, he

happily welcomed me into the club. When showing off my ink to my other tattooed friends, I heard accolades that I was finally ‘one of them’. My experience plays into the ritual of consuming, in that if you’re brave enough or rich enough to ink the deeper layers of your skin or to drop millions on a painting that you magically gain access to this club of special people just like you. “The Commodity Club” highlights the parallels and blurred lines that exist between the two ‘subcultural’ groups of tattoos and contemporary fine art. By taking iconography from modern art and placing them within an American traditional style and context, I’m offering a visual representation of my research and further showcasing the parallels between contemporary art and the world of tattoos. “The Commodity Club” offers up parallels to the viewer and allows them to form their own conclusions or to change their own minds.

As a research based artist, I rely heavily on histories and theories to guide me and my BFA final show is no different. I found my basis for this show in the writings of Karl Marx, Walter Benjamin, Slavoj Žižek, and



With my show, “The Commodity Club”, 2018

others as they highlight philosophies of commodification in art. Citing visual artists like Dr. Lakra and Norman ‘Sailor Jerry’ Collins as reference, I used bright colors, bold lines, and simplified forms to further channel the old school tattoo vibes that started tattoos on the path of being the ultimate cool kid commodity. This show is a visual reaction to my research, it is a

questioning of the varied relationships between the modern fine art world and the world of old school tattoo culture. I seek to question what makes these 'clubs' so special and why it is only the select few that gain access.

The commodified history of modern art holds strong parallels to the history of tattooing beginning in the mid 1940s with Norman 'Sailor Jerry' Collins. With the advent of World War II and Sailor Jerry himself that thrust tattoos into the field of commodification, as before the war, the ritual of tattooing was seen primarily in Polynesian and Japanese tribal roots and marked a rite of passage or coming of age. When Norman Collins staked his shop in Honolulu, however, tattoos became quick, brash, and fetishistic. The format of the flash sheet, pre-drawn designs that gained popularity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and utilized by Sailor Jerry and others, made it easier for people to walk out with freshly inked skin in one sitting and enabled a greater notion that tattoos were something to be commodified, something to be bought and sold. The works on those first flash sheets form the basis of what comes to mind when American Traditional tattoos are mentioned: a rose and dagger, bald eagles, ships sailing the waves. These pieces form the core iconography that tethers tattoos to that specific time period, and they provide a glimpse into the beginnings of their commodification and reproducibility as, "designs were intentionally kept simple in an effort to further increase speed of application and enable an artist to accommodate more clients," (Festa, 3).

The basic economic ideology of supply and demand describes the rise of tattoos: those unsure of their fates sought to commemorate their lives and loves on their bodies and tattooing rose up to meet the need. There was a counterculture created by Sailor Jerry that served those who lived in a permanent state of danger: it was sailors going off to fight, wanderers not

knowing their next destination, prisoners facing hardships, and others. Initially, tattoos were a subversive art form and not accepted by the masses or by the fine art world, but that's nothing new and, "if you look through art history, there's always an art form that's emerging that's not accepted," as noted by Lee Anne Hurt Chesterfeld (Schwab, 3). Though throughout modernity, tattoos weren't taken seriously until recent years, the works of tattoo artists like Norman 'Sailor Jerry' Collins, Mr. K, and Dr. Lakra are fetishized by their followers and the members of the elite tattooed club of people.

Aside from the fact that tattoos are in fact art and fit with modern art in that regard, there are inherent historical connections that tattoos and fine art share even in their inception and beginnings as paying for a tattoo from a tattoo artist is similar to commissioning an artist for work as in that the recipient, the tattoo-ee and the sponsor respectively, gain both a work of art and the "cultural cachet of being associated with the artist," (Schwab, 5). According to Chris Weller in *The Atlantic*, getting inked helps craft an indelible sense of identity and while that is true, it also offers access to a group of people like yourself, aka other tattooed folks, that help to shape your identity as well. Perhaps the underlying reason that we ink our skin and buy expensive works is so we are not perceived as ordinary or un-special. It one of the inherent parts of humanity that we seek to stand out from the herd, we want to be remembered as individuals rather than grouped together and inking your skin or purchasing a painting by a highly regarded artist is perhaps the best way to tether our identities to something that helps us stand out. We use the commodification of works to our advantage as we seek out things that have been fetishized and put them upon ourselves. Tattoos, and works of fine art, are aesthetic objects at their core, regardless of the inherent personal meanings attached to them by their

owners and creators and that allows them to become more easily reproducible and more likely to become commodified as one can strip away meaning and thoughts to allow only the visual to be perceived. It like is artistic voyeurism as we can see a work on someone's skin and see the end product, one that can be materialized with relative ease, without knowing the importance or relevance of the work to both the person who created it and the person who sports it.

Historically, those who choose to get tattoos have prided themselves on being outside the masses: sailors, prisoners, and bikers and yet, tattoos are no longer seen as a social marker. As is pointed out by Gary Foster and Richard Hummel in their study, "...decisions to acquire tattoos are no longer bound by social class, expressions of deviance and pathology, or themes of ideology, but are purchased merely as commodities in a consumer culture." Tattoos are goods to be purchased and consumed just like paintings, abet a bit more permanent. Tattoos could also be considered a fetishistic charm and are no longer associated with their original 'devil may care' attitudes as they have been "gentrified and repackaged ... just as the original 1970s punk subculture was semiotically pillaged by the culture industry," (Kosut, 1038). Similarly, those who have commissioned and purchased works by artists perceive themselves to be of a different status: the bourgeoisie, the aristocracy, and simply those with money. Yet these groups of individuals who perceive themselves to be above the masses are still a part of the intrinsic system of beliefs in the same way that a devout Catholic holds tight to their religious philosophies. With the societally curated attitudes that accompany the philosophies of tattoos comes conversations of authenticity and community. Looking back at Norman "Sailor Jerry" Collins and the sense of iconography and unity that he brought to those considered on the fringes of society: bikers and sailors could sport the same swallow for different reasons, as

“... a tattoo's meaning was fluid across and within the various groups who utilized the form and thus erased stable readings while marking unstable possibilities,” (Kosut, 1041). There was an immediacy that Sailor Jerry offered in his tattoos that likened itself to becoming commodified as it was a marker of someone proudly declaring themselves. It was a marker of a sailor going off to sea or a biker setting out to roam: those initial groupings of individuals that sought out tattoos to mark themselves apart started a trend which became the antithesis of the purpose. The intent that lies beyond the ink is about individuality and a self-awareness while the modern reality is tattoos are not any different, and not above, the masses.

Minimalist artist Carl Andre noted in an interview alongside Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe that, “the fetishism of commodities lies not in their physical aspect but in their ready convertibility into unwithering (immortal) finance capital,” (100). It is in art's ‘unwithering finance capital’ that rests the commodity fetishism: we believe that by spending millions on paintings that we become protected from being ordinary and surround ourselves with others like us who recognize the importance of our self-involvement. We are like the artists that we purchase pieces from: we thrive on the thrill of perceiving ourselves as better than the common people and we cling tight to those ideologies of exclusivity. “It's slightly comic that artists, of all people, should want to be saints when it seems that saints have rarely been involved in the production of anything ... except their own martyrdom,” (Gilbert-Rolfe, 101). Seemingly the only thing artists freely produce is their name: it is their name that matters more than their works. It is the artist's name that sells works and enables a higher level of commodification and consumption in the sense that without the hallowed signature adorning the work, they buyer cannot show it off to their envious fellow millionaires. People don't purchase art because solely because they

love it, though hopefully it is the main catalyst; art is purchased by individuals to be seen. Art, and by extension, tattoos, are meant to be seen and envied. It is our inherent belief as humans that we must interact with our fetishistic society by showing what we were able to achieve/acquire/pay for while everyone else was left wanting.

The question of art as a commodity has become as ubiquitous as the egg and the chicken: does one truly cause the other and does one have the pride and ownership of being first? Yes, the art must arguably exist before it can be commodified and later fetishized but that is not the case when the artist has a name. The name of the artist arguably is more important, more commodified, and more fetishized than their physical work. There are no retrospectives of unknown artists, as only the narcissists survive in the art world. The mostly modern artists who stand the test of time (and that I've chosen to use their works for my show) are those who are unafraid to emblazon their names in the skies and unafraid to sell their works to those few who want them just to prove they can have them. It feeds back into the inherent fetishism that resides within the world of art, and by extension, tattoos, and the notion that because you can purchase this item or have this artist tattoo the deeper layers of your skin, then you are part of a higher order. The majority of art collectors that own some of the most critical works in art history do it for the name recognition. They may appreciate the art, yes, but their purpose is not to amass a collection of works they love, rather it is to build a portfolio. It is a sense that those few elites only are motivated by themselves and their heightened need to craft an identity within the context of owning these works and perhaps, "...their motivations are just to show that they have the power to purchase," noted Jeff Koons in an interview (Brookes, 12).

It is not to suggest that before the era of modern art that there was no commodification taking place, but it wasn't until the likes of Warhol and Koons that brash consumerism and commodity fetishism became addressed within the artworks themselves. They took the art market into their own hands and enabled a heightened sense of fame and fetishism. Works like Koons' "The New" (1979) was explicitly confronting the, "fetishistic appeal of consumer culture" (Brookes, 11) by placing box-fresh vacuum cleaners in clear Perspex boxes. Given that Koons' commentary on commodity fetishism in "The New" (1979) has become a materialistic commodity, selling for hundreds of thousands of dollars, confirms the vicious cycle of consumerism that overtakes artist commentary and turns anything into a fetishized commodity. Other intentionally banal works like Andy Warhol's "Green Coca-Cola Bottles" (1962) for which he famously said, "A Coke is a Coke and no amount of money can get you a better Coke than the one the bum on the corner is drinking. All the Cokes are the same and all the Cokes are good," (Brown, Warhol) is antithetical in that by taking the great equalizer that is a Coca-Cola and emblazoning his name on it, Warhol elevated said Coke into something that only the wealthy and famous can afford. Yes, everyone can still get a regular Coca-Cola but to have an Andy Warhol Coca-Cola is the elevated symbol of owning the commodity that everyone can participate in. Warhol's Coca-Cola fetishizes the original and makes it that much more desirable to the masses. The very notion of the commodity is fed by our capitalistic society that, "rates a diamond over fresh water," (Oxford Reference, Smith). It perpetuates the ideology of commodity fetishism that wrongly governs the world, and by extension, the art market. Art can be seen as a capitalist venture. It serves a purpose of power in that it controls society and drives us towards it. When art is perceived as a purely capitalist movement, it lessens the

inherent importance of art and its meaning, “If one were to take the notion that creating art is a means to surface deeper truths and insights then he or she may realize art, in the realm of mass production, presumably only serves to diversify capitalism and not burgeon a sense of creativity.” (Estiler, 2). Tattoos are existing within that same space as they control society based on a sense of judgement and either drive someone towards or away from it. It is the herd mentality as both fine art and tattoos are bought and sold for personal gain in the way that the stock market is. As pointed out by Rob Sewell, the core notion of Marxism is that, “we must see beyond the appearance of things to the real relationships,” (3). That is, we must dissociate the perceived use-value, the usability or the commodification ability of an object from its exchange-value, the value that we attach to an art piece because of the artist’s name or current popularity which is nearly impossible in the current art market as a whole.

As a more contemporary example, when Da Vinci’s “Salvator Mundi” (1503) sold at Christie’s for over 450 million in late 2017, it offered yet another highly-profiled example of the commodification of art and highlighted the, “...degree to which salesmanship has come to drive and dominate the conversation about art and its value,” (Pogrebin, Reyburn, 4). The winning bidder didn’t pay for the perfectly fine, damaged physical painting, rather Alex Rotter paid for the artist’s name and the highly fetishistic ideology that accompanies it. The brand of Da Vinci is all that remains and it is only those who are part of the ‘other’ that are permitted to bask in its glow. Rotter paid for the brand of Da Vinci and the thrill of elitism in knowing that he outbid the others and now owns Christie’s proclaimed ‘Last Da Vinci’: he can place the holy relic among his collection and bask in the knowledge that he is forever a part of the club. Even the way in which “Salvator Mundi” was put up for auction, next to Andy Warhol’s silkscreen “Sixty Last Suppers”

provides a glimpse into the inherent culture of commodification of art. Aside from the fact that these works were literally up for sale and up to be further commodified, by placing a work dated at about 1500 next to Rothkos and Basquiats creates an air of heightened artistic voyeurism as it seeks to attract a crowd of art buyers that are seeking to spend money and gain notoriety. As Todd Levin explained, "This is an old master painting, but because it's extraordinarily highly valued, they inserted it into their biggest-ticket auction and artificially tried to create context with the Warhol," (Reyburn, 6).

The modern art world is about seduction. Auction houses and museums alike know their audiences and flash their wares and seek to seduce and commodify their stock through the ideologies of commodity fetishism. Slavoj Zizek notes in his film, "A Pervert's Guide to Ideology", that ideology is a lens through which we view the world: we gather information through said ideologies and regurgitate the same philosophies not realizing we have the choice to remove the rose colored glasses of society's conceived notions. However, even once the glasses are removed (if the subject does choose to remove them) we are still within the ideologies. There is no escaping them and we, as a society don't want to. We thrive upon and within our societal philosophies and they sustain us as otherwise we would be cast out among the wreckage of a life without classified order as, "Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence," (Althusser, 109). Without our sociality conceived notions of what it means to exist and function in reality, we would break down. The commodification of fine art and tattoos are just another example of how we use objects to advance our belief in an ordered sense of community and humanity as ideology has a certain level of material existence, as further noted by Althusser.

The modern world of commodity fetishism questions the idea of an artist's calling being a sacred vocation from God as if anyone is narcissistic enough to tout their work as groundbreaking can find themselves in the art history books soon enough. The modern art world, seemingly, does not exist to highlight the achievements of artists past, rather it now exists only as an entrance to a club of elitism and fetishism. Which isn't to say that it's a completely bad thing, it makes the works more exclusive and more awe-inspiring when witnessed first-hand rather than through the lens of others. When I walked into the Courtauld Institute in 2015 and saw Manet's "A Bar at Folies-Bergère" (1882), I stood staring at the large painting for upwards of twenty minutes ... and then I photographed it to post to social media. Because while I was honored to be in the presence of one of Édouard Manet's most stunning works, I couldn't help myself that I needed to gloat to others that I was there and they weren't. Thus, Walter Benjamin's notion of the privileged reproduction comes into play and the importance of a work's privileged reproduction emerges.

As works fall into socially defined notions of commodification, it brings to question the authenticity of said society and its artistic philosophies. In *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, Walter Benjamin outlines the shift from works that could not be considered commodities, like during the Renaissance period, to the mid-19th century as artists were able to secure both their name and capital. The age of mechanical reproduction was a societal shift towards the commodity as artists could truly benefit, both in reputation and funds, from the reproduction of their work on a mass scale but the 'advancement' did not come without cost. Benjamin's philosophies regarding the aura, a sense of magical force or power not dissimilar to the anthropological definition of fetish, of works is perhaps best illustrated with da

Vinci's "*Mona Lisa*" (1503-06) as it is the most widely recognized pieces of art iconography, which is to say, is the most reproduced piece of art iconography.

Some art students dislike the painting purely as an attempt to see themselves as more discerning and cultured, than the masses who recognize the piece as the epitome of art, and yet, arguments both condemning and defending the *Mona Lisa*'s worthiness both play into the importance of the painting's inherent aura and commodification. It is the history of the painting that lends itself to being the most widely recognized as up until the painting was stolen in 1911 right off the walls of the Louvre, it was just another piece on the wall. It had an aura, as all works do according to Benjamin but after the painting was returned in 1913, it suddenly was the pinnacle of artistic achievement because the masses had been exposed to it constantly over the two years that it was missing. It solidified itself into the collective unconscious of the world and thus became commodified to the highest order. I myself even buy into the brand recognition of the "Mona Lisa" as my phone case sports a photo shopped version of the (in)famous painting. With the immediate recognition and the clamoring of millions of tourists to get a photo of the small painting, it, according to Benjamin, decimates the aura, as a critical point within the aura is the distance from which the viewer sees and perceives the work. As with the *Mona Lisa* and most other significant pieces of art history, there is no aura left to surround them as with the age of easy reproduction comes an era of disinterest as we are exposed to the iconography too often to give it much real thought: the works sink into our subconscious. As Benjamin noted, "...the work of art reproduced becomes the work of art designed for reproducibility," (218) and that is the crux of the aura of commodification. While reproducing works enables a heightened capital for the work, it lessens the work's inherent

use-value. Flash sheets of American Traditional tattoo iconography fall within the same perils as if everyone has a rose and dagger tattooed on their forearm, then, within the confines of Benjamin's philosophies, it loses its aura of mysticism and meaning: the work is no longer unique and no longer authentic if it is reproduced relentlessly.

Art museums serve as the defining crux between reproduction and the artistic aura as they serve to be a beacon of culture and an enlightened sense of understanding. Yet, within modern societal confines, we collectively treat museums, particularly the well-known ones, as mere photo ops. We generally discard the sacred aura of the presence of original works of art and seek only to reproduce them as backgrounds in our selfies or as proof to others of how cultured we are as a society because we are here basking in the glow of the ethos. We only go to the well-known museums like the Louvre or the MOMA because we know that when we inevitably post photos to social media of the museum that others will recognize it and be envious of our fortune and our ability to spend thousands of dollars to travel to said museums. We see ourselves as the epitome of culture when strolling through the sculpture gardens but we set foot in the museum to prove that we were there. The phrase, "pictures or it didn't happen" lives in our collective unconscious at all times: we must prove ourselves worthy by posting photos for others to see. We thrive on envy in the moments that we were able to witness this work of art while others were left wanting. That we were able to get this tattoo from a well-known and respected artist while others must pretend to be happy for us and like our Instagram photo of it. And it is that moment of envy that pushes the cycle of commodification and fetishism forward: we want to outdo the person before us, we want to get a better tattoo by a more recognized artist and we want the more expensive Warhol screen

print. It is the collective subconscious of forced societal expectations that we must commodify and fetishize our world and our belongings. By investing, believing, and/or participating in these groups of subcultural art lovers and tattoo lovers, they are becoming the very thing that they set out to make a point against. The tattoo subculture is a slave to the masses now, opposite of the original attitude. "It is the genius of the bourgeoisie to be able to buy anything. That is, by offering money the capitalist ruling class creates exchange value where none existed before," (Gilbert-Rolfe, 103) and within that exchange value resides the commodification of tattoos and modern art by which people hinge their reputations and their names.

Within modernity, both tattoos and contemporary fine art have overwhelmingly become part of an intrinsic system of commodities and further fetishism. This shift is due, in part, to societal expectations and subconscious notions formed by said expectations of what it means to be part of a community and what expectations one must meet. By looking at modern art and tattoos within the similar lens of commodification and fetishism, it enables one to see the inherent parallels that exist within the two forms throughout their histories.

Bibliography

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York:

Monthly Review P, 2001. Print

Anne M. Velliquette, Jeff B. Murray, and Elizabeth H. Crever (1998). "*The Tattoo Renaissance:*

an Ethnographic Account of Symbolic Consumer Behavior", in *NA – Advances in*

Consumer Research Volume 25, eds. Joseph W. Alba & J. Wesley Hutchinson, Provo, UT :

Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 461-467. Print

"Art's Commodification through Andy Warhol." *KOYAC*, KOYAC, <https://koyac.net/en/post/arts-commodification/46>. Accessed 9 Dec. 2017.

"Art: Postmodernism, Fetishism, and Marxism." *Weekly Worker*, 2 June 2014,

<https://weeklyworker.co.uk/worker/996/art-postmodernism-fetishism-and-marxism/>.

Accessed 19 Mar. 2018.

Ballard Brown, Tanya. "How About A Coke? Warhol Painting Up For Grabs." *NPR*, NPR, 12 Nov.

2013. Accessed 20 Feb. 2018.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Belknap Press, 2008.

Brockes, Emma. "Jeff Koons: 'People respond to banal things – they don't accept their own

history." *The Guardian*, The Guardian, 5 July 2015,

[https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jul/05/jeff-koons-people-respond-](https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jul/05/jeff-koons-people-respond-to-banal-things-they-dont-accept-their-own-history)

[to-banal-things-they-dont-accept-their-own-history](https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jul/05/jeff-koons-people-respond-to-banal-things-they-dont-accept-their-own-history). Accessed 19 Feb. 2018.

Cole, Devin. "Art as Commodity or Art as Experience?." *Boston.com*, The Boston Globe, 10 Apr.

2012, [archive.boston.com/business/blogs/global-business-](http://archive.boston.com/business/blogs/global-business-hub/2012/04/art_as_commodit.html)

[hub/2012/04/art_as_commodit.html](http://archive.boston.com/business/blogs/global-business-hub/2012/04/art_as_commodit.html). Accessed 21 Jan. 2018.

- "Commodity Fetishism ." *Oxford Reference* , Oxford University Press , 2017,
www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110810104638104. Accessed
6 Nov. 2017.
- Estiler, Keith. "When Art Becomes Commodified, Does It Help or Hinder
Originality?." *Hypebeast*, <https://hypebeast.com/2016/7/commodified-art-kaws-ron-english-shepard-fairey>. Accessed 19 Feb. 2018.
- Festa, Joe. "A Short Incomplete History of American Traditional Tattooing." *New York Historical
Society*, New York Historical Society, 6 Feb. 2013, [blog.nyhistory.org/a-short-
incomplete-history-of-american-traditional-tattooing/](http://blog.nyhistory.org/a-short-incomplete-history-of-american-traditional-tattooing/). Accessed 3 Mar. 2018.
- Foster, Gary S., and Richard L. Hummel. *THE COMMODIFICATION OF BODY MODIFICATION:
TATTOOS AND PIERCINGS FROM COUNTERCULTURE TO CAMPUS**. Eastern Illinois
University, 2012.
- "History of Tattoos ." *Sailor Jerry*, <https://sailorjerry.com/en/tattoos/overview/>. Accessed 19
Mar. 2018.
- Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe, "Nietzschean Critique and the Hegelian Commodity, or the French Have
Landed," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 1 (Autumn, 1999): 70-84.
- Morley, Anthony. "How is Pop Art more than art?." *History of Pop Art: Cultural Madness in the
20th Century*, George Mason University, [historyofpopart.onmason.com/is-pop-art-
more-than-art/](http://historyofpopart.onmason.com/is-pop-art-more-than-art/). Accessed 21 Jan. 2018.
- Pilling, Geoffrey. "Marx's 'Capital', Philosophy and Political Economy ." *Marxists*,
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/pilling/works/capital/ch05.htm>. Accessed 14 Nov.
2017.

Pogrebin, Robin, and Scott Reyburn. "Leonardo da Vinci Painting Sells for \$450.3 Million,

Shattering Auction Highs." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 15 Nov. 2017.

Accessed 30 Jan. 2018.

Reyburn, Scott. "Why Christie's Put a Rare Leonardo da Vinci in a Contemporary Auction." *The*

New York Times, The New York Times, 15 Nov. 2017,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/03/arts/christies-leonardo-da-vinci-auction.html>.

Accessed 19 Feb. 2018.

Schwab, Katherine. "Highbrow Ink." *The Atlantic*, The Atlantic , 3 Dec. 2015,

[https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2015/12/tattoos-high-](https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2015/12/tattoos-high-art/416769/)

[art/416769/](https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2015/12/tattoos-high-art/416769/). Accessed 21 Dec. 2017.

Shaviro, Steven. "Benjamin, Warhol, and the Aura." , 25 Oct. 2005,

www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=453. Accessed 9 Jan. 2018.

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. Edinburgh, Bloomsbury, 1776.

Teffs, Erin. *Tattoos as Subcultural Style, Commodity and Self-Expression*. London, Oxford Press,

2010.

Weller, Chris. "The Identity Crisis Under the Ink ." *The Atlantic*, 25 Nov. 2014,

[https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/11/the-identity-crisis-under-the-](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/11/the-identity-crisis-under-the-ink/382785/)

[ink/382785/](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/11/the-identity-crisis-under-the-ink/382785/). Accessed 20 Feb. 2018.

Zizek, Slavoj, Actor. *A Pervert's Guide to Ideology*. Directed by Sophie Fiennes 2012. Accessed 7

Feb. 2018.

Žižek, Slavoj. "The Sublime Object of Ideology." London ; New York : Verso, London ; New York,

1989. Includes bibliographical references (p. 233-234) and index.

