

Creative Individuals, Creative Places: Marc Jacobs, New York and Paris

NEBAHAT TOKATLI

Abstract

Marc Jacobs is a self-described postmodern fashion designer who is believed to give a downtown New York allure to everything he touches, even though he now lives and works in Paris and routinely taps into the value-adding sources and innovative energies of far-away places such as Tokyo. Here I present Jacobs as one of the emerging global tastemakers whose relatively less place-bound and powerfully global experiences have significant implications for the arguments around the sociology and geography of creativity. More specifically, I argue that the transterritorial nature of Jacobs' creativity points to a more complicated geography of creativity than has been acknowledged in the literature.

Introduction

Marc Jacobs, one of today's best-known fashion designers, is believed to give a downtown New York allure to everything he touches. He was educated as a fashion designer in New York and it was in New York that he was named 'the most consistently strong, individualistic, real, live, kicking designer' (Spindler, 1997: 11). His business, Marc Jacobs International, is based in New York and his reputation continues to be irrevocably tied to this city. According to a *New Yorker* writer, he is one of the two individuals perhaps most responsible for 'transforming the West Village [of New York] from what it was ten years ago into what it is today' and, in fact, Bleecker Street in the West Village now feels like 'Marc Jacobsland' (Levy, 2008: 91–2).

Marc Jacobs makes an especially rich subject for a case study for a number of reasons. First of all, he is an intriguing subject because, even though he values his own creative talent as much as other designers (after all, he has the word 'perfect' tattooed on his right wrist), he explicitly acknowledges that creativity in fashion is a social process, and that total originality is a myth. He is known for his self-identification as a postmodern fashion designer, and for his self-conscious understanding of his role as a cultural arbiter in a global world. All this is interesting because the recognition that creation is not simply the release of something that is already in the creator's mind is something that we normally hear from sociologists (see Wolff, 1993). Similarly, his insight that the creativity of designers is rooted as much in their ability to pick up on cultural currents and popular culture as in their own 'thinking repertoires', and that creativity requires collaboration and, in fact, emerges from collaboration, is a scholarly statement (see Molotch, 2003: 31).

Jacobs' critical approach to the concept of genuine and total originality is somewhat surprising, given that the fashion industry is where, in the words of Trebay (2002), 'a charmingly antiquated notion of fashion as a pure creative effort' still stubbornly hangs

I would like to thank Norma Rantisi, Sally Weller and the IJURR referees of this article for their comments, which significantly improved the earlier version.

on.¹ As another critic writes, designers usually tend to think of their work as art and ‘get snippy’ at suggestions questioning their originality (Levy, 2008). Interestingly, Marc Jacobs seems to share more with sociologists who write about the sociology of creativity than with his fellow designers — a point that adds color to the account of the designer here.

The second reason why Marc Jacobs is an intriguing subject is the fact that despite his continuing reputation of being a New York designer, he has been living in Paris since 1997 and has been working simultaneously in both New York and Paris. In Paris, he is the chief designer of Louis Vuitton, a part of the luxury-goods conglomerate Louis Vuitton Moët Hennessy (LVMH), where he is responsible for Louis Vuitton’s ready-to-wear collections. Marc Jacobs’ Louis Vuitton collections, which are considered a little sleeker and subtler than his Marc Jacobs designs, have been extraordinarily successful. In fact, LVMH’s recent outstanding performance is believed to be mainly driven by the exceptional momentum achieved by Louis Vuitton, which recorded double-digit revenue growth even in the first half of 2009 — while its other divisions experienced revenue falls owing to the economic downturn. Jacobs’ major contribution seems to have come from his remarkable success with the iconic Louis Vuitton handbags: ‘It is incredible that in a downturn the consumer still buys so many Louis Vuitton bags, but she or he does’ (according to a luxury-goods analyst cited in *The Economist*, 19 September 2009: 80).

While he lives in Paris, Marc Jacobs also routinely taps into the value-adding sources and innovative energies of far-away places such as Tokyo. By doing so, he offers us an opportunity to think more about the local–global geographies of the creative industries. Both Molotch (1996; 2002) and Scott (1997; 2008: 94) have written extensively on the processes that make places such as Paris, New York and Los Angeles creative localities, not only ‘by reason of local cultural traditions and symbologies that become congealed in their products, and that imbue them with authentic character’, but also because of their ‘irresistibility to talented individuals who flock in from every distant corner . . . because these are the places where professional fulfillment can consistently be best pursued’ — the result being the creation of monopoly rents. However, the focus of both Scott (1997; 2008) and Molotch (1996; 2002) is more on these cities as separate entities, and when they look for connections between these localities, they do so mainly by tracing the manner in which finished products flow between these places. All this still leaves room for a discussion of the transterritorial nature of creativity — something that connects these cities to each other even before the products designed by Marc Jacobs and others ‘flow with relative ease across . . . borders’ (Scott, 2008: 98).

This last point leads us to the observation by Scott (1997) that as capitalism globalizes there appears to be a ‘deepening tension’ between place-bound (local) and non-place (global) occurrences. There is no consensus in the literature as to how to weigh the former against the latter. On the one hand, there are those such as Appadurai (1990: 16) who place the emphasis on non-place globalized occurrences and experiences to such a degree that they regard locality as becoming ‘a fetish which disguises the globally dispersed forces’. On the other hand, there are those who point to ‘the reassertion of place’ and still see localities as uncontested repositories of creativity (Scott, 1997; 2008; Molotch, 1996; 2002). Obviously, it would be too much to expect this account of Marc Jacobs to settle these arguments. However, Marc Jacobs’ role as a global tastemaker with both place-bound and non-place experiences at least offers some valuable clues to the local–global geography of fashion.

It should be pointed out that Marc Jacobs’ influence extends beyond fashion. For example, when Marc Jacobs picks a particular rock band for his fashion show, the band becomes famous ‘because people associate Marc with “good creative and aesthetic taste”, not just fantastic fashion sense’ (Currid, 2007: 142). In the market research that

1 Alexander McQueen, another well-known designer, once said the following: ‘I don’t think you can become a good designer, or a great designer, or whatever. To me you just are one. I think to know about color, proportion, shape, cut, [and] balance is part of a gene’ (cited in Frankel, 2001).

was conducted for Daisy, a perfume he was introducing, ‘women at a mall in the Midwest were asked if they’d heard of Marc Jacobs. Many said yes, but when they were asked who he was, they often replied a “rock star” or an “actor”’ (Levy, 2008: 92). The enormous influence that Marc Jacobs has in the fashion industry opens up another argument here: that creativity is also very much about power.

Like other industries, the fashion industry is a place where underlying interests bind individuals into often hidden, unequal relationships. In fact, in the fashion world, the dimension of power relations may be somewhat less hidden than elsewhere. After all, this is an industry that is sometimes likened to a ‘medieval court’ in its social hierarchy (see Entwistle and Rocamora, 2006: 742). This point is supported, for example, by the countless references to Anna Wintour, the editor of the American *Vogue* magazine, as the most powerful individual in fashion. In fact, in the fashion world, everybody who is anybody (including Marc Jacobs, of course) is reported to be defined by virtue of what Anna Wintour thinks of them. This openness within the industry as to who the fashion elite are and what sort of pecking order they adhere to provides us with valuable opportunities to study the power relationships within the industry. This includes the manner in which credit for design is distributed within the industry, as well as the manner in which copyrights serve as instruments for expanding power (see Bettig, 1996).

This, then, is a closer look at fashion designer Marc Jacobs, which provides us with an opportunity to explore at least three themes concerning the notion of creativity. The notion itself is a highly contested one in a number of literatures ranging from cultural studies to law, which, despite many efforts, remains ‘rather threadbare in terms of its concrete meaning’ (Scott, 2008: 77). The three themes that I will be exploring concerning this contested notion are the sociology of creativity, the geography of creativity and the hidden (or perhaps not-so-hidden) power relationships around creativity. As I deal with the challenge of linking these three themes, I will refer to work on the logic and dynamics of contemporary capitalism by Appadurai (1990), Scott (2008) and Molotch (2002). However, before elaborating on these and other points that this case study of Marc Jacobs suggests, I shall first present two short sections to introduce the designer to the reader, first as the most interesting young talent in New York and then as a truly global tastemaker residing in Paris and working simultaneously in New York and Paris, with global ties extending as far as Tokyo.

A career starts: ‘someone would pay for that kind of thing’

Marc Jacobs was formally educated at Parsons, the New School for Design in New York — the school where the country’s first fashion design program was launched in 1906. Parsons has since been credited with giving rise to Seventh Avenue, the epicenter of American fashion. Today, according to the school, it is estimated that 70% of the design talent on Seventh Avenue is Parsons-educated. (Well-known Parsons alumni include Adrian, Claire McCardell, Tom Ford, Donna Karan, Isaac Mizrahi, Narciso Rodriguez, Anna Sui, Derek Lam, Mark Badgley, James Mischka, Lazaro Hernandez and Jack McCollough).

There is no doubt that the education that Marc Jacobs received at Parsons has affected how he has since practiced fashion design. What is perhaps equally important: it was through Parsons that Marc Jacobs made some of the most important contacts of his career. For example, at Parsons he met Barbara Weiser, who saw his collection of hand-knit sweaters and sold them at Charivari under the label Marc Jacobs for Marc and Barbara. Jacobs also earned his first awards while he was a student at Parsons: his senior collection earned him the Perry Ellis Gold Thimble, the Chester Weinberg Gold Thimble and the Design Student of the Year award.

Marc Jacobs also met Robert Duffy at Parsons — the person who was to be his business partner for the next 25 years. In 1984, when Duffy saw the fashion show that Jacobs put on for his graduation at Parsons, he was taken by three sweaters that had ‘the

most awkward proportions and shapes and colors' and still looked 'so right on those girls'. The inspiration was the artsy, young New Yorkers who were at that time experimenting with the proportions of their clothes in order to look different from everybody else. For example, Duffy himself was buying expensive cashmere sweaters and shrinking them in the wash. He always thought that 'someone would pay for that kind of thing' (Larocca, 2005; Levy, 2008).

It is not clear to what extent the education that Marc Jacobs received at Parsons was responsible for his knack of picking up on cultural trends and successfully putting his spin on them and thus making them his own. Today one of the school's objectives is to educate designers 'to become cultural barometers reflecting . . . contemporary life', and the curriculum includes critical thinking and fashion history. However, during the 1980s, when Marc Jacobs was a student at Parsons, the school's curriculum did not pay as much attention to contemporary or historic influences as it does now. In fact, according to Tim Gunn, who was the chair of the design department at Parsons between 2000 and 2007, no fashion history class existed before he joined the school:

The department felt they didn't want the students over encumbered with influences. It's like, wait a minute. That is what the whole industry is about: influences. So now there is a required three semester sequence of fashion history (Tim Gunn, cited in Peden, 2005).

Regardless of whether or not the school then formally acknowledged that influences were what the industry was about, Parsons seems to have helped Jacobs to become a cultural barometer simply by being located in New York and letting him use his social life in New York as one of his main influences:

I remember being teased by my draping teacher at Parsons. She said, 'You are so jaded.' I said, 'I'm not jaded. I've just been a New Yorker for the past 16 years' (Marc Jacobs, cited in Clarke, 2001).

Here Marc Jacobs is especially referring to the New York of the early 1980s and, in the words of Currid (2007: 36), its 'insomniac, coke-fueled, disco-lit world of nightlife'. Then, New York:

was bankrupt, the murder capital of the world, but also the crucible of an amazing creative crossover between street, music, art and fashion. This was just moments before the graffiti artists, hip-hop stars, break dancers, clubs, DJs and image obsessives of [New York] . . . exploded into major mainstream money-making enterprises . . . Madonna, Keith Haring, Jean-Michel Basquiat . . . Steven Meisel . . . Stephen Sprouse . . . (Mower, 2009: 12).

Among these people, the fashion designer Sprouse was especially influential. For example, in 1986, when Marc Jacobs was awarded the Ellis Award for New Fashion Talent by the Council of Fashion Designers of America (CFDA), and attracting attention as the youngest designer ever to have received the award, it was Sprouse that all New York was talking about as the 'designer with his finger on all the pulses, destined to be the next thing' (*ibid.*). The look that made Sprouse so cool and contemporary at that moment was one that 'seemed straight out of the underground, and strictly for club kids', even though his 'clothes were impeccably made from finest alpaca and cashmere' (*ibid.*). It was Sprouse who had come up with the idea of taking what young people were wearing at clubs and turning them into expensive fashion — a formula that Jacobs would successfully implement a few years later in 1992, a year after MTV introduced the sounds of Seattle 'grunge rock' to its viewers and Marc Jacobs saw a possibility in the growing popularity of the music genre.

Seattle grunge rock featured bands such as Nirvana and Pearl Jam, with band members wearing the 'threadbare flannel shirts, knobby wool sweaters and cracked leatherette coats of the Pacific Northwest's thrift-shop aesthetic' (Marin, 1992: 1). Jacobs called his collection 'grunge' that year and put on a now landmark fashion show in which

beautiful women with dirty-looking hair wore layers and layers of clothing, including flannel shirts with clashing prints, unlaced combat boots, and crocheted wool skullcaps. In doing this, he had done what was expected from a contemporary fashion designer: taking what was going on and making it look better, sharper and stronger. Two weeks after the show, *The New York Times* (*ibid.*) announced that ‘all in the blink of a flashbulb — the fashion designer Marc Jacobs, who has never even been to Seattle, was hailed as the guru of grunge’. This happened to the dismay of the original followers of the music genre, but, more importantly, to the delight of large crowds of young people who were apparently looking for a self-identity. Soon afterwards, a Manhattan stylist said that all the young models in New York were asking him to make ‘their lovely locks a little more greasy-looking’ (*ibid.*).

Interestingly, because of the look’s overall appearance of cheapness, the public had to be reassured that there was not a drop of polyester in the whole collection, that those sloppy flannel-looking shirts were made of fine sand-washed silk and that some of the other clothes only looked like polyester. Perhaps most reassuring was the fact that the clothes were priced appropriately high: these were expensive clothes even if they did not look it. For example, the silk shirts printed to look like flannel were priced at US \$300, and the shrunken cashmere sweaters at US \$1,200 (Larocca, 2005; Levy, 2008: 94):

I found a two-dollar flannel shirt on St. Mark’s Place and I sent it off to Italy and had it made into a \$300-a-yard plaid silk. It was like the Elsa Perretti crystal tumbler at Tiffany that was inspired by a paper Dixie Cup (Marc Jacobs, cited in Clarke, 2001).

In 1992, Marc Jacobs received the Women’s Designer of the Year award from the Council of Fashion Designers of America (an organization that would recognize Jacobs again in the future) and was embraced by the fashion community as an exceptional talent. Among his supporters, one particular individual was especially important: Anna Wintour, the editor of the American *Vogue* magazine, known as ‘the fashion world’s most powerful figure, one who can make or save a designer’s career’ (Oppenheimer, 2005: 332).² What called attention to Marc Jacobs in the early 1990s was the fact that he appeared, in the words of a fashion critic, to be ‘a designer with his own ideas, his own point of view and his own style’. He seemed to have ‘a detached cool . . . that comes from within, from a life, from a circle of friends and from an awareness of contemporary culture that is entirely . . . intuitive’ (Spindler, 1997: 11).

This fashion critic’s take on Marc Jacobs obviously contradicts the old-school narrative that someone is either born to be a fashion designer or not. This is partly because, in the case of Marc Jacobs, the heavy influence of his social world on his design is a little too obvious. The role played by chance in Marc Jacobs’ life cannot be ignored either. For example, even though there are noticeable similarities between Sprouse and Jacobs, it is worth pointing out that Sprouse never made money and was finished in 1987 after a collection that referenced the Black Monday crash. Marc Jacobs, by contrast, became fashionable in a period of increasing affluence when there was a sufficient number of young people who could spend thousands of dollars on, for example, shrunken cashmere sweaters.

Marc Jacobs was in a sense the product of the New York City of the early 1980s, a period just before the creative milieu (that Sprouse was part of and Jacobs was observing first-hand) shifted from being a tightly knit counterculture to something entirely different, as its members from Madonna to graffiti artist Jean-Michel Basquiat became, in the words of Mower (2009: 12), ‘mainstream money-making enterprises’. Stephen Sprouse turned out to be a little too early to turn his fame into a money-making machine,

2 Even today, Marc Jacobs still acknowledges that his work is often influenced by what Anna Wintour tells him ‘in broad strokes’. Apparently he tells her what he is thinking about. Once Anna Wintour’s approval has been secured, then Marc Jacobs goes ahead and finalizes his look (Oppenheimer, 2005).

but Marc Jacobs, who learned from Sprouse how to be receptive to themes and images from popular culture, timed his career exactly right.

Marc Jacobs becomes a global tastemaker

In 1997, Marc Jacobs was already famous for the ‘individualistic, hip, detached cool’ signature that he adopted when he took the thrift-shop aesthetic from Seattle and gave it a New York allure. That same year he was asked (reportedly after Bernard Arnault, chairman of LVMH, had sought the advice of Anna Wintour) whether he would like to be the head designer of either Christian Dior or Givenchy. Both brands were part of LVMH, which also had Louis Vuitton under its umbrella — a legendary French luggage maker, whose transformation into a broad-based luxury-goods company is considered to be one of the great marketing success stories of the twentieth century. Since Jacobs did not want to follow another designer, he refused to head the design teams at either Dior or Givenchy and instead suggested that he should work for Louis Vuitton. At that time, Louis Vuitton was offering bags, suitcases, scarves and other accessories, and the management of the company was wary of further broadening its product line (Toy, 1996). However, Marc Jacobs not only managed to convince LVMH to let him start expensive ready-to-wear collections for both women and men at Louis Vuitton, but also negotiated for LVMH to finance his own lines in New York. As part of the agreement, LVMH provided US \$140,000 for Jacobs to open his Mercer Street store in New York.³

When Marc Jacobs first started to work for Louis Vuitton, he was reported to have hidden the legendary LV logos of the luggage maker beneath buttons, hems and soles of shoes. Over time, he came to embrace the logo and, in 2000, became so comfortable with it that *Vogue* magazine reported that Jacobs had taken the house’s signature and ‘gone native’ — something that turned out to be a smart commercial move. A few years later, *Fortune* magazine would estimate that Jacobs had quadrupled the brand’s sales, from US \$1.2 billion in 1998 to US \$4.8 billion in 2006, while maintaining profits at 40%.

This commercial success can be ascribed in particular to a number of expensive handbags that Jacobs had designed in cooperation with other designers and artists. Here, one of his talents turned out to be an understanding of the increasing importance of accessories in fashion, especially handbags and shoes. This, by the way, continues to be the case, and is now understood by all designers. In 2006, a fashion critic wrote that handbags seemed to have become more important than clothes:

In some instances, as at the Christian Lacroix show . . . this point was put across so baldly that each model sashayed down a vivid green runway, stopped for the cameras and then, apparently as instructed, awkwardly held out her purse (Trebay, 2006: 1).

It was also clear that Jacobs had a talent for knowing exactly when the complementary talents of others might meld with his own to create something altogether new. The graffiti bag — his collaboration with Stephen Sprouse — sold so well in 2001 that it was launched again in 2006 and is still being advertised in fashion magazines. Similarly, Takashi Murakami of Tokyo contributed his pop art to the bags and in 2008 famously interspersed Vuitton’s monogram with a camouflage print. Richard Prince of New York collaborated with Marc Jacobs for Vuitton’s Spring 2008 collection, the inspiration partly coming from his nurse paintings.⁴ These collaborations created such a global stir that it is now reported that every Japanese schoolgirl’s ambition is to own a Vuitton bag (Toy, 1996).

3 Today LVMH owns 96% of Marc Jacobs International (which now includes the Marc Jacobs Collection and his less expensive secondary line Marc by Marc Jacobs, as well as Little Marc, a children’s line) and has a one-third stake in the Marc Jacobs trademark.

4 It should be noted that Marc Jacobs is by no means the first fashion designer to collaborate with artists. For example, Schiaparelli collaborated with Salvador Dali, Jean Cocteau and Man Ray as early as 1936 (see Blum, 2004).

[A]t this point one would have to go a long way to find anyone immune to the special, socially elevating effects of hauling an LV monogram around . . . What it is all about . . . is selling consumers on the dream that in a handbag can be found the secret to having a life more glamorous, dimensioned and storybook than one's own (Trebay, 2006: 1).

The idea at Louis Vuitton seems to be the creation of 'the most startling and memorable images, the ones that will be most often reproduced, most copied and that will, ultimately, sell the most'. This is because:

Strong brands need billboards . . . that is precisely the trick Marc Jacobs has pulled off in the nearly 10 years . . . at Louis Vuitton. The proof can be found at the label's flagship store on the Champs-Élysées. On most any day you can find a big crowd lining up behind velvet ropes there, waiting to get inside . . . (*ibid.*).

Louis Vuitton is a strong brand, which is part of one of the most powerful conglomerates in fashion: LVMH, whose perfumes include Christian Dior, Kenzo and Givenchy; whose watches include TAG Heuer, Hublot and Zenith; whose wines and spirits include Dom Perignon, Krug, Hennessy and Belvedere and whose retail outlets include DFS, Sephora and Le Bon Marché. The group also controls various clothing lines, including Fendi (Italian with German designer Karl Lagerfeld), Donna Karan (American with New Yorker designer Donna Karan), Givenchy (French with Italian designer Riccardo Tisci), Berluti (Italian with Italian designer Olga Berluti), Pucci (Italian with British designer Matthew Williamson), Loewe (Spanish with British designer Stuart Vevers) and Kenzo (Japanese with Italian designer Antonio Marras).

LVMH (whose retail network consisted of 1,025 stores as of June 2008) reported almost 17.2 billion euros in revenue in 2008, a large share coming from its fashion and leather goods category.⁵ Among all the firms under the LVMH umbrella, the group's performance is believed to be driven mainly by the momentum achieved by Louis Vuitton (with a total of 405 stores), which recorded double-digit revenue growth even in the first half of 2009, when its other divisions experienced revenue falls as a result of the economic downturn.

What is interesting about LVMH is that, even though it is an important part of the cultural economy of Paris, it is now so global in scale and scope that it does not exactly fit into the picture drawn by Scott (1997: 330):

The cultural economy of Paris, by contrast [with Los Angeles] is very much focused on the production of luxury articles for a more select clientele. It draws on a long tradition of superior craftsmanship and artistry . . . and, unlike the case of Los Angeles, the concessions that it occasionally makes to everyday commercial values tend to be signs of failure rather than success.

Louis Vuitton seems to be proud that owning an LV bag is now the dream of every Japanese girl. According to the group's annual reports, its Chinese clientele is already Louis Vuitton's third largest. It is thus no wonder that Marc Jacobs does not see his role at Louis Vuitton as being, in the words of Drake (2006: 2), a 'purveyor of grand wardrobes for elegant ladies'. Instead, he regards himself as a cultural arbiter, a global tastemaker, as someone who can create 'an aura of sex appeal, glamour and even fame that is potentially accessible to all' (*ibid.*). All this is consistent with the fact that he belongs to a generation of designers who see it as part of their role to break down the barriers between high society and the rest, between high culture and low culture and between formerly distinct categories of cultural creation such as fashion, design,

5 Marc Jacobs' own business, mostly owned by Louis Vuitton, is not small either. In 2005, Marc Jacobs International is said to have had about US \$400 million in sales from Marc Jacobs boutiques in the United States and abroad. In 2008, Marc Jacobs stores could be found in Europe, the Middle East and especially in Asia: there were 46 Marc Jacobs stores in Japan alone.

painting, music, and perhaps in the case of graffiti, criminality.⁶ Many of these designers identify themselves as postmodern, which, among other things, seems to refer to their conviction that, in today's world, both the consumers' sense of who they are, and the designers' sense of what their creativity is for, are somewhat undetermined. On the consumer's side, there is the belief that it is possible to be upwardly mobile and to move from one class to another, and that the first step is 'to look the part', something which is proved by:

all these cute-enough twenty-something girls who . . . show up on publicists' guest lists for events around town, where they have their pictures taken in borrowed clothes and subsequently declare themselves socialites (Belcove, 2007: 32).

On the fashion designers' side, there is now an understanding that designers, painters, actors, musicians and other creative people (as well as celebrities) are entitled to freely move into each other's areas, in the process routinely tapping into the knowledge, creativity and ability of others, either through formal collaboration or informal 'remastery':

That is what creativity is: you use people to open doors that are your own. You do not copy other people, but they make things accessible within you (Loulou de la Falaise, cited in Drake, 2006: 146).

The next two sections of this article build on these last points and discuss them under the headings of the sociology of creativity and the geography of creativity. Collectively, these two sections point to the importance of broad creative networks and expand upon the following observation of Scott (1997: 334):

[The success of many cities], then, depends not only upon their ability to tap deeply into local sources of value-adding externalities and innovative energy, but also to project their outputs onto national and international markets and to ensure that they can negotiate their way through a variety of cultural barriers in different parts of the world.

But what is missing here is the possibility of these cities tapping into each other's sources and value-adding externalities even before they have produced outputs to be projected onto markets other than their own. Could it be that in today's world, where 'an altogether new condition of neighborliness' exists (Appadurai, 1990: 2), creative places also collaborate — as creative people do? If so, does the manner in which the value-adding externalities and innovative energies of Paris, New York, London and Tokyo are being combined suggest one transterritorial place of fashion? Could it be that the creative powers of individual cities are increasingly emerging from these collaborations, and that the monopoly rents created in them are increasingly collected by corporations such as LVMH? In the rest of the article, these questions will be of primary interest.

The sociology of creativity

Marc Jacobs is said to start the design process with an idea that usually reflects a current obsession of his (something, for example, inspired by the works of art that he collects — by Andy Warhol, Francis Picabia, Georges Braque, John Currin, Elizabeth Peyton, David Hockney, Ed Ruscha and Richard Prince). But afterwards, at his design studios, he then surrounds himself with the other designers who work for him and waits for the collaboration process to incrementally conceal the original source of his idea (Levy, 2008). It is from this collaboration that a collection is expected to come together: 'in fits

6 Marc Jacobs calls this 'a sort of anti-snobism snobism' (cited in Clarke, 2001).

and starts' — even though there is no guarantee that it will actually come together (*ibid.*: 96). In the meantime, there are also the fabric suppliers, fitters, tailors, craftspeople, stylists, fashion editors, fashion critics and many others with whom he collaborates and from whom he receives scrutiny, peer review and, hopefully, approval.

During many interviews, Marc Jacobs has repeatedly told journalists that he has never done a thing by himself (cited in Rickey, 2008). Of course, this is partly his way of giving credit to his design team and acknowledging the earlier fashion designers, painters and musicians who have inspired him, the fabric suppliers and tailors who have helped him to translate his concept into a product, the stylists who have helped him put a 'look' together, as well as the fashion editors and critics who have validated the worth of the end result again and again over the years. Alternatively, we can also interpret his statement as something more than a simple expression of gratitude and praise, and find in it echoes of Bourdieu's (1971: 185) description of 'the creative project as . . . an adjustment between determinism and a determination'.

Popular fashion literature gives the impression that this latter interpretation is not too far-fetched. For example, the comment by fashion critic Spindler (1997: 11) that was mentioned earlier, that Marc Jacobs' individualistic signature 'comes from within, from a life, from a circle of friends and from an awareness of contemporary culture that is entirely . . . intuitive' clearly tries to balance the influences of the social environment (that which comes from 'a life', 'a circle of friends', 'the contemporary culture') and individual creativity (that which comes from 'within'— 'intuitively'), as in Bourdieu (1971).

Over the years, Marc Jacobs himself has also expressed ideas on social networks and collaboration that seem to indicate that he understands that, as Wolff (1993) puts it, individuality is constructed in socialization. Moreover, he frames this within the context of postmodernism, and in doing so he echoes Baudrillard (1983: 133) that:

[the postmodern man] can no longer produce the limits of his own being, can no longer play nor stage himself, can no longer produce himself as mirror. He is now only a pure screen, a switching center for all the networks of influence.

For example, in 2002, Marc Jacobs told a fashion critic from the *The New York Times* that someone would have to be out of his mind to think that he could do 'all this alone'. He was reportedly referring to one of the most common misconceptions about the design-intensive segment of the fashion industry: that fashion is the product of purely creative effort by a single designer inventing a 'look'. Jacobs added that, in fact, the old-school narrative of 'I just took a trip to India, and the colors and the spices and the sky and the seashells on the beaches inspired my new collection' was 'kind of ridiculous' (Trebay, 2002: 8). The interview focused on an earlier claim by Oscar de la Renta, another well-known fashion designer, that Marc Jacobs had plagiarized one of his coats from 1967. Jacobs' reaction was that this was an instance of his love of referential material; and the fashion critic not only understood Jacobs' point of view but also went so far as to ridicule Oscar de la Renta for not keeping up with the times: Was it possible that 'Oscar de la Renta . . . may have missed school on the day when the key chapters on postmodernism were being assigned?' (*ibid.*).

One of the two primary points made here, by both Marc Jacobs and the fashion critic Trebay, is that an over-emphasis on individual creativity is misleading because it ignores the process of designing, which always involves many others. The second point is that in today's postmodern world, approaches to fashion design draw as much on popular culture as on individual creativity. In fact, the whole idea today is to find a new aesthetic by incorporating elements from previous traditions, other designers and from popular culture. Jameson (1984: 68) calls this new aesthetic mode 'pastiche'. In music, it is called 'sampling' — reusing what has already been created with the claim of fundamental and significant reinterpretation — and is considered a distinctive creative practice. After all, in this 'age of image saturation and appropriation', where 'some of the most interesting

and widely accepted forms of creative act involve recycling', every design necessarily refers to earlier designs — with the reference being 'sort of lost and not in your face' (Trebay, 2002: 8). Therefore, from this perspective, Oscar de la Renta's claim that Marc Jacobs had plagiarized one of his coats from 1967 had no validity — and not merely because the copy was not identical. In fact, 'a bald copy might have been even wittier' (*ibid.*).

In practice, when applied to fashion, a postmodern approach entails a significant amount of mixing and matching of what were formerly distinct categories — something that is consistent with the underlying belief that, in a postmodern society, people's sense of who they are floats around in a state of potential (if not actual) change (Bauman, 1992), and that it is possible to move from one class to another. In this context, fashion is an eclectic free-for-all, a 'carnival of signs', where anything and everything is up for grabs in . . . the 'supermarket of style' (Tseñlon, 1995 and Polhemus, 1995, cited in Sweetman, 2007: 292).

The idea that anything and everything is up for grabs is believed to turn consumption into a creative process. Today's postmodern marketing paradigm declares that market power produces the freedom for consumers to construct themselves according to any imaginable design through commodities. Imagination is no longer the talent of only the designers but also of consumers themselves who author, imagine and design their own worlds, experiencing consumption as 'a volitional site of self-creation' (Holt, 2002: 82).

However, even when consumers 'author' their own lives, they are still in constant need of some 'ghostwriting' help from designers such as Marc Jacobs, who are expected to stimulate consumers' imagination, inspire and provoke, and help them interpret the world that surrounds them (Holt, 2002: 87). A number of social critics have called attention to the possibility that these postmodern approaches to fashion and marketing are all about creating illusions about the notion of a consumer (as well as illusions for the consumer): the subtle distortions associated with the postmodern interpretations of fashion and marketing make consumers believe that they are 'real social agents', when, in fact, they are at best 'choosers' (Appadurai, 1990: 16). Appadurai (*ibid.*) calls this 'the fetishism of the consumer'.

Marc Jacobs is reported to be especially good at stimulating consumers' imagination and he seems to be doing this by turning his eye and hand to an idea, and by making it, in the words of Drake (2006), 'non-negotiable', so that after a while only his vision remains. For example, neither Marc Jacobs nor Stephen Sprouse were the first to come up with the idea of the commodification of graffiti. In the mid-1980s, paintings by graffiti artists were already selling for thousands of dollars. What Marc Jacobs did in 2002, when he used graffiti by Stephen Sprouse on Louis Vuitton bags, was to make it a blockbuster.

The geography of creativity

Marc Jacobs' New York connections are obvious. In the early 1980s, his social environment famously consisted of a group of creative people from downtown New York who, in the words of Currid (2007), counted on the collision of cultures to stimulate their creativity. In later years, Jacobs' social world included, among others, his business partner Robert Duffy, painter Richard Prince, fashion editor Anna Wintour and many others. These people also have strong associations with New York (the New York of a later, more moneyed era) — the New York connection even being true of the Japanese artist Takashi Murakami, who runs a major art production business with offices and studios not only in Tokyo but also in Queens, New York.

Still, the belief that Jacobs gives everything he designs a downtown New York allure requires some scrutiny. In fact, what Scott (2008: 77) observes about creativity in general is also valid here: the notion of the 'downtown New York allure' is 'rather threadbare in terms of its concrete meaning'. For example, it is worth remembering that Marc Jacobs'

biggest break, his now landmark grunge collection of 1992, was more closely related to the thrift-shop esthetic of Seattle, a city that Jacobs had never visited, than it was to New York. Could it be that, as Drake (2003) suggests, designers deal with subjective, imagined or constructed localities that are as important as, if not more important than, the real or objective locality? And if so, to what extent does this support what Appadurai (1990) calls 'the fetishism of the locality'?

Paris is also now in the picture — the city that Marc Jacobs moved to in 1997. He had first visited Paris when he was seventeen and had 'cried like a baby' on the plane home because he felt so sure that he was meant to be a Parisian (Levy, 2008: 97).⁷ Since then, Marc Jacobs has only visited his Manhattan office for about five weeks before each New York show, and seems to prefer the less intense life of Paris:

I always get this certain anxiety when I'm in New York . . . I start hyperventilating. How can you stay on top of the art scene and what's on TV, and read all the books? In New York, I just feel paralyzed by all that I'm missing. I don't feel like that as much in Paris. It's healthier for me (Larocca, 2005).

It seems that while an army of aspiring cultural arbiters are still counting on the collision of cultures in New York to stimulate their creativity, this may not necessarily be the case for those who have already arrived. Once you become a global tastemaker, people come to you wherever you are: your social networks are no longer as grounded in particular places. In addition to New York, there are also Paris and Tokyo, and many other global cities — as well as the first-class cabins of planes flying between these cities. (In fact, a couple of New York fashion designers famously started their careers by passing a note to the editor of *Vogue* magazine during a flight).

To what extent does Jacobs need Paris? For someone who finds the old-school narrative of visiting a place and being inspired by it 'kind of ridiculous', probably not much. Of course he needs the fabric suppliers, fitters, tailors, craftsmen, stylists, fashion editors and fashion critics whom he collaborates with, and many of them are in Paris — but increasingly not all of them. The Italian craftsmen and the Japanese artists would visit Jacobs' studio regardless of where it was located. After all, Jacobs' studio is 'a lab where billions are made' (Prigent, 2008). For example, Jacobs' collaboration with Takashi Murakami, the collaboration that has probably generated the most interest, started in neither Paris nor New York, but rather in cyberspace:

When I first saw Takashi Murakami's work . . . I thought, I would love it if the mind that imagined this dizzying world of jellyfish eyes, singing moss, magic mushrooms and morphing creatures would be willing to have a go at the iconic Louis Vuitton monogram. So I e-mailed Takashi . . . Before long, there he was standing in my Paris office . . . He and his crew, with total respect for Vuitton's heritage, were eager to contribute to the creation of a new chapter (Jacobs, 2008).

Another Japanese artist whose contemporary art was Marc Jacobs' inspiration for his 2007 collection for Louis Vuitton (especially the polka-dotted Vuitton bags) is Yayoi Kusama, who lives in Tokyo. There really is 'an altogether new condition of neighborliness' in today's world (Appadurai, 1990: 2), which suggests that if Marc Jacobs wanted to have his design studio not in Paris or New York but somewhere completely different, then Louis Vuitton would probably accommodate him in one way or another. The following quotation is from an NYDailyNews.com article in which a journalist interviewed Loïc Prigent, the filmmaker of the 2008 documentary *Marc Jacobs and Louis Vuitton*. According to Prigent, who followed Jacobs as he and his teams prepared and presented two Spring 2007 collections:

7 Catherine Malandrino is another designer (originally French) who claims that her clothes have a 'look and feel' that is Parisian and New Yorker at the same time.

In Paris, when a coat goes missing, Jacobs whips one up — over the phone. ‘He’s on a phone call from New York’, says Prigent, ‘and he just dictates a coat at 11 in the evening . . . Someone in New York is drawing or taking notes, I don’t know. “Okay, you take that coat from the last collection, you do this with the shoulder, you do that with the arm, and then a dart.”’ It was amazing (NYDailyNews.com, 2008).

Obviously, it would be too much to interpret the above quotation as evidence for the manner in which two cities collaborate with each other. However, there really is a creative collaboration between the two cities that goes beyond sharing Marc Jacobs. Paris is, and has always been, where the greatest concentration of creative talent in the fashion industry exists. What is interesting is the fact that most of this talent is now foreign, mainly, according to some observers (see *The Economist*, 6 March 2004: 4), because of the ‘stifling rigidity of the French educational system’. Despite all the historical infrastructure and the existence of significant state support for the industry in France, it is the fashion schools of London and New York that produce a disproportionately large share of the world’s most talented designers. It is traditional for most of them to go to Paris to prosper; and Paris ends up utilizing the creative talent that was nurtured elsewhere: examples include the Moroccan-born Israeli Alber Elbaz (working for Lanvin), the Italian Riccardo Tisci (working for Givenchy) and the Gibraltar-British John Galliano (working for Christian Dior).

London with its Central Saint Martin’s College of Art and Design and the London College of Fashion, and New York with its Fashion Institute of Technology and Parsons, the New School for Design, seem to be the source of most of Paris’ foreign designers.⁸ In fact, it looks as if these cities function as one transterritorial place, fulfilling different roles and yet functioning together: Paris is where the most powerful fashion corporations are, together with the strongest state support and infrastructure for fashion; and New York and London are still where the ‘cool and kicking’ designers are trained, who later fulfill their childhood dreams and work in Paris.

Power relationships and creativity

Loïc Prigent, the filmmaker of the 2008 documentary *Marc Jacobs and Louis Vuitton*, observes that in Jacobs’ Paris studio, old, dead styles come back to life with the touch of Marc Jacobs’ healing hand. This involves the designer constantly turning to the past: to ‘the imitation of dead styles . . . [that are] stored up in the imaginary museum of now global culture’ (Jameson, 1984: 65). In practice, this means that Marc Jacobs and his buyers constantly visit flea markets all over the world and buy pieces to be remastered. In 2008, a few years after being accused of plagiarism by Oscar de la Renta, Marc Jacobs once again had to defend himself against the same charge, this time because of a scarf created by the Swedish designer Gösta Olofsson in the 1950s. In this case, the copy was indeed identical: the landscape on the scarf was depicted, in a Marc Jacobs design, from such a vantage point that it could only have been sketched from Olofsson’s back yard. Jacobs settled with Olofsson’s son through monetary compensation. Neither the monetary amount nor the legal arguments (perhaps including a discussion of the postmodern take on originality) were disclosed. Apparently the scarf was bought at a flea market in the United States.

Once put together, Marc Jacobs’ designs become genuine articles to be protected from knockoff manufacturers who might copy them. In fact, the handbags that Marc Jacobs designed in collaboration with Murakami are some of the most copied articles in the world. Louis Vuitton is reported to have been spending US \$10 million a year trying to shut down counterfeiters as well as lobbying against the practice (Toy, 1996). For

8 Parsons also has a Paris School of Art and Design.

example, in 2006, eight makers of luxury goods, including LVMH brand owners Givenchy and Marc Jacobs, sued a trust with six properties in New York's Chinatown, demanding the eviction of those tenants who were selling counterfeit goods. In 2008, the city shut down an entire block of Chinatown and seized US \$1 million in counterfeit goods, as a result of 'the [building] owners' unwillingness to comply with repeated attempts to get counterfeiting activity out of the buildings'. However, some hours after the shutdown, the *New York Daily News* had no trouble buying cheap knockoffs only a block away.

One of the reasons why it is difficult for governments to deal with the counterfeit market is that the knockoffs are often identical in quality to the originals (as confirmed by Louis Vuitton executives, according to a staff member, cited in Toy, 1996); and thus the demand for them is extremely high. However, the consumer sovereignty that is celebrated when expressed through established brands does not seem to be celebrated when it is expressed through 'super fakes' (Tungate, 2005: 207).

It is certainly interesting that the postmodernist defense used when Marc Jacobs copies (or 'remasters') a coat designed by Oscar de la Renta or a scarf by Gösta Olofsson apparently does not apply to fake Louis Vuitton bags. There is apparently nothing 'witty' about manufacturers from Italy, Turkey, South Korea, Morocco, Thailand and China copying Louis Vuitton handbags (and achieving almost exactly the same quality) and then attaching tags of, say, US \$80, instead of thousands of dollars.⁹ There seems to be a very fine line between 'remastering' and 'copying', which casts an interesting light on the intellectual property-rights question in fashion. As legal scholars observe, established fashion designers, not unlike:

Postmodern writers . . . as well as . . . artists, continue to claim identification of their name with the works they produce, and when eligible, they do not seem to hesitate to claim copyright protection. Their sense of individual achievement seems to linger, even in [their] sweeping rejections of it (van Camp, 2007: 253).

Recently, a number of legal scholars have tried to tackle the question of copyright protection in the era of postmodernism (see Shimanoff, 2002; van Camp, 2007). They collectively explain the philosophical and legal difficulties of accommodating postmodern appropriations without falling foul of copyright infringements. Jacobs once said, 'so what if the idea for Vuitton's latest shoes came from an old Andy Warhol drawing of shoes? The end result is a totally new product' (cited in Rickey, 2008). It is an open question whether the same logic can be used to defend the knockoffs: are not 'super fake' handbags made in China also totally new products? This point directs us to Bettig's (1996: 2) argument that copyrights serve as 'an instrument of wealth that can be utilized in the cycle of capital accumulation to generate more wealth . . . [and] . . . also as the basis for expanding market power'. The distribution of credit for original designs depends on the power relationships in the fashion industry, an industry in which the question of who is endowed with how much 'fashion capital', in the words Entwistle and Rocamora (2006), matters a great deal.

In the United States, where laws are more tolerant towards creative remastery than they are in the European Union, the legal approach to originality is such that the term 'original' only means that the work was independently created by the author (as opposed to being copied from other works) and that it possesses at least some minimal degree of creativity. The United States Supreme Court agreed in 1991 that:

Originality does not signify novelty; a work may be original even though it closely resembles other works so long as the similarity is fortuitous, not the result of copying (Feist, cited in van Camp, 2007: 254).

9 Some other designers and firms are more tolerant. For example, Coco Chanel is quoted as having once said: 'Fashion should slip out of your hands. The very idea of protecting seasonal art is childish. One should not bother to protect that which dies the minute it is born' (Charles-Roux, 2005, cited in Scafidi, 2007: 124).

In the European Union, laws are stricter. Consequently, powerful designers such as Jacobs and firms such as Louis Vuitton can straddle Europe and the United States, consciously exploiting the uneven geography of regulations.¹⁰

Conclusion

In this article, I have made an effort to understand the manner in which the luxury-goods conglomerate Louis Vuitton Moët Hennessy (LVMH) harnesses the creative capabilities of Paris and New York through Marc Jacobs. While Jacobs once belonged to a creative milieu in downtown New York with a culture that seemed immune to corporations such as LVMH, today he is a global tastemaker with ties extending as far as Tokyo. Clearly, the case of Marc Jacobs shows the capability of corporations such as LVMH to take urban countercultures and turn them into crucial elements of their productive strategies.

Jacobs' ability to give a New York allure to everything he designs is now also part of the productive strategy of LVMH. I have pointed out that this 'New York allure' lacks a precise meaning to some degree, and have connected this observation to Appadurai's (1990) notion of the fetishism of the locality obscuring globally dispersed forces. Of course, this account does not intend to deny the points made by Scott (1997; 2008) and Molotch (1996; 2002) concerning the enduring importance of these localities. The characteristics of New York and Paris are still congealed in their products and they are still the places to which creative individuals flock from every corner of the world. These cities still create monopoly rents — even if they increasingly do so as one transterritorial place: New York/Paris. What is different now is the manner in which these rents are collected by contemporary transnational corporations such as LVMH, as they create illusions that mask 'translocal capital, transnational earning-flows, global management and often faraway workers . . . in the idiom and spectacle of local control, national productivity and territorial sovereignty' (Appadurai, 1990: 16). Perhaps they also do so in the idiom and spectacle of that elusive concept: the New York (or Paris) allure.

Nebahat Tokatli (tokatlin@newschool.edu), Milano Graduate School, New School University, 72 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011, USA.

References

- Appadurai, A. (1990) Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture* 2.2, 1–24.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983) The ecstasy of communication. In H. Foster (ed.), *The anti-aesthetic: essays in postmodern culture*, Bay Press, Port Townsend.
- Bauman, Z. (1992) *Intimations of postmodernity*. Routledge, London.
- Belcove, J.L. (2007) Letter from the editors. *Social studies. W Magazine* January, 32.
- Bettig, R.V. (1996) *Copyrighting culture: the political economy of intellectual property*. Westview Press, Oxford.
- Blum, D.E. (2004) *Shocking! The art of fashion and fashion of Elsa Schiaparelli*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

10 Sally Weller called my attention to this point. Here I have not delved into the extent to which the fashion industry receives differing protection under intellectual property laws in different places. Even in the United States, trademark legislation protects brand names and logos; some aesthetic elements can be protected if 'separability' (physical or conceptual) is proved; and designs on the surface of clothing can be copyrighted. See Cox and Jenkins (2005) for a brief review, which sheds light on some of these issues. The same source also mentions Louis Vuitton's unsuccessful attempt, in 2004, to sue the luxury retailer Dooney & Bourke over their multicolored 'DB' monograms that were alleged to infringe upon Vuitton's 'LV' monograms.

- Bourdieu, P. (1971) Intellectual field and creative project. In M.F.D. Young (ed.), *Knowledge and control: new directions for the sociology of education*, Collier-Macmillan, London.
- Clarke, M. (2001) Marc Jacobs [WWW document]. URL <http://www.indexmagazine.com> (accessed 15 March 2009).
- Cox, C. and J. Jenkins (2005) Between the seams, a fertile commons: an overview of the relationship between fashion and intellectual property. Ready-to-share: fashion and the ownership of creativity. A Norman Lear Center Conference [WWW document]. URL <http://www.learcenter.org> (accessed 15 March 2009).
- Currid, E. (2007) *The Warhol economy: how fashion, art, and music drive New York City*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Drake, A. (2006) *The beautiful fall: fashion, genius, and glorious excess in 1970s Paris*. Back Bay Books, New York.
- Drake, G. (2003) 'This place gives me space': place and creativity in the creative industries. *Geoforum* 34.4, 511–24.
- Entwistle, J. and A. Rocamora (2006) The field of fashion materialized: a study of London fashion week. *Sociology* 40.4, 735–51.
- Frankel, S. (2001) Alexander McQueen [WWW document]. URL www.showstudio.com (accessed 15 March 2009).
- Holt, D.B. (2002) Why do brands cause trouble? A dialectical theory of consumer culture and branding. *Journal of Consumer Research* 29.1, 70–90.
- Jacobs, M. (2008) Takashi Murakami. *Time Magazine*, 28 April [WWW document]. URL www.time.com (accessed 15 November 2008).
- Jameson, F. (1984) Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. *New Left Review* 146, 53–94.
- Larocca, A. (2005) Lost and found. *New York Magazine* 21 August [WWW document]. URL <http://nymag.com/nymetro/shopping/fashion/12544/> (accessed 10 October 2010).
- Levy, A. (2008) Enchanted: the transformation of Marc Jacobs. *New Yorker* 1 September, 90–98.
- Marin, R. (1992) Grunge: a success story. *The New York Times* 15, 1.
- Molotch, H. (1996) LA as design product: how art works in a regional economy. In A.J. Scott and E.W. Soja (eds.), *The city: Los Angeles and urban theory at the end of the twentieth century*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Molotch, H. (2002) Place in product. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26.4, 665–88.
- Molotch, H. (2003) *Where stuff comes from: how toasters, toilets, cars, computers, and many other things come to be as they are*. Routledge, New York.
- Mower, S. (2009) The man who put Marc in the pink. *The Observer* 8 February, 32.
- NYDailyNews.com (2008) Stylish documentary offers rare glimpse into Marc Jacobs' chaotic world, 2 February [WWW document]. URL http://www.nydailynews.com/entertainment/movies/2008/02/03/2008-02-03_stylish_documentary_offers_rare_glimpse_-1.html#ixzz0iFtviCBa (accessed 29 November 2008).
- Oppenheimer, J. (2005) *Front row: Anna Wintour*. St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Peden, L.D. (2005) Shopping with Tim Gunn, chair of Parsons fashion department and star of 'Project Runway'. 31 March [WWW document]. URL <http://www.fashionwiredaily.com> (accessed 29 November 2008).
- Prigent, L. (dir.) and Constant, F. (prod.) (2008) *Marc Jacobs and Louis Vuitton*. Documentary film.
- Rickey, M. (2008) Marc Jacobs: a fashion force to be reckoned with. *The Independent* 26 May [WWW document]. URL <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/fashion/features/marc-jacobs-a-fashion-force-to-be-reckoned-with-834246.html> (accessed 10 October 2010).
- Scafidi, S. (2007) Intellectual property and fashion design. In P.K. Yu (ed.), *Intellectual property and information wealth: issues and practices in the digital age*, Praeger, Westport, London.
- Scott, A.J. (1997) The cultural economy of cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21.2, 323–39.
- Scott, A.J. (2008) *Social economy of the metropolis*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Shimanoff, E. (2002) The odd couple: postmodern culture and copyright law. *Media Law and Policy* 11.1, 12–49.

- Spindler, A. (1997) Two take the money and produce. *The New York Times* 9 April, 11.
- Sweetman, P. (2007) Anchoring the (postmodern) self? Body modification, fashion and identity. In M. Barnard (ed.), *Fashion theory: a reader*, Routledge, London.
- The Economist* (2004) Rags and riches: a survey of fashion. 6 March, 4.
- The Economist* (2009) The substance of style. 19 September, 80.
- Toy, S. (1996) 100 years of Louis Vuitton. *Cigar Aficionado*, Autumn 1996 [WWW document]. URL www.cigaraficionado.com (accessed 29 November 2008).
- Trebay, G. (2002) Familiar, but not: Marc Jacobs and the borrower's art. *The New York Times* 28 May, 8.
- Trebay, G. (2006) Beautiful business. *The New York Times* 12 October, 1.
- Tungate, M. (2005) *Fashion brands: branding styles from Armani to Zara*. Kogan Page, London and Sterling, VA.
- van Camp, J.C. (2007) Originality in postmodern appropriation art. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 36.4, 247–58.
- Wolff, J. (1993) *The social production of art*. St. Martin's Press, New York.

Résumé

Marc Jacobs est un créateur de mode qui se décrit de lui-même comme postmoderne et qui, dit-on, apporte le charme du cœur de New York à tout ce qu'il touche, même s'il vit et travaille désormais à Paris et s'il valorise régulièrement les ressources et énergies innovatrices de lieux aussi éloignés que Tokyo. Jacobs est présenté ici comme l'un des nouveaux prescripteurs de goût internationaux dont les expériences relativement moins circonscrites et profondément mondialisées influencent considérablement les débats autour de la sociologie et de la géographie de la créativité. Plus précisément, la nature transterritoriale de la créativité de Jacobs révèle une géographie de la créativité plus compliquée que ce qu'admet la littérature.