

Mandoki, Katya. 2003 “Aesthetic Contagion in the Era of Globalization” *Dialogue and Universalism* Vol. XIII No. 11-12/2003. *Aesthetics in the 21st Century*. Polish Academy of Sciences. Poland PL ISSN 1234-5792. pp.141-150.

Katya Mandoki

AESTHETIC CONTAGION: THE *KITSCH* AND GLAMOUR PATHOGENS

ABSTRACT

A biological mapping will be applied to the understanding of culture in the present context of massification and globalization. This mapping will allow us to view a continuity encompassing cellular, pluricellular and social organisms. We will examine the concept of “contagion” as an expedient tool for elucidating various social phenomena related to the aesthetic. The strategies for coping with cultural contagion are complex and must consider both aesthetics’ invigorating as well as debilitating effects. Artistic education enhances dispositions towards aesthetic contagion but aesthetic theory has neglected research of aesthetic susceptibilities that deplete basic adaptive strategies of self-esteem and self-respect in individuals and social groups. During the 20th century we have witnessed the appalling political effects of stereotyping, aggrandizement and stigmatization deployed by aesthetic means in its noxious manifestations. The present globalization process and the acceleration of telecommunications turn the question of aesthetic contagion and its alluring power all the more relevant and worthy of examination. In all cases we must deal with aesthetic mechanisms and corresponding susceptibilities capable of generating significant social effects. The problem remains open, but a definite move in this direction is construing an adequate explanatory paradigm where the projection from natural sciences to cultural studies seems auspicious.

Key words: aesthetic contagion; autopoietic units; biosemiotics; culture; glamour; metaphorical mapping; kitsch; systemic; stigma.

INTRODUCTION

As a girl, I was deliberately exposed to contagion by two kinds of pathogens: the rubella virus and the pathos of classical music. The first took hardly 15 to 20 days until the symptoms appeared. The second took years. Going to a concert, a movie or a painting exhibition are deliberate acts of contagion. We sensitively open ourselves to a set of artistic patterns to be touched or “bitten” by them, as

by a *Yersinia pestis* infected flea, except that its effects are not high fever, vomiting, muscular pain, mental disorganization or delirium as in the Bubonic plague, but the opposite: an incentive for the imagination and a sense of pleasure and spiritual arousal. Instead of the enlargement of our lymph nodes, it is our sensibility and understanding of life that may be enlarged. What aesthetic theory calls “having an aesthetic experience” is equivalent to deliberately exposing ourselves to sensitive contagion by an aesthetic focus to achieve symptoms Kant described as “harmonious interplay of understanding and imagination”.

As the metaphorical projection above is indicating, we will apply a biological framework to understand cultural phenomena in the present context of massification and globalization. Lakoff and Johnson have amply argued that metaphorical projections are not only basic components in everyday speech and common understanding but heuristic tools that have accompanied the development of philosophical and scientific knowledge.ⁱ Through this biological mapping, we will apply the concept of “contagion” for elucidating relevant social phenomena related to the aesthetic, and consequently consider both aesthetics’ nourishing as well as its debilitating effects. Among the latter we will briefly examine two categories that can be considered as aesthetic pathogens: *kitsch* and glamour. Hence a definition of cultural disease is required to discern between invigorating and pathomorphic symptoms derived from the aesthetic in a given social context.

CULTURAL CONTAGION

Cultural contagion is necessary for every community’s cohesion and is implemented through tradition and education beginning with the family and school, and continued through political, professional, commercial, military, religious, mediatic and as many institutions a particular society develops. It may occur spontaneously as in children’s natural tendency to learn and adapt to their cultural environment by imitation or may be implanted by disciplinary procedures through formal education or institutional coercion.ⁱⁱ What is important to emphasize is that throughout these processes, the aesthetic plays an important role as a powerful means of contagion due to its alluring potential to engage mental, emotional and corporeal responses.

As the minimal unit of medical contagion is the cell, the minimal unit for cultural transmission and aesthetic contagion is the sign as examined by semiotic theory, particularly biosemiotics.ⁱⁱⁱ Thus semiotics or the study of signs is equivalent for cultural epidemiology to the study of micro-organisms for medical epidemiology. Signs, as cells and neurons, are clustered and activated into patterns that participate in the development of an organism in all three orders of autopoietic units defined by Maturana and Varela: the first is the live cell or unicellular organisms, the second involves pluricellular organisms or individu-

als, and the third order refers to pluri-individual organisms or social phenomena from insects like termites, ants, and bees to primates.^{iv} In this paper we will focus exclusively on human third order autopoietic units.

We have learned very much during the last decades about sign processes that take place in first and second order units such as DNA transmission and the operation of immunological and nervous systems. In third order units, these processes have been explored by semiotics, linguistics, discourse analysis, cultural studies and hermeneutics, yet we do not fully understand why do certain sign patterns rather than others fit more easily into greater number of receptors and why are they consequently more contagious in cultural transmission.^v One of the answers, and a fundamental one, pertains the aesthetic domain. Aesthetic patterns apparently engage emotion related centers of the brain such as the limbic system, the amygdala and prefrontal cortex, that activate attention and sympathetic identification directly affecting action and decision making.^{vi} Besides receptivity to relevant adaptive information, second and third order units also project compliant receptors to enticing patterns in probably similar terms to antibodies' projection of receptors matching antigens' particular patterns or as post synaptic neurons' receptors to neurotransmitters. By "enticing patterns" we may understand those that display rhythm and novelty, unity in diversity, distinctive sensorial stimulation recruiting aural, visual or other corporeal awareness directly by immediate perception or indirectly through imagination and emotional memory.^{vii}

AESTHETIC FOCI OF CONTAGION

Medieval and Renaissance clergy were well aware of the powerful effects of aesthetics as foci of contagion when they built cathedrals, painted murals, carved sculpture, composed music and enacted dramatic mass rituals and sacramental theater to spread Christianity through Europe and the rest of the world. Today, aesthetic foci are repeatedly exploited through psychological engineering or trial and error strategies by the advertisement industry and political marketing.^{viii} Political campaigns' advisors have consistently deployed aesthetic enticement towards detected dispositions among potential voters by targeting emotions to the desired voting decision.^{ix} As can be inferred from the above, the aesthetic domain is not reduced to the narrow sense of art and beauty but embraces the various areas of cultural production in both poetic and prosaic manifestations.^x It is obviously not reserved to the cultural elite, appealing to both refined as well as to tacky taste by what Bourdieu defines as *habitus* within the wide spectrum of cultural classes.^{xi}

We have witnessed dramatic cases of epidemic cultural contagion during the 20th century in both invigorating and detrimental manifestations through the westernization of Japan and other eastern countries after World War II, the easternization of western baby boomers' adoption of religious and cultural tradi-

tions from India, Japan, China and Tibet during the 60's and 70's, the Marxist expansion through eastern Europe, China and part of Latin America, and in its most lethal form, the nazification of Germany. In every case, aesthetic foci played an important role through the mediation of art forms, the dissemination of alluring pictures of the world, the coming into fashion of particular identitary outfits, the multiplication of leaders' portraits and effigies (Mao, Stalin, Hitler, John Lennon, Che Guevara), of graphic symbols (hammer and sickle, peace & love sign, swastika), anthems (*The International*, *Let my people go*, *Horst Wessel Lied*), slogans,^{xii} and the organization of massive gatherings (Woodstock and similar rock concerts, party and State rallies, particularly Speer's design for the Nazi party at Zeppelin field). As the Bubonic plague spreads more rapidly in crowded places, certain aesthetic displays become more contagious, as Hermann Parret notes, through intercorporeity, euphony and synaesthesia (in Aristotle's sense of affective being together), a fact that explains its allure among multitudes gathered under political, athletic, religious or musical purposes.^{xiii}

AESTHETIC DISEASE

Aesthetic theory has always taken for granted that everything related to the aesthetic must necessarily be worthy and virtuous. It is time to overcome this moralistic, naive dogma and face the fact that aesthetic contagion can be used for many purposes both socially advantageous and deleterious. We have neglected and forgotten too soon the essential role aesthetic contagion took in the configuration of the Third *Reich* and other totalitarian regimes.^{xiv} This historical fact makes it possible to objectively speak of aesthetic infection despite its dangerous resonances reminding us of the nazis' own censorship of what they called "degenerate art" or of Stalinists' proscription of "reactionary art". The concept of "aesthetic infection" requires a clear definition to both safeguard artistic freedom and yet maintain the capacity to discern its possible enfeebling implementations.

We can define cultural health and disease based on an embodied, absolute criterion of thriving, balanced life as a fundamental principle. Consequently, aesthetic foci of contagion are invigorating when they provoke what Kant understood as "an harmonious interplay of faculties" uniting imagination and understanding, the individual with the communal, and the emotional, mental and sensorial experience. It is an integrating experience at two levels: a) internally as an experiential integration of body and mind, of mental and of corporeal faculties and b) externally as an integration of the individual in the community through *sensus communis* as "public sense" in Kantian aesthetics.^{xv}

On the other hand, through this particular, negative case of cultural infection, aesthetic foci are (deliberately or not) exerted to paralyze, deteriorate, and injure the quality of life of second and third order units by alienating individuals from themselves, their community and their context. If life is ordered through various

scales from the cell to the tissue, the organ, the system, the individual body to the social body, the latter is also networked through various scales from the family to the neighborhood, the city, the nation and the global system. Disease or malfunction at any of these levels directly affects those subsequent in various degrees depending on proximity and density of connections.

KITSCH AND GLAMOUR PATHOGENS

One instance of aesthetic infection denounced by various authors (although not, of course, in medical terms) during the 20th century is the case of *kitsch*.^{xvi} They have all struggled to define *kitsch* by philosophical, artistic, religious and ethical approaches with no final result, as it is sometimes taken as a kind of art, or as pseudoart, as a subjective state, as a quality of certain objects, persons, responses or behaviors.^{xvii} Through a biological metaphorical mapping, the concept of *kitsch* can be significantly clarified as an aesthetic pathogen analogous to a simple cold everyone has experienced in its effects of watery eyes, nasal congestion, temporary numbing, and a pleasurable sense of unreality in a self indulgent, cozy manner. We can recognize its similarity to the lachrymose effect, the mawkish, gushy, sentimental experience of *kitsch* as its equivalent in the cultural domain that may become a chronic condition as it is constantly produced and reproduced by global mass culture. Following Broch's intuition that rather than an inventory of objects, *kitsch* pertains to a subjective state, it is thus comparable to a subject enduring this common viral infection.^{xviii}

Kitsch is, however, a relatively innocuous pathogen when compared to another much more malignant aesthetic infection analogous to neoplasia or tumoration which has either passed unnoticed by aestheticians or been conflated with *kitsch*: it can be defined as the "glamour pathogen".^{xix} As there are various degrees of virulence among tumors ranging from benign outgrowths to malignant cancer, the glamour pathogen can also manifest itself as a harmless blow up of certain cultural characters, views and values or as their oppressive aggrandizement that seizes 2nd or 3rd order human organisms jeopardizing their identity. Its malignancy stems from the fact that it automatically breeds its inverse complement, the "stigma pathogen", which is viciously aggressive. The glamour-stigma pair has become an endemic cultural disease in hypercapitalist societies generating schismogenic effects or disjoining processes compromising these units' identity. Schismogenic effects were explored by Gregory Bateson who proposed the "double-bind hypothesis" in studying schizophrenia as a conflictive tangle of mutually annihilating adaptive strategies.^{xx} Thus the "double-bind" endangers the individual in its attempt to adapt socially and injures precisely what it intends to defend: its identity and self esteem. This "double-bind" concept can be extended beyond Bateson's original sense of family third order units (in Maturana and Varela's sense) to the communal and social, endangering its cohesion and balanced stability. It is typically exemplified today by the ce-

lebrity system that glamorizes superstars, like previous heroes and gods' adoration, except that it generates the pair of erotization-frustration among its devotees depleting susceptible individuals' self into a sense of inferiority.^{xxi} Among its various consequences are mass hysteria related to celebrities, rejection of self body image as in anorexia and bulimia disorders among young female population in Western countries or as the increasing demand for Caucasian style folded eyelid plastic surgery among Korean young girls, likely to be followed by breast implants.^{xxii}

Significantly, glamour does not apply to ethical, intellectual, civil or professional merit but to the blowing up certain individuals, artifacts, ideas, lifestyles or behaviors way beyond proportion whose effects today can be traced through the aesthetization of violence and of the use of weapons, of fierce financial or athletic competition and of the narcissistic cult of the body constantly disseminated into susceptible minds through global mediatic transmission. In more traditional societies the opposite process prevails, where rather than glamorize celebrities or aggressive lifestyles, older members of the community are honored generating loop patterns that guide individuals naturally through their biological and social cycles.

THE GLAMOUR/STIGMA COUPLING

Glamorization and its symmetrical pair, stigmatization, are both aesthetic processes because they directly concern matters related to taste such as attractiveness or repulsion, the pleasing or the defective.^{xxiii} Beauty and the sublime are attributed to the glamorized as ugliness and the grotesque to the stigmatized. While glamorization is tolerated as endemic and even sponsored by the entertainment, sports and fashion industries, its stigmatization effects are overlooked despite their harmful consequences particularly among the most susceptible population: teenagers.^{xxiv}

A paradigmatic case of this pathogen's deployment was nazism: it began with the glamorization of Aryans and nazis and the stigmatization of non-nazis and non-Aryans concocted through the glamorization of its Führer by the effect of his hyperbolic rhetoric and the extreme rigidity of the NSDAP's assemblies (associated to *rigor mortis* or tetanus, not precisely a healthy, vital condition). In addition to this glamour/stigma infection, the Third *Reich* also recruited the *kitsch* pathogen in its potential to move the masses through sentimentality and the stereotypation of art and propaganda. As I mentioned above, had nazism deployed only *kitsch*, its results would have been relatively innocuous by merely sentimentalizing art and reproducing cultural clichés. But the glamorization of the "German blood", of the "Fatherland", of "national sentiment" and of "self sacrifice" worked ideologically so well through aesthetic rhetorization, that it bred lethal stigmatization of alterity or otherness.^{xxv}

What is most indicative about *kitsch* and glamour's turpitude is their disquis-

ing mechanism. As the AIDS virus disguises itself as the body's own cells hiding in lymphocytes and macrophages, *kitsch* and glamour distortedly mirror and disguise themselves respectively as beauty and the sublime. Beauty and elegance become a viscous cuteness in *kitsch*, as magnitude and grandeur of the sublime become aggrandizement and grandiloquence in glamour.^{xxvi}

The great scale and the conflictive, intimidating character that Kant found in the sublime are also mimetized in glamour, except that it is not reason and imagination which conflict in the latter but a batesonian type *double bind* tangle of the erotization-frustration coupling or self effacing veneration. By disguising sentimentality as sensibility, archetypes are reduced to mere stereotypes shattering any genuine communicative and social bond. The so called "post-modern sublime" is also a disguise of what is nothing other than the postmodern glamour of overchoice and overproduction through the conspicuous excess of commodities in hypercapitalist societies.

IMMUNITY BY HUMOR

Immunity against these pathogens may be achieved not, of course, by eradicating celebrities or *kitsch* objects (similar to the dangerous task of annihilating bacteria which are basic for our survival) but by a simple inoculation of humor. Glamour is thus immediately shrunk into its proper size and *kitsch* can be appreciated as a pathetic caricature of beauty. By humor I do not mean mockery or sarcasm which can be deadly serious (as in the self-degrading jokes of the stigmatized obese), but healthy humor antibodies that expose *kitsch*'s pretentiousness and sentimentalism and paralyze glamour's stigmatizing effects. Humor antibodies allow us to even indulge in the pleasure of these frivolities keeping them at a proper distance.

Medical metaphors have been rhetorically applied to social phenomena for political purposes as Hitler's referring to Jews, Marxists and Bolsheviks as "infectious diseases". The point is whether this metaphor can be used for analytical rather than purely ideological purposes and whether it can render any heuristic value. My claim is that it does, as it has enabled the distinction among different sorts of aesthetic contagion.

We conclude that the aesthetic is not always perfectly neutral nor entirely virtuous. What determines toxicity of aesthetic foci is in the last instance the disturbed agent's condition: its susceptibilities. As Maturana and Varela write, "the changes that result from the interaction between the living being and its environment are brought about by the disturbing agent but *determined by the structure of the disturbed system.*"^{xxvii} Aesthetic foci are thus a determining factor and a necessary but not sufficient condition for cultural contagion. Contagion is therefore the result of an organic coupling between strong magnetic disturbing agents or aesthetic foci of contagion and related dispositions (psycho-ecological factors) in the structural identity of the disturbed systems. Whereas

susceptibilities may pass unnoticed as weak empirical evidence lacking precise tools for their diagnosis, aesthetic foci are salient if adequately interpreted as symptoms to diagnose disease in all cases of sentimentality, stereotypation, grandiloquence, aggrandizement and stigmatization which, from a medical perspective, are analogous to congestion, clotting, rigidity, tumoration, swelling and intolerance to self substances. Aestheticians have thus a substantial responsibility to detect and understand aesthetic foci of contagion, particularly in the prevalent process of globalization, a task we will never be able to cope with if we continue to circumscribe the aesthetic to the narrow margins of art and beauty. Cultural epidemics are not new: they came together with military imperialism, religious proselytism and colonialism, but never before was this process so expeditious and penetrating as it is today due to global mediatic mass contagion whose import we do not fully understand. The problem remains open, but a definite move in its solution is arriving to an adequate explanatory paradigm where the projection from natural sciences to cultural studies seems indeed auspicious.

ⁱ Cf. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1980) and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh* (New York: Basic Books 1999).

ⁱⁱ On the operation of these disciplinary procedures, cf. Michel Foucault, *Vigilar y castigar*, translated by Aurelio Garzón del Camino (México D.F: Siglo veintiuno 1983, 8th) and Michel Foucault, *El nacimiento de la clínica* (México D.F: Siglo veintiuno 1983, 9th).

ⁱⁱⁱ On biosemiotics, I will refer the reader to Thomas Sebeok and Jean Umiker-Sebeok (eds.), *Biosemiotics: The Semiotic Web 1991* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 1992) and Thomas Sebeok, and Jean Umiker-Sebeok (eds.), "Biosemiotics: its roots, proliferation, and prospects" *Semiotica* (special issue about J. v. Uexküll) vol. 110, nos. 1/2 (2000), pp. 157–170.

^{iv} Cf. Humberto R Maturana and Francisco J. Varela, *The Tree of Knowledge; the biological roots of human understanding*, translated by Robert Paolucci (Boston: Shambhala 1992).

^v This problem interested Dan Sperber in *Explaining Culture. A Naturalistic Approach* (Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell 1996) who attempted to use an epidemiological approach to culture, yet neglected both the aesthetic and the semiotic constituents of this process, which are no less than the form, content and mechanism of cultural transmission, and thus his endeavor missed its target. The basic problem with Sperber's work, apart from his antisemiotic bias, is approaching cultural phenomena through the dubious mentalistic notion of "representations", neglecting culture's material basis. I address these problems in "A host of ghosts in Descartes' theater" *Semiotica* vol. 142 nos. 1-4 (2002) pp. 361–379.

^{vi} Cf. Antonio Damasio, *Descartes' Error. Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain* (New York: Avon Books 1994).

^{vii} Sperber's statement that "[t]o become cultural representations is not—or rather, is not directly—their formal properties. . ." [*Explaining Culture. A Naturalistic Approach*, op. cit., p. 63] is later contradicted when he recognizes that some versions of a tale (for example) or of any other cultural representation are more widely distributed owing to their display of a "better form: that is, a form seen as being without either missing or superfluous parts, easier to remember, more attractive". Ibid., p. 108. He does not, however, develop this idea which is only mentioned briefly.

^{viii} As we all know, products for mass consumption are consciously designed according to patterns which are deemed most likely to fit into as many potential consumers' receptors as possible. Consumers often choose among similar use-value products based mainly upon the aesthetic-value of their packaging or advertisement.

^{ix} Even if this procedure is politically immature, it is a fact that votes are often decided more upon candidates' personal appeal and upon the fabricated aesthetic image to promote them than upon their rational arguments, programs' consistency and political agendas.

^x For an extensive elucidation of prosaic aesthetics, cf. Katya Mandoki, *Prosaica: introducción a la estética de lo cotidiano* (México: Grijalbo 1994).

^{xi} Cf. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1984).

^{xii} Slogans involve both phatic and aesthetic functions of language in terms proposed by Roman Jakobson, *Essais de Linguistique Générale* (Paris: Minuit 1963), p. 129. The latter illustrated in Eisenhower's campaign slogan "I like Ike".

^{xiii} Herman Parret, *The Aesthetics of Communication: Pragmatics and Beyond*. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers 1993).

^{xiv} On a further elaboration on the mechanisms of nazi aesthetics, cf. Katya Mandoki, "Terror and Aesthetics: Nazi Strategies for Mass Organisation" *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, vol. 42, July 1999, pp. 1–18.

^{xv} Kant's insistence that aesthetic experience is non conceptual implies that while the conceptual proceeds by distinctions and differentiations, the aesthetic proceeds by integration. Aesthetic contagion may enhance understanding and derives its pleasure from the experience of opening up our capacity to sensuously, mentally, and emotionally relish life as a diversified yet integrated whole. Immanuel Kant (1790) *Critique of Judgment*, translated by James Creed Meredith, Electronic version from the American Philosophical Association Gopher at <http://www.epistemelinks.com>.

^{xvi} Cf. Hermann Broch, *Kitsch, vanguardia y arte por el arte* (Barcelona: Tusquets 1979, 2nd ed.); Ludwig Giesz, *Fenomenología del kitsch* (Barcelona: Tusquets 1973); Milan Kundera, *La insoportable levedad del ser* (México: Patria/Tusquets 1984); Karlheinz Deschner, *Kitsch, Konvention un Kunst, Eine literarische Streitschrift* (Munich 1957); Abraham Moles, *El kitsch: el arte de la felicidad* (Barcelona: Paidós 1990, 1st ed.); Gillo Dorfles, *Il Kitsch: antologia del cattivo gusto* (Milan: Mazzotta 1968); Kathleen Higgins, "Sweet Kitsch", in Philip Alperson (ed.), *The Philosophy of the Visual Arts* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992), pp. 568–581, among others.

^{xvii} For Broch, a pioneer in the study of *kitsch*, this is an ethically abject aesthetic evil that results from the substitution of the ethical category by an aesthetic one.

^{xviii} Broch mentions, for instance, Hitler's enthusiastic attraction to *kitsch*: "He lived blood type *kitsch* and loved sacharin type *kitsch*." Herman Broch, *Kitsch, vanguardia y*

arte por el arte, op. cit., p. 30.

^{xxix} Glamour centers around those who manage to hoard, rather than distribute, enormous financial capital. The problem is that hoarding itself is aesthetically exhibited as the topmost aim and glory of individuals: it is invested with glamour. On the aesthetics of accumulation, cf. Katya Mandoki, "Material Excess and Aesthetic Transmutation" *Parallax 18*, vol. 7, no. 1, May 2001, pp. 64–75.

^{xxx} Cf. Gregory Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (Toronto: Random House 1972).

^{xxxi} One of its most notorious pathological effects is the increasingly common movie and television stars' stalkers' syndrome.

^{xxxii} On glamorization of Caucasian models' effects upon Korean girls'. Cf. Kim-Walhain, Taeyon "The Manipulation and Presentation of the Korean Woman's Body" Paper presented at the 29th Popular Culture Association Conference (1999).

^{xxxiii} On stigmatization, I will refer the reader to the classic work of Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall 1963).

^{xxxiv} As the teenage criminals' confessions attest, last decade's violence in American high schools has always been a result of stigmatization imposed by their more "popular" classmates.

^{xxxv} Cf. Mandoki, "Terror and Aesthetics: Nazi Strategies for Mass Organisation", op. cit.

^{xxxvi} Both *kitsch* and glamour pathogens can be displayed artistically as well as extra-artistically. An artistic or poetics' expression of *kitsch* is, as in Giesz's example, classical music "mantovanization", and a non artistic, prosaic *kitsch* is commonly found in overloaded personal apparel or home decoration and sentimental souvenirs collections. Giesz, *Fenomenología del kitsch*, p. 32. Equally, glamour in poetics is expressed through sentimental aggrandizement in artworks, typically leaders' deification in portraits and effigies, whereas prosaic glamour is found in the star system and jet set figures' glorification through the media. When the glamorizing elements such as appearance, youth, success or money are lost, the glamorized themselves become victims of stigmatization as in the dramatic self imposed reclusion of divas like Marlene Dietrich and Greta Garbo.

^{xxxvii} Humberto R Maturana and Francisco J. Varela, op. cit., p. 96. Dispositions and susceptibilities are also mentioned by Sperber in *Explaining Culture; A Naturalistic Approach*, but due to the problems mentioned above, they are not properly developed.