



ALICJA RACINIEWSKA 
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

ON CHANGEABILITY AND UNCHANGEABILITY IN FASHION

Abstract

The aim of this article is to provide an in-depth analysis of the issue of change and constancy in fashion, challenging the common belief that fashion is exclusively a domain of ephemerality and instability. After discussing the theoretical approaches to change and constancy in fashion in the first part, the second part introduces the categories of changeable unchangeability and unchangeable changeability and uses them to analyse selected aspects of the contemporary fashion system, showing their paradoxical nature. Given the social significance of fashion, the paper will contribute to a broader debate on change and constancy in contemporary social life.

Keywords: fashion change, fashion return, changeable unchangeability, unchangeable changeability, fashion heritage

INTRODUCTION

A common belief is that fashion marches under the banner of volatility, inconstancy and transience. Nevertheless, if we look more deeply – especially at the structural elements and mechanisms by which fashion operates and the relationship between fashion and time – we can see the complexity and slippery nature of the topic of fashion’s changeability. German philosopher and sociologist Georg Simmel,

in his famous *Philosophy of Fashion* from 1905, already pointed out that despite frequent changes in style, the change in fashion itself remains unchanged. Walter Benjamin's elaborations of the temporal mechanisms of fashion allow for a more intense understanding the dynamics of changeability and immutability inherent in fashion. Contemporary fashion seems to perfectly reflect the issues described by these German thinkers.

Taking these considerations into account, in this essay I propose a polemic with the thesis focused on change as a basic feature of fashion, arguing that fashion is fundamentally a paradox, one of the dimensions of which, is the constant oscillation between changeability and immutability. After a brief review of the literature on the subject of change and the constancy of fashion, I introduce the terms *unchangeable changeability* and *changeable unchangeability* which, on the one hand, emphasise the changes in objects and structures of the contemporary fashion system, and on the other, emphasise their durability. Next, based on existing research and my own reflections, I relate these categories to selected phenomena of the contemporary fashion system.

Fashion is recognised as a significant economic and sociocultural force, as well as the complex system of clothing production and the meanings associated with it. Although there are many systems of fashion production, the world's dominant model is the Western capitalist model, operating according to a specific paradigm and consisting of many domains (production, distribution, retailing, design, advertising, marketing, wearing, destruction), social actors, practices, discourses and objects [Payne 2019]. This is how the fashion system will be understood here, although due to the limited size of this essay, not all elements of this system will be analysed.

The paper's main theoretical contribution is to introduce analytical categories in order to study phenomena related to fashion in the later modernity of neoliberal capitalism, whose common feature is the tension between change and immutability, and these two aspects are rarely analysed together. Reflections on the interaction of change-constancy in fashion will additionally contribute to a broader debate on this issue in contemporary social life.

EPHEMERAL AND IMMUTABLE: THE PARADOXICAL NATURE OF FASHION

Alice Payne introduces *fashion-as-change* as one of the three components of her systemic concept of fashion, emphasizing that "a critical dimension in the understanding of fashion is the notion of change" [Payne 2021: 19]. Fashion

practitioners constantly emphasise the changing nature of their industry; there are also abundant studies and theoretical considerations that emphasise the ephemeral nature of fashion and changeability as a key parameter of fashion practice and experience [e.g. Lipovetsky 1994; Lehmann 2000; Wilson 2003; Breward, Evans 2005; Barthes 2005; Bauman 2010; Pecorari 2021]. Many of these researchers indicate that they are following the path set by French poet and critic Charles Baudelaire, for whom fashion was the hallmark of modernity, characterised by the experience of transience and perpetual temporal flux. However, it is worth remembering, that for Baudelaire, beauty, art, fashion and the experiencing of modernity had a complicated, dual nature: “the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent, the half of whose other half is the eternal and the immutable” [Baudelaire 1964: 12].

The dual, paradoxical nature of fashion was fully recognised on many levels by German philosopher and sociologist Georg Simmel. For him, fashion performs a “double function” (Ger. *Doppelfunktion*), by constantly oscillating between “the tendency towards social equalization with the tendency toward individual differentiation and variation” [Simmel 1997: 189]. The contradictory nature of fashion is additionally shown in the very manner of its social becoming and cancelling itself in its realisation [Simmel 1997: 192]. Finally, despite frequent changes in style, the change in fashion itself remains unchanged: “Although the essence of each individual fashion is precisely that of not being immortal”, fashion is, as “a general concept, as a fact of fashion as such, indeed immortal (...) In this instance, the fact that change itself does not change endows each of the objects which it affects with a psychological shimmer of permanency” [Simmel 1997: 203–204]. This “permanency within change” is furthermore revealed in the return of change-oriented fashion to its former forms when these are partially erased from memory, because, like all other phenomena, it has a tendency to save energy and achieve its goals in the most economical way [Simmel 1997: 204].

The phenomena of fashion returns were later explored by American anthropologist Alfred Kroeber. Through quantitative research on visual data presenting European women’s dresses from the period 1844–1919 [Kroeber 1919] and then 1787–1936 [Richardson, Kroeber 1940], Kroeber has discovered a kind of pendulum in clothing styles – a cyclical regularity of changes within the structure of fashion itself, that contradicts its supposedly chaotic and capricious nature. His approach to cultural change in the category of a wave that propagates, decays, and then returns, has paved the way for studies that sought to understand and forecast trends and its cycles [e.g. Vejlggaard 2007; Kim, Fiore, Kim 2011; Brannon, Divita 2015; Blaszczyk, Wubs 2018; Raymond 2019]; to identify a varied pace, a multiple time frames, scopes and scales of fashion’s change

[Geiger 2011; Rocamora 2013; Zborowska 2013; Kipoz 2020; Payne 2021]. Additionally, there are studies on popularity of trends described as: wearing “the spirits of the past time” [Vinken 2005:69], *retro fashion*, *vintage fashion*, *sartorial remembering* and *fashion historicism* [e.g. Baines 1981; Martin, Koda 1989; Clark 2005; Guffey 2006; Jenss 2015; Hill 2021, Gnolli 2023]. This research on the self-referential qualities and practices of fashion has constituted a counterpoint to the accepted concept of fashion as novelty, changeability and ephemerality, additionally showing that – paraphrasing a well-known saying about history, attributed to Mark Twain – fashion does not repeat itself but rhymes.

Penetrating more deeply into the essence of the matter, German philosopher Walter Benjamin has interpreted the changing-unchanging nature of fashion from yet another angle. Interested in exploring the nature of time and history through the analysis of fashion, he treated fashion as a “measure of time” (Ger. *Zeitmaß*) and a perpetually (re)actualised collective technique for operationalizing time [see Ekardt 2020]. He considered fashion as a “mold in which modernity is cast” [Benjamin 2002: 833], although he has emphasised the rather negative side of modernity (temporal, passing, ruined and wounded by time). Fashion, as “an eternal return, of what is new”, was for him a “time of hell” [Benjamin 2002: 401], and the ghastliness of this feature of fashion has its roots in the dialectic of industrial production and circulating goods, resulting in the perpetual return of the same thing (reproduction of exchange value) masquerading as what is currently the newest (new face of the commodity). Additionally, using two concepts for which fashion is a model – the *tiger’s leap* (Ger. *Tigersprung*) and *dialectical images* (Ger. *Dialektischen Bilden*) – Benjamin has shown that fashion leaps tiger-like into the thicket of the past to extract from it something that has been temporarily rejected, disconnected and forgotten, and to introduce this achievement into the current context and to present it as the newest and up-to-date. The transition from unfashionable to fashionable occurs abruptly, in a dialectical manner, through a combination of temporarily separated moments. Moreover, the fashionable leaps into the past function in the form of recurring quotations that do not form a continuous narrative. Thus, for Benjamin, fashion is ruled both by discontinuity and continuity. Building on Benjaminian concepts, British fashion historian Caroline Evans has examined how the recycling of historical motifs has dominated a certain strand of fashion design in the 1990s [Evans 2000]. She indicates that the “scavenging aesthetic underpinned much of the historicism of 1990s design that «inaccurately» pillaged the past to produce a contemporary aesthetic. Rather than recreating one period, its historical borrowings were multi-layered (...), folding one historical reference back on another” [Evans 2000: 25].

The cutting-edge fashion of the 1990s has created a specific temporal hybrid, in which various moments of historical time were placed in one design, and history itself was treated non-nostalgically, as a huge collection of images, styles and shapes ready for re-use.

Current research shows that discontinuities, changes and ruptures in fashion do not necessarily involve progress or lead to the establishment of a lasting aesthetic normativity in the long run. Rupture here refers to a movement against the current aesthetics or style, causing a reorganization at the level of design practices and procedures; however, it rarely leads to a complete transformation of the fashion system and its organization. Moreover, although old practices and aesthetics are pushed by new ones into the background, into the *démodé*, they may return in a mutated form in another place, time and/or function. Consequently, old styles, aesthetics and practices coexist at the same time. Simmel and Benjamin have emphasised this paradox: fashion as such emerges from a series of ruptures and discontinuities of styles and aesthetics in the surface layer, and through them it changes, but at the same time in the depths persists as a form and system of creativity, maintaining the continuity of certain underlying organisational practices and principles.

Although the complex relationship to time and the paradoxical nature of fashion have been recognised in the literature, there is a lack of more systematic analyses of the change-constancy dimension in relation to the contemporary fashion system. There are many valuable studies on creativity-heritage interplay in the context of French luxury fashion houses [e.g. Barrère, Santagata 2005; Pistilli 2018; Donzé, Wubs 2018; Zanon 2018; Donzé 2023; Courbières 2024]; however, they are primarily case studies of marketing strategies of luxury fashion houses, analysed in isolation from other aspects related to fashion's change and constancy.

Respecting existing studies and research approaches, building on them, and at the same time extending them in the further part of this essay, I propose the categories of *unchangeable changeability* and *changeable unchangeability* to study the contemporary fashion system. My reflections here are very loosely inspired by the notions of *dynamic continuity* and *continuous instability*, introduced by Magdalena Nowicka-Franczak into the diagnosis of the Polish public debate after 1989 [Nowicka-Franczak 2020]. Both of the categories proposed below emphasise, on the one hand, the inevitable changes arising from the nature and logic of fashion itself, as well as being the result of political, economic, social and cultural transformations, and, on the other hand – the persistence of certain structures and practices, despite the mentioned changes. Additionally, they allow us to study the paradoxical nature of phenomena previously considered separately.

UNCHANGEABLE CHANGEABILITY

The category of *unchangeable changeability* enables us, above all, to rethink the consequences of the persistent change in proposed styles and designs, and in particular, to perceive that one of fashion's constitutive features can, paradoxically, undermine its social significance. These constant aesthetical changes and ruptures lead to the fragility of all rules and orders introduced by fashion. This may be one of the reasons, why public discouragement and lack of respect for fashion, treating it as something irrelevant and not worth pursuing, still persists. It also undermines the power of fashion as an agent of social change.

The continual breaking with what is now, by introducing counter-proposals, allows aesthetics and values previously marginalised and invalidated to be introduced into the social space. Much has been said in recent decades about the need for inclusivity and representativeness in fashion, as well as about the social and political significance of it. "Fashion can articulate and potentially subvert constructions and presentations of identity, disturb totalitarian tendencies and visualise political dissent. In era when politics is largely mistrusted (...) fashion might effectively address old and new injustices, not only those of fashion, but also of the wider world", writes Djurdja Bartlett in defence of fashion [Bartlett 2019: 56].

Certainly, fashion helps in publicising certain topics and social issues, and its ability to transform the Imaginarium, create new language, and to rewrite and transgress established conventions cannot be denied. However, its values, its logic and fundamentals on which fashion is based, are problematic in the context of its political effectiveness. It is not just about the commodification, instrumentalization and exploitation of reality by fashion for its own ends.

The category of *unchangeable changeability* sheds light on how the instability of fashion, based on its scheduled change, challenges or undermines its status as an agent of a real political change. As recent years of fashion activism and political fashion trends have shown, statements expressing solidarity with feminism were soon replaced with "stay home during the pandemic" messages, then replaced with BLM solidarity statements, only to be replaced by something else again. Meanwhile, political actions and real political changes require perseverance, responsibility, everyday work and the relative constancy of the position taken [Raciniewska 2023].

The very constantly changing nature of fashion itself, makes it rather a laboratory and testing ground for aesthetic tastes, political worldviews and ethical positions, pushing the boundaries of social imagination. Additionally,

as Lipovetsky points out, the contradictory nature of fashion has led to “the establishment of a shallow instability as a permanent system” and turned out to be a tool for stabilizing and consolidating modern liberal democracies [Lipovetsky 1994: 4,7]. Which brings us to the second category.

CHANGEABLE UNCHANGEABILITY

Changeable unchangeability refers primarily to the permanence of certain elements of the fashion system, which, on the other hand, are characterised by a widespread flexibility and even subversiveness, being dependent on the current material and social conditions of fashion production and consumption, social awareness and moods, in addition to changing policies.

An example of the phenomenon *changeable unchangeability* is the institution of the fashion week. The capriciousness and unpredictability of fashion changes was tamed by the introduction of a chronological *temporal architecture* [Pomian 2021] of Western fashion, in the form of the fashion seasons, mimicking the natural seasonal changes. The “natural” autumn-winter and spring-summer fashion seasons were first introduced at the court of Louis XIV, using the press (*Le Mercure Galant* – the first periodical to report on the fashion world) as a tool for the process of measuring and rationalising fashion time. The twice-yearly change in fashion was then institutionalised during the 19th and 20th centuries by Parisian *haute couture* and its professional organisation and governing body (today: the *Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode*¹), in the form of the so-called fashion week, giving rhythm to the garment production system and enabling fashion to become a commercial power [Kawamura 2004; Jones 2007; Van de Peer 2014]. Despite recent attempts to accelerate the seasonality of fashion on the one hand, and to interrupt its continuity, by introducing a seasonless model on the other [Stauss 2021; Van de Peer, Lefevere 2021] – flexibility has allowed the institutions of the fashion week and the fashion season to survive to this day.

Changeable unchangeability refers, of course, to many items of clothing, looks, styles, forms and shapes of the garments. A perfect illustration of this concept is the exhibition *About time: Fashion and duration*, presented at the Metropolitan Museum of Art Costume Institute (Met) at the turn of 2020/21, honouring the

¹ 1868: *Chambre Syndicale de la Couture, des Confectionneurs et des Tailleurs pour Dames et Fillettes*; 1911: *Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne*; 1945: *Chambre Syndicale de la Haute Couture*; 1973: *Fédération Française de la Couture, du Prêt-à-Porter des Couturiers et des Créateurs de Mode*; 2017: *Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode*.

museum's 150th anniversary. In a concise and dense visualization of a "150-year clock of the architecture of the female form" [Cambell 2020], 60 pairs of iconic fashion objects were organised around the principle of "60 minutes of fashion". Each minute presented a pair of garments equidistant from one another: the first object was placed at the front, on a chronological timeline from 1870 (the year of the Met's founding) to the present day, and the second one was placed behind it, on the non-linear timeline. The object placed at the back was related to the front one in terms of shape, motif, decoration, material, or technique, although it predated or postdated the first object. For example, the black velvet corset strapless dress from Jean-Paul Gaultier's autumn-winter 1984/85 collection was paired with a black "Tulip" evening dress by Charles James from 1949; a white fitted Bar jacket and flare long black skirt from Christian Dior 1947 New Look collection with Junya Watanabe black leather "Bar" shape biker jacket and long skirt from the fall-winter 2011/12 collection; Mrs. Arnold ca. 1895 black dinner dress with black ensemble from Comme des Garçons autumn-winter 2004/05 collection. The organizational structure of this intellectual exhibition has confronted two parallel timelines to highlight different temporalities of fashion and to "express the concept of duration as outlined by the French philosopher Henri Bergson, in which time exists as a continuous flow and the relationship between the past and present is one of coexistence rather than succession" [MET 2020]. It has also shed light on the institutionalization of borrowing in fashion, which accompanies the cult of novelty and creativity, leading to the durability of certain design solutions despite some changes.

Additionally, *changeable unchangeability* deals with the persistence of specific actors, who are the most visible and significant players in the fashion world, and who are responsible for introducing new themes and styles and for continuing or discontinuing existing practices. One of them is the figure of the designer. Although fashion design is, and has always been, a collective and collaborative process, the modern fashion system is organised around the myth of a fashion designer as an artistic genius and a sole creator proposing new styles. The idea goes back to the second half of the 19th century and Charles Frederick Worth, who broke with the system of tailors fulfilling orders from wealthy individuals, introducing a specific institutional organization and a unique business strategy that consolidated previously separate activities and emphasised the creative aspect of fashion production. The fashion house (Fr. *Maison de couture*) developed designs and collections, dictated the nature of each designed item down to the smallest detail and controlled the process of its production and the final effect. The designer – *couturier-créateur* – had power, prestige and the highest place

in the hierarchy of the fashion house; he also took responsibility and credit for the created creations.

Worth began to use the discourse of fine art in his business to promote the image of the designer, defining himself as *artiste en robes, compositeur de toilettes*, posing as an artist in photographs, and presenting his work in terms of art and creation [Szaradowski 2016]. Furthermore, following the example of artists, Worth has introduced the practice of marking his clothes with a signature (Fr. *la griffe*) – in the form of a label with his name sewn into them – which was a guarantee of authenticity and added tangible value to the clothes. Later designers followed suit, further refining his strategy. To this day, the fashion system has been dependent on labels, dominated by the discourse of creativity and the importance of the designer’s role; however, for a dozen or so years now, a parallel narrative, that criticises the functioning of today’s system for damaging creative work, has been developing.

Although this criticism has not led to systemic changes in fashion, each new wave shifts the focus of the debate. The suicide of Alexander McQueen in 2010 and John Galliano’s departure from Dior in an atmosphere of public scandal one year later, were described as an end of “a wild fashion ride”, and interpreted in terms of personal problems and the mental condition of “fragile, artistic creators”, broken by “the pace of fashion today, and particularly the rigorous structure of a corporate fashion house” [Menkes 2011]. Raf Simons’ departure from Dior and Alber Elbaz from Lanvin in 2015, emphasised to a greater extent the changes that had taken place in the profession of a fashion designer (who had now become a creative director) and the lack of time for true creativity: “Like that bird in a gilded cage, creative people at the major fashion houses have everything (...) Everything, but time.” [Menkes 2015]. The difficult times of the global COVID-19 pandemic have cast doubt on the governing rules of fashion system, a belief that the fashion system is broken was loudly expressed and many fashion professionals has expanded on the desire for a fresh start [Vestoj 2021; Amed 2021]. Finally, the current problems of many luxury brands with a new wave of departing designers, whose positions are not being replaced, even though many talented designers are out of work, reveals, according to commentators, “a gradual breakdown of the social contract between creatives and their corporate bosses, who are not championing creativity in the way they once did (...) Most of the brands (...) have backed away from high-risk, high-reward fashion driven by creativity” but falling sales indicate, that “the current formulaic, corporatised, anodyne approach to fashion is clearly not working” [Amed 2024]. The debate on the current status of fashion designers shows the *changeable unchangeability*

of this position: the durability of the designer myth, despite constant tensions and changes in the role of creative director in individual fashion houses. It also sheds light on the last issue I would like to address in this section.

The concept of *changeable unchangeability* is also useful in the analysis of contemporary brands, especially luxury ones, whose activities influence the entire fashion sector. To understand their current status, it is important to recall that at the end of the 20th century, fashion saw a transition from an industry dominated by small and medium-sized family businesses to one composed of international conglomerates controlling financial resources, distribution systems and a portfolio of seemingly unrelated brands². The entry of these international financial groups into the luxury segment was funded by taking over the private heritage created by the acquired historical companies and then commercializing this heritage.

French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu was one of the first to draw attention to the problem of succession in fashion as a problem of “transmitting a creative power” [Bourdieu 1974, quoted in: Barnard 2020: 50]. The designer’s signature (Fr. *la griffe*) is a mark transferred to material objects to change their symbolic nature (fashion object). However, it is also a proper name that can be inherited. Luxury groups thus transfer the positive image and reputation of great creators-founders to the brand itself. *La griffe* (the association between creative products and the creator’s name) is transferred into a legally protected trademark (the association between products and the company name), and this transfer enables the value of the historical creator’s name to be extended over time and space. “The capitalization of heritage in trademarks as brand names allows the transfer of IPRs in reputation heritage assets” [Barrère, Delabruyère 2011: 331]. This may explain the dependence of contemporary fashion on labels and trademarks, which no longer serve only as an inner lining, but become patterns and decorations on the surface of the clothes – it serves consistency and create continuity.

Furthermore, corporate fashion brands embrace a paradoxical heritage brand strategy, consistently managing the tension between continuity and change [Cooper, Merrilees, Miller 2020]. Thanks to the strategic use of the past as a marketing resource, luxury brands become “the heirs and keepers of historical tradition, and this continuity legitimizes much of their positioning in luxury” [Donzé 2023: 45]. This strategy has much of Hobsbawm’s invented tradition

² This applies to both the luxury fashion sector, where the most important players are LVMH (Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton), Kering (formerly PPR), Richemont and the Prada Group, and the so-called fast fashion sector, represented primarily by Inditex Group, H&M Group, Fast Retailing (Uniqlo), which effectively competes with luxury brands. Only a few brands from the luxury sector (e.g. Chanel, Hermes) successfully operate independently outside large conglomerates.

[Hobsbawm, Ranger 2008], and involves selectively selecting elements from a brand's past and combining them with present-day elements (images, people, places) to create an appealing narrative that gives meaning to the brand's current identity.

Christian Dior's new brand strategy, based on heritage, for example, was built on discourse on the continuity of a tradition of artistic creativity and core brand values such as glamorous elegance, modern style and revolutionary creation. Although the revolutionary style of the hired star designer John Galliano was at odds with the classic conservatism of the brand's founder, new discourse was adopted, portraying Christian Dior as a revolutionary couturier who "changed the codes of global elegance with his first collection in 1947" [Dior 2020a] that "more than six decades after its birth (...) continue to inspire Dior. The New Look is a perpetual revolution" [Dior 2020b]. Today the narrative is different, responding to the current interests of the brand: "Christian Dior was fascinated with art (...) Right from the founding of his Maison in 1946, he transformed his dreams into irresistible creations, seeking to break with the sombre war years by elevating pure joy. His visionary spirit celebrated and enchanted women the world over. In only ten years, Monsieur Dior revolutionised the conventions of elegance and femininity, designing collections infused with dreams" [Dior 2024]. The above quotes illustrate how the luxury brands manage the paradox of their corporate brand heritage – simultaneously maintaining past heritage and embracing change, navigating tension between relevance and consistency.

Additionally, the strategic management of fashion heritage includes other practices, such as creating, managing and promoting brand archives; collaborating with museums and art galleries; running corporate museums; collecting creative knowledge and the collective heritage of Parisian haute couture craftsmanship; developing the very discourse of creativity and heritage in fashion. In this way, interested primarily in capitalizing on brand reputation and profiting from lower segments, corporate luxury brands are forced to make costly investments in creative and artisanal heritage and promote the growth of the creativity of low-profit haute couture. Another paradox, which seems to be explained by French sociologist Jean Davallon. Heritage in his approach, is an output of social process of creating a temporal continuity between the past, present and future, stitching these different temporal regimes. On the one hand, this requires the recreation of the connection between the heritage object and its original context of creation, through the work of memory and the production of knowledge about a given object. On the other hand, heritage is not only a useful resource. Heritage creates obligations for its heirs – it obliges them to protect and preserve it,

it obliges them to popularise and exhibit it, and finally, it obliges them to pass it on to future generations [Davallon 2006, 2024].

Fashion heritage is indeed a paradox. In the course of the heritage-making process, from objects to be acquired, worn and experienced sensorially through the body, fashionable goods become objects rather to contemplate, admire and study. From objects intended for exchange for new ones, they become things worth preserving and conserving. From objects with exchange and use value, they become objects with display value. As Oliver Assouly points out, fashion heritage provides a counterpoint to fashion itself and its destructive nature, and “may serve to redeem the compulsive declassification and discarding of fashion articles” [Assouly 2022: 57]. From the point of view discussed in this paper, fashion heritage is also the introduction of an element of immutability into the world of fashion objects.

CONCLUSION

The paper’s main theoretical contribution is the introduction of analytical categories to study phenomena related to fashion in the later modernity of neoliberal capitalism, whose common feature is the tension between change and immutability, and which are rarely analysed together. The category of *unchangeable changeability* draws attention to the fact, that change – one of fashion’s constitutive feature – can, paradoxically, undermine its social power and significance and challenge its ability to be an agent of significant social and political change. The category of *changeable unchangeability*, on the other hand, sheds light to what extent contemporary fashion is shaped by its own heritage and functioning in dialogue and tension between continuity and change. Both categories reveal the paradoxical nature of contemporary fashion system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amed Imran.** 2021. “How independent fashion brands are navigating the crisis”. *Business of Fashion* 16.02.2021.
- Amed Imran.** 2024. “The fashion system is creaking. Will it collapse?”. *Business of Fashion* 14.06.2024.
- Assouly Oliver.** 2022. Capitalism in the heritage economy. In: *19 takes on fashion*. Collective (eds.), 55–69. Paris: Institut Français de la Mode.
- Baines Barbara.** 1981. *Fashion revivals: From the Elizabethan Age to the present day*. Batsford. London.
- Barnard Malcolm.** 2020. *Fashion theory. A reader*. Second Ed. London: Routledge.

- Barrère Christian, Sophie Delabruyère.** 2011. “Intellectual property rights on creativity and heritage: The case of the fashion industry”. *European Journal of Law and Economics* 32(3): 305–339.
- Barrère Christian, Walter Santagata.** 2005. *La Mode. Une économie de la créativité et du patrimoine, à l’heure du marché.* Paris: Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication.
- Barthes Roland.** 2005 [1967]. *System mody.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Bartlett Djurdja.** 2019. Can fashion be defended? In: *Fashion and politics.* D. Bartlett (ed.), 17–57. London, New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Baudelaire Charles.** 1964 [1854]. The painter of modern life. In: *The painter of modern life and other essays.* J. Mayne (ed. and trans), 1–40. London: Phaidon Press.
- Bauman Zygmunt.** 2010. “Perpetuum mobile”. *Critical Studies in Fashion and Beauty* 1(1): 55–85.
- Benjamin Walter.** 2002. *The arcades project.* Cambridge, Mass, London: The Belknap Press/ Harvard University Press.
- Błaszczyk Regina Lee, Ben Wubs (eds.).** 2018. *The fashion forecasters: A hidden history of color and trend prediction.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Brannon Evelyn, Lorynn Divita.** 2015. *Fashion forecasting.* New York: Fairchild Books.
- Breward Christopher, Caroline Evans (eds.).** 2005. *Fashion and modernity.* Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Campbell Nicky.** 2020. Visiting “About time: Fashion and duration” at the Met Museum. CFDA 27.10.2020. <https://cfda.com/news/visiting-about-time-fashion-and-duration-at-the-met-museum> [access: 10.01.2025].
- Clark Judith.** 2005. *Spectres: When fashion turns back.* London: V&A Publications.
- Cooper Holly, Bill Merrilees, Dale Miller.** 2020. “The corporate heritage brand paradox: Managing the tension between continuity and change in luxury brands”. *Australasian Marketing Journal* 29(4): 320–328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2020.08.003>.
- Courbières Caroline.** 2024. “L’étiquetage patrimonial des marques de mode”. *In Situ: Revue des patrimoines: Le vêtement et la mode, un patrimoine incarné* 52(2024):155–168. <https://doi.org/10.4000/insitu.40157>.
- Davallon Jean.** 2006. *Le don du patrimoine. Une approche communicationnelle de la patrimonialization.* Paris: Hermès-Lavoisier.
- Davallon Jean.** 2024 [2023]. *Heritage traces in the making. A communicational analysis of modes of heritagization,* London: Wiley-ISTE.
- DIOR.** 2020a. https://www.dior.com/couture/fr_fr/la-maison-dior/depuis-1974 [access: 10.05.2020].
- DIOR.** 2020b. https://www.dior.com/couture/fr_fr/la-maison-dior/dior-en-histories/la-revolution-du-new-look [access: 10.05.2020].
- DIOR.** 2024. Identity. Christian Dior. <https://www.lvmh.com/en/our-maisons/fashion-leather-good/christian-dior> [access: 10.01.2025].
- Donzé Pierre-Yves.** 2023. *Selling Europe to the world. The rise of the luxury fashion industry, 1980–2020.* London, New York: Bloomsbury Visual Arts.
- Donzé Pierre-Yves, Ben Wubs.** 2018. LVMH: Storytelling and organizing creativity in luxury and fashion. In: *European fashion: The creation of a global industry.* Błaszczyk R.L., Pouillard V. (eds.), 63–85. Manchester University Press.
- Evans Caroline.** 2003. *Fashion at the edge. Spectacle, modernity and deathliness.* London, New York: Yale University Press.

- Geiger Anette.** 2011. Fashion and time. The impossibility of the present. In: *Fashion out of order. Disruption as a principle*. D. Mink (ed.), 148–157. Stuttgart: ARNOLDSCHE Art Publishers.
- Gnoli Sofia.** 2023. “«Historical mode». Heritage and revival in contemporary fashion”. *ZoneModa Journal* 13(2): 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2611-0563/18518>.
- Guffey Elizabeth.** 2006. *Retro: The culture of revival*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Hill Colleen.** 2021. Restlessness: Retro revivals. In: *Reinvention & restlessness. Fashion in the nineties*. C. Hill, V. Steele (eds.), 92–109. New York: Rizzoli Electa.
- Hobsbawm Eric, Terence Ranger.** 2008. *Tradycja wynaleziona*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WUJ.
- Jens Heike.** 2015. *Fashioning memory. Vintage style and youth culture*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Jones Jennifer.** 2007. *Sexing la Mode: Gender, fashion and commercial culture in Old Regime France*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Kawamura Yuniya.** 2004. *The Japanese revolution in Paris fashion*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Kim Eundeok, Ann Marie Fiore, Hyejeong Kim.** 2011. *Fashion trends: Analysis and forecasting*. London, New York: Berg.
- Kipoz Solen.** 2020. *Slowness in fashion*. London: Dixi Books.
- Kroeber Alfred.** 1919. “On the principle of order in civilization as exemplified by changes in fashion”. *American Anthropologist* 21(3): 235–263.
- Lehmann Ulrich.** 2000. *Tigersprung: Fashion in modernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lipovetsky Giles.** 1994 [1987]. *Empire of fashion. Dressing modern democracy*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Martin Richard, Koda Harold.** 1989. *The historical mode*. New York: Rizzoli.
- Menkes Suzy.** 2011. Galliano’s departure from Dior ends a wild fashion ride. *The New York Times* 01.03.2011. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/02/business/global/02galliano.html> [access: 10.05.2020].
- Menkes Suzy.** 2015. Why fashion is crashing?. *British Vogue* 01.03.2011. <https://www.vogue.co.uk/article/raf-simons-why-fashion-is-crashing> [access: 10.05.2020].
- MET.** 2020. <https://metabouttime.cargo.site/> [access: 10.01.2025].
- Nowicka-Franczak Magdalena.** 2020. Od zszywania do rozprucia i z powrotem. Wymiary i wzory debaty publicznej we współczesnej Polsce. W: *Strefa publiczna w Polsce i jej współczesne konteksty*. J. Arcimowicz, K. Gadowska (red.), 305–336. Warszawa: ISP.
- Payne Alice.** 2021. *Designing fashion’s future. Present practice and tactics for sustainable change*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Visual Arts.
- Pecorari Marco.** 2021. *Fashion remains. Rethinking ephemera in the archive*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Pistilli Ornella.** 2018. “The heritage-creativity interplay. How fashion designers are reinventing heritage as modern design: The French case” *ZoneModa Journal* 8(1): 77-95. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2611-0563/8223>.
- Pomian Krzysztof.** 2021[1984]. *Porządek czasu*. Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria.
- Raciniewska Alicja.** 2023. Polish “Black Protests”: Political dress and the politics of fashion. In: *Dangerous bodies. New global perspectives on fashion and transgression*. R. Mahawatte, J. Willson (eds.), 117–146. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan/Springer Nature.
- Raymond Martin.** 2019. *The trend forecaster’s handbook*. Laurence King Publishing.
- Richardson Jane, Kroeber Alfred.** 1940. “Three centuries of women’s dress fashions: A quantitative analysis”. *Anthropological Records* 5(2): 111–153.

- Rocamora Agnes.** 2013. New fashion times: Fashion and digital media. In: *The handbook of fashion studies*. S. Black, A. de la Haye, J. Entwistle, A. Rocamora, H. Thomas, R. Root (eds.), 61–77. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Simmel Georg.** 1997 [1905]. Philosophy of fashion. In: *Simmel on Culture. Selected writings*. D. Frisby, M. Featherstone (eds.), 187–206. London, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stauss Renate.** 2021. “The doubters, or, to love fashion is to doubt in fashion: An impossible interview”. *Vestoj. The Journal of Sartorial Matters* 10 (On Doubt): 93–105.
- Szaradowski Piotr.** 2016. *Elegancja Francja. Z historii haute couture*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie.
- Van de Peer Aurélie.** 2014. “So last season: The production of the fashion present in the politics of time”. *Fashion Theory* 18(3): 317–339. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175174114X13938552557880>.
- Van de Peer Aurélie, Merel Lefevere.** 2021. “Little doubts everywhere”. *Vestoj. The Journal of Sartorial Matters* 10 (On Doubt): 159–169.
- Vejlgaard Henrik.** 2008. *Anatomy of a trend*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Vinken Barbara.** 2005 [1994]. *Fashion Zeitgeist: Trends and cycles in the fashion system*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Wilson Elizabeth.** 2003. *Adorned in dreams. Fashion and modernity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Zanon Johanna.** 2018. Reawakening the “sleeping beauties” of haute couture: The case of Guy and Arnaud de Lummén. In: *European fashion: The creation of a global industry*. Błaszczyk R.L., Pouillard V. (eds.), 86–118. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Zborowska Agata.** 2013. „Wywoływanie duchów mody”. *Czas Kultury* 2(173): 134–141.

Alicja Raciniewska

O ZMIENNOŚCI I NIEZMIENNOŚCI W MODZIE

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest pogłębiona analiza zagadnienia zmienności i niezmienności w modzie, przełamująca powszechne przekonanie, że moda jest wyłącznie domeną efemerydy i niestałości. Po omówieniu dotychczasowych podejść teoretycznych odnoszących się do zmiany i niezmienności w modzie w części pierwszej, część druga wprowadza kategorie *zmiennej niezmienności* oraz *niezmiennej zmienności* i wykorzystuje je do diagnozy wybranych aspektów współczesnego systemu mody, ukazując ich paradoksalną naturę. Ze względu na społeczne znaczenie mody, przedstawione analizy przyczynią się do szerszej debaty na temat zmiany i stałości we współczesnym życiu społecznym.

Słowa kluczowe: zmiana mody, powrót mody, zmienna niezmiennosc, niezmienna zmienność, dziedzictwo mody