

ical apprehensions, is also characterised by a differentiating play that sets apart not just any “big Subjects” but little “subjectivities” with, if I may say so, a low rate of hegemonic impact. No matter how much passion, organization and genius, is invested into the creation of an event, the hegemonic effect can be measured one way or another by the market response.

Maybe this was a basic “discovery” of the 1960s and 19070s, when some artists in different areas of aesthetic *praxis*, reacted to such reality, bearing in mind that the result of their reaction to a particular work of art would be judged by the market as well. Andy Warhol “described” the reality of the modern industrial world by eclectic compositions, which mainly exposed the process of massive reproduction. In his images of multiplied icons of the star system (Marilyn Monroe, Elvis Presley etc.), he persuasively demonstrated that in such a world a category of uniqueness is a matter of a process of multiplication of certain icons. Taking into account that he established a level of comparison between Campbell Soup and movie icons, Warhol preceded the post-modern usage of the category of reification. Michelangelo Antonioni, whose movies were seen as a bit enigmatic and hermetic at the time that they were first shown, contributed to his specific gaze upon urban subjectivity and especially upon the reality, which such subjectivity unintentionally produced. After the film *Blow up* (1966), based on the Julio Cortázar’s story, Antonioni actually became very transparent since he identified perceived reality as the very same one as that, which is produced – in the given case – by the machinery of representation in both possible senses (as a camera and as a social field of signification). Besides, it seems that quite a large audience accepted Antonioni’s cinema, at least in Europe. At the same time, the 1960s brought about a massive participation of the urban youth in the communication of multiple meanings. The main motive of the fashion designer Mary Quant was “... to extend the meaning of fashion beyond the classical couture designs of the affluent” (Bernard, 1978: p. 8). “Ordinary people” expressed their answers to the question about their identity with their own bodies by “animating” creations of Mary Quant and other designers from Carnaby Street. Since then the fashion designers became comparable to what philosophers have ceased to be: a kind of oracle of the reality of the society, which is defined by sociologist like Giddens and Bourdieu as the “reflexive society”. Listen carefully to what people like Karl Lagerfeld or Viviane Westwood are saying, and how their descriptions of sewing dresses and of what their designs represent correspond to attributes of the constitutively “unstable” reality.