www.Arts-Journal.com

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
THE ARTS IN SOCIETY

VOLUME 6, ISSUE 4, 2011

COMMON
GROUND

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE ARTS IN SOCIETY is peer-reviewed,
supported by rigorous processes of criterion-referenced article ranking and qualitative
commentary, ensuring that only intellectual work of the greatest substance and highest
significance is published.

Scope and Concerns

The International Journal of the Arts in Society (The Arts Journal) creates a forum for discussion and publication of innovative theories, practices and critical commentaries in the arts.

The Arts Journal acknowledges the need for critical discussion on issues in the arts, and specifically as they are situated in everyday life, culture, economics and politics. Linked to critical cultural discourse, creative acts of engagement are called for that respond to the needs of our times. What is called for is no less than 'free speech zones', which have become ever more pressing in present-day contexts of globalisation, and its social, economic and political artefacts of cultural homogenisation and commodification.

The Arts Journal aims to create spaces for open dialogue and exchange in all aspects of the arts, where interdisciplinary discussions can emerge from a variety of format presentations – from more traditional academic papers, to workshops, garden conversations, staged readings, performances, and exegeses – all in the context of an international meeting place and publication.

Articles published in the Journal range from the expansive and philosophical to finely grained analyses based on deep familiarity and understanding of a particular area of social knowledge or art practice. They bring into dialogue artists, theorists, policymakers, arts educators, and their overlapping roles.

The aim is not only to create a reflective knowledge community, but also an actively engaged one – moving works from the studio to public discourse, inspiring creativity from the public stage and exhibition space to the policy chambers – as well as providing a fora for reflexive thinking about the role of the arts in society. The Arts community also creates an opportunity to forge a design agenda for the arts.

A design agenda asks the question, 'What is to be done? How can artists, theorists, cultural critics and educators seize the historical moment to create an agenda for the arts which positions them powerfully in relation to the often competing and intersecting agendas of economy, science and technology?'

Sites
In our twenty-first century context, longstanding sites of production, consumption and display – such as the theatre, the museum, the gallery, and the publishing house – are being contested by new forces of media, popular culture, and commerce. These various forms of contestation and re-arrangement have given rise to new art forms, media and venues, from the street to the Internet. To what extent have old forms and new forms merged, replaced or challenged one another? In what ways do the various sites of reception and display affect sites of production – from the artist's studio to the community hall? Is there such a thing as interdisciplinarity? And how do artistic media work with and interpret these cultural flows and institutionalised spaces?

Media
We live in an increasingly visual culture, where all forms of media intersect with the 'crisis of information' that overloads everyday life. These media include the visual arts, the textual arts, the aural and musical arts, the gestural and performative arts, and the spatial arts. These categories roughly correspond to standard classifications of artforms as music, theatre, literature, poetry, dance, painting, sculpture, photography, film and television, and architecture. Such are the disciplines and artforms of our historical experience. While these disciplines undergo various processes of transformation and at

times destabilisation, they are sometimes displaced by new means of production and their related meanings (the raw materials and methodologies of representation), reproduction of forms and meanings (first mechanical and now digital), and distributions of meaning (the methods of reaching audiences and interacting with them). To what extent do we need to develop new research approaches alongside creative tools to redefine these rearrangements of classical disciplines?

Policy

How does art shape educational, cultural and national policy? Given the proliferation of cultural institutions, such as museums, what role do these institutions play in larger projects of community formation, nation-building or international relations? How are hierarchies of art world classifications reproduced or challenged by new forms of institution-building and policy-making? Artists and the arts themselves are often referred to as 'cultural ambassadors' in international fora. Such terms raise issues of political relevance and call into question related concerns of value neutrality, and the deployment of art forms and practices to signal or help to dissolve social and political conflict at local, regional and international levels. What is the role of public education in these debates? 'Which publics' are represented or included?

Participants

Who are the participants in today's globalised art world? Has the art world fragmented into a scattered heteronomy of 'art worlds'? Who are the players, the gatekeepers, and to what extent do our mainstream institutions reinforce or reflect the hierarchies of art world structures and opportunities for artists? How do artists and cultural workers reconcile their visionary projects with the mundane pursuits of marketing and profit as measures of success? What are the structural constraints that create and perpetuate the motif of the "starving artist"? How do shifting contexts – such as moving from a community festival to a world festival event – create and redefine audiences and audience participation? What is the responsibility of the artist to explore these and other issues? What, finally, is the role of art in society?

More than ever, these are open questions. As a space to engage these questions and others, and to broaden a participatory base, the Journal provides a setting to make linkages across disciplinary, geographic and cultural boundaries.

The Arts in Society Community

This knowledge community is brought together around a common shared interest in the role of the arts in society. The community interacts through an innovative, annual face-to-face conference, as well as year-round virtual relationships in a weblog, peer reviewed journal and book imprint – exploring the affordances of the new digital media. Members of this knowledge community include artists, academics, educators, administrators, advocates and policy makers, curators, researchers and research students.

Conference

Members of the Arts Community meet at the International Conference on the Arts in Society, held annually in different locations around the world in conjunction with global and local arts events.

The inaugural Conference was held in conjunction with the Edinburgh Festivals, Edinburgh, Scotland in 2006, and in 2007, in collaboration with the Documenta12, Kassel, Germany. In 2007 an International Symposium on the Arts was also held during the Armory Show in New York and in co-sponsorship with the Center for Art and Public Policy, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University. In 2008, the Conference was held at the Birmingham Institute of Art and Design, Birmingham City University, Birmingham, UK, with a special theme of Art and Communication. In 2009, the Conference was held at Venice, Italy in conjunction with the Venice Biennale. In 2010, the Conference was held at University of Sydney, Sydney College of the Arts, Australia. In 2011, the Conference was held at Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Berlin, Germany. In 2012, the Conference will be held in Art and Design Academy, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK.

Our community members and first time attendees come from all corners of the globe. The Conference is a site of critical reflection, both by leaders in the field and emerging artists and scholars. Those unable to attend the Conference may opt for virtual participation in which community members can submit a video and/or slide presentation with voice-over, or simply submit a paper for peer review and possible publication in the Journal.

Online presentations can be viewed on YouTube.

Publishing

The Arts Community enables members to publish through three media. First by participating in the Arts Conference, community members can enter a world of journal publication unlike the traditional academic publishing forums – a result of the responsive, non-hierarchical and constructive nature of the peer review process. *The International Journal of the Arts in Society* provides a framework for double-blind peer review, enabling authors to publish into an academic journal of the highest standard.

The second publication medium is through the book series The Arts in Society, publishing cutting edge books in print and electronic formats. Publication proposal and manuscript submissions are welcome.

The third major publishing medium is our news blog, constantly publishing short news updates from the Arts in Society Community, as well as major developments in the various disciplines of the arts. You can also join this conversation at Facebook and Twitter or subscribe to our email Newsletter.

Table of Contents

COMMON GROUND

Sociological Causation of Worth Distinction in Contemporary Visual Arts

Zahra Rahbarnia, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Samineh Ansari, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstract: The subjects related to the artists, especially visual art and its works, have been always controversial. The differences among the worth of various art works have been referred to a wide range of causes such as qualitative and technical reasons, historical considerations, aesthetical values, etc. Although it seems that these reasons contain neglected social origins and aspects themselves, the merely sociological causes are considered to be of importance in understanding these differences. Focusing on the art creator, i.e. the artist, this article investigates the social causes in worth differences amongst the artworks. The main subject in this paper is to find and understand the merely sociological roots of artwork's distinction in their worth. In the beginning the concepts of art and artists are defined, considering that demonstrating any definition for the artist concept should be accordant to the previously presented definition of art. Meanwhile the field concept in Bourdieu's action theory has been expounded (in order to be used to describe the artist's world instead of class concept), and the institutional theory of defining art by Dickie and Danto has been chosen to describe artist's groups. Then there is a case study on five Iranian contemporary virtual artists based on the comparison of four kinds of capitals. Consequently the relation between the virtual artist's social field and varieties of virtual arts is explained and the hypothesis about the existence of this connection in contemporary Iran is established. Social reasons are in fact, considered to be very effective in explaining the distinction of artworks by their value and worth.

Keywords: Art, Worth, Institutional Theory, Capital, Social Field, Visual, Arts

An Introduction to the Inadequacy of Non-Sociological Reasons in Valuation Differences amongst the Art Works

THE **SUBJECT OF** art, similar to other fields related to human being, contains plurality, variation and, sometimes, opposite ideas. Opposite ideas includes primary concepts, goals and approaches. The conflict between theory and action starts from philosophical and theoretical differentiation in aesthetics and creativity and continues to validating artistic activities and art works.

The penetrating concepts to the art, with various objects and origins, are sometimes in conflict with each other; and this constitutes the special feature of art. Therefore, the nature of art, the quality of art and the reason of art are all highly worthy besides the art work itself, its creator, the addressee and the mediators. All these lead to different attitudes which may include complete results.

Besides the important topic of the relation of art works with the type of order, pledge and employer which sets pure art against cheap art, the overall study of art is related to study on the general and specific addressees of art, the field and capital of the artist and the role of these factors in validating the art works.

The Background of Worth Categorization in Arts

The first valuation of different kinds of arts, art works, and consequently, artists is traced back to the eighteenth century.

Under the topic of "the modern system of the arts" appearing from the eighteenth century, Henfling explains that Sharl Bato separates "fine arts" from "mechanical arts" and divides fine arts into music, poetry, painting, sculpture and dance (Henfling, 1377: 11).

He also considers the distinction between "pure arts" and "useful arts" or applied arts to be similar to the distinction between fine arts and mechanical arts. Because some believe that what is mechanically made (for example camera) is not to be conceived as art. In the same way, what is designed for an applied purpose (for example a vase or an official building) is not considered to be art. According to Tatarkiewicz, some people hesitated to call opera an art in the nineteenth century and "high art" was set against "low art". "Low art" consisted local arts, jazz music etc. The aforementioned categorizations did not last a long time. Nowadays, excluding applied arts (or the useful arts) from art seems intractable and difficult to defend (ibid: 14).

General and Specific Addressees' Valuation on the Art Works

People's opinions and ideas on the beauty of the art work do not originate from inward because they may alter according to time and place, so they arise from outward. In art's point of view "outward" means the time and place of happening and to the artist it equals to "life environment" and "life time". It is also the civilization to which s/he belongs so inevitably his/her ideas reflect and unveil that civilization.

Despite their differences, aesthetics and sociology have overlapping fields. The contribution of social affairs and art are not easily distinguished because the two fields are interwoven. They include phenomena such as language, family/tribal/national signs, collection of traditional and collective shapes, ceremonies that harmonize human's demeanor and behavior, and finally common people's culture - a vast field in which the forms contain a collective worth besides having a beautiful nature.

The aesthetical theories with the formalistic approaches frequently look into the form of art works and seem to be proud of being praised by a few specific people.

The art work being accepted or refused by the addressees equals to success or failure, which means to be forgotten or ridiculed. These kinds of approvals or disapprovals are either scattered (common people's view) or organized (universities-literary centers). If the artist works for all kinds of addressees and they judge his/her work, the study of art can not be separated from the study of its addressees, including its aesthetical addressees i.e. members of a church or a literary center or the educated elite (Bastide, 1376: 66). Roger Bastide(1898-1974), French sociologist and anthropologist, categorizes the relation between the artist and the work addressees according to whether they are general or specific. As in some approaches arts are divided into distinct categories including fine art, public and popular art, to clarify

the base of such distinction is of special importance in art sociology. From one hand, there are arts to be admired by the specific people and contain various categorization of pure and fine arts which are called *high art*. On the other hand, the applied arts include popular art and public commercial arts which are called *low art*. The former addresses specific group of people and is visited in museums and galleries, the latter which brings cultural or financial benefits is in close relation to the public.

Levine[1] (1933-2006) investigated the artistic forms of the Americans in the beginning of the nineteenth century. He shows that they had a common culture that was less hierarchical and in comparison to their posterity a century later, they were less accurate and subsequent categorizes. As there was no clear cut between serious art and popular art, Shakespeare and many authors, musicians, visual artists had a wide range of addressees. According to Levine, while high art was coming into the sacred zone, the novice cultural hierarchy in United Sates not only deprived the low class people of the high art, but also separated the high class people from the popular art (Alexander, 1384: 130-131). Some authors believe that the distinction between the two categorizations is natural and there is no need for sociological analysis. But it seems that this distinction is interrelated with sociological bases from the very beginning.

The Role of Addressee, Art Work Creator's Position, Art Work and/or Mediators in Works Valuation

The way of art work valuation has begun from calling graded titles and although considered to the addressees' social classes, pays special attention to uni-version works or the ones to be copied. But in valuation, no position is served for the artist. On the other hand, the discussion about categorization differences according to the inherent characteristics of the art works was not convincing. Some of these discussions include:1- High art to be richer than popular art; in response it should be said that this opinion ignores some complexity of the low arts.2- Understanding high art needs more instructions as it becomes vague to the addressee without instructions. It is true that the ability to enjoy from all artistic forms enhances in accordance to knowledge of the rules applied in that form and this issue sometimes becomes necessary; but it is noteworthy that many subjects of high art are popular. Monalisa by Da Vinci, Sun-flowers by Van Goc, Monet's Water lily are some examples of visual arts. 3- High art coincides with thoughtful and aesthetical experience while the low art just entertains. In other words, high art is *artist-oriented* and popular art is *addressee-oriented*. In artist-oriented art the addresses should adapt themselves to the artistic form and focus on the artist's ideas. On the contrary, in addressee-oriented art the artist should pay attention to the addressees' needs and express the meanings unveiled. Therefore, a joy coinciding a difficult activity (thoughtful-aesthetical reactions) seem better than an easy entertaining joy (to escape from reality). You can listen carefully to Beethoven's music (especially when you are instructed, in a thoughtful-aesthetical experience) or doing house works or reading a book you can listen to this music as background music (Alexander, 1384: 120-121). In other words, when there is possibility of replacing different entertaining works with high works at different circum-stances, with the positive efficiency of art in life process or limiting art to a specific condition and specific and distinguished addressees and calling words such as low, high, fine, pure,

---

[1] Lawrence William Levine was an American historian

dignified, useful, popular, public etc. containing general concepts, there is no defendable approach to reach an overall view.

The Inherent Worth of Art Works and the Uni-Versions

The other point is that different types of art have inherent differences. These distinctions sometimes originates from their nature as some arts are multiple in some points. For example, in music and theatre there are multiple performances and for a literary text, photography or graphics there are multiple versions; while in some other arts such as painting, sculpture and architecture the art work may be uni-version. In fact, different validation amongst great visual arts or great arts of music or literature comes out of their uniqueness which is different from multiple existences of other arts. The first appearance of copy technology, i.e. photography, and surrealism were simultaneous. Gravure in all its kind, photography and cinema overlapped the border of original and copy version by the means of pulling the art work nearer to the addressee and creating an ever present work in place of a work confined to a unique place. Benjamin[2] in Art Work article published in 1936 considers some important side effects for the so-called issue.

Firstly, there is a close connection between multiple copies and creating a distinct new aesthetic viewpoint. This new aesthetics comes out of a pure culture which is different from the taste of common people from one side and its rules (aesthetics amongst the artists and few numbers of addressees) are different from the rules of economic production (commercial culture under the reign of capitalism) on the other side. Secondly, gap between the artist and addressees, the producer and consumer widens. The third point is related to the alteration of comprehending the art work by us. From one side, new technologies of photocopies make something possible to be seen; on the other hand, the change in number and structure of the common people, especially the ever increasing number of art work participants, has altered their style of participant (Shartie, 1384: 66-69). In visual arts there are both copied works- such as cliché's or fake copies- and unique works.

Many painters have made the fake copies of their works and it violated creating a uni-version of the work. Nowadays, there are no limitations to the technologies to differentiate between the original work and the copy one. Some times it is said that copies of a painting can highlight the importance of the original one; if work creation in high qualities and in style of great artists' style(either in painting or music) becomes common, it influences on the works of great masters. The terms "simulation" or "pastiche" are some times used in derogatory meanings. If an art work is inherently and aesthetically considered, such distinctions are meaningless and the nature of the work itself should be judged.

Explaining these distinctions, the nature of the differences are commonly ignored and in various circumstances, divert dimensions of the distinction is considered ambiguously. For example, in differentiating the inherent distinction of different types of arts sometimes the economic value of the art is considered, sometimes its worth in the art world is important and sometimes the distinction of the artist in validation is of importance.

---

[2] Walter Bendix Schönflies Benjamin(1892-1940)was a German-Jewish intellectual, who functioned variously as a literary critic, philosopher, sociologist, translator, radio broadcaster and essayist. His work, combining elements of historical materialism, German idealism and Jewish mysticism, has made enduring and influential contributions to aesthetic theory and Western Marxism, and has sometimes been associated with the Frankfurt School of critical theory.

The Institutional Theory and the Role of Mediators or "Art World" in Valuating the Arts

Discussing about what is called "art world", some general questions should be responded otherwise, the claim of approving a hypothesis about art world becomes baseless and misleading. Some writers deny the importance of the definition of art, consider it a useless affair and believe that attempting to find a comprehensive definition of not only is useless but also hinders understanding art. Selecting one of art's definitions is inevitable and the criticism on it should be ignored.

"The *institutional theory* is one of the important and challenging theories in the twentieth century, basing a modern definition of art and set by Arthur Coleman Danto[3] and George Dickie[4] "(Henfling, 1377: 11). This theory is chosen for the paper because the criticism on it does not interfere in research hypothesis and also there is coordination between the so-called theory and the rest of theoretical frame.

"What makes a work artistic is not a special quality to be recognized inside the work, but a special status y the art world as Arthur Danto mentions" Dickie says.

Danto claims that something to be recognized as art needs something that eye can not see or recognize and that is called "the art world". What does the art world mean? As Dickie explains the main people of this world exist in a non-unified institution but they are in relation to each other in different ways. This collection includes artists (including painters, authors, musicians), directors (or producers), museum directors, museum visitors, theater spectacles, journalists, critics, art historians, art philosophers and others. He also claims that "the art world proceeds to the common work" and this work "defines a social institution". The core feature of this institution is presenting special art works. This presentation or conferring of status changes something into an art work. The art works have common point in this feature and the concept of art can be defined according to that (Hanfling, 137730). This German philosopher[5] (1927 –2005) regards the inherent worth of the art works to be influenced by the art mediators and introducing "the art world" he indicates the superiority of sociological approaches to the aesthetic approaches.

The Factors of Manner, Life Style, Position, Taste, Action, Habitus (from the Viewpoint of Giddens, Bourdieu, Peterson, Simkus)

The most important determining social factors in art validation include the addressee, the mediator or art world (the artists' class), the artist or the work itself. Investigating the role of different factors leads to a comprehensive view on recognizing the degree of determining art work worth. "Social scientists assume profession as the indicator of social class. They believe that people who have the same jobs, experience similar social privileges or privations accordingly, have similar life styles and benefit from similar life opportunities" (Giddens, 1386: 416). There is no decisive connection amongst the artists as the social groups. It seems that the correlation mostly exist in the life styles of the artists. Therefore, the relation between life style and the profession of social classes is definite.

---

[3] (born 1924) is an American art critic, and professor of philosophy
[4] (born 1926 in Palmetto, Florida) is an American philosopher
[5] Oswald Hanfling

Besides Giddens' view about the relation of life styles with social class and career, there is the outlook of Bourdieu (1930-2002), the French sociologist. He defines disposition, manner, or habits as a collection of temperaments gathered in the actor's personality. It helps the actor to manage different situations in a way that it can be called the unconscious cultural, the obligatory rule of any selection, the coordinating principle of the actions, and the physical/mental pattern of conception, evaluation and action. Therefore, factors such as the actor's (including the artist or the addressee) temperament, taste and manner, play important roles in evaluating and valuating the works.

Peterson and Simkus, the contemporary American sociologists, did a research in the United States and proposed two changes to Bourdieu's. Firstly, Bourdieu suggests a hierarchy of tastes in which the high art is on the top, the low art is on the bottom and some forms of art are in the middle. Peterson and Simkus believe that this model is similar to a column and similar numbers of forms are placed in each hierarchy. But as there are just a few high forms of art, and the low and middle forms are plenty, they suggest that the metaphoric column should be replaced with a pyramid: some high forms commonly agreed is placed at the top, and the closer we become to the sides, the number of popular forms increases. Secondly, Bourdieu mentions that the class sections consume the cultural productions from the column exactly similar to their class positions (Alexander, 1384: 126). Therefore, there exist various valuations on different artistic forms. The origins of these forms and the class characteristics of the addressees play important roles in the type of valuation.

The Similarities in the Class, Field and Capitals of Art World Members

The order observed in the social affairs arises from a structuring mechanism rooting in the actors and their manners. On the other hand, manner is in close relation to position. Each actor, gains a kind of manner which is in accordance and correlation to the social position. In the book called "Distinction", Bourdieu introduces the actors' divergent taste according to different bourgeoisie manners. The manners of these social groups are shaped by directing their life styles. Position is the intermediate chain that connects the concept of manner to the concept of field. Field consists of the positions which are defined in relation to each other. In Bourdieu's view, field is considered to be a kind of dynamic structure which is the open space of actors being under its influence by accepting the play rules (Jamshidiha and Parastesh, pp. 11-16). The process of distinction and differentiation leads the field to appear. The status of the social factors in the hierarchy of economic/cultural capital distribution results in the formation of conditions which have equal life styles.

As it is seen, the people's temperament and taste-in relation to their profession and life style- forms the field in the groups owning different percentages of capitals. "The social atmosphere is in fact based on the *capital*. The mixture of cultural and economic capital causes different groups to appear. As Bourdieu claims, these groupings deserve similar value systems and tastes. Generally, they have alike life styles; in other words, they select the divergent life styles according to the *habitus*. The sectors of this unit have a kind of *structural relationship* " (Nikzad, p.192). Although the formation of the concept of the field roots in the concept of the class, it does not mean that the neighboring people in this atmosphere consist of a class in Marxist way; i.e. to reach a goal, a group moves in contradiction to another group (Jamshidiha and Parastesh, 1386: 21). In other words, the position of the actors in the field is interrelated to their capital; so their position in the field is set according to the quality and

quantity of the capital they own. They dispute against the definition of rules governing the field according to their position which finally leads to more capital saving. Therefore, dispute strengthens or weakens the rules governing the field and redefines the borders of the field.

Extending the concept of capital, Bourdieu sketches its social and cultural feature. The completion of various social fields coincides with differentiation of diverse capitals. He divides capital into four sub categorizations:

1. Economic capital: any kind of financial possession including the ownership of public/private production capital. It is used for producing objects or services.
2. Cultural capital: including mental/educational/instructional characteristics, educational degrees, goods, official and interpersonal skills, habits, tastes, manner of speech and life styles by which a person distinguishes him/herself from others.
3. Social capital: membership in social, familial or relative groups; i.e. circumstances, relations and social networks the person is a member of and can benefit for his/her own favor.
4. Symbolic capital: consisting of the symbols one uses to legitimate his/her capital; for example: reputation, fame and ethical features in general.

Different kinds of capitals are exchangeable. The degree of capital exchangeability in various markets depends on the social debates. For example, the surplus production of academic certificates can reduce the interchangeability of educational to the economic capital. It happens because the ones who have university degrees should challenge to change their social capital to the economic capital, for example a high income job (Turner, 1998: 512). The role of cultural and economic capital in valuating art works, with the capacity of exchangeability, is noteworthy.

Cultural capital has two main resources: habitus in family life and education, which is replaced to family habitus. Education helps the person to learn taste, politeness and the manners that intimidates him/her to a special status. Sometimes, high cultural capital exists next to the high portion of economic capital, especially if it lasts in many generations. In the market of art works today, the border of cultural capital and economic capital has disappeared (Momtaz, 1383: 152). Having a successful market sometimes has a negative impact and sometimes, on the contrary, influences on valuation of the art works.

These capitals are not inherent, so these are achievable. Capital exchange following the art work market causes changes of the actor, including the artist or the addressee, spontaneously. "Therefore, the actors' position in the social atmosphere has the potentiality of exchange; because the naturalness of the capital helps in position stability while position change is the acquisitive nature of the capital. This attitude towards the capital lets Bourdieu follow life trajectory as a cognitive approach. General kinds of the capitals are divided into smaller amounts of money, for example public capital, religious capital, literary capital etc" (Jamshidiha and Parastesh, 1386: 23-24). These kinds of capitals are considered to be the mediators of the art works and play roles in setting art world, marketing and valuation. In this way, the specific class benefits from high altitude and the more validated their works, the more capitals they receive. And the circle continues.

The Distinction between the Capitals and the Field

The capital distribution reflects the class structure in the social system. The dominant class owns the highest portion of economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital. The middle class has less than they and the lower class possess the least portion of capital. Therefore, class structure is not a simple linear hierarchy in this system. There are sub categorizations in each class which are distinguished by the capital forms and formats and also the social origin (Turner, 1998: 512-513). As a result, benefiting from symbolic and cultural capitals, an artist who inherits art from his/her ancestors has more opportunity to gain capital in the field of art world.

Following popularity in the art world and the specific class, the artist enjoys from necessary dignity to settle the aesthetic rules, owns lots of capital and considered to belong to the dominant class. On the contrary, the limited field belongs to the owners of less capital; and this influences valuating each works. Accordingly, capital opposition forms the structure of power field and impacts artistic affairs besides social, political and cultural debates.

Bourdieu's three-limbed model about taste which has a direct relation to education and social class contains three factors: 1- legitimate taste, 2- average taste, 3- popular taste. Life style and cultural taste is explained in this model. The aesthetics of the lower class is an under domination aesthetics which should always justify itself by the taste of dominant class. Bourdieu believes that the work class is less capable of constructing an aesthetic view than the middle or high class. The beauty of objects is defined by the dominant classes and it may include the beauty of a car to a painting or a picture. The distance between higher classes and their vital needs let them think about the beauty dimensions more seriously and this shows their distinction. In fact, taste is an important factor of identity (Momtaz, 1383: 152-153). In this way, the experts in pure arts are distinguished from the experts in applied arts. In other words, taste directs consumption and therefore different life style are formed; because taste permanently changes necessities to the priorities and free of any mechanical impose, gathers together a collection of choices which manages our styles of life. On the other hand, these diverse life styles help in reproduction of the taste and manner; because life style is the atmosphere under which the actors learn how to live, what priority to have, what should they consider beautiful and how to validate. These kinds of distinctions are formed aesthetically. "Distinction explains the relation between the aesthetic taste and its social field. Therefore, Kant's claims on the existence of a pure and abstract aesthetics which are unrelated to the social life are criticized because the field studies show a wide range of tastes. These differences are not explainable by Kant's attitudes. So, the sense of aesthetics is a social ability which reflects the person's class and social education. But the mechanism of such an education is in the way that it seems the aesthetic judgment needs an internal talent, meanwhile in Kant's theory pure aesthetics owes to superior bourgeois class position (Jamshidiha and Parastesh, 1386: 6). Artistic manner and taste in this approach is a tool to establish the social group which evens the access to the material and symbolic objects. Cultural capital is exchanged according to the taste. If the art elite apply this capital, they will put an invisible border between themselves and the lower classes and preserve the class distinctions as they are in the position of power.

Conclusion

It is sometimes said that the people's ideas and opinions about the beauty of an art work and its worth can not be inherent because they change by time and place. So, they are inevitably from the outward. "Outward" for an art work equals to "time and place" of existence. To the artist it is the "life environment" and "life time" and the civilization to which she/he belongs. Therefore his/her ideas mostly reflect that civilization and validating the art works is not dependant of the time and place of creation.

On the other hand, considering the relation between the social field of the visual artist and different types of these arts it becomes clear that "social causes in relation to the artist's capital" play role in "differentiating the worth of art works". The collection of valid works in the eyes of elite ignores some great works as well as unvalued works; especially the works created by the middle social classes are not favored by the elite. This shows the importance of the addressee in validating the art works.

Most important of all, ignoring "the art world" (which is connected to perceivable concepts such as group, class, social institution), representing "art status" (which is interrelated to the concept of capital importance, worth and types) and the characteristic of "art work distribution" (which is closely related to the art economy and its supporters) the comprehensive discussion of art seems impossible. Considering non-sociological limitations about validating art works, including the aesthetic discussions, creativity, copies, etc. is also of importance in capital distribution amongst different groups of artists.

References

Alexander, Victoria (1384). "Art and the Social Bordes". Translated by: Ameri Mahabadi, Ali. Binab Journal. No. 8.

Bastide, Rojet (1374). *Art and Society*. Tehran: Toos Publication.

Giddens, Antony, Yardsal, Karren(1386). *Sociology*. Translated by: Chavoshian, Hasan.Tehran: Ney Publication.

Henfling, Oswald (1377). *The Essence of Art*. Translated by: Ramin, Ali. Tehran: Hermes Publication.

Jamshidiha, Gholam Reza, Parastesh, Shahram (1386). "Dialectic Manner and the Field in Pierre Bourdieu's Action Theory". Journal of Social Sciences. No.30.

Nikzad, Mehrdad (1382). "Social Analysis of the Consuming Actions*"*. Research Journal. No.7

Shartie, Rojet (1384). "From Mechanical Copies to the Electronic Representations".Translated by: Nik Farjam, Ali. Binab Journal. No. 9

Turner, Jonathan H. (1998). *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Sixth edition.

Turner, Jonathan H. (1998). *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Sixth edition.

About the Authors

Zahra Rahbarnia

Dr. Zahra Rahbarnia received her PhD in arts research form Alzahra University in 2006 and Masters of illustration from the University of Tehran in 1996. She's also graphic design (BS) graduate in 1988 from art university, Tehran. For the past two decades, she has taught courses in layout, theoretical basics of color, photography, criticisms of arts, she also has taught graduate courses in theoretical basics of illustration and photography, sociology of art, wisdom of art, communication of art and new art. She is currently head of faculty of art at Alzahra University. Her areas of interests include interdisciplinary research in arts. She has been published several times in various fields such as comparative study of illustration in Iran, cultural grounds and arts education, pictorial advertising and society, etc. Associate professor, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran.

Samineh Ansari

Masters Student in urban design, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran.