

Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty

Volume 11 Number 1

© 2020 Intellect Ltd Introduction. English language. doi: https://doi.org/10.1386/csfb_00007_2

INTRODUCTION

SUSAN B. KAISER

University of California, Davis

ANNEKE SMELIK

Radboud University Nijmegen

Editors of Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty

Materials and materialities: Viral and sheep-ish encounters with fashion

The question of what role materials and materialities play in critical fashion studies emerges for us at the present time for at least two reasons. We write this introduction in the context of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. As the virus spreads globally from body to body, the importance of material protection, along with ‘social distancing’, becomes paramount. In the hospital context, especially, material shortages of face masks and shields, protective gowns, ventilators

and testing swabs present life-threatening conditions due to sheer demand as well as supply chain disruptions. On 27 February 2020, the World Health Organization declared, 'The current global stock-pile of PPE [Personal Protective Equipment] is insufficient' (WHO 2020a). The COVID-19 pandemic brings materials, their flows and functionality into stark relief. By the end of April, many countries were recommending or demanding cloth face masks for everyone in public spaces, with the clarification that medical masks (e.g. N95s) should be reserved for healthcare workers. The materiality of masks raises a number of aesthetic, cultural, psychological and social issues that we discuss – later in this introduction – through the lens of a posthumanist perspective.

Secondly, but of special significance for this issue of *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, the coincidentally timed papers and exhibition review also point directly to issues of materials and materialities. All three articles delve into what emerges from the materials associated with sheep: for example, wool fibre, woollen tweed fabric, sheepskin. Each also locates material cultural expressions in themes of place, and even nationality, but within larger contexts of globalization. Before addressing the COVID-19 crisis and introducing the articles and the exhibition review in this issue, we briefly explore concepts of materials and materialities in relation to posthumanism.

The material turn

In an essay entitled 'Materials against materiality', the British anthropologist Tim Ingold argues that the concept of materiality represents 'a real obstacle to sensible enquiry into materials, their transformation and affordances' (2007: 3). We agree that materials need to be foregrounded in a more thoughtful way in critical fashion studies, but also argue that their transformations – i.e. processing, manipulation, design, representations through material subjects and material cultures – similarly continue to need serious attention. In fashion studies, thinking about materials, the 'raw' ingredients of fibres and fabrics, always necessitates thinking about materiality: the 'cooked' but not yet completely 'done' products resulting from these materials, including their sociocultural representations and constructed meanings in everyday life. In other words, we suggest the importance of understandings that pay attention to *both* material sources and properties *and* social constructions of their meanings as materials are processed, transformed and constructed and resisted (Smelik 2018: 36–38). Although we agree with Ingold (2007: 14) about the importance of taking 'materials seriously, since it is from them that everything is made', we argue that critical fashion studies must encompass both materials and materialities.

In fact, in recent years the humanities and qualitative social sciences have experienced a 'material turn' (Rocamora and Smelik 2016: 11–15; Woodward and Fisher 2014; Jenss and Hofmann 2019; Lehmann 2019). The idea of addressing materials is not new, but had been temporarily obscured by the dominance of the linguistic turn in structuralism and post-structuralism (Barad 2003). New

materialism has its roots in many older schools of thought, from Marxism to feminism, from Science and Technology Studies to Actor Network Theory and from phenomenology to material culture studies (Coole and Frost 2010). New materialism abides by the notion that things, objects, art, fashion and people are made of matter, that is to say they are all mixtures of organic, mineral, vegetable and synthetic materials (Smelik 2018: 34). From a new materialist perspective, matter is not just passive and futile stuff, but should be considered as an active and meaningful actor in the world (Barrett and Bolt 2013: 3, 5; Ingold 2012). A reconsideration of materials and materiality in fashion studies is urgent because the fashion system is in rapid transition, both technologically and environmentally, demanding ethical fashion (Tseëlon 2014). Wearable technologies promise 'smart' materials as well as innovative approaches to production and consumption. At the same time, the system of fast fashion is cracking at the seams, because the fashion industry excels in pollution and waste due to overproduction and overconsumption (Fletcher and Tham 2014). In all of these developments, issues of identity and embodiment remain crucial to fashion.

Inasmuch as materiality includes the body as well as clothes, accessories, cosmetics and other material products, so also does it open the door to subjectivity, including the ways through which individuals mind their appearances (Kaiser 2001). Similarly, the concept of materiality offers ways to rethink material culture, which in anthropology and archaeology in the twenty-first century has experienced a 'new momentum following its long hibernation in the basements of museology' (Ingold 2007: 5). Taken together, materials (in the concrete sense) and materialities (in a more abstracted sense) call for understandings that bridge between human and non-human perspectives, at all levels of analysis, including global supply chains and fashion circuits.

A posthuman perspective

It may be opportune to place new materialism within the theoretical framework of posthumanism (Ferrando 2019: 158–59). A posthuman perspective proposes a non-anthropocentric view by taking the human subject away from the centre of attention (Vänskä 2018: 17). It permits an understanding of fashion as materially co-produced in a complex network of interrelated human and non-human actors. As such, the term posthuman refers to the insight that the human is always already interconnected with the wider material world (Braidotti and Hlavajova 2018: 3). Posthumanism acknowledges a nature–culture continuum that defies binary thinking, such as between the human and its many others – the non-human. Traditionally, the non-human pertains to nature or the organic: to trees, animals or monsters, as well as to bacteria, fungi or spiders. Today, the non-human equally refers to the technological or inorganic world of robotics, artificial intelligence or synthetic polyamides. In the case of fashion, the non-human can be made of natural fibres and fabrics like wool and tweed or of technological materials like polymer fibres, solar cells or 3D-printed fabrics.

What posthumanism and new materialism share is their endeavour to rethink and undo dualisms (Coole and Frost 2010). A dualistic or binary mode of thinking is a way of dealing with difference by creating an opposition or dualism out of it, for instance between the human and the non-human, nature and culture, the material and the immaterial. The deconstruction of binary oppositions gets 'intensified' in new materialism (St. Pierre et al. 2016: 99). Posthuman thought takes it further by arguing that the two terms, such as nature and culture, are always and already mutually involved and messily entangled (Haraway 2016; Braidotti 2013, 2019). In other words, nature–culture is a continuum rather than an absolute opposition, which means that the human–non-human can also be positioned on a continuum.

Posthuman critique and new materialism converge in their critical engagement with the contemporary world. There is a strong ethical concern for real-life conditions and the need for creative responses to current challenges (Braidotti and Hlavajova 2018: 1). This ethical and political critique makes sense because posthumanism claims that we are entangled with the world – a world that today suffers under the regime of a microscopic non-human organism: a virus. A posthumanist perspective can bring these things and practices – viruses, materials, objects, bodies, identities and labour – together, because it starts from a dynamic notion of life in which human bodies, fibres, fabrics, garments and technologies are inextricably entangled. Such a perspective helps understanding fashion as materially co-produced in an intricate network of intersecting human and non-human actors.

The virus and the face mask

The COVID-19 virus can indeed be characterized as a non-human actor that invades human actors. The virus is a material that is invisible to the human eye – 0.1–0.3 microns per virus particle (Sokolowski and LaBat 2020) – but whose actions can be deadly to the human body. As of May 2020, more than 300,000 have died worldwide from COVID-19, and the number continues to expand as economies begin to open up after lockdowns and as the virus spreads globally.

Internationally, epidemiological and policy-oriented strategies to cope with the pandemic vary. In posthumanist terms, the virus, as a non-human actor, does not seem to care which human bodies it enters. However, the bodies themselves, human actions, socio-economic conditions and cultural practices differ in the outcomes of the non-human to human continuum.

An early area of debate pertained to human actions as well as other materials: for example, 'to mask or not to mask' (Eikenberry et al. 2020). There was widespread agreement that medical masks such as N95s should be reserved for healthcare or other essential workers due to material shortages (WHO 2020a, 2020b), but there were mixed and dramatically changing messages regarding whether the general public should engage in cloth (non-medical) mask wearing. In early April 2020, interim guidance from the World Health Organization maintained that 'there is currently no evidence that

wearing a mask (whether medical or other types) by healthy persons in the wider community setting, including universal community masking, can prevent them from infection with respiratory viruses, including COVID-19' (WHO 2020b: 1).

Other scientists, however, argued for the 'precautionary principle', indicating that there is an important distinction between 'absence of evidence and evidence of absence' (Feng et al. 2020; Howard et al. 2020). Cloth masks, that is, are 'better than nothing', especially when they are made from appropriate fabric and fit well (Sokolowski and LaBat 2020). By April 2020 of the epidemic, both the United States and European Center for Disease Prevention and Control recommended cloth masks as a practical solution for use by the public, due in part to the convincing evidence that (1) many COVID-19 patients are asymptomatic, (2) they are most infectious in the early days of infection and (3) the incubation ranges from 2 to 15 days (Howard et al. 2020). Further, Hong Kong experienced nearly 100 per cent public compliance with the use of masks, and has had a very low death rate from COVID-19 with relatively positive health outcomes (Tufekci et al. 2020).

Cultural as well as material and medical factors had influenced some of the earlier advice for the public not to mask in Europe and the United States; in addition to concerns about material shortages and perceptions of a false sense of security (and hence non-compliance to important health-preserving practices such as handwashing and social distancing), there had been concerns about stigmatization and discrimination (Howard et al. 2020). Unlike the invisibility associated with the virus, the mask is highly visible and has not been customary in western cultures.

Mask usage in public for health purposes varies culturally, with much more commonality in Asian countries, especially since the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) outbreak in 2003. South Korea and Taiwan distributed disposable surgical masks early on in the pandemic; Japan and Singapore have been distributing cloth masks to their entire populations (Howard et al. 2020). In China, mask wearing is a practice associated with modern material culture. Dating to the 1910–11 pneumonic plague epidemic in Manchuria, wearing masks in public became associated with 'reason', 'hygienic modernity' and 'proof of Chinese scientific sovereignty' (Lynteris 2018). During the 2003 SARS epidemic, masks became known as material objects that render visibility to 'limiting infection as a civic duty in the context of epidemic or pandemic threat' (Lynteris 2018).

In terms of materialities, masks have to become transformed into 'public goods' with widespread usage – along with social distancing, handwashing and other hygienic practices – in order to achieve 'society-wide source control' (Tufekci et al. 2020). There are benefits to individual wearers, depending on the particular material and fit issues associated with the mask, but the most measurable positive outcomes accrue to others; it is an act of generosity to others to don a cloth mask. Inasmuch as 'western' cultures have tended towards individualist rather than collectivist needs, compliance requires a transformation in meaning and thinking. As Austria began to mandate mask wearing in public spaces such as grocery stores, for example, Chancellor Sebastian Kurz noted that it would be

a 'big adjustment', because 'masks are alien to our culture' (Norimitsu 2020). Associated with disguise and 'self-conscious [...] artifice' (Tseëlon 2012), masks require a lot of rethinking in Euromodern philosophy and practice in order to become 'one with the body' (Tseëlon 1999). In posthumanist terms, the nature–culture and non-human–human continua need attention in a way that decentres individualist human impulses and needs.

In the midst of material shortages and mixed, changing policy messages regarding the public wearing of face masks have contributed to cultural anxieties regarding exposure to the virus, compelling a variety of strategies by producers and consumers alike. Do-it-yourself videos instruct sewers and non-sewers how to make do with materials on hand, from fabric and sheets to T-shirts. Volunteers make masks for hospitals and nursing homes, while private consumers have become producers at home.

To address aesthetic concerns, many smaller fashion brands or designers are making fashionable face masks, including sequined, 3D-printed and recyclable ones (Philipkoski 2020). Still, in cultural studies terms, the flows in the fashion system have collapsed and blurred, or at least become challenged or aggravated by cultural anxieties, supply shortages and uncertainties (Kaiser 2012: 41). The fashion industry has suffered financially, but some clothing companies, including large fast fashion ones such as Zara (Spain) and H&M (Sweden), have converted to the production of personal protective equipment in the form of face masks and protective gowns. Luxury brands like Armani, Gucci and Prada in Italy (Bramley 2020) and LVMH in France (Dior, Fendi, Louis Vuitton and Givenchy) have resorted to making face masks for their respective governments.

We made our excursion into the phenomenon of face masks, because the pandemic reminds us that we are all material subjects: embodied knowers dependent on fabrics, clothes and other materials not only for protective, but also for aesthetic, cultural, economic, political, psychological and social reasons. Further, material subjects include both non-human and human components within the larger contexts of material culture, local circumstances and global circuits.

Location and globalization: Sheep-ish materials and materialities

Material networks of intersecting human and non-human actors are both transnational and local. In the realm of fashion, materials and materialities alike flow in circuitous ways. Branding and other kinds of storytelling shape and transform understandings of materials and their cultural and transcultural meanings. All three of the manuscripts in this volume shed light on the ways in which non-human actors such as sheep produce materials (wool fibre, sheepskin) that are variously processed, spun, woven, designed, sewn, commoditized, branded and rebranded, transported, purchased and worn. All also grapple with concepts of place and national identity in the context of the globalized fashion system.

In 'The Tweed Run meets Harris Tweed: Stories of a fashionable cycling experience', Catherine Glover combines the non-human materialities of bicycles and clothing tailored from woollen tweed fabric. The Tweed Run is a public cycling event in London, named after a material source of pride in the United Kingdom: Harris Tweed, a fabric handwoven from pure virgin wool by islanders in the Outer Hebrides of Scotland. As Glover notes, tweed is 'a cloth capable of engineering and reengineering a sustainable relationship with its subjects over time'. Avid participants in the annual cycling event wear tailored tweed garments, with a nod to the British tradition of men's tailoring on Savile Row. Glover argues that fashioned human bodies on bicycles form a symbolic and aesthetic 'third space', especially in an event that engages a lot of storytelling and includes references to a Victorian sense of Britishness. The branding of Harris Tweed, British-based Brompton fold-up bicycles, and the Tweed Run itself all contribute to this 'third space'. Whether or not participants wear Harris Tweed garments or ride Brompton bicycles, however, the licensed event has circulated internationally – including to countries in northern Europe with earlier and stronger traditions of cycling.

Wool also appears in 'Queer(ing) tailoring: Walter Van Beirendonck and the glorious bastardization of the suit', by Nicola Brajato. After an historical review of the suit as the masculine uniform cohered over time to become the hegemonic symbol of masculine dress, Brajato offers a breakdown of three dimensions associated with the suit: queer(ing) design through deconstructive and reconstructive strategies, queer(ing) surfaces in the form of fabrics and patterns and queer(ing) styling, for example, with the use of accessories. For over twenty years, Van Beirendonck has challenged the masculinized hegemony of wool and tailoring alike by mixing wool with materials such as household materials, silks, metal boning and Lurex in his 'suits' and styling them with models' 'beards' of green foam and foliage, Plexiglas masks and acid green latex gloves. Using a queer analytic lens, Brajato theorizes the ways in which Van Beirendonck engages 'critical and destabilizing strategies' in his radical creative work; pushes the boundaries of bodies, 'suits', gender and identity; and transforms concepts of masculine elegance. His suits are decidedly not bourgeois, nor are they traditionally masculine. As Brajato notes, fashion journalist Suzy Menkes described his suits as posthuman and/or prosthetic as early as 1997. References to apocalyptic science fiction abound in the materials Van Beirendonck uses, as well as the discourses and critiques surrounding his work.

Yet another material-analytical take on sheep draws not on their wool but rather on their skins, as presented by Rachel Matthews in 'Understanding ugg boots: Travels through place, space and time'. As Matthews notes, ugg boots are humble, soft, double-faced footwear comprising sheepskin: fleece on the inside and tanned skin on the outside. Initially created and popularized in Australia and linked to agricultural practices, surf culture, national identity, rebellious youth and leisure time at home, discourses surrounding the transnational circulation of Uggs (the brand owned by the American-owned Deckers Outdoor Corporation) have diverged into the realms of high fashion and celebrity culture. Matthews' analysis results in discourse-assemblage mappings

that demonstrate the differences between Australian and transnational understandings of the humble boot, known for fostering the 'ugg shuffle' when humans walk in them. This contributes to the perceptions in Australia of ugg boots as designed to be homebound or worn in very casual settings after surfing. In contrast, since 2016 Deckers' Uggs have been seen on high fashion runways. Their transnational circulations focus much more on celebrity and representation than on authenticity and production.

Exhibition review

The final piece in this issue is Nina Cole's review of an exhibition, *Cross Colours: Black Fashion in the 20th Century* at the California African American Museum in Los Angeles (25 September 2019 through 23 August 2020, but closed at the time of this writing due to COVID-19). The label Cross Colours emerged in 1989 with the tag line 'Clothing Without Prejudice' and featured hip hop and Pan-African streetwear styles, including baggy clothes, bright colours and socially conscious messages. As Cole asserts in her review, the brand and the clothes themselves were revolutionary, and the exhibition does an impressive job of capturing their trajectories and transnational influence, sociocultural significance and political as well as aesthetic references and ramifications. This exhibit is a reminder about the significance of self-representation – in this context, in African diasporas – through human and non-human assemblages such as fashion.

The vicissitudes of face masks during the pandemic of COVID-19 and the use of wool in its many manifestations – tailored tweed garments for cycling in London, the bourgeois masculine suit queered by a Belgian designer, soft ugg boots from Australia – highlight the role that materials and materialities play in critical fashion studies. The interconnectedness of non-human with human materials and materialities becomes evident as brands and stories circulate in ways that rely not only on localities – including national identities and pride – for a sense of authenticity, but also on transnational capitalist flows for the sake of profit-making and global recognition. Together, sheepish materials/materialities and the COVID-19 pandemic compel critical fashion studies to consider strategies for posthuman knowledge-making in an uncertain world.

References

- Barad, Karen (2003), 'Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28:3, pp. 801–31.
- Barrett, E. and Bolt, B. (eds) (2013), *Carnal Knowledge: Towards a 'New Materialism' Through the Arts*, London: I. B. Tauris.

- Braidotti, Rosi (2013), *The Posthuman*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2019), *Posthuman Knowledge*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi and Hlavajova, Maria (eds) (2018), *The Posthuman Glossary*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Bramley, Ellie Violet (2020), 'Prada the latest brand to make medical face masks', *The Guardian*, 24 March, <https://www.theguardian.com/fashion/2020/mar/24/prada-the-latest-fashion-brand-to-make-medical-face-masks>. Accessed 24 April 2020.
- Coole, Diana and Frost, Samantha (eds) (2010), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Eikenberry, Steffen E., Mancuso, Marina, Iboi, Enahoro, Phan, Tin, Eikenberry, Keenan, Kuang, Yang, Kostelich, Eric and Gumel, Abba B. (2020), 'To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face mask use by the general public to curtail the COVID-19 pandemic', medRxiv, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.06.20055624>. Accessed 25 April 2020.
- Feng, Shuo, Shen, Chen, Xia, Nan, Song, Wei, Fan, Mengzhen and Cowling, Benjamin J. (2020), 'Comment: Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic', *The Lancet*, 20 March, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanres/article/PIIS2213-2600\(20\)30134-X/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanres/article/PIIS2213-2600(20)30134-X/fulltext). Accessed 25 April 2020.
- Ferrando, Francesca (2019), *Philosophical Posthumanism*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Fletcher, Kate and Tham, M. (eds) (2014), *Routledge Handbook of Sustainability and Fashion*, London: Routledge.
- Haraway, Donna (2016), *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Howard, Jeremy, Huang, Austin, Li, Zhiyuan, Tufekci, Zdimal, Vladimir, van der Westhuizen, Helene-Mari, von Delft, Arne, Price, Amy, Fridman, Lex, Tang, Lei-Han, Tang, Viola, Watson, Gregory L., Bax, Christina E., Shaikh, Reshama, Questier, Frederik, Hernandez, Danny, Chu, Larry F., Ramirez, Christina M. and Rimoim, Anne W. (2020), 'Face masks against COVID-19: An evidence review', <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202004.0203/v1>. Accessed 24 April 2020.
- Ingold, Tim (2007), 'Materials against materiality', *Archaeological Dialogues*, 14:1, pp. 1–16.
- (2012), 'Toward an ecology of materials', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41, pp. 427–42.
- Jenss, Heike and Hofmann, Viola (eds) (2019), *Fashion and Materiality: Cultural Practices in Global Contexts*, London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts.
- Kaiser, Susan B. (2001), 'Minding appearances: Style, truth and subjectivity', in J. Entwistle and E. Wilson (eds), *Body Dressing*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 79–102.
- (2012), *Fashion and Cultural Studies*, Oxford: Berg.
- (2019), 'Material subjects: Making place, making time through fashion', in H. Jenss and V. Hofmann (eds), *Fashion and Materiality: Cultural Practices in Global Contexts*, London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts.

- Lehmann, Ulrich (2019), *Fashion and Materialism*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Leung, Chi Chiu, Lam, Tai Hing and Cheng, Kar Keung (2020), 'Mass masking in the COVID-19 epidemic: People need guidance', *The Lancet*, 21 March, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(20\)30520-1/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)30520-1/fulltext). Accessed 24 April 2020.
- Lynteris, Christos (2018), 'Plague masks: The visual emergence of anti-epidemic personal protection equipment', *Medical Anthropology*, 37:6, pp. 442–57, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01459740.2017.1423072>. Accessed 23 April 2020.
- Onishi, Norimitsu and Méhuet, Constant (2020), 'Mask-wearing is a very new fashion in Paris (and a lot of other places)', *New York Times*, 9 April, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/09/world/europe/virus-mask-wearing.html>. Accessed 25 April 2020.
- Philipkoski, Kristen (2020), '30+ fashion brands pivoting to make stylish coronavirus masks', *Forbes*, 12 April, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kristenphilipkoski/2020/04/12/30-fashion-brands-pivoting-to-make-stylish-coronavirus-masks/#89e5a0b1d697>. Accessed 24 April 2020.
- Rocamora, Agnès and Smelik, Anneke (eds) (2016), *Thinking through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists*, London: I. B. Tauris and Bloomsbury.
- Smelik, Anneke (2018), 'New materialism: A theoretical framework for fashion in the age of technological innovation', *International Journal of Fashion Studies*, 5:1, pp. 31–52.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth, Mazzei, Lisa and Jackson, Alecia (2016), 'Introduction: New empiricisms and new materialisms', *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16:2, pp. 99–110.
- Sokolowski, Susan L. and LaBat, Karen (2020), 'Making your own mask? These are the five most important things to consider', *The Conversation*, 16 April, <https://theconversation.com/making-masks-at-home-what-you-need-to-know-about-how-to-reduce-the-transmission-of-coronavirus-136122>. Accessed 24 April 2020.
- Tseëlon, Efrat (1999), *Masks, Disguise and Identity*, London: Bloomsbury.
- (2012), 'Fashion and the orders of masking', *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, 3:1&2, pp. 3–9.
- (2014), 'Introduction: A critique of the ethical fashion paradigm', *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, 2:1&2, pp. 3–68.
- Tufekci, Zeynep, Howard, Jeremy and Greenhalgh, Trish (2020), 'The real reason to wear a mask', *The Atlantic*, 22 April, <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2020/04/dont-wear-mask-yourself/610336/>. Accessed 25 April 2020.
- Vänskä, Annamari (2018), 'How to do humans with fashion: Towards a posthuman critique of fashion', *International Journal of Fashion Studies*, 5:1, pp. 15–31.
- Woodward, Sophie and Fisher, Tom (2014), 'Fashioning through materials: Material culture, materiality and processes of materialization', *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, 5:1, pp. 3–23.

World Health Organization (2020a), 'Rational use of personal protective equipment for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)', 27 February, https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331695/WHO-2019-nCov-IPC_PPE_use-2020.3-eng.pdf. Accessed 24 April 2020.

——— (2020b), 'Advice on the use of masks in the context of COVID-19: Interim guidance', 6 April, https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331693/WHO-2019-nCov-IPC_Masks-2020.3-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Accessed 24 April 2020.

Suggested citation

Kaiser, Susan B. and Smelik, Anneke (2020), 'Materials and materialities: Viral and sheep-ish encounters with fashion', *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, 11:1, pp. 9–19, doi: https://doi.org/10.1386/csfb_00007_2

Contributor details

Susan B. Kaiser is professor at the Departments of Design and Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies, the University of California, Davis. She has published widely in critical fashion studies, textiles and clothing, cultural studies, and feminist studies. Her books include *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic Appearances in Context* and *Fashion and Cultural Studies*.

E-mail: sbkaiser@ucdavis.edu

Anneke Smelik is Katrien van Munster professor of Visual Culture at the Radboud University Nijmegen (Netherlands). She has published widely in the fields of fashion, cinema, popular culture and cultural memory. Her latest books are *Delft Blue to Denim Blue* and *Contemporary Dutch Fashion and Thinking Through Fashion. A Guide to Key Theorists*.

E-mail: a.smelik@let.ru.nl

Susan B. Kaiser and Anneke Smelik have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.
