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Abstract: The late Dame Vivienne Westwood was a pioneer of the punk movement and she remains known for her commitment to various social justice causes—the most prominent being climate advocacy. However, throughout her career as a designer, Westwood’s work evolved from grass-roots punk designs to a commercialized brand shown on runways from London to Paris. Westwood’s life offers us a glimpse into how we can make decisions as workers, activists, and leaders. Are we able to change corrupt systems from the inside? Was Westwood able to subvert the capitalist machine as a revolutionary, or was punk cultural production eventually embedded into the very institution it was protesting?

The Life of Dame Vivienne Westwood

If you ever say ‘I used to be punk’ then you never really were! Punk is a mindset, a way you think and live, so you either are a punk or you are not! It is not just a ‘phase’ you go through!
- John Patrick Logan, online poll respondent (Holmes, 2016, n.p.)

Born in 1941 in a provincial town in Cheshire, England, Dame Vivienne Westwood quickly rose to fame when she stepped onto the British punk scene in the early 1970s. As a teenager, Westwood customized her school uniform and designed all her clothes (Westwood 2009). She attended Harrow Art College but left because she “didn’t know how a working-class girl like [her] could possibly make a living in the art world” (Victoria & Albert Museum 2004, n.p.). She then worked in a factory before becoming a primary school teacher (Frankel 1999). Westwood met and married Malcolm McLaren in 1967. By 1971, McLaren was selling clothes designed by Westwood in a shop on King’s Road in London; the shop went through many iterations and names, but it is best known as SEX.

SEX rapidly became a cultural focal point for the burgeoning British punk scene. Prominent punk musicians, such as Siouxsie Sioux of Sixouise and the Banshees and Sid Vicious of the Sex Pistols, shopped there (Lister 2015). Westwood and McLaren garnered fame—and notoriety—through their dressing of young punks in London. By 1974, McLaren was working as the manager for the Sex Pistols, and the band frequently wore Westwood’s clothes, both on and off the stage (Lister 2015).

Low employment rates, the Vietnam War, and racial tensions in England defined Westwood’s younger years: the punk movement was a response to this uneasy social order. It was
birthed by working-class young people protesting the inequitable conditions of the material world (Clark 2003). For many, punk was a protest or a “way of changing the world” (Alexander 2012, n.p.). This is evidently the case for Westwood, as she describes in a 2012 interview with Vogue:

I was so upset with what was going on in the world. I just couldn’t stand the idea of people being tortured and that we even had such a thing as war. I hated the older generation, who had not done anything about it. Punk was a call-to-arms for me. (Alexander 2012, n.p.)

Westwood’s work reflected these social and political beliefs. Her path to fame was built on protesting the establishment and subverting cultural norms. Furthermore, Westwood was not simply involved in the punk scene; she dressed the entire movement. Put succinctly, Vivienne Westwood’s clothes defined punk.

By her death in 2022, Vivienne Westwood had become known as more than just the architect of the punk movement; she had become an international fashion icon despite having received no formal training as a designer. Regardless, to this day, contemporary styles draw inspiration from her work. Westwood’s fashion house is one of the last remaining independent global fashion brands; in 2020, her company profited close to five million USD before taxes from sales worth over 500 million (France-Presse 2023). In 2004, the Victoria and Albert Museum launched the world’s largest exhibition dedicated to a British fashion designer, hosting over 150 pieces by Westwood to offer a retrospective of her career.

Vivienne Westwood defined herself as both a fashion designer and an activist. Her advocacy was varied, from her early punk days protesting the bourgeois establishment to her later years focusing on environmental activism. Regardless of the cause, anti-capitalist protest and rhetoric remained a critical part of her work. But, as her political engagement evolved throughout her 50-plus-year career, she drew both respect and contempt. Westwood’s life offers us a glimpse into what it means to protest capitalism from within the machine. Does it always end in failure, as capitalism appropriates all art that reacts against it? Or does Westwood’s career show us there is more than one way to rebel and change can happen from the inside?

The Pioneers of Punk

In 1975, the New York Dolls—a band managed by Malcolm McLaren—took the stage in communist red leather pants to perform a show that was, in their words, a “very special ‘entente cordiale’1 with the People's Republic of China” in front of a hammer and sickle backdrop (Lister 2015, n.p.). Notably, the association with communist China during the Cold War was radical for its time. This moment has come to define the beginning of the punk aesthetic: anger at the establishment had crystalized into a movement. While not all punk is political, for numerous artists and musicians, punk was indeed a politically mobilizing force. Joe Strummer, the co-vocalist of the British punk band The Clash, blatantly claimed that “punk rock for me was a social movement” (Moore and Roberts 2009, 273). The sound, clothes, and art were a pushback against the flare jeans, peace, and love manifesto of the 1960s that had arguably failed in its progressive initiatives. As anthropologist Dylan Clark put it, the core of early punk was “calculated anger” (Clark 2003, 225).

---

1 Entente cordial is a French term meaning cordial agreement.
Moreover, punk was bigger than anger: it was a movement dedicated to protest, praxis, and conscious building (Moore and Roberts 2009). Punk was revolutionary and borderline destructive in its goals; the movement aimed to “tear apart consumer goods, royalty, and sociability, and it sought to destroy the idols of the bourgeoisie” (Clark 2003, 225). The anthems of the movement focused on a variety of political issues. For instance, the Sex Pistols’ 1977 single “God Save the Queen” took aim at the British monarchy:

God save the queen  
The fascist regime  
They made you a moron  
A potential H bomb

While The Clash’s 1982 single addressed police violence:

You have the right not to be killed  
Murder is a crime  
Unless it was done  
By a policeman

Similarly, The Clash’s 1980 triple album Sandinista! was named after the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, who were protesting the United States’ illegal occupation of their country. Punk has no cohesive ideology, but it is often defined by its anti-establishment ethos. This anger and revolutionary ideology coalesced to build a space separate from hegemonic structures. Radical punk aimed to “build a scene that could not be taken” or create communities free from the capitalists and moneyed elite (Clark 2003, 225). The punk movement would prove so unconventional that traditional society would not understand it. In other words, it would be “untouchable, undesirable, and unmanageable” (Clark 2003, 225).

Problems and hypocrisies arose, however, with the commercial success of punk. Partly due to the scene’s increasing consumer popularity, in 1978, the British anarcho-punk band Crass released the song “Punk is Dead”:

It’s just another cheap product for the consumers head…  
CBS promote the Clash  
But it ain’t for revolution, it’s just for cash

Through their lyrics, Crass is arguing that The Clash is no longer punk if it is palatable enough to be shown on CBS. The whole movement was supposed to represent an alternative to the wealth aspirations of conventional society. Yet, The Clash had arguably become a business like any other. As one writer detailed, this was the ultimate betrayal of the punk movement, to be seen as “selling out” (Hodgkinson 2011, n.p.). To this point, in 1998, the band’s lead singer Penny Rimbaud claimed:

The movement [has] been bought out. The capitalist counter-revolutionaries had killed it with cash. Punk degenerated from being a force for change, to becoming just another element in the grand media circus. Sold out, sanitized, and strangled,
punk had become just another social commodity, a burnt-out memory of how it might have been. (Rimbaud 1998, n.p.).

In other words, Rimbaud claimed that punk had died only twenty years after the movement’s genesis. Social and political events at the time could support this claim. In 1978, the Sex Pistols broke up. In 1979, Sid Vicious overdosed and died, and the English elected Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister, a woman known for her conservative party platform that emphasized free market capitalism and cutbacks on government spending. A year later, the Americans elected Ronald Reagan as President, who similarly supported seemingly unregulated capitalism along with anti-communist insurgencies abroad. The great radical movement, started by working-class youths, had been killed.

Alternatively, the antithetical maxim of the punk movement, “Punk is dead. Long live punk,” questions this narrative (Clark 2003, 223). Rather than die, contemporary punk has, as all things do, evolved. It has become “decentralized, anti-hierarchical, mobile, and invisible…a loose assemblage of guerrilla militias” (Clark 2003, 234). In short, the punk movement went underground. Being a punk in the twenty-first century can mean a myriad of things; these days, the scene’s anti-establishment principles are “called punk, yet it has no name” (Clark 2003, 234). The first phase of the movement may have ended with the artists “bought out” or dead, but the punk ethos still exists within the contemporary cultural landscape.

**Fashion as a Rebel Movement**

Throughout the evolving nature of punk, members embodied the movement’s radical ethos through fashion. Furthermore, dressing the movement was no small feat. The making of clothing is a serious business, as Demna, the embattled artistic director of Balenciaga, recently put it: “...fashion to me can no longer be seen as an entertainment, but rather as the art of making clothes” (Collins 2023, n.p.). For Westwood, artistic expression was inherently linked to political action; her initial designs reflected and even encouraged rebellion against the existing oppressive structures (Rosato 2022).

Westwood’s clothes displayed themes related to class struggle, take, for example, Westwood’s 1976 “Only Anarchists Are Pretty” shirt (See Appendix B). The shirt, currently in possession of The Met, has vertical stripes, an image of Karl Marx, and phrases such as “Only Anarchists Are Pretty,” “Try supervision,” and “chaos” (Rosato 2022, 15). The vertical stripes are emblematic of Nazi prison uniforms; when paired with the anarchist imagery, the shirt reminds individuals not to blindly follow political leaders and resist regimes that demand uniformity. The shirt also stands in poignant opposition to British capitalist structures; Malcolm McLaren confirmed Karl Marx’s image was chosen due to Marx’s influence in starting workers’ rights movements (Rosato 2022).

Moreover, Westwood used the technique of distressing fabric to rebel against the aristocracy’s respectability standards while snubbing the well-heeled class. Two of Westwood’s most famous early punk designs are the “God Save the Queen” ensemble (See Appendix C) and the “Two Cowboys” shirt (See Appendix D). “God Save the Queen,” in the Victoria and Albert Museum’s possession, features an image of Queen Elizabeth on distressed fabric held together with a safety pin through her lip—a clear snub of the monarchy. By placing a safety pin through the lip of the Queen, Westwood is defiling her image and questioning the respect and position of the monarchy in British society. Additionally, the image is placed alongside lyrics to “God Save
the Queen” by the Sex Pistols. The song is provocative, saying, “She ain’t no human being” and “There is no future in England’s dream.” The “Two Cowboys” shirt, in The Met’s possession, features two cowboys standing naked from the waist down on purposefully distressed fabric. Before fashion designers distressed clothes for their art, distressed clothing was worn only by people who could not afford new clothes. As such, Westwood’s intentionally distressed clothing is a political reaction against elitist ideas of clothes as wealth signifiers (Rosato 2022).

Westwood not only confronted ideas surrounding economic inequality in her work, but she also challenged the gender binary and heterosexual norms. Returning to the “God Save the Queen” ensemble, the piece features bondage-style pants attached to a skirt. This type of look was not uncommon for Westwood and constituted another political act on her part. By connecting a skirt, a traditionally feminine article of clothing, to pants, a more masculine article of clothing, Westwood was intentionally subverting traditional gender binaries (Rosato 2022). “Two Cowboys” also pushes back against the heteronormative power structures that dominated Britain throughout the twentieth century. The positioning of the two men on the shirt, their proximity, and the gesture of one fixing the other’s collar signifies a sexual relationship between the two. Any display of homosexuality during this time was inherently a protest. A woman in the 1970s was even arrested and charged with obscenity for wearing Westwood’s shirt in London, demonstrating the garment’s provocative and rebellious nature (Alderson 2016).

Westwood’s earlier works mimicked the punk ethos of rebellion against the establishment. Her garments protested wealth disparities, the dominance of the British monarchy, and repressive sexual norms. Through the semiotics of her clothes, Westwood contributed to the punk movement and the raising consciousness of youths in England, challenging young shoppers in her store to not accept societal inequalities. However, Westwood’s clothes still encouraged a form of capitalistic consumption, which may contradict the essence of punk. Teasing apart whether consumption can ever be radical is a messy affair, and it is not always guaranteed punk embodies transformative potential.

Even so, a crucial aspect of the punk scene was the emphasis on DIY (Do-It-Yourself) culture. While not all punk was DIY, DIY cultural production was dominant within the scene. Punks and academics alike interpret DIY as a form of activism and anti-capitalist in nature. It represents a mobilizing structure that encouraged punks to be more than just consumers and instead build the world they wanted to see. Punks created the music, art, and clothes that defined their movement themselves (Moore and Roberts 2009). For example, many punk bands intentionally separated themselves from the profit-orientated music industry; the Sex Pistols and The Clash had record deals with major labels, but Crass insisted on only recording with their independent label. Further, many of these punk bands took themes of resistance and protest beyond their music. Some started their own record labels, organized networks of independent music venues, and created zines, intentionally producing in opposition to capitalism (Moore and Roberts 2009). DIY production was the “mechanism” that mobilized the punk movement and created alternatives to capitalist infrastructures (Moore and Roberts 2009, 288). Moreover, Westwood incorporated these same DIY themes in her work. As a Westwood collector wrote, “The only real way to win...against capitalism is to do what Westwood did and make things yourself” (Clarke and Holt 2016, 26).

In a 2013 blog post, Vivienne Westwood’s son Ben wrote about watching his mother create the iconic “Only Anarchists Are Pretty” shirt, describing her writing on the shirt by hand and experimenting with different dyeing methods. Ben Westwood wrote, “[The] whole shirt embodied the punk ethos of ‘Do it Yourself,’ an ethos that you yourselves can follow. Make your own shirt” (Westwood
DIY, while political and anti-capitalist, is not heterogeneous in its application. The practice is meant to stand in opposition to economic hegemony, potentially pointing to the inalienability of labor in this space. Yet, while Westwood making her own shirt is creatively—and ideologically—meaningful, the question remains: how much autonomy can an individual have over their work or means of production while operating from within the capitalist system (Cogan 2006)?

“Buy Less, Choose Well, Make it Last”

By her death in 2022, Westwood had come a long way since her early years designing at the shop on King’s Road. If the punk movement went underground in the ‘80s, Westwood stepped into the spotlight instead. SEX was eventually renamed “Worlds End,” and her localized punk fashion entered the high fashion circuit. Westwood debuted her first official catwalk collection, Pirate, with Malcolm McLaren in 1981. Three years later, Westwood’s Spring/Summer 1984 collection Hypnos was shown at Tokyo’s Best of Five global fashion awards (Victoria & Albert 2004). In 1990 and 1991, she received the Womenswear Designer of the Year Award from the British Fashion Council (Victoria & Albert 2004). A year later, Westwood received an Order of the British Empire (OBE) and Damehood in 2006, ironically from Queen Elizabeth II (Dore 2022). Westwood also opened multiple flagship stores across the globe, including in New York, Los Angeles, Paris, and beyond. In 2022, her fashion house had a gross profit of £40.4 million (Halliday 2023).

However, as her career and life progressed, Westwood began to step away from fashion to focus more on activism and direct action. Throughout the twenty-first century, Westwood was involved in advocacy work defending civil liberties doctrines like habeas corpus, nuclear disarmament, and figures like Julian Assange. Assange founded WikiLeaks, an organization known for publishing confidential government documents in the name of transparency (Ray 2024). Westwood and her partner Andreas Kronthaler even designed Assange and his longtime partner Stella Morris’ wedding day clothes (Ng 2022).

In particular, Westwood’s later years saw her focusing more heavily on spheres related to environmental justice, accountability, and mass consumerism. Correspondingly, Westwood’s later collections displayed this increasing interest in environmental activism. For instance, Westwood launched her Buy Up Dress Less collection from Spring/Summer 2019 with a call to action: “We are fighting right now to save the world; and punks love a fight” (Newbold 2018, n.p.). After winning the British Fashion Award for Positive Change in 2018, Westwood proclaimed free market capitalism is “the cause of all our problems—climate change, war... it’s programmed to fail” (The Vivienne Foundation 2018, n.p.). Her Homo Loquax collection from Autumn/Winter 2019/2020 displayed this theme even more. Greenpeace activists walked the runway in Vivienne Westwood’s designs, most featuring political statements about capitalism, consumerism, and the environment. This collection included clothes with phrases such as “we sold our soul for consumption,” “bankers are evil,” and “all profit belongs to me, so long as you keep buying crap” (Vivienne Westwood 2019, n.p.). But, some identify the “crap” in question as Westwood’s overpriced clothes; a “Buy Less Choose Well” shirt from Westwood’s brand costs £85.

Regardless, Westwood has never limited her protest to just the catwalk. In 2005, Westwood began working on a collection that she named AR: Active Resistance to Propaganda. Two years later, Westwood published her manifesto, a short story with the same title. She described it as a “journey to find art...[and] its aim is to encourage young people to be art lovers” (Westwood 2016, n.p.).
7). Various student and professional groups “went on tour” performing the manifesto across the United Kingdom, including the Royal Shakespeare Company, reinforcing Westwood’s status as an influential cultural figure. (Westwood 2016). In 2014, Westwood cut off her hair to protest climate change (Lidbury 2014). In the same year, Westwood stated that climate change, specifically working with Greenpeace’s Save the Arctic campaign, was her priority, not fashion (Thorpe 2014). A year later, Westwood drove a tank into British politician David Cameron’s front yard in response to his government issuing 27 fracking licenses (BBC 2015).

Despite Westwood’s dedication to direct action, critics have labeled her activism as hypocritical due to her wealth, celebrity status, and implicit encouragement of consumerism through her fashion career. In 2016, Vivienne Westwood and her son Joe Corré, fathered by Malcolm McLaren, set afire McLaren’s collection of punk memorabilia in protest of climate change and the migrant crisis. Some of the clothes burned included pants made from PVC (plastic polyvinyl chloride), which becomes a pollutant when burned (Cosier 2022). The collection was valued at £5 million, but Corré remarked the real value of the clothes was their representation of “a moment in time when people thought they could do something. And then it [punk] just turned into a pose. And it’s been a pose ever since.” (Strauss 2016, n.p.). Corré also proclaimed, “Punk rock is not important. Punk has become another marketing tool to sell you something you don’t need” (Strauss 2016). Corré was likely referring to the overwhelming commodification of punk; case in point, nearly every American mall sells a version of “punk” clothing. In this way, punk and, more broadly, the entire concept of rebellion have been devalued into a commodity for corporations to attempt to sell (Clark 2003). Yet, the criticisms of the commodification of punk are often pointed directly at Corré’s parents. Without McLaren, the Sex Pistols would have never transformed into the punk equivalent of a teenage-heatthrob-boyband (Strauss 2016). The mere existence of punk in high fashion circuits can be attributed to Westwood herself, the same woman who started selling clothes denouncing the British monarchy, only to accept an OBE and Damehood from the institution twenty years later.

Despite this, Westwood’s most significant cause is arguably her rejection of mass consumerism. As Westwood herself pointed out, mass consumerism, capitalism, and environmentalism are intertwined. In 2007, Westwood boldly claimed, “I don’t feel comfortable defending my clothes. But if you’ve got the money to afford them, then buy something from me. Just don’t buy too much” (Cadwalladr 2007, n.p.). The tension in this quote reflects the broader dilemmas in Westwood’s late career. Her position as an agent in a consumption-driven industry contradicted her role as an activist and punk. This paradox existed in a morally gray area and elicited many admirers and critics. One such critic, Suzy Menkes, a fashion editor of the International Herald Tribune, said:

How dare she send out a show laced with anarchist messages, take her bow in a clinging dress with the word ‘propaganda’ spiraling around her ample figure, announce that the spirit of her show is ‘the more you consume, the less you think’ and then take the opportunity to launch her collection of punk safety pins in diamonds? (Cadwalladr 2007, n.p.).

In 2010, Westwood told reporters she hoped people “stop buying clothes.” (Katz 2010, n.p.) But, directly before making this statement, Westwood debuted an Autumn/Winter line at London Fashion Week (Katz 2010).
Westwood’s controversial business practices spanned further than her minimalist consumption ethos: in 2015, Westwood and her fashion label were accused of tax avoidance. Westwood’s firm had been paying 2 million pounds to an offshore account. By doing this, her business was no longer subject to UK taxes (O’Halloran 2015). In short, she had dodged paying £500,000 per year to the UK treasury (O’Halloran 2015). However, a few months earlier, Westwood had become one of the biggest benefactors of the English Green Party, donating £300,000 to the Party that year (Gale 2015). She preached her support, saying, “The 1% of the world population who are in power...[are] taking us into disaster,” supposedly excluding herself from this claim (Gale 2015, n.p.). The Green Party paradoxically supports a Tax Dodgers Bill that would outlaw the use of offshore companies to avoid paying English taxes—the same practice Westwood engaged in. Westwood received criticism for endorsing a political party whose agenda she does not adhere to (O’Halloran 2015). In response to her tax avoidance, young Green Party activists voted to ban her from a planned tour of British universities where she aimed to generate youth support for the Party (Mendick 2015).

**Confronting Fashion’s Environmental and Social Impacts**

As of 2012, garment manufacturing pollutes more than any other industry besides oil; the market is dominated by environmental and humanitarian problems linked to unregulated supply chains, chemical pollutants, and staggering carbon emissions (Bliss 2019; Suraci 2021). Disturbingly, the amount of clothes produced globally since 2000 has doubled, and the time span consumers wear an item of clothing has decreased by 40% (Suraci 2021; Sharpe 2022). This increase in rapid clothing consumption is largely due to the emergence of “microtrends” on social media that decrease the amount of time an item of clothing is deemed chic (Copestake 2022). Westwood’s response is simple: “Buy less, choose well, make it last” (Westwood 2014, n.p.). To her point, Westwood purposely avoids engaging in microtrends; as one admirer argued, “her clothes are so timeless as to be the most eco-friendly...they never go out of style” (Yotka 2018, n.p.).

Comparatively, many fashion brands actively work to fulfill the significant consumer demand created by microtrends. To do so, these companies exploit unfair labor practices to produce their clothes for incredibly cheap. Around 75% of clothing exports are made in the Global South, as countries in this region tend to have fewer labor regulations (Anastasia 2017). Notably, this practice is an intentional consequence of the global economic order. At the end of the 1970s, economic restructuring meant labor-intensive production was purposefully moved to the former colonies of Western nations, and these workers were tasked with making goods for consumers in the North (Fröbel 1980, n.p.). The new international division of labor, while banal in theory, had severe consequences for individuals within the Global South. The cheapest worker is usually the most marginalized one, in this case, poor working-class women. Due to a lack of transparency around their supply chain, brands that cater to consumers in the Global North can exploit labor in the Global South through incredibly harsh working conditions (Harris 2022). On top of this, most of the 75 million garment workers worldwide are women, and textile production emits 1.2 billion tons of greenhouse gas emissions yearly (Anastasia 2017; United Nations 2018). In an industry filled with human rights abuses, brand transparency regarding supply chains is a feminist and environmental issue. Likewise, this indirect relationship between women in the former colonies and those in the West relies on patriarchal gender roles that generate both the unfair working conditions and the beauty standards that drive consumption (Chang 2020).
Concerningly, the structures of the global supply chains have become embedded in contemporary capitalism. Supply chain capitalism is a given for brands in the West, and outsourcing is the unfortunate norm (Tsing 2009). Cross-border labor-capitalist relationships within the fashion industry beg important questions concerning the alienation and exploitation of women’s labor. Karl Marx, who is featured in Westwood’s designs, described estranged labor as “...labour that is external to the worker… he does not affirm himself, but he denies himself.” (Marx 1844, n.p.). Labor in the fashion industry’s commodity chain is coerced, representing an inherent imbalance between the proletariat manufacturer and the bourgeois consumer. It is easy to imagine Westwood at the beginning of her creative career, sewing clothes for SEX in the back of her shop and in her home. It is nearly impossible to fully conceptualize the brutal reality of clothing manufacturing in the Global South. One ethnographer described a garment worker in Sri Lanka by saying:

She was part of the machine herself, the human arms which gave it life. Yet, how did she do it, how did her slender body cope with the tremendous strain of this, strenuous, repetitive, continuous work for eight hours a day, for six days a week, for four weeks a month, for months and for years? For how long could she actually go on doing this before everything became too much to bear? (Seneviratne 2019, 160).

Similar to the English factory-men Marx was writing about in the 1840s, this Sri Lankan worker is alienated from her product, her body, and seemingly her humanity through the production process: all for the benefit of the capitalist owner and consumer. Though this individual does not produce clothing for Westwood’s brand, her company likely places workers in parallel conditions.

This dichotomy is largely—but not entirely—defined by the class differences separating garment workers and buyers across borders. Global inequality has surged between 1975—the year the punk movement began—and 2010 (Niña-Zarazua, Roope, and Tarp 2017). Additionally, wealth inequality is larger between countries than within any one nation (Lockwood 2021). Highly unequal income levels across nations can be explained, in part, by the cross-border exploitation made possible by supply chains. Disturbingly, 46% of the world’s global wealth belongs to the wealthiest 1%: a group Westwood criticizes but is firmly part of (Milanovic 2016).

Global Transitions: The DIY Spirit to Supply Chain Realities

While Vivienne Westwood’s firm does not produce clothing at the same rate as fast fashion brands, its operations still lack supply chain transparency. Since the passage of the Modern Slavery Act in 2015 in the United Kingdom, the Vivienne Westwood group has published a yearly summary of their business and supply chain transactions to ensure their firm is not using compulsory or slave labor. The report includes some, but not all, the data regarding the countries where Westwood’s company manufactures its merchandise (Vivienne Westwood 2021). Tracing supply chains is a complex process, making it easy for corporations to greenwash their business.

2 Greenwashing refers to a range of practices businesses engage in to appear to be more environmentally friendly without altering their harmful actions. Broadly, corporations leverage consumers’ concerns over their environmental footprints to increase product consumption while not changing business practices (Hill 2023).
practices. Good on You—an index that analyzes the environmental and human impact of clothing brands—notes there is no evidence Westwood’s brand ensures living wages (Good on You 2022). The company also does not complete comprehensive audits of its supply chains (Good on You 2022). Overall, the brand is given a 3/5 rating. Similarly, Panaprium, another sustainability index, gave Vivienne Westwood a rating of 5/10. According to Panaprium, Vivienne Westwood does not disclose information regarding manufacturing facilities, ethical production standards, and work conditions across the brand’s supply chain. In 2013, when an editor at Eluxe Magazine asked Westwood about her dubious supply chains and lack of eco-friendly materials, she responded that she had maintained the same suppliers for decades and switching was “too complicated” (Lodhi 2013, n.p.). Through these practices, Vivienne Westwood’s brand has become embedded in supply chain capitalism placing her seemingly miles away from the DIY production that defined her early years. Further, supply chain capitalism leverages the non-economic positionality of individual workers, i.e., gender, religion, ethnicity, etc., to create an economically efficient system; as anthropologist Anna Tsing points out, “No firm has to personally invent patriarchy, colonialism, war, racism, or imprisonment, yet each of these is privileged in supply chain labor mobilization” (Tsing 2009, 151). Strikingly, the same societal injustices that brought Westwood into the punk movement are the ones that her company is benefitting from.

As previously mentioned, the fashion industry harms women on two axes: the laborers exploited to make clothes are typically women in the Global South, and the consumers are primarily women in the Global North (Chang 2020). In addition, much of the impetus to engage in environmentalism falls on women due to what researchers call the “eco-gender gap.” The eco-gender gap refers to women’s increased attention to environmental concerns compared to men (Capecchi 2018). Practically, this means companies market eco-friendly products and initiatives towards women instead of men (Capecchi 2018). Concerningly, the eco-gender gap could be a result of men resisting environmentally conscious practices to maintain their constructed gender identity; for example, academics found men are less likely to carry reusable bags because of their perceived association between sustainable practices and effeminate characteristics (Brough et al. 2016; Swim 2019). While criticisms of Westwood’s practices are justified, her leadership should also be considered in this context, wherein women must lead the environmental movement due to constructed gender roles.

The Power of Her Platform

Nevertheless, denoting Westwood as a rebel without a cause would be an oversimplification of her life, career, and activism. In terms of direct action, Westwood has donated money to a variety of organizations; in 2011, she gave over £1.5 million to Cool Earth, a charity that aims to save rainforests in Peru, the Congo Basin, and Borneo (Cool Earth 2011). Comparatively, in 2019, Britain gave £10 million to help fight the Amazon rainforest fires (Woodcock 2019). After visiting an Asháninka community, an indigenous group living in the rainforests of Peru, she dedicated Vivienne Westwood fashion shows to Cool Earth, designed t-
shirts, lobbied the Peruvian government, and rallied support from other notable celebrities, including Kate Moss and Naomi Campbell (Cool Earth 2011).

Celebrity activism like Westwood’s can draw scorn, but their advocacy can increase awareness around important issues. Through a semantic analysis of 1,000 YouTube comments on Leonardo DiCaprio’s 2014 U.N Climate Speech, one communications researcher found that celebrity advocacy regarding climate change received abundant public attention and generated “science-oriented conversations” about the causes of climate change (Park 2019, n.p.). As the Chief Communications Officer for the ACLU, Michael Moore, put it, “Artists have always played a fundamental role, using their talents and influence to advance the cultural conversation about issues that matter” (Primeau 2017, n.p.). Due to their larger-than-life stature, when celebrities talk, people listen. Videos, speeches, tweets, and Instagram posts from celebrities garner hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of views. While celebrity activism has its pitfalls, celebrities can reach more people and spread critical messages on a wider scale than members of the general public.

Alternatively, many frame celebrity activism as wealthy, often white, citizens of the Global North masquerading as saviors for the Global South. Criticisms of ethnocentrism or activism for the sake of a public image may be fair. But, even if celebrities engage in activism for selfish reasons, does it truly matter if celebrities benefit in tandem with the marginalized groups they advocate for? Activism surely bolsters celebrities’ public images, and as one article phrased it, “causes are to celebrities what corporate social responsibility is to business—every established name has to have at least one” (Cole, Falisse, and Radley 2015, n.p.). In addition, many celebrity activism campaigns operate within existing capitalist structures, a point of scorn for many. Yet, these campaigns, and more broadly, ethical consumption practices, do make a difference in the lives of those in the Global South (Davis 2010).

Throughout her life, Westwood received many awards not only for her designs but also in recognition of her activism. In 2018, she received the Swarovski Award for Positive Change, and in 2021, Westwood received the Good Energy Award, both recognizing her climate activism (Yotka 2018; Vivienne Westwood 2021). As already noted, Westwood’s participation and engagement in climate protests are extensive. Westwood launched a campaign to encourage engagement with climate issues at the 2012 London Paralympics Closing Ceremony, unfurling a large black and white banner reading “CLIMATE REVOLUTION” in bold letters (Waters 2022). Two years later, Westwood led the London Fracked Future march to protest the British government’s embrace of the controversial practice (Griffiths 2014). Her diaries, published in book form in 2016, portray Westwood as a woman who is consistently thinking about art, activism, and her role in these tangled cobwebs. One of her first acts after emerging from the 2020 COVID-19 lockdown was to protest the possible extradition of Julian Assange to the United States; he is currently being held in a prison in South London (Kampmark 2023). Specifically, Westwood organized a protest where she was suspended in a large bird-like cage in a bright yellow suit to signify a canary in a coal mine (Kampmark 2023). Westwood likened the canary in a cage protecting miners’ lives to Assange protecting society at large (Kampmark 2023). Her actions evidence a woman deeply committed to her praxis, enough so that supporting social causes, such as Assange’s extradition, is an immediate priority for her post-COVID lockdown.

The Ongoing Debate: “Green Queen or Green Washer”

With climate concerns at the forefront of many consumers’ minds, brands have begun switching to more environmentally conscious practices. Yet, many greenwash their business
practice instead of reworking their manufacturing to be more eco-friendly. Correspondingly, John Lydon of the Sex Pistols once called Malcolm McLaren and Vivienne Westwood “a pair of shysters: they would sell anything to any trend that they could grab onto” (Thill 2008, n.p.). In 2017, Vivienne Westwood’s firm sold shirts with phrases such as “Loyalty 2 Gaia,” “Politicians R Criminals,” and “We are not disposable” for $595, $180, and $80, respectively. These shirts were seemingly perfect examples of capitalist business practices taking over punk and repackaging it for mass consumption (Bernard 2017). Moreover, in an opinion piece titled “Green Queen or Green Washer,” writer Isis Wheelwright points out the purpose of a catwalk is to encourage consumption to sell capital and clothes (2023). Wheelwright continues by writing, “What is being sold is a protest against the garment itself,” and the act of buying and selling these objects is dangerous; by making morality something we can wear, what we look like matters more than what we do (2023, n.p.)

The original DIY ethic of punk fashion stands in stark opposition to these practices. DIY encourages anti-capitalist modes of production where individuals can self-organize and own the means of production (Clarke and Holt 2016). Westwood narrated this sentiment through an example: “Take your mother’s old brasserie and wear it undisguised over your school jumper and have a muddy face” (Lunning 2013, 111). However, due to the scene’s anti-establishment ideology and praxis, critics argue that it is impossible to commodify without diluting the essence of punk (Rosato 2022). The movement emerged from a disdain for the status quo. It was meant to fight against everything from the monarchy to capitalism. Due to this, Westwood’s art resonated with people, with a generation that grew up in the backdrop of war and economic recessions. Can we fault Westwood for capturing the spirit and attention of her generation? After all, artists must put food on the table, just as bankers and politicians do. Even acknowledging this, Westwood’s brand has evolved since her days designing clothes for SEX, begging the question if mass popularity now precludes Westwood’s art from being punk. For instance, Westwood’s “Only Anarchists Are Pretty” shirt was remade in 2013. Rembrandt replaced the Marx patch; instead of proclaiming ‘Anarchy,’ the shirt now features the title of Westwood’s manifesto ‘Active Resistance to Propaganda’ and the phrase ‘Do it Yourself.’ (Westwood 2013). The shirt retailed for £360. Perhaps Westwood has proved there is “no ‘outside’ to capitalism” as consumption will always repackage radical cultural production (Léger 2016, 40).

Westwood’s statements and clothes are often seen as paradoxical: a fashion designer telling consumers to stop buying clothes while churning out products with untraceable supply chains. Yet, movements will never be for sale. As a New York Times style editor put it, “Brands are not activist. A brand cannot empathize, a brand does not yearn, a brand does not hurt. Brands and people are not the same” (Bernard 2017, n.p.). At the same time, Westwood’s clothes will always be revolutionary. Her career was defined by subverting expectations and challenging what we think society should look like and value. At its core, fashion is a form of visual art. Further, fashion is a tool, a way to uphold existing beauty and capitalist standards—or reject them. Fashion can be a revolution or just as easily a submission to societal norms, and SEX changed fashion forever. Westwood’s work is reflected in the corsets, platform shoes, and tartan skirts that young people still wear today.

Westwood wrote in her book that for her, “Fashion [is] a vehicle for activism” (Westwood 2016, 2). In this sense, Westwood’s clothes were a way to convey counter-hegemonic ideologies. By creating clothing that appropriated bourgeois symbols, opposed the monarchy, and insinuated homosexuality, Westwood engaged in conscious raising and rebellion against reigning power
structures. Westwood famously wrote in her diaries, “I can’t tell you the inspiration for my fashion, I have to talk about climate change” (Westwood 2016, 8). Cynics claim Westwood was more concerned with increasing her own social capital than enacting real change. However, one cannot overlook the attention Westwood generated for climate justice issues. Even the idea of a designer telling people to “buy less, choose well, and make it last” is nearly unprecedented in the fashion world; in 2019, the former CEO of H&M stated, “We should not stop consuming since it leads to economic growth” (Westwood 2014; Karlsson 2020, n.p.).

Conclusion

Vivienne Westwood’s life and career represent a multifaceted journey of creativity, activism, and contradiction. From her early days as a pioneer of punk fashion to her later years as a vocal advocate for environmental justice, Westwood’s impact on the fashion industry and beyond is undeniable. Her garments were powerful representations of class struggles, encouraging individuals to interrogate the world around them instead of accepting it at face level. Further, “Buy well, choose well, make it last” may be an even more powerful call to arms due to the positionality of a fashion designer advocating against rampant consumerism. Her activism also extended beyond mere rhetoric, as she engaged in direct action, donated substantial sums to environmental causes, and used her platform to amplify marginalized voices. However, with her fame, she became increasingly separated from her working-class background and the struggles of ordinary people. Despite many admirers, Westwood drew scorn for her rebellion against an industry in which she was still working. Even more concerning was her continued participation in an industry that structured its supply chains around colonial-era exploitations. This begs the question of how engaged in radical praxis she truly was. Overall, Dame Vivienne Westwood’s life reminds us that rebellion takes many forms.

In 1989, Vivienne Westwood mocked then-Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by posing on the cover of Tatler as the PM above the words, “This woman was once a punk,” styled in the same ‘ransom note’ typography used by the Sex Pistols (See Appendix A). The cover bore an uncanny resemblance to Thatcher, and Westwood even wore a suit that Thatcher herself had ordered but had yet to be delivered (Waters 2022). Notably, Westwood loathed the PM; she called Thatcher a “hypocrite” in her diaries and said her economic policies were “pyramid schemes” (Waters 2022). Moreover, the magazine caused quite a stir, with copies of it blown up on billboards in London during Fashion Week (Waters 2022). Thirty-five years later, the cover has taken on a different meaning as the ‘ex-punk’ is arguably Westwood herself, a woman unable to reject the allure of commercial success and wealth.

Westwood’s clothes may have been doomed the moment she began selling them at SEX, even before she was known on the runways of Paris and London. Truly, that may be the folly of any radical movement: to believe it can escape the institutions it was born into. Furthermore, capitalist institutions have the extraordinary ability to repackage anything that stands against them, turning once-radical art into a product for mass consumption (Léger 2016). Is an artist or activist wrong for “focus[ing] on how to soften [capitalism’s] rough edges, rather than how to get beyond it as a system?” (Richey 2008, 725). Westwood’s life embodies the complexities and contradictions inherent in challenging structures of domination while navigating life and a career within them. Is it a betrayal or compromise for an artist, activist, or punk to engage in softening capitalism’s edges rather than striving to transcend it entirely?
Westwood passed away on December 19, 2022, at the age of 81. The invitation to her memorial service featured a command: “When in doubt, dress up!” (Paton 2023, n.p.). Actress Helena Bonham Carter spoke, saying:

How can I possibly chart the cultural impact of one of this country’s greatest designers?... [She was] a true feminist and lover of women...While Karl Lagerfeld tried to marry his cat, you drove a tank onto the prime minister’s front lawn as part of an anti-fracking protest. Not many fashion designers do that. (Paton 2023, n.p.).

Corré described his mother giving him a to-do list from her deathbed to “Stop war, stop climate change and end capitalism” (Paton 2023, n.p.). Westwood’s deathbed requests were suitably grandiose for the larger-than-life woman. What else would the Godmother of Punk ask of the world?
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Appendix A: Westwood in the News (Waters 2022)
Appendix B: Only Anarchists Are Pretty (Rosota 2022; Westwood 2013)

B1: Westwood’s original ‘Only Anarchists are Pretty shirt,’ designed in 1976.

B2: Westwood’s updated design from 2013.
Appendix C: Westwood’s ‘God Save the Queen’ ensemble, designed in 1976 (Rosota 2022)
Appendix D: Westwood’s ‘Two Cowboys’ shirt, designed in 1974 (Rosota 2022)