

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**

Кафедра теорії та історії світової літератури

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

з історії зарубіжної літератури

на тему: Consumer culture and materialism in the American family novel

Студентки групи МЛа 03-20
Факультету германської філології
денної форми навчання
Спеціальності 035 Філологія
Глущенко Ангеліни Михайлівни

Науковий керівник:
к. філол. н.,
доц. Рикова Ганна Сергіївна

Student of group MLa 03 -20
Faculty of german philology
full-time study program
specialization 035 Philology
Anhelina Mykhailivna Hlushchenko

Academic supervisor:
candidate of philological sciences,
Associate professor Hanna Serhiivna Rykova

м. Київ – 2024 рік

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1. CONCEPT OF MATERIALISM

1.1. Materialism

1.2. Materialistic consume culture

CHAPTER 2. ANALYSIS OF THE CONSUMER CULTURE AND MATERIALISM

2.1. Materialism and the Deteriorated American Family A Baudrillardian Reading of Edward Albee's The American Dream

2.2. Learning about Materialism and Consumer Culture

CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the research topic lies in the fact that consumer culture and materialism have become an integral part of modern society, affecting various aspects of our lives. The American family novel, as a reflection of society's lifestyle and values, is an important source for studying these phenomena.

The topic "Consumer culture and materialism in the American family novel" is very relevant, especially in today's world, saturated with advertising, commerce and the desire for material wealth. The study of such a topic provides an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of how modern consumer culture affects individual and family values, relationships, and identity.

The American family novel, like many other literary genres, often reflects the values and priorities of society. Consumer culture can be a key element in these novels, as it influences the characters' decisions, their relationships, and the overall dynamics of the plot.

The study of such a topic allows you to understand and reflect in your works the relationship between consumer culture, materialism and family values. It also sheds light on how readers perceive these themes and how they are reflected in contemporary society.

In addition, the study reveals the evolution of these themes from earlier eras to the present, showing how the views of consumer culture and materialism in literature changed, and how this reflected on family relationships.

In general, the topic has great potential for understanding modern society through the lens of literary research.

The purpose of the study is to analyze the relationship between materialism and consumer culture in the American family novel and highlight the impact of materialism on family values and ideals in the context of American social reality.

To achieve the set goal, the following scientific and practical **tasks** must be solved:

1. To analyze the concepts of materialism and materialistic culture of consumption.
2. To study the role of materialism in the development of American family dynamics.
3. To analyze the impact of materialism on the perception of the "American Dream" in Edward Albee's novel.
4. Identify possible ways to overcome the negative consequences of materialism in family life.

The object of research is an American family novel.

The subject of the study is consumer culture and materialism in the American family novel.

Research methods. The following research methods were used: analysis, generalization, synthesis of data, etc.

Structure of work. The coursework consists of an introduction, two chapters, conclusions and a list of used literature (25 titles).

CHAPTER 1. CONCEPT OF MATERIALISM

1.1. Materialism

Materialism is one of the main directions of philosophy, which, in response to the so-called main question of philosophy, asserts that being, nature, material is primary, and spirit, consciousness, the ideal is secondary. The definition of primary and secondary differs among different philosophers. Representatives of vulgar materialism believed that thoughts, ideas, consciousness, that is, what is usually considered ideal, is also material. However, materialists usually recognize the existence of the ideal, although they consider it to be generated by complexly organized matter. Materialism in philosophy opposes itself to various schools of idealism, as well as dualism. Rejects human free will.

The term is also used to denote worldly attitudes and behavior in which material goods dominate the hierarchy of values. Such views and behavior are often associated with selfishness and consumerism.

It is human nature to study (analyze) the surrounding world. Among its manifestations, two classes are distinguished: phenomena belonging to the mental (own thoughts, desires, ideas) and external phenomena, phenomena of the world of objects, things. Philosophical thought is a generalization of a person's ideas about the world. Philosophical teachings mostly seek to establish a single primary basis from which everything could be understood. Such teachings are called monistic (as opposed to dualistic and pluralistic). Materialism is one of the varieties of monism. He declares the world of things to be the main, primary one, and the mental world to be derivative, or, in the language of philosophy, an epiphenomenon [1].

The central concept of materialism, matter, is a general term for the totality of the world of things outside human consciousness. The word matter comes from Latin, in which it means "building material". The mental world of a person, his thoughts are an entity, seemingly self-evident, so the reality of the external world in materialism is

postulated. Such a departure from the limits of one's own thinking is called transcensus. Having taken this step, declaring matter to be primary, materialist teachings try to explain the mental, the ideal. The search for such an explanation is one of the main tasks of materialism. At the beginning of the 21st century, the philosophy of consciousness occupies a leading place among philosophical problems.

The search for an answer to the essence of the ideal divided materialist philosophy into different currents. Eliminative materialism generally denies the existence of the mental, declaring it an illusion, folk psychology[9]. Reductionism tries to reduce mental to material processes. The vulgar materialism of the 19th century declared thoughts to be material.

Another task of materialist philosophy is the analysis of the general properties of matter itself. Specific properties of matter are studied by natural science, science. Since science sets itself the task of explaining the world, starting from itself, without the involvement of the ideal, scientists, whatever their own philosophical views, stand on materialistic positions due to their methodology. Such materialism is called spontaneous.

Materialist Francis Crick said this about human free will: "although we think we have free will, our decisions are already predetermined for us, and we cannot change them" [2].

In classical metaphysics, materialism is the doctrine of Democritus and Leucippus that everything in the universe is matter or material. All events were explained within the framework of movements and changes initiated by this matter. In contrast to them, Plato asserted the existence of some incorporeal objects, which he called forms. Aristotle also did not limit himself to a completely materialistic explanation of the world, but believed that the soul is immaterial. Although it was his doctrine that gave rise to more sophisticated materialist views compared to the Pre-Socratics, it in no way affected the uncompromising materialism of Hobbes, who is considered the founder of the modern understanding of materialism. Ancient materialism, especially Epicurus, is characterized by an emphasis on the personal

self-improvement of a person: liberating him from fear of the gods, from all passions and acquiring the ability to be happy under any circumstances.

According to some researchers, the materialistic tradition has deep historical roots in ancient China. The outstanding representative of this tradition is considered to be the philosopher Wang Chun. Even earlier, Xun-tzu developed the ideas of Confucius in a materialistic and realistic direction. In ancient India, materialism arose around the sixth century AD. He is associated with the works of such thinkers as Ajita Kesakambali, Payasi, Kanada and with the Charvaka school. Kanada was one of the first atomists. Atomistic views were also characteristic of the Nyaya-Vaisesika school, but this school is difficult to classify as materialistic, since their representatives believed in gods. Atomism also entered Buddhist and Jain philosophy [3].

Marx and Engels combined materialism with Georg Hegel's dialectics. The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels, unlike all other types of materialism, does not reduce matter to substance only. Matter encompasses both physical fields and processes occurring in the world. An integral characteristic and main property of matter in dialectical materialism is movement. Applying the dialectical method, in every phenomenon of the world there is a contradiction, which is the driver of development. The movement itself is declared to be a unity of variability and stability, dynamics and statics. Development takes place in a spiral, through the denial of denial.

Marx and Engels extended materialism to the understanding of history by constructing historical materialism. For a long time, it was believed that the course of history is determined only by the subjective will and actions of prominent persons and does not have a separate independent objective direction. Hegel in his work "Philosophy of History" suggested that the basis of the historical process is an ideal beginning capable of development according to its own laws, a higher idea that becomes an objective necessity for all others. Historical materialism finally rejected the reliance on idealism. Marx believed that the cause and driving force of historical development are internal contradictions in the production sphere, which with the

development of society take the form of class struggle. This reason is objective and, in fact, does not depend on specific people participating in historical processes.

Marx and Engels called their approach materialist dialectics. The very term dialectical materialism appeared later, in Soviet times, when the disparate philosophical thoughts of the classics of Marxism-Leninism were collected into a training course. Soviet philosophers continued to develop dialectical materialism, and it gradually began to constrain the development of thought, turned into a dogma [4].

Later, Western thinkers, such as Gilles Deleuze, made attempts to rework and strengthen classical materialist ideas. Modern theorists such as Manuel Delanda, who work in the direction of this revived materialism, are called "new materialists".

In the 20th century, in Western philosophy, materialism developed mainly as a mechanistic one, but a number of Western materialist philosophers also maintained an interest in dialectics. Unlike ancient materialism, materialism now pays much attention to the spiritual development of man.

Naturalism is often attributed to materialism, since it does not assign a special place to man in nature; empiricism, which considers as real only what can be perceived with the help of natural and scientific methods; neopositivism, from the very beginning rejects the explanation of the spiritual-spiritual essence of things [source?]. However, positivism and neopositivism cannot be called materialism, because it rejects the very statement of the question about the independent existence of any being outside of known thinking; considers only the analysis of sensations possible and systematizes them through the analysis of language. The philosophy of Bertrand Russell and his school is also partly materialistic: although Russell denies the concept of substance, he considers thinking to be a class of events in the human brain [5].

At the beginning of the 20th century, physicalism was formulated - a line of thought that reduces all existence in the world to physical properties. On the one hand, it can be considered materialism, and on the other hand, physicalism expands the list of entities necessary to describe the world, including, in addition to matter, physical fields, energy, etc..

Many contemporary philosophers, including Daniel Dennett, Willard Van Orman Quine, Donald Davidson, and Jerry Fodor, work within what can be broadly called physicalism and materialism, and as a result there have been different views on how to explain the mind—functionalism, anomalous monism, identity theory, and others.

Scientific materialism is often characterized as reductionist. In recent years, Paul and Patricia Churchland have come to defend a radically opposite approach (at least to this hypothesis)—eliminativist materialism, which denies the existence of mental phenomena at all, arguing that the notion of them is folk psychology, an introspective illusion. In this sense, such concepts as "faith" are not grounded at all - like the belief that the disease is inflicted on a person by a demon. While reductionism reduces some phenomena of the world to others, eliminativism calls for the elimination (destruction) of certain theories in the light of new discoveries. Revisionist materialism stands in the middle between these two extremes.

The materialism of the late 20th and early 21st centuries is represented by the philosophical direction of "ontological philosophy", the leader of which is the American philosopher Barry Smith. Philosophical materialism can be called an independent direction of philosophy precisely because it allows consideration of a number of problems, the formulation of which is excluded by other directions of philosophical knowledge. Another concept, which in principle continues and to some extent expands the materialist idea, can be called the principle of "semantic externalism", in which the content of the statement is explained as "externally determined" [6].

The nature and definition of matter, like any other important concept in science and philosophy, causes heated debate. Is there a single type of matter, or are there many types? Is it continuous or does it consist of separate particles? Is it a substance or a substrate? The questions are clouded by the fact that in the West the word matter (in English) is used not only in philosophy, but also in physics, while in Ukrainian physics it is better to call "physical" matter substance. The word matter in the sense of substance is increasingly entering the Ukrainian language through

mechanical translations from English. For example, the name dark matter has already been established in the Ukrainian language. Due to this coincidence of terms, when encountering the word matter, it is difficult to understand what exactly it is about.

Scientific knowledge about the structure of the world is changing. In the 19th century, views of the continuity of matter prevailed. Then it became clear that matter consists of particles - atoms. Thanks to the theory of relativity, physical fields acquired the status of entities, materiality. Quantum mechanics established the impossibility of simultaneous measurement of some physical quantities, for example, the position of a particle and its momentum. Quantum mechanical results have, in principle, only a probabilistic interpretation. At the end of the 20th century, discoveries in astronomy showed that not everything can be seen. The conclusion about the existence of dark matter and dark energy is made only from the analysis of the rotation of distant galaxies and the accelerated expansion of the universe. Therefore, science does not know everything, and there is no certainty that it will guess what it does not know.

Because scientific ideas about matter change, materialism cannot rest on a specific theory of matter. As Noam Chomsky pointed out, any property can be declared material if matter is defined in such a way that materiality corresponds to this property.

Outright materialism—the philosophy that asserts that there are no causes in the universe other than material ones, and that all phenomena called spiritual or moral are functions of matter—is rarely heard today. However, indirect materialism—that is, the emphasized, unexpressed conception that material causes explain all things—remains. Today, people do not usually say, as followers of mechanistic materialism, that man should be seen as a machine or a set of chemical formulas. For the most part, they categorically do not deny the existence of immaterial factors in the universe [7].

Criticism of materialism is heard both from the camp of its idealistic opponents-philosophers and from the ranks of some scientists. A materialistic

worldview is incompatible with religion. In particular, among theologians you can hear the following:

Materialism is an auxiliary doctrine of any tyranny, one dictator or the masses. The dominant tendency is to turn people from independent individuals into cogs of a single, large social machine; make society, not conscience, the center of life; to subject the soul to things, to depersonalize a person.

Some critics have criticized materialism for its overtly skeptical, narrow, or reductionist approach to theory, rather than its ontological claim that matter is a single substance. In particular, John Polkinghorne, a particle physicist and theologian in the Anglican tradition, objects to what he calls the promises of materialism, that is, to the claim that materialist science will in the future explain all phenomena that still remain unexplained. Polkinghorne prefers a philosophical direction called two-aspect monism, which lays the foundation of being on a neutral primary basis that is neither matter nor idea.

Proponents of digital physics declare not matter but information to be the primary basis of all phenomena in the world. Max Tegmark put forward the mathematical world hypothesis, which represents the universe as a mathematical object.

Noam Chomsky criticized materialist scientists for not clearly defining what matter is, leaving the term vague. Chomsky also claims that the concept of matter can change with new scientific discoveries, as it has already happened, and therefore materialist scientists are dogmatic, claiming the opposite.

Clive Staples Lewis criticized it by saying that "strict materialism contradicts itself for the reason that Professor Haldane long ago said: 'If my thought processes are entirely determined by the behavior of the atoms of my brain, I have no reason to trust my thoughts . . . and therefore no reasons to believe that the brain consists of atoms...".

Materialists cannot praise the actions of other people, because in their worldview all actions are predetermined, and therefore, a person had to do what he did, and there is no merit, but doom.

The development of materialism can be traced throughout the history of Western thought from its very beginning and can be found everywhere in the history of philosophy. In antiquity, Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius Carus followed the materialist line most consistently. Ancient materialism, especially Epicurus, is characterized by an emphasis on the personal self-improvement of a person: liberating him from fear of the gods, from all passions and acquiring the ability to be happy under any circumstances.

Materialism reached its peak in the era of the French Enlightenment, but during this period it remained mechanistic and reductionist (that is, it tended to deny the specificity of the complex, reducing it to the simple). It acquired a decisive influence on European philosophy in the 19th century.

Historical materialism is part of Marxist philosophy; it follows from the fact that social consciousness is ultimately determined by social existence. It greatly influenced the Western opinion, especially on M. Weber, although he denied the universality of the historical-materialist methodology, constantly arguing with Marxism.

In the 20th century, in Western philosophy, materialism developed mainly as a mechanistic one, but a number of Western materialist philosophers maintained an interest in dialectics.

In contrast to ancient materialism, materialism now pays much attention to the spiritual development of man.

Naturalism is often referred to as materialism, since it does not assign a special place to man in nature; empiricism, which considers as real only what can be perceived with the help of natural and scientific methods; neopositivism, from the very beginning rejects the explanation of the spiritual and spiritual essence of things. However, positivism and neopositivism cannot be called materialism, because it rejects the very statement of the question about the independent existence of any being outside cognitive thinking; considers possible only the analysis of sensations and their systematizing language. The philosophy of B. Russell and his school is also

partially materialistic: although Russell denies the concept of substance, he considers thinking to be a class of events in the human brain.

The materialism of the late 20th and early 21st centuries is represented by the philosophical direction of "ontological philosophy", the leader of which is the American philosopher Barry Smith. Philosophical materialism can be called an independent direction of philosophy precisely because it solves a number of problems, the formulation of which is excluded by other directions of philosophical knowledge.

Another concept that basically continues and to some extent expands the materialist conception can be called the principle of "Semantic Externalism", in which the content of the statement is explained as "externally determined".

Despite most theorists' disdain for the arguments against type identity theory, there is a more radical materialist theory that embraces even more counterintuitive conclusions. Instead of taking on the explanatory burden of connecting the identity of mental and brain events, these theorists argue that everything is purely physical. There are no thoughts, no emotions, no minds. Everything is just the influence of the brain and other physical processes. This kind of materialism is called eliminative materialism or reductive materialism because it asserts not only that mind and world must be explained consistently and within science, as Descartes and Locke agreed, or that mind must be seen as part of the physical realm as the type identity theorists. to do, but that the mind is simply not there. Contemporary proponents of eliminative materialism, Pavlo Churchland and Patricia Churchland, explain our perception of the world according to neuroscience. An eliminative materialist would say that feeling pain is an illusion. We are used to calling certain things pain when there are only physical events going on underneath. In discussions with the Dalai Lama, Patricia Churchland states that she cannot say that she even has the emotion of love for her own child (because love is an illusion) and the beliefs of ordinary people who say that there are such things as love and others emotions are false (Houshmand, Livingston, and Wallace 1999). Folk psychology, a theory of mind that embraces the intuitions of "common people" who are not educated in science, is just a convenient myth.

Eliminating materialism is the most extreme view, the opposite of substance dualism. The eliminative materialist really eliminates the existence of minds, and with them all the features of mentality. They reject experiences, thoughts and even actions. Therefore, although eliminative materialism explains everything within a scientific framework, it does so at great cost to our intuition, thoughts, feelings, and self. Indeed, it eliminates most of what theory of mind sets out to understand. Many philosophers argue that Ockham's Razor goes too far if most of what we set out to explain is completely dismissed. An account of mind that recovers more of the features of normal life and explains those within scientific frameworks is better for preserving the life and meaning of what people think, do, and say.

1.2. Materialistic consume culture

Cultural systems have long been an important topic of anthropological, sociological, cultural, political, historical, and archaeological research. They emphasize various determinants of cultural development, mostly resorting to the study of culture as a state of society or a degree of social process, and eventually fall into a semiotic metanarrative. They consider culture in the context of subordinating people to values and norms, observing traditions, acquiring the skills of an individual as a member of society, etc. At most, they look for answers to the key questions of culture, where it comes from, what is its nature, what causes cultural diversity, in abstract entities that are usually impossible to investigate using empirical methods.

Instead, cultural materialism offers a new vision: to answer the question of culture, it expands the horizon of the scientific field, namely, it takes into account infrastructural factors in the formation of culture. This approach makes it possible to explain cultural systems, their values, norms, ideologies and beliefs, social institutions and practices through population, production and environmental variables. This article reveals the essence of the fundamental principles of cultural materialism, its main concepts and connections between them, and also highlights the weaknesses of this approach.

Cultural materialism is a theoretical paradigm based on the idea that social life, political culture is the answer to the practical problems of earthly existence. This term was introduced by the American anthropologist Marvin Harris in the book "The Formation of Anthropological Theory" (1968), and the actual research strategy was presented in the work "Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for the Science of Culture" (1979). It is not surprising that this research strategy emerged at the end of the 1960s. Anthropological thought was permeated through and through with the idea that cultural changes in human systems occurred, first of all, due to a change in the opinion of their bearers, and not due to the peculiarities of material factors. Marvin Harris sharply criticizes the approach of idealists and relativists, expressing a kind of rebuke to E. Durkheim and Levi K. Strauss.

Brian Ferguson, who developed the principles of cultural ecology, Leslie White, the founder of cultural anthropology, Martin Murphy, who studied the impact of foreign labor on demography and industrial relations, and Maxine Margolis, who dealt with issues of gender, migration and anthropological ecology, Allen Johnson, an economic anthropologist.

Harris calls the goal of cultural materialism "the creation of a pan-human science of society, the achievements of which were based on a logical evidence base and could be accepted by the pan-human community" [8, p. 12]. The researcher improves K. Marx's strategy, bypassing the Hegelian component. Instead, he takes into account reproductive and ecological data, as well as material conditions, which were, in fact, the subject of Marxism. That is, the paradigm of cultural materialism encompasses the theory of evolution, cultural ecology, functionalism, geographic determinism, and Marxian materialism.

As defined by Marvin Harris, dialectical materialism and structuralist Marxism are considered close to cultural materialism. However, cultural materialism differs from Marxist materialism in that it rejects the inevitability of Hegelian dialectics (the idea that all systems function through dialectical negation), emphasizing the importance of the means of production and the features of the environment as determinants of social behavior. The strategy of cultural materialism

is separated from philosophical materialism and dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism is a sub-case of cultural materialism [8, pp. 141–148]. The mystification of the historical process in the conditions of dialectical materialism is no less significant than in the conditions of bourgeois cultural idealism. An important difference between Marxism and cultural materialism is that the latter explains the features of the structure of society only from the perspective of production in the context of infrastructure. Instead, Marxists claim that material conditions belong to the realm of the basis, which functions on the basis of infrastructure [8, pp. 277–281].

Cultural materialism differs quite significantly from Marxism, primarily in the absence of class theory. The second stumbling block is the recognition of the uneven distribution of power and resources: Marxists claim that all changes, including cultural ones, are beneficial only to the ruling classes. Cultural materialism recognizes the existence of inequalities, but does not emphasize class distribution, based on the idea that innovative changes benefit both the oppressed classes and the dominant ones [9, p. 234]. Marxism emphasizes that all cultural changes are favorable only to the ruling class. Finally, both of these approaches assume that cultural change is the result of innovations by society itself, which chooses the most rational strategy. True, within the framework of cultural materialism, a certain utopian form is not presented.

M. Harris expands the Marxist three-level model of culture, asserting that every cultural system contains three components: infrastructure as a method of production and reproduction, structure as social relations, and superstructure as ideological relations. The researcher emphasizes the priority of the first, which dominates the other two, determining their development. However, it does not exclude feedback. Why does infrastructure play a dominant role over structure and superstructure? Infrastructure consists of those things that are most necessary for human life and well-being, and therefore this area is gaining priority. Infrastructural conditions are also parts of sociocultural systems that are subject to restrictions established by laws [8, p. 58].

Cultural materialism is based on two assumptions about societies. First, different parts of societies are interconnected. That is, a change in one part entails a change in others. For example, if certain changes occur in the institution of the family, they cannot be considered outside the context of other institutions (economic, religious, political). Secondly, the surrounding world is the basis for the socio-cultural system. Man, unlike other biological species, actively transforms the environment, and not only adapts to it. However, the biological, physical, and chemical factors of the environment in which a person lives still limit and make him dependent on this environment [8, pp. 162–164].

It is known that people, like other living creatures, draw energy and resources from nature in order to conduct life activities. Natural resources, raw materials and energy are finite, moreover, the environment has a certain limit of tolerance for human intervention. With this in mind, each society adapts to these natural limitations in its own way. A common feature of all societies is the need to draw energy and resources from the environment in order to sustain life, because this is the basic task of the human population. Therefore, structural classification (division into infrastructure, structure and superstructure) is universal for all societies.

In the work "Formation of Anthropological Theory: History of Cultural Theories", cultural materialism is presented as a socio-cultural analogue of Ch. Darwin's selection. Harris does not appeal to "human nature", the uniqueness of cultures, values, structures. He develops the principles of techno-environmental and techno-economical determinism. They mean that similar technologies in their application to similar environments will cause the same conditions of work, production, and distribution of resources [9, p. 4]. It likens social structures that justify and coordinate the activities of groups of people through the means of shared value and belief systems. Transferring this idea into a research strategy, the principles of techno-environmentalist and techno-economic determinism indicate the priority of studying the material conditions of socio-cultural life.

The cultural-materialist approach emphasizes empirical science, focusing on observable quantitative phenomena rather than subjective thoughts or behavior. The

epistemological principles of cultural materialism imply a clear distinction between emic and ethical (terms borrowed from Kenneth Lee Pike). "Emic" refers to an approach in which the researcher tries to study the features of a culture in such a way as to be able to think and act as bearers of that culture. "Ethical" means categories and rules that are foreign to the subjects of study. Cultural materialism affirms the strategic priority of the ethical approach. Emic (inner thoughts) and behavioral schemas are the result of practical, material considerations and often explore facts that may seem unimportant to indigenous people [8, pp. 38–41]. Instead, the categories of ethical anthropology are operationalized from the position of the observer and can be applied to any group, regardless of the internal emic structure of the latter.

Marvin Harris adheres to Marx's thesis that the method of production in material life determines the general nature of social, political, and spiritual life processes, "it is not human consciousness that determines existence, but social existence determines consciousness". The production of immediate material means of existence lays the basis on which religion, state institutions, and art are later formed.

Within cultural materialism, infrastructure consists of modes of production and reproduction; technologies and social practices through which society transforms the surrounding world. Modes of production include the actions of a community that fulfills the task of meeting the basic needs of existence through gathering, hunting, agriculture, industry, services, etc. The method of reproduction involves actions performed by society in order to regulate population growth.

Infrastructure reflects the relationship between culture and nature, within which there are sociocultural practices aimed at overcoming or changing the structural ecological, physical and chemical limitations of human activity [8, p. 51].

The structure corresponds to the organizational aspects of society. It consists of the domestic economy (organization of production, reproduction, exchange, and consumption within the household) and political economy (groups and organizations exercising control over production, reproduction, exchange, and consumption outside households). Political economy, according to Harris, covers political institutions,

organizations, armed forces, police, corporations, division of labor, taxation, education, mass media, class and caste systems, trade unions, labor and charity organizations, etc. [8, p. 53].

The superstructure is the ideological dimension of society. It is a kind of code of social order by which sociopolitical institutions are formed and structured. The superstructure defines the rights, duties and roles of members of society. The superstructure includes everything that is not part of the infrastructure and structure - values, beliefs, convictions, conscious and unconscious, symbolic components, rituals, ideology, art, science, etc. [8, p. 54].

Basic ethical behavioral categories, along with certain sociocultural phenomena, fall under characteristic domains. Mode of production – technologies and practices by means of which basic subsistence production, especially the production of food and other forms of energy, is expanded or restricted, with certain possibilities and limitations inherent in a certain habitat. These are life technology, techno-environmental relations, ecosystems, employment. The method of reproduction - technologies and practices for regulating the size of the population. Courts include demography, mating patterns, fertility, birth rate, mortality, care of offspring, medical control of demographic patterns, contraception, abortion, infanticide. The domain of political economy is the organization of reproduction and basic production, exchange, and consumption within villages, cities, states, and empires. It also includes political organization, factions, clubs, associations, corporations; division of labor, taxes, tribute; political socialization, inculturation, education; class, caste, urban and rural hierarchy; discipline, police, army/control; war. Behavioral superstructure – art, music, dance, literature, advertising; rituals; sports, games, hobbies; science.

Infrastructure, structure and superstructure constitute a socio-cultural system. A change in any component of this system usually leads to changes in the rest of the components. In this sense, cultural materialism can be combined with all varieties of functionalism, which use the analogy of society with an organism (organic metaphor)

to demonstrate the interdependence between "cells" and "organs" of the social "body" [10, p. 283].

The stability of the food resource depends on infrastructural variables, including geological and meteorological factors, as well as the ways in which people reproduce. The stable birth rate of the hunter-gatherer era owes its existence to infrastructure. Structural and infrastructural components, social behavior and economics influence the development of superstructure institutions (for example, religion or art). As Marvin Harris proves, infrastructural variables are primary in relation to structural and suprastructural variables and determine the character of the latter. For example, the increase in the birth rate can be explained more by free access to food rich in protein and carbohydrates, and by high technology in the field of medicine, than by religion. Structural and superstructural features develop secondarily from the infrastructural base. The primacy of infrastructure is based on two key aspects: humans (like other species) must expend energy in order to obtain energy; our ability to give birth to offspring is more valuable than spending energy on ourselves [8, p. 56–57]. The study of social groups becomes an analysis of how groups find a balance between reproduction, production and consumption of energy.

Although the analysis of structural and superstructural factors in Harris is built in the same way as the analysis of infrastructural variables, the researcher approaches them differently. It checks the infrastructure for relevant structure-defining variables and the structure for variables that would define the superstructure. The problem with the relationship between production and reproduction is that cultures have used technological improvement not to ease labor but to increase fertility. Harris notes that over the past 300 years, there has been an unprecedented increase in technology in the production and military spheres, but as a result, humanity has become more active, killing people and giving birth to children [11, p. 90].

Cultural materialism, explaining the stratification of states, focuses on various techno-environmentalist contexts of their development [8, pp. 103–105]. First, it is a different level of development and scale of imperial systems in Eurasia in contrast to

the civilizations of the New World. Secondly, it is a different degree of depletion of ecosystems under the conditions of drainage (irrigated) agriculture and farming in the conditions of tropical forests. The type of economy developed in the latter involves scattered production centers. therefore, most of the political units that arose here were rather secondary formations that developed on the periphery of trade routes and routes of conquest campaigns of hydraulic empires. This same set of factors explains why capitalism and parliamentary democracy did not develop in the named eastern civilizations based on irrigation. Feudalism, which, according to Marx, precedes the rise of capitalism, requires a decentralized mode of production. So, this aspect of cultural materialism can be seen as a kind of geographical determinism, presented by authors from Lev Mechnikov and Karl-August Wittfogel to Jared Diamond.

Criticisms of cultural materialism mostly concern those aspects that lie beyond the approach itself. Yes, one such aspect is the narrowness of the approach: its oversimplification leads to reductionism. First, it is the reduction of knowledge to science. On the one hand, Marvin Harris writes that he does not exclude various methods of cognition, from shamanism, mysticism, schizophrenia to hallucinations caused by psychotropic substances [8, p. 6]. On the other hand, all his theoretical guidelines are imbued with the idea that non-scientific knowledge has no value for anthropological research.

The second reduction that can be traced in this approach is the reduction of the social sciences to cultural materialism. Cultural materialism (or other research strategies that emphasize ethical infrastructure) is the only valid scientific strategy within the social sciences (including anthropology). It is repeatedly emphasized that certain domains of the superstructure can be autonomous, but no argument is given to support this thesis. For example, Harris proves that the Jewish taboo on pork has material implications, but does not provide other examples that certain cultural features do not have an economic basis. He admits that not only infrastructural factors are determinative, but reversible effects are also possible, and only if infrastructural causes cannot be found, should the researcher then look for structural and suprastructural variables. For example, military success can sometimes be

explained by strategy and fighting spirit, rather than material or quantitative advantages.

Marvin Harris can also be accused of effectively destroying the connection between cultural materialism and other social sciences, for example history or sociology. What role do they play if knowledge about the world is based on biological, geographic, demographic data? Are these sciences incorporated into the paradigm of cultural materialism or are they completely rejected? And doesn't this ultimately mean that anthropology takes on a fully "scientific" form?

Finally, after reading the works of Harris, one gets the impression that all cultural phenomena necessarily have a materialistic explanation. There is a risk of overgeneralization and constant search for an economic basis, which may turn out to be a coincidence or a second-order circumstance.

It is noteworthy that cultural materialism, in contrast to classical structural-functional analysis, indicates that changes initiated in ethical and behavioral methods of production and reproduction are more likely to cause deviations or changes in political, ideological sectors than vice versa.

In other words, political and ideological factors have a weaker reversible effect. Changes in emic superstructures have less potential to change the system as a whole. For example, in the 1960s, a large part of the youth believed that industrial capitalism could be destroyed through a "cultural revolution." Innovations in music, clothing styles, ways of thinking and life in general appeared under the banner of "counterculture". However, these changes in no way affected the stability of the structure and infrastructure of American capitalism. Instead, the profits of companies selling The Beatles records and Levi Strauss jeans only increased. However, infrastructure cannot be considered as a one-factor determinant, because it is a heterogeneous set of technological, demographic, economic, and environmental variables.

The first chapter of the course work examines the main concepts of materialism and materialistic consumer culture, which are key in the context of the American family novel. Materialism, as a philosophical doctrine, emphasizes the

material world as the basis of all that exists, while materialistic consumer culture reflects this philosophy in practical aspects, such as the constant desire to consume material goods.

By analyzing these concepts, one can better understand how they affect American family novels. They become the foundation for understanding the behavior of the characters, the development of the plot and the relationships between them. Analysis of the materialistic culture of consumption in the context of family life allows us to discover how modern American literature reflects social values and priorities.

Concluding the first chapter of the course work, it can be determined that materialism and materialistic consumer culture are key aspects of the American family novel, and their study will allow to better reveal the depth and relevance of this genre.

Conclusion to the 1st chapter

Therefore, materialism is a philosophical concept that believes that the basis of everything that exists is matter, and not ideas, spirituality or divine forces. In the materialist paradigm, the world is seen as a set of material objects and processes that are amenable to scientific analysis and explanation.

In sociology and cultural studies, materialism can also refer to an emphasis on material values, wealth, possession of things that are recognized as important in a person's life. This can manifest itself in the pursuit of material goods, consumerism, or the belief that material comfort or status is the basis of happiness and satisfaction in life.

CHAPTER 2. ANALYSIS OF THE CONSUMER CULTURE AND MATERIALISM

2.1. Materialism and the Deteriorated American Family A Baudrillardian Reading of Edward Albee's *The American Dream*

In British Theatre 1950-70 Arnold P Hinchliffe distinguishes between the committed playwrights and the absurdists. While Brechtian plays are highly committed in their aim to imitate reality, Samuel Beckett's absurdism in *Waiting for Godot*, Hinchliffe believes, fits the representation of modern existence [12]. Hinchliffe asserts that Anti-theatre of the absurdists was not a deviation as it was a brief period of photographic realism. He agrees with absurdists in their belief that there is a compelling need to free oneself from the former assumptions about the character and the values, in order to reflect the haunted contemporary world and its lack of meaning. It was with Martin Esslin's famous *The Theatre of the Absurd*, however, that the term absurd was introduced and some playwrights were presented as its practitioners. Edward Albee, the American playwright is considered as one of the founding fathers of the American theatre of the absurd.

Edward Albee is one of the most influential American dramatists of the twentieth century. Trailing just behind Arthur Miller, he wrote a number of plays that are considered landmarks in the history of the American drama. His theatrical career is full of achievements. He is a famous one-act playwright. Most of the playwrights write one-act plays as well as full length plays, of course, putting a hand in every sort of sub-genre. This applies to all the greatest American playwrights including Eugene O'Neil, Tennessee Williams, and Arthur Miller. Like Samuel Beckett, and Harold Pinter, Albee has variously depicted the absurd in the modern man's life. *The Zoo Story* (1958) is probably the play which catapulted Albee to fame. It was followed by other massive plays including *The Death of Bessie Smith* (1959), *The Sandbox* (1959), and *The American Dream* (1960). Thereafter, Albee had a victory with his

first full - length play *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* in 1962, and went on producing two his full length plays *Tiny Alice* (1964) and *A Delicate Balance* (1966).

Albee's absurdist plays satirize, lampoon, refract and criticize the American contemporary existence. He is labeled by Martin Esslin as an absurdist playwright. Esslin sees that Albee "comes into the category of the Absurd precisely because his work attacks the very foundations of American Optimism". Like Jean Paul Sartre, Albee believes that the responsibility of drama is to help modern man recognize the ultimate significance of human life. As a dramatist of human condition, Albee probes into the human psyche and like other contemporary writers, Albee's dramas take the shape of a search for meaning which involves man at every level of his conscious experience. He monitors in his plays the essential sickness of the American soul and explores the possibilities of meaningful existence in a supposedly meaningless universe. The purpose of the genuine "theater of the absurd", as Albee states in "Which Theatre Is the Absurd One?", is "to make a man face up to the human condition-as it really is."

Edward Albee brings out this kind of crisis of modern human life in almost all of his plays. The crisis of modern human life is due to the lack of communication, individualism, materialism, alienation and lack of motivation for living life. Throughout his plays, he explores the tragedy of the modern man in a very sensitive and comprehensive way. From the beginning of his career, his ears were sensitive to the voices of anguish of human life. *The American Dream* is a convoluted piece which satirically skewers the notion of "the American dream". It draws on the playwright's own dissatisfaction with his strained, painful childhood. The play was first performed at the York Playhouse, in New York, 1961. It has been read as a comedy about the absurdity of contemporary America. It is considered by Esslin as one of the "promising and brilliant first examples of an American contribution to the Theatre of the Absurd" (268). He maintains that it "clearly takes up the style and subject-matter of the Theatre of the Absurd and translates it into a genuine American idiom" [13]. Nicolas Jr. Canaday, also, considers the play as America's "best example of what has come to be known as 'the Theatre of the Absurd'. Albee announced in the

preface of the play that it is "an examination of the American Scene," and an attack on the wrong artificial values in the American society. Therefore, a subtle dramatic investigation of The American Dream will explore that the play is a kind of condemnation of the modern empty life in a highly materialistic world.

2.2. Learning about Materialism and Consumer Culture

In today's society, consumerism and materialism are often influenced by comparisons with celebrities and media portrayals, leading many to feel the need for more possessions. Research shows that materialism can contribute to social isolation, low self-esteem, and overall dissatisfaction with life. Many believe that acquiring more possessions is key to happiness, despite evidence suggesting otherwise. Media and advertisements prey on our insecurities and desire for social status. This issue is particularly relevant due to the rise of "hyper-consumers" among adolescents. A study by the Association for Psychological Science titled "Cuing Consumerism: Situational Materialism Undermines Personal and Social Well-Being" suggests that materialistic individuals tend to have lower levels of well-being. Through various experiments, researchers found that exposure to desirable consumer goods can increase materialistic concerns, leading to negative emotions and decreased social engagement. The study concludes that the negative effects of materialism are not limited to those who are inherently materialistic [14].

Today, our world is saturated with material possessions and a high standard of living that many of us simply accept as the norm. We find ourselves immersed in a culture of mass production, where acquiring and spending has become a predominant, yet creative, aspect of modern life. History professor William Leach, in his article "Manufacturing a Consumer Culture," argues that the rise of modern consumer culture taps into the human inclination towards excessive desire for material goods. Leach posits that American consumer capitalism has fostered a culture that rejects the past and tradition in favor of a future-oriented pursuit of possessions, blurring the line between a fulfilling life and the accumulation of goods. This cultural transformation

is highlighted by a comparison to life 150 years ago, when rural communities prioritized stability, frugality, and family bonds. Handcrafted items were cherished and passed down through generations, and purchased goods were meticulously maintained, repaired, and repurposed. However, a shift in culture emerged in the mid-1800s in the United States as urban commerce began to overshadow rural living.

The United States was undergoing a rapid transformation into a fast-paced society. According to Leach, commerce took center stage in the national consciousness, giving rise to a consumer culture: "In the years following the Civil War, American capitalism began to shape a unique culture that diverged from traditional family and community values, conventional religious beliefs, and typical political structures." This market-driven culture prioritized the exchange and flow of money as the cornerstone of aesthetic life. Its core elements included acquisition and consumption as pathways to happiness, a fascination with the new, the democratization of desires, and the elevation of monetary value as the primary measure of worth in society [15].

Historian and author Stephanie Coontz, in her book "The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap," notes a shift in the perception of consumption over time. She observes that the term "consumption" evolved from its earlier negative connotations of waste and depletion to a positive association with fulfilling human needs and desires. This transformation of consumer culture was driven by various factors, including the influence of amplified advertising. Advertisements played a crucial role in stimulating consumer desires and creating a demand for promoted products. The rise of mass marketing as its own industry was instrumental in maintaining a continuous flow of consumers and money. Additionally, the concepts of brand loyalty and consumer confidence became valuable commodities in this consumer-driven environment. Coontz also highlights how advertising capitalizes on human fears and the innate desire for social acceptance to further fuel consumerism.

In her research study titled "Do media portrayals of affluence foster feelings of relative deprivation? Exploring a path model of social comparison and materialism

on television viewers' life dissatisfaction," author Hyeseung Yang investigated the impact of American television's promotion of capitalist consumerism on viewers. Yang conducted an experiment involving adult residents in Pennsylvania, collecting and analyzing data through surveys. The study's results indicate that frequent television consumption may correlate with an increase in materialistic values, perceptions of others' wealth, and a sense of disparity between one's own material wealth and that of others.

Additionally, a series of studies published in the journal *Motivation and Emotion* have shown that as individuals become more focused on material possessions, their overall sense of well-being and purpose tends to decrease. While materialism can contribute to economic growth, it also has negative implications on a personal level. Consumerism and materialism are closely linked and can have detrimental effects on personal well-being, relationships, communities, and the environment. An article titled "How Consumerism and Materialism of Modern Society Make Us Unhappy, Lonely, and Unconfident" delves deeper into the impacts of the consumer culture we have created. The article highlights that consumerism and materialism often lead to comparisons with others, and feelings of inadequacy can arise when it seems that others are more successful. The constant exposure to advertising plays a significant role in shaping our desires and perceived needs. The article emphasizes the detrimental effects of consumerism and materialism on individuals, suggesting that materialism may contribute to social isolation [16].

Despite the growing awareness of the impacts of materialism and consumerism in society, there is a rising concern among parents, educators, and consumer activists about the influence of materialism on adolescents. In 2003, Lan T. Nguyen conducted a research study titled "Growing Up in a Material World: An Investigation of the Development of Materialism in Children and Adolescents" to explore the link between children's social-cognitive development and consumption values, specifically materialism. The study focused on three main subtopics: the emergence of self-brand connections in children and adolescents, the role of developing self-concept in materialism among children and adolescents, and the

influence of parental factors on materialism in children and adolescents. Researchers analyzed the evolution of self-concepts from childhood to adolescence, with a particular emphasis on the relationship between branded possessions and self-concepts. They also investigated various aspects of the self, such as self-esteem, in understanding the connection between age and materialism.

The passage you provided highlights the impact of social-cognitive development, family factors, and external influences on the development of materialistic values in children and adolescents. It emphasizes how children's self-concepts evolve with age, leading to a greater focus on material possessions and brands. Family dynamics, such as parenting styles and family structures, play a crucial role in shaping children's attitudes towards materialism. Additionally, the influence of consumer brands on self-concepts becomes more pronounced as children grow older and become more aware of brand images and identities. The article suggests that parents, peers, and the media are significant socialization agents that contribute to the rise of materialism among young individuals. Understanding these factors can help parents and educators guide children towards more balanced values and priorities, promoting healthier attitudes towards material possessions and consumerism. It underscores the importance of mindful parenting and media literacy in fostering positive self-esteem and values in children and adolescents [17].

The passage you provided discusses how contemporary artists explore and critique consumer culture through their artwork. Angie Kordick's article focuses on how consumerism is reflected in contemporary art pieces that incorporate famous corporate symbols and mass-produced goods. The text highlights the significance of shopping as a ritual that shapes and transforms identities in modern urban life.

Pop art, which emerged in the mid-1950s, played a pivotal role in critiquing and celebrating consumption choices and mass production. Pop artists used ordinary and recognizable imagery from popular culture, such as brands, celebrities, and advertisements, to elevate them to the status of fine art. By incorporating elements of

mass culture into their work, Pop artists created visually striking combinations that reflected the commercialized nature of society.

The article mentions artists like Leon Sessix, known as Dotmaster, who deconstruct consumerism through their art rather than simply criticizing consumption. Dotmaster's work, such as the piece "High Roller" featuring a Gucci shopping bag used as a dispenser for spray cans and paint rollers, aims to challenge consumerism by incorporating high-end brands in unexpected ways [18].

Overall, the passage underscores how contemporary artists use their creativity to comment on and question the materialism and consumerism prevalent in capitalist societies. Through their art, they invite viewers to reconsider their relationship with consumer culture and reflect on the impact of commercialization on society and personal identity.

During the interview, Dotmaster was asked whether his work primarily revolves around political or social issues. He responded by emphasizing that his art tackles personal political matters, particularly focusing on the mundane yet significant issue of trash. He believes that his work serves as a reminder for individuals to acknowledge their responsibility and understanding of broader societal issues, rather than offering definitive solutions. Dotmaster's approach is more about presenting visual commentary rather than aligning with specific political parties. Similarly, Banksy, a renowned graffiti artist and political activist from England, explores themes of materialism and consumerism in his work. One of Banksy's notable pieces, "Jesus Christ with Shopping Bags" from 2005, critiques the excessive consumerism prevalent during the holiday season. In this artwork, Jesus Christ is depicted holding shopping bags in each hand, symbolizing the commercialization of Christmas and the shift away from its original spiritual values. WideWalls notes the powerful message conveyed by this piece, questioning how the pursuit of unnecessary possessions has overshadowed the core principles of compassion, love, and forgiveness that Christmas represents. This artwork prompts viewers to reflect on whether modern society's fixation on material goods has compromised the essence of the holiday [19].

Alec Andon, aka Alec Monopoly, an artist hailing from New York, is the closest in style to my work. He has achieved international acclaim for his art featuring the iconic character from the well-known board game Monopoly. Alec Monopoly aims to challenge the consumerist structures prevalent in mainstream culture through his art, as demonstrated in his series “Richie Rich” and “Scrooge Money Mesmerized” [20].

Alec Monopoly's artistic style bears a striking resemblance to that of the renowned street artist Banksy. Through his artwork, Monopoly aims to subtly critique the capitalist and consumerist structures prevalent in contemporary popular culture. He achieves this by reinterpreting well-known icons in a manner that invites viewers to see them through his unique perspective. Ultimately, it is the audience's interpretation and imagination that breathe life into Monopoly's artwork. By incorporating characters like the Monopoly man and other familiar cartoon figures, Monopoly creates art pieces with narratives that resonate with a broad audience, tapping into shared memories and experiences [21].

On a 36” wide by 80” long piece of plywood, the artwork titled "The Golden Soapbox" is created using acrylic paints and spray paints. In this piece, depicted in figure 3, Scrooge McDuck is portrayed standing atop a stack of Hermes Boxes. He is shown spray painting a brick wall behind him with imagery of cash and lyrics from Cardi B's popular song "Money," specifically the line "All I really need is the money." These lyrics symbolize the prevailing message in today's music culture that equates money with success and fulfillment. The incorporation of Cardi B's lyrics serves to highlight the theme of materialism and consumerism in the artwork. It reflects the idea of an insatiable desire for wealth and possessions, even when one is already affluent. The stacked Hermes boxes symbolize the idealized social hierarchy that many aspire to reach. The accumulation of these luxury boxes represents notions of class, wealth, and the pursuit of a higher social status [22].

The concept of chaos is visually conveyed through a recurring pattern of shapes on the right side of the painting, specifically in the area devoid of dollar signs. This pattern symbolizes disorder and confusion, contrasting with the singular focus of

Scrooge McDuck on the prominent dollar sign. His fixation on this symbol suggests a disregard for the world around him, consumed solely by the pursuit of wealth. The influence of famous artist Rihanna's 2013 song "Pour it Up" is evident in the painting's title. The song features lyrics that emphasize her affluence, with lines like "all I see are dollar signs." This lyrical theme resonates with the central message of the artwork, highlighting the allure and obsession with wealth that can lead individuals to overlook the broader context of their surroundings [23].

The brand's association with luxury was perpetuated through media advertisements in the 1900s, influencing popular culture. Kanye West referenced Grey Poupon in his 2016 song "Facts," highlighting its connotation of luxury. Inspired by Andy Warhol's iconic Campbell Soup artwork, I created a 42" x 25" painting featuring a modernized version, symbolizing the intersection of art and consumerism. By altering the label on each Grey Poupon bottle to include upscale ingredients like caviar, I aimed to emphasize the product's luxury status and employ pop art aesthetics to convey irony and humor. This artistic choice reflects the ongoing evolution of consumer culture and its connections to social class [24].

In conclusion, the pursuit of materialism and consumerism has negative social and personal consequences. The constant desire to acquire wants rather than needs is linked to feelings of depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, isolation, and strained relationships. Extensive psychological research supports these findings, indicating that materialism can diminish happiness and inner peace for individuals across all social classes, whether wealthy, poor, or in between. Author George Monbiot describes materialism as a destructive system that leads to unhealthy comparisons with others, perpetuated by societal pressures. The belief that increased wealth and possessions equate to greater well-being only fuels mass discontent [25].

Materialism and consumerism have had a detrimental impact on the fabric of our society. Many individuals are losing sight of their moral compass and struggling to differentiate between right and wrong choices. The primary focus has shifted to pursuing a high-quality life and superficial comforts, with the belief that human needs

are the sole priority and that everything is readily provided by the environment. This mindset is predominantly influenced by scientific reasoning.

In the second chapter of the coursework, an analysis of consumer culture and materialism through the prism of the American family novel, focusing on the novel "American Dream" by Edward Albee and other sources, was carried out.

Analyzing materialism and the fallen American family in the context of the "American Dream", it is revealed how the priorities and values of families are reflected through their attitude to material goods. Albee's novel highlights how the constant pursuit of success and wealth can lead to the decline of family ties and moral values.

Examining materialism and consumer culture has allowed us to better understand how these aspects affect American family dynamics and relationships. They become the basis for analyzing conflicts that arise in families, as well as for understanding how these conflicts reflect modern social trends.

Concluding the second section of the course work, it can be determined that the analysis of consumer culture and materialism in family novels helps us better understand the impact of these factors on family life and relationships in modern American society.

Conclusion to the 2st chapter

Consumer culture and materialism are two key components of modern society that deeply affect the individual and collective experience of people.

Consumer culture is defined as a set of ideas, values, norms and practices related to the consumption of goods and services. It covers everything from mass media and advertising to fashion and lifestyle. Consumer culture shapes our perception of what is important and desirable, and influences how we express our identities.

Materialism, on the other hand, is an increased focus on material goods and physical pleasures as the main sources of satisfaction and happiness. Materialism can

be manifested in the rapid accumulation of property, the search for status symbols, as well as in the constant desire for material success.

These two concepts are often interconnected. Consumer culture often reinforces a materialistic way of thinking, creating ideals based on owning things and achieving material comfort. In turn, materialism can reinforce a culture of consumerism, as people seek to achieve satisfaction through the acquisition of goods and services.

However, this phenomenon can also have negative consequences, such as increasing consumer debt, environmental problems from overproduction and consumption, and a growing sense of inner emptiness in people who seek to solve it through material means.

Therefore, the analysis of consumer culture and materialism allows us to better understand modern society, its values, trends and influence on people's lives.

CONCLUSION

This term paper explores in detail the theme of consumer culture and materialism in the American family novel. In the first chapter, the key concepts of materialism and materialistic consumer culture are defined, which provided a theoretical basis for further analysis.

The second chapter analyzes the culture of consumption and materialism through the prism of the American family novel, particularly with the help of the novel "The American Dream" by Edward Albee. This analysis made it possible to understand how these themes are reflected in family relationships and how they affect the individual characters of the characters.

Demonstrative consumption is a kind of construction of an image that an individual wants to convey to others. The "logic of consumption" described by H. Simmel suggests that the rich, with the help of new consumption models, try to build a border that separates them from the majority, the masses, focusing on them, try to catch up, and the rich, fleeing from this symbolic persecution, reinvent everything and new symbols of distinction.

"Glitz" and mass culture in general constitute another mode of ostentatious consumption - "disgusting comparison" that often turns into "money rivalry" (money imitation) - a behavior characteristic of the poor pretending to be rich, and evokes the famous competition between the Christmas tree eater and the arrogant daughter of the American millionaire Vanderbilt. Such behavior can be manifested when a person buys an expensive car on credit, visits a restaurant where he leaves a month's salary in the evening, sells an apartment to celebrate a wedding.

Consumer culture and materialism are two interconnected aspects of modern society that affect people's lifestyle, values, and attitudes toward material things.

Consumer culture is defined as a set of practices, customs, ideals and values related to the process of buying and using goods and services. In many societies, consumption can be seen as a way of self-expression, social status or satisfaction of personal needs. However, consumer culture can also have negative consequences, such as resource overuse, increased waste, and environmental impact.

Materialism, in turn, refers to the increased value that people place on material things and their possession. Materialism can manifest itself as a desire to gain wealth, improve one's material condition, or a desire for luxury and prosperity. It can also be related to consumption as a way of satisfying personal needs and achieving happiness.

Although consumer culture and materialism can be important aspects of modern life, it is important to maintain a balance and not let them dominate other values such as mutual understanding, social responsibility and personal development. In general, the course work made it possible to better understand how consumer culture and materialism affect American family novels, which opens new ways to understand modern literary trends and social problems.

Анотація

Американські сімейні романи часто відображають складність споживчої культури та матеріалізму у сучасному суспільстві. Ця робота аналізує взаємозв'язок між споживчою культурою і сімейними цінностями, а також вплив матеріалізму на міжособистісні відносини у контексті американських сімейних романів. Дослідження виявляє, які елементи споживчої культури формують уявлення про щасливе життя та сімейні цінності в романах, а також як матеріальність впливає на характери і взаємини героїв. Через призму аналізу конфліктів, цінностей і змін у сімейних відносинах у романах, робота розкриває складність взаємозв'язку між споживчою культурою, матеріалізмом і сімейним життям у сучасному американському суспільстві.

Ключові слова: романи, матеріалізм, споживча культура, цінності.

Summary

American family novels often reflect the complexity of consumer culture and materialism in modern society. This work analyzes the relationship between consumer culture and family values, as well as the influence of materialism on interpersonal relationships in the context of American family novels. The study reveals which elements of consumer culture shape the idea of a happy life and family values in novels, as well as how materiality affects the characters and relationships of the characters. Through the prism of the analysis of conflicts, values and changes in family relations in the novels, the work reveals the complexity of the relationship between consumer culture, materialism and family life in modern American society.

Key words: novels, materialism, consumer culture, values.