



Plastic Subjects: Plasticity, Time, and the Bling Ring

Adam E. Foster

To cite this article: Adam E. Foster (2022) Plastic Subjects: Plasticity, Time, and the Bling Ring, *New Political Science*, 44:2, 265-282, DOI: [10.1080/07393148.2022.2058290](https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2022.2058290)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2022.2058290>



Published online: 29 Apr 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 62



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Plastic Subjects: Plasticity, Time, and the Bling Ring

Adam E. Foster 

Political Science, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the events surrounding a string of robberies from the homes of young celebrities living in Los Angeles County by a group of teenagers referred to by the media as “The Bling Ring.” It argues that the group demonstrates the intersections of desire and materiality under the conditions of a culture driven by idolization of the celebrity, referring to the works of Jean Baudrillard, Pierre Bourdieu, and French collective Tiqqun. It further examines the events as a moment where subjects were able to escape the life-narratives imposed upon them by the State. Rather than adhering to the norms of regular adolescent life, reproduced and enforced through what Michael Shapiro identifies as “national-time,” members of the Bling Ring endeavored to create their own lives according to what I refer to as “celebrity-time,” revealing processes of becoming in the work of Gilles Deleuze, and plasticity in that of Catherine Malabou.

Introduction

The words “Bling Ring” are synonymous with Sophia Coppolla’s 2013 film of the same name. Recounting the story of a group of vapid, socially alienated, pop culture obsessed teenagers who enter the homes of celebrities to steal clothing, jewelry, and other personal belongings in order to emulate the glamorous lives seen in representations of Hollywood culture, Coppolla’s film is a poignant satire of the intersections of youth culture and celebrity worship. It is also a film whose plot would leave viewers with the impression, unless they knew otherwise, that it is a work of fiction. While the desire to become a celebrity is a recognizable feature of Western culture, by all accounts, for it to be so amplified that it produces a conspiracy to burgle as many as fifty different celebrities of over \$3 million dollars¹ – let alone a conspiracy organized by high school students – seems too outlandish to be a real story. However, as the adage goes, truth is stranger than fiction; Coppolla’s film is based off a true story, with its narrative adapted from an actual event. For the most part, all that Coppola changed was the characters’ names.

CONTACT Adam E. Foster  adamef@hawaii.edu  Political Science, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA

¹David Gardner, “Bling Ring’ Burglars Who Stole Millions from Stars’ Homes Had List of Famous Victims, Court Told,” *The Daily Mail Online*, September 17, 2010, <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1313077/Bling-ring-burglars-stole-millions-stars-homes-list-famous-victims-court-told.html>.

It is ironic that the Bling Ring's crimes – which were rooted in a desire to become celebrities on a material and corporeal level – would culminate with a major Hollywood adaptation, turning the real-life teenagers into characters in a film. That said, adapting the story to film was by no means a stretch. Coppola conceived of the project after reading about the teenagers in *Vanity Fair*, finding that the story of their crime spree “sounded like it had the elements for a fun pop movie.”² It is easy to see why: the article that inspired the film, authored by Nancy Jo Sales,³ portrays the teenagers as both normal (through their relatable adolescent dreams of stardom) and abnormal (in just how far those dreams pervaded their subjectivity and ways of being). It is a compelling read. More intriguing, however, is that the teenagers come across as if they *did* belong in the spaces occupied by celebrities and Hollywood stars. The members of the Bling Ring quoted in Sales article speak of the high-end boutiques and clubs they visited with such familiarity and ease that it feels unfathomable that they *didn't* belong there. In other words, the portrait of the Bling Ring painted by Sales is one of a group of teenagers who embodied what it meant to be a star – without having done anything to deserve it.

This article examines the Bling Ring to understand the relationship between forms of subjectivity and modes of desire associated with the culture of celebrity-idolization. It builds off existing research on the role of the celebrity under the conditions of capitalism, which have shown how “celebrities are the production locale for an elaborate discourse on the individual and individuality,”⁴ as well as central to “categorizations of the public sphere” that are “connected to the heightened significance of popular culture and democratic culture.”⁵ Given the centrality of individualism to liberal forms of democratic governance,⁶ inquiry into this discourse is deeply political, rather than solely cultural or social. Unlike previous studies on celebrity discourse, this project explores the form of individual subjectivity that are produced amongst the *fans* of celebrities, rather than amongst celebrities themselves. It examines how members of the group came to embody a new form of subjectivity – different from the ontology of the average American high school student. This subjectivity can be observed by examining how their lives became *mediated* through different forms of “screens:” the television screen, the film screen, and the computer screen. Much as the term celebrity can be thought of as a “mediating frame” through which a figure's public persona is performed across various mediums,⁷ the Bling Ring cannot be understood separate from their own mediation in these same cultural interlocutors. Moreover, this mediation emerges in the face of the media's role in creating the conditions of possibility for the crimes to occur, as well as in the construction of “the Bling Ring robberies” as

²Ryan Gilbey, “Sofia Coppola on The Bling Ring: ‘What These Kids Did Really Took Ingenuity,’” *The Guardian*, July 4, 2013, sec. Film, <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2013/jul/04/sofia-coppola-the-bling-ring-interview>.

³Nancy Jo Sales, “The Suspects Wore Louboutins,” *Vanity Fair*, March 2010, <https://archive.vanityfair.com/article/share/e9cc0cc3-dbf1-4fab-8367-5fc7c05608e6>.

⁴P. David Marshall, *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*. 2nd ed. (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 4.

⁵Marshall, 7.

⁶Wendy Brown and Janet Halley, “Introduction,” in *Left Legalism/Left Critique* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 5.

⁷Philip Drake and Andy Miah, “The Cultural Politics of Celebrity,” *Cultural Politics* 6 (March 2010): 51–52, <https://doi.org/10.2752/175174310X12549254318746>.

a media event. By event, I am not simply referring to an inconsequential moment in time. Rather, drawing on the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, I argue that the event constitutes a temporal period in which something changes. In this case, what changes is the subjectivity of the Bling Ring's members. The processes of becoming that the members underwent are of interest because they reveal novel forms of subjectivity under the conditions of capitalist-celebrity culture, wherein the way of life adopted by celebrities emerges in the sphere of the non-celebrity. Given that celebrities are often partitioned from the wider public, living in a "radically separate world,"⁸ these forms of subjectivity are contingent upon an erasure of this partition; as such, they may be an anomaly. Nonetheless, given the intensity of celebrity-idolization in the contemporary era, the subjectivity of the Bling Ring provides insight into the full extent of this idolization's individuating power. To this end, the Bling Ring unsettles assumptions of rationality that accompany Cartesian subjectivity that is traditionally found when discussing political subjects.

To perform this analysis, I employ a methodology that is drawn from the work of political theorists who engage with cinema as a form of thought. To think and write *cinematically* entails a hermeneutic practice that approaches the object of analysis as one would approach a film. Such a strategy requires, as Davide Panagia argues, that one "conceive of the work of political thinking as one of stitching and cutting scenes, worlds, vistas and sights."⁹ This form of thought lends itself well to understanding The Bling Ring. Insofar that it can be constituted as an event separate from reproductions and representations in print media, television, and film, the robberies operated according to a cinematic logic. As the event unfolded, it unfolded cinematically, with its entire progression taking place *on the screen*. Footage of the teenagers taken on security cameras were broadcast when the robberies became a news story on celebrity gossip programs like TMZ. It was these same programs that had produced the decadent, glitzy portrayals of celebrities' lives that the teenagers consumed so voraciously, and whose reporting was exploited to learn when their targets would be out of town. Studying the Bling Ring means stitching the various media representations of the crimes together into a cohesive portrait of the event. Furthermore, this form of cinematic hermeneutics mirrors Deleuze's notion of the event, described as "the forces in their various relationships in a proposition or a phenomenon, and to the genetic relationship which determines these forces (power)."¹⁰ To stitch these pieces together is to understand how relations of power interacted with one another and co-mingled to create a temporal moment where a change occurred. In the case of the Bling Ring, these forces all emanate from an idolization of the celebrity and her lifestyle. Heeding this observation, this article seeks to consider the ways in which the world of the American teenager and the world of the American celebrity become stitched together through intensive flows of desire (to use the language of Deleuze and Guattari) that circulate amongst the subset of popular culture that intersects with teenage life. In

⁸Jeffrey C. Alexander, "The Celebrity-Icon," *Cultural Sociology* 4, no. 3 (November 1, 2010): 329, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975510380316>.

⁹Davide Panagia, "Preface: Show, Don't Tell," in *Politics, Theory, and Film: Critical Encounters with Lars von Trier*, ed. Lori J. Marso (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), ix.

¹⁰Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche & Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1983), xvii.

this sense, the “radically different world” of the celebrity no longer seems that foreign to the lives of the public. Instead, we can begin to see how popular culture and the media begin to disintegrate the barrier separating the two. While not exclusive to adolescent culture, it is amongst teenagers that the erasure of the distinction between the world of the celebrity and the world of the citizen is perhaps clearest.

Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Event: Subjects & Objects

What followed the Bling Ring’s robberies was transition from the institutional life of the child whose subjectivity is confined to the archetype of the student into a world of excess and hedonism as the teenagers spent their time partying and living luxuriously, inhabiting spaces where celebrities also mingled. The members directly involved in the robberies were a group of high school students in the Los Angeles area,¹¹ but in one way or another, each of these teenagers stood outside of the official (that is, socially authorized) habitus of the American high school student.

Standing outside the habitus places them within an exteriority that is both epistemological and ontological. Epistemologically, this exterior field is the realm of desire. In his work concerning Deleuze’s philosophy of the event, François Zourabichvili points to the existence of an “exteriority ... inherent to desire” in which “all desire proceeds from an encounter.”¹² Exiting the habitus lead to the teenagers encountering the Celebrity – not as a person, but as the abstract celebrity-icon described by Jeffrey Alexander, that become “objects of worship”¹³ and symbolize a life of extreme luxury and wealth¹⁴ – with productions of desire emerging as a result. Desire, for Deleuze and Guattari, is not the expression of a “lack,” a yearning for what one does not have. Such a conception of desire would require an attempt to understand the teenagers’ yearnings *a la* “I do not have this article of clothing, and I want it” or “I do not have the life of a celebrity, and I want it.” Deleuze and Guattari instead affirm the “intrinsic power of desire to create its own object.”¹⁵ When the subject encounters an object exterior to its own being, intensive flows of desire create meaning which are then inscribed upon the object. The desire to be a celebrity was inscribed onto the objects the teenagers would steal from their victims.

There is another aspect to the epistemological exteriority of the group: it evades the traditional notions of Cartesian subjectivity, where the subject moves inwards towards rational deliberation and categorization. As Deleuze writes, thinking in the exterior means “we no longer pass through an interior, whether it is the interior of the soul or consciousness, the interior of essence or the concept, in words, that which has always constituted the principle of philosophy.”¹⁶ Instead, exteriority articulates “a

¹¹Allen Salkin, “Going for the Bling: Hollywood Burglars,” *The New York Times*, November 13, 2009, sec. Fashion & Style, <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/15/fashion/15bling.html>.

¹²François Zourabichvili, *Deleuze: A Philosophy of the Event: Together with The Vocabulary of Deleuze*, ed. Gregg Lambert and Daniel W. Smith, trans. Kieran Aarons (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 147.

¹³Alexander, “The Celebrity-Icon,” 325.

¹⁴Alexander, 329.

¹⁵Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 25.

¹⁶Gilles Deleuze, “Nomadic Thought,” in *Desert Islands: And Other Texts, 1953-1974*, ed. David Lapoujade, trans. Mike Taormina (Los Angeles, CA: Cambridge, MA: Semiotext(e), 2004), 255.

counter-philosophy ... a discourse that is first and foremost nomadic, whose utterances would be produced not by a rational administrative."¹⁷ In short, this externalized thinking and being functions through forms of desire that stand in opposition to the rigid codes of the status quo and the institutional life that accompanies it.

In their exteriority, the teenagers would be better described as outcasts rather than liberated nomads. Nicholas Prugo was a student at Indian Hills, an alternative high school, after being expelled from Calabasas High School for excessive absences. There he met Rachel Lee, who is described as "spoiled" and "haughty." Their later co-conspirator, Alexis Neiers, describes Lee as follows: "Rachel's a klepto freak ... She was so manipulating, so conniving. Nick always did what she said. Rachel was in charge. She started it all."¹⁸ Both were from affluent families, and both were estranged from their parents. They bonded over fashion, and both had dreams of designing their own clothing lines. Lee aspired to study at the Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising in L.A, as "a lot of the *Hills*¹⁹ girls went there."²⁰ Prugo and Lee occupied a space on the fringe of teenage society, outcasts in a school that was *tailored* for outcasts in its design as an alternative to the typical high school (a zone of institutional life that consumes much of an adolescent's time and labor).

Prugo and Lee aspired to become like the celebrities they viewed on TV. This not unheard, nor something that is strange and unnatural for children and adolescents. Nor is it entirely unrealistic, as vocations within "cultural production ... have not yet acquired the rigidity of the older bureaucratic professions."²¹ Said differently, the parameters of the celebrity-class are porous. Its membership is contingent on recognition and fame,²² and not on inherited cultural-capital. It is not at all uncommon for someone from humble or average backgrounds to find fame as an actor or musician. Entering the celebrity-class is an aspiration for many, including Prugo and Lee who did not want to be *like* celebrities but wanted to *be* celebrities. This aspiration is not uncommon, but how the pair strove to achieve this goal reveals a deviation from the norm.

The pair initially began with what they called "checking cars —taking credit cards and cash from unlocked Bentleys, Mercedeses, and other fancy rides parked in their neighborhood. The next day, they'd go shopping." It is in these first acts that the early moments of a transformation can be seen, evident in Prugo's recollections of these shopping sprees: "We'd go to, like, Kitson, a Melrose boutique popular with starlets. We'd walk in, stylized and beautiful. We'd use the cards — no one would question."²³ Within the space of the clothing store, they *were* starlets in an ontological sense; they were able to exist in accordance with the habits and lifestyle of a celebrity.

¹⁷Deleuze, 259.

¹⁸Sales, "Suspects Wore Louboutins."

¹⁹A reality television show that aired on MTV.

²⁰Sales, "Suspects Wore Louboutins."

²¹Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2010), 148.

²²Drake and Miah, "The Cultural Politics of Celebrity," 50; Marshall, *Celebrity and Power*, 4.

²³Sales, "Suspects Wore Louboutins."

To some degree, this shift in Prugo and Lee's was contingent upon their location. As Pierre Bourdieu notes, differences between lifestyles can be thought of in relation to their "distribution in a *socially ranked geographical space*" in which

a group's chance of appropriating any given class of rare assets ... depend partly on its capacity for the specific appropriation, defined by the economic, cultural and social capital it can deploy in order to appropriate materially or symbolically the assets in question in its distribution in social space.²⁴

Thinking in terms of space highlights the opportunistic aspects of this ontology. It is by virtue of the social, domestic, and geographical spaces they occupied that Prugo and Lee were able to act like celebrities. Their ability to do so was contingent on the fact that they lived in affluent neighborhoods in Southern California, near the high-end stores frequented by celebrities. No doubt, it would be much harder (or perhaps impossible) for even these early moments of stylizing oneself as a celebrity to have occurred had the two teenagers lived elsewhere in the United States. These spatial considerations do not *explain* the transformation, but rather serve as the conditions of possibility that allowed for the transformation to take place. To understand this transformation, one must understand the relationship between processes of self-fashioning and our object-oriented reality.

Jean Baudrillard rightfully notes that social status is inherently tied to our objective reality through material objects that serve as "the carriers of indexed social significations, of a social and cultural hierarchy."²⁵ In *For A Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, he seemingly agrees with Bourdieu that the subject's place in society is fungible, and views this fungibility as problematic in that it creates "an essential problem ... [in] the disparity between intentional mobility (aspirations) and real mobility (objective chances of social promotion)."²⁶ Baudrillard challenges the capitalist fantasy of one's social and economic position being an assemblage of one's aspirations and hard work. Instead, he argues that this model "often comes to compensate and overdetermine the relative inertia of social mechanisms." Instead of notions of willing and deciding that accompany Cartesian subjectivity, hope is at the crux of Baudrillard's model. He argues that "individuals *hope* because they 'know' they can hope – they *do not hope too much* because they 'know' that in fact this society opposes unconquerable barriers to free ascent – they *hope however a little too much* because they also live by a diffuse ideology of mobility and growth."²⁷ While this may be true for the archetypal citizen, measuring just how much she can hope without thinking outside of the confines of what is possible within her social reality, Prugo and Lee moved away from *hoping* to *enacting*, turning away from the ontologies presented in Bourdieu and Baudrillard's models towards a mode of subjectivation that takes place on a more existential level wherein the very fabric of one's existence becomes altered, and not simply one's position in society, or their material conditions and possessions. Members of the Bling Ring were not simply improving their lives under the conditions

²⁴Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 148.

²⁵Jean Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, trans. Charles Levin (St. Louis, MO: Telos Press, 1981), 37.

²⁶Baudrillard, 38.

²⁷Baudrillard, 39.

of a teenaged student, but rather radically departing and constituting themselves in an entirely different life with its own logic and conditions of possibility. Their actions were a way of reinventing themselves and escaping from the habitus of the high school student.

It would be misguided to say that the Bling Ring's members ceased to be teenagers. Instead, a certain tendency that exists within adolescence (and indeed within subjectivity tout court) became amplified in their emerging ontology. Tiqqun articulate a concept of the Young-Girl (which is emphatically not a gendered concept) that refers to "the model citizen as redefined by consumer society since World War I" that forced capital to "socialize" and "create its own culture, its own leisure, medicine, urbanism, sentimental education and its own mores."²⁸ Central to this culture is the celebrity. As P. David Marshall argues, the celebrity has become a living metaphor for value in society, with its infamy something readily shared amongst members of the multitude. As such, Marshall asserts that the celebrity is central to new articulations of the public sphere in the face of a heightened importance of popular culture in democratic society.²⁹ This produced an "extraordinary expansion of print, digital, and television celebrity coverage."³⁰ In the face of these changes, Horkheimer and Adorno infamously argued that idolization of celebrities only functions to reinforce the consumerism of late capitalism by deluding the masses into thinking they can be like the celebrities they worship,³¹ foreshadowing the critique that would later be put forth by Tiqqun. However, Horkheimer and Adorno's account might suggest the public are wholly passive actors who are naively guided by the dictates of ideology. Instead, as Alexander's work on the celebrity-icon shows, celebrities are "objects of worship" for which the public has an "insatiable appetite ... for celebrity news and gossip." Moreover, these acts of celebrity consumption allow persons to use celebrity-icons as "transitional objects, ... mediating between internal external reality."³² The interplay between one's internal and external realities shows that there are limits to the autonomy afforded to the subject in Alexander's study – much as the subject's agency limits the totalizing power of culture and ideology seen in critical theory. Therefore, the reterritorialization of the self into that of a celebrity, evident in Prugo's recollections, is a product of both ideological coercion and a conscious rejection of the imposed ontology of the average teenager.

Within this dynamic, objects themselves begin to have agency, as the consumer is acted upon by the object rather than being an actor. As Baudrillard notes, "individuals know themselves (if they do not feel themselves), to be judged by their objects, to be judged according to their objects, and each at bottom submits to this judgment."³³ Ultimately, objects – not people – articulate this judgment. It doesn't operate according to an internal logic that is specific to the individual as a unique, indivisible, and

²⁸Tiqqun, *Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young-Girl*, trans. Ariana Reines (Los Angeles, CA: Cambridge, MA: Semiotext(e), 2012), 15.

²⁹Marshall, *Celebrity and Power*, 6–7.

³⁰Alexander, "The Celebrity-Icon," 325.

³¹Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 124.

³²Alexander, "The Celebrity-Icon," 325.

³³Baudrillard, *Critique*, 40.

self-contained entity that is often postulated in liberal thought. Rather, “objects, their syntax, and their rhetoric refer to social objectives and a social logic.”³⁴ In this vein it seems more apt to say that what changed with the Bling Ring was not so much the self-hood of the members themselves, empty and meaningless without objects themselves, but the objects they possessed. More importantly, this objective truth enacted a social rather than personal transformation, and its catalyst was found in their mediated, external reality rather than in some supposed psychological trait. Instead of the teenagers having deeply held, self-determined convictions and characteristics to which forces of desire, greed, and vanity fed into, there existed an organizing force inherent to the interplay between consumerism and the materiality of the luxurious clothing associated with celebrity-life. This force orchestrates the self-fashioning that the members of the Bling Ring ultimately undertake. Truly, one dimension of the Bling Ring, constituted as an event, is the reconstitution of the members’ subjectivities in accordance with a new object-oriented reality.

Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Event: Subjects & Affects

Understanding the relationship between culture and capitalist consumption points to another crucial dimension of the Bling Ring’s transformation; it helps orient one’s thinking to the intersections of sovereignty and subjectivity. Political science often approaches concerns of subjectivity through a Cartesian lens, postulating political actors to be calculating and cognitively-aware, whose actions are intentional even if the consequences are not. One could just as easily refer to the Cartesian subject as the sovereign subject in line with Carl Schmitt’s definition of the “sovereign individual” as “the one who decides.”³⁵ Yet the contrast between Bourdieu and Baudrillard forces one to think of subjectivity as not synonymous with autonomy. Another way in which the Bling Ring can be constituted as an event, then, can be found in the dimensions that reveal the limitations of sovereignty for understanding, both the actors in a sociology of everyday life, and the affective politics that emerges in its stead.

The move away from a Cartesian subjectivity begins as the scope of their attempts to escape adolescence expands, and their escapades turn into something far more extreme than petty theft from unlocked cars: robbing the homes of young celebrities whose fashion they admired, exploiting the synopticon that accompany being in the “public eye.” As Sales notes, “they started ‘checking up on celebrity Web sites’ ... they’d drive by celebrities’ homes to do surveillance, figuring out how to get in.” In October 2008, they chose Paris Hilton as their first target on the basis that she was “dumb,” fobbing her four times. Other targets included Orlando Bloom, Rachel Bilson (whose home was burglarized six times), and Audrina Partridge (who was the first victim to take note of her missing objects, and publicizing footage of the robbery from her home surveillance cameras). By 2009 it had grown into a substantial criminal enterprise, with its membership having expanded beyond just Prugo and Lee. As a report by the Los Angeles Police Department points out, “while this activity started as

³⁴Baudrillard, 38.

³⁵Michael Hardt, “The Power to Be Affected,” *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 28, no. 3 (September 1, 2015): 216, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-014-9191-x>.

a twisted adventure for Prugo and his small group of friends fueled by celebrity worship, ... it quickly mushroomed into an organized criminal enterprise." The question that follows is: what motivated them to engage in such transgressions?

There is no readily available answer to that question. For the teenagers, it seems as if there lacked a clear motivation. The best evidence of this lay in what Prugo, who has spoken with utmost candor in his media appearances, says of the robberies: "We just did it. I know it sounds dumb, but Rachel just wanted the clothes. She wanted to look pretty."³⁶

This (non-)explanation transfers the locus of action to a realm beyond that of the Cartesian, rational subject to a realm beyond conscious and rationalized deliberation embodied in Descartes infamous proclamation "I think, therefore, I am." In this realm, one instead finds a naivety posited by Tiqqun, wherein "the Young-Girl moves in the oblivion of Being, no less than in that of the event."³⁷ If anything, Prugo's inability to rationalize the robberies indicates that this is not a question of the sovereign decision-making seen in Cartesian modes of subjectivity.

The failure of Cartesianism is revealing. As Lauren Berlant notes, the sovereign individual is a myth. In this vein, "people are not always engaged in projects of self-extension ... and in fact, they seldom have significant control over their decision-making." Following this, Michael Hardt argues that "the fact that the power of the world outside of us so far surpasses our own power means that we are affected by others much more than we affect the world or even autonomously affect ourselves, and thus our capacity for sovereign decision-making is minimal too."³⁸ With this in mind, if one returns to Prugo's claim that Lee "just wanted to look pretty," it reveals a great deal of emphasis on appearing, or "seeming," a particular way, creating an ontology of appearance structured on affect instead of thought. Instead of an autonomous subject, a world of affects reveals itself, in which the individual serves only as the loci for their actualization, which Deleuze and Guattari argue renders the subject "a passive and phenomenal self, an always affectable, modifiable, and variable self."³⁹ In other words, the subject becomes plastic.

By plasticity, I am referring to what Catherine Malabou characterizes as being "two things: on the one hand, to be 'susceptible to changes of form,' malleable ... and on the other hand, 'having the power to bestow form, the power to mold,' ... at once capable of receiving and giving form."⁴⁰ The resonance between the affective and the plastic modes of subjectivity are powerful: both reflect simultaneous processes of shaping the world, and being shaped by it in turn. These processes are perpetually in motion, through "the simultaneity of a becoming, whose characteristic is to elude the present."⁴¹ Such a notion is reflected in both the affective subject and the plastic subject. Deleuze posits that affect "refers to the passage from one state to

³⁶Sales, "Suspects Wore Louboutins."

³⁷Tiqqun, *Preliminary Materials*, 33.

³⁸Hardt, "The Power to Be Affected," 216.

³⁹Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1996), 31.

⁴⁰Catherine Malabou, "The Future of Hegel: Plasticity, Temporality, Dialectic," *Hypatia* 15, no. 4 (November 2000): 203, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2000.tb00362.x>.

⁴¹Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, ed. Constantin V. Boundas, trans. Mark Lester and Charles Stivale (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 1.

another."⁴² Therefore, subjectivity must be deferred, waiting for what one will become. This dimension of affectivity is better articulated by Malabou, who argues that the "wait and see" is "the structure of subjective anticipation," wherein subjectivity "comes to be."⁴³ Malabou seemingly compliments Deleuze and Guattari well, but where her notion of plasticity differs from that of affectivity lay in questions of permanence. For Malabou, "things that are plastic preserve their shape ... once given a configuration, it is unable to recover its initial form."⁴⁴ Such is the case with the members of the Bling Ring. Once their becoming-other began, the change became permanent. There was no returning to the life of an ordinary teenager.

In this regard, theorizing the Bling Ring from an individualist psychological standpoint would be inappropriate. Nor would it be a fruitful endeavor as such insights would provoke insight only into the motivations of those involved in the crime spree. While these may perhaps be *interesting*, what is more noteworthy is the context in which the Bling Ring emerged, its relationship to the larger mosaic of cultural life in the United States, and the problematical nature of celebrity idolization. One must therefore think of the Bling Ring – not as a minor blip in the news that has since faded into history and the margins of the media – but rather to think of the Bling Ring as an *event*.

A Theory of the Event

Deleuze argues that, "with every event, there is ... the present moment of its actualization, the movement in which the event is embodied in a state of affairs, an individual, or a person, the moment we designate it by saying '*here*, the moment has come.'"⁴⁵ Thinking through the concept of the event problematizes the idea of a trajectory, wherein the lives of individuals are expected to follow a certain path given certain conditions, wherein change is measured as a deviation from the traditional trajectory. A trajectory is logical – as is the event. The event, however, often operates according to a logic that is hidden and reveals itself only with the actualization of the event. When this logic is revealed, it supplants our previous understanding of the world. Therefore, the event constitutes a moment where the perceived trajectory of one's becoming no longer makes sense. While trajectory-thinking might consider the Bling Ring as an outlier wherein the universal categories and stimuli of adolescent lives produced a few subjects that did not conform, the event tells us that there are other modalities of life and becoming that have gone unnoticed (or perhaps even were hidden) until they became actualized and apparent through the event. The Bling Ring began to operate according to a different logic than that of the archetypal teenager.

If the event is the transformation (or becoming) of the teenagers, then the agency of material objects that Baudrillard's thought elucidates are present in the event as well. That an event is not relegated exclusively to the subjects who witness it, but

⁴²Gilles Deleuze, *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*, trans. Robert Hurley (San Francisco: City Lights Publishers, 2001), 49.

⁴³Malabou, "The Future of Hegel," 211.

⁴⁴Malabou, 204.

⁴⁵Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 151.

includes non-human objects and immaterial affects, is of great importance, as it means the encounter that serves as the catalyst for the event is not restricted to the actions of human subjects, but rather includes these other non-human actors. With the Bling Ring, articles of clothing and even non-material forces such as the dream of fame were so central that it is apt to view them as having agency. However, that events are known to us – as human subjects – solely through the *experiences* of human subjects cannot be underscored. Though events may transcend the human subject, they may nonetheless experience them when they intersect with human life in some form. In this vein, Zourabichvili argues an event becomes known to us as “an experience of *being*,” in that *thinking* of the event is always *experiencing* it as well.⁴⁶ The terrain in which we experience these events is the field of time.

A theory of the event cannot be effectively addressed without an account of temporality, by which I mean a particular modality of space and time that is navigated by the subject. Paul Ricoeur presents a conception of time that rejects attempts to paint temporality in a broad stroke by speaking of history and time universally, glossing over specificities and differences in the process. However, time is experiential; it is felt differently by different peoples and groups. Consider, for example, the tension between what Ricoeur describes as “the private time of individual fate and the public time of history.”⁴⁷ In short, if one thinks of a person’s life as having a specific meaning or trajectory, it is seldom the same as that of the nation-state (though it may be in service of the nation-state, or the nation-state may benefit from it). A prime example of this distinction might be the archetypal “rags to riches” story of a new member of the celebrity class. Born and raised far from the pop cultural nexus of California to blue-collar parent, someone may be of such profound talent it is said they were “destined for Hollywood,” with the moments of their lives leading up to their “big break” and subsequent moments in their career. Though some might say it is a quint-essentially American story, this is not the story of the American nation-state itself. Moreover, this imagined entertainer likely does not imagine their life as constituting a short moment in the larger history of the American experiment in democracy. The differences between the two narratives is so profound that it only follows that time be plural; the nation and the citizen occupy different temporalities as moments have different meaning for each of them.

It is easy to imagine a private time of individual fate, referring to the time during which the becoming of the plastic subject occurs. This would be separate from a public time that is oriented towards the present, constituting what Michael Shapiro terms “national time.” During national time, Shapiro argues, “the state’s autobiographical performance, its stories of its founding, legitimacy and continuity ... presents its people as ‘subjects’ in a signifying process aimed at showing the national life as a continuous heterogeneous process of renewal.”⁴⁸ While such a temporality seems inherently focused on the past in order to assert its legitimacy, it is not tantamount to

⁴⁶Zourabichvili, *Philosophy of the Event*, 173.

⁴⁷Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative, Volume 3*, trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1990), 17.

⁴⁸Michael J. Shapiro, “National Times and Other Times: Re-Thinking Citizenship,” *Cultural Studies* 14, no. 1 (January 1, 2000): 84, <https://doi.org/10.1080/095023800334995>.

nostalgia. Rather, it is forward thinking, centered on the present moment and the future that may emerge, given that states “put considerable energy into managing anticipations as well as historical memory.”⁴⁹ Considerations of how history is remembered now, and will be remembered in the future, are of utmost importance. National time is a present and future project of how the state’s narrative will be preserved and continued through a historical memory held by the social body of its citizenry. In creating its world-time – that is, its temporal orientation to the world in which it lives – the subject must thread her own individual temporal orientation through that of the national-time that is being imposed upon her by the state’s narrative.

A subject cannot, however, situate themselves in more than one temporality at a given moment. As Ricoeur notes, “just as we can represent to ourselves only a single space of which diverse spaces are no more than parts (not different kinds assemble under one concept), in the same way different times can only be successive.”⁵⁰ To simultaneously experience national-time and individual-time would then be patently impossible. However, it remains to be seen how one finds themselves oriented towards a particular temporality, the mechanics of which are revealed through Ricoeur’s reading of Martin Heidegger.

Drawing on Heidegger’s philosophy, Ricoeur articulates a notion of world-time that focuses on “the mode of being of the things we encounter ‘in’ the world: present-at-hand ... ready-to-hand.”⁵¹ Following this, he argues that “the time ‘in’ which we ourselves are is understood as the receptacle of things present-to-hand and ready-to-hand.”⁵² World-time is therefore not a noun, but a verb: one *is* in the world by making sense and articulating their own existence upon the malleable clay of space-time. One cannot do this on more than one register, as their being is univocal and singular, thereby creating a tension between world-timing according to one’s private becoming and world-timing according to the public time of the nation-state.

With that complex layering of temporalities in mind, we can observe that the teenagers were subject to what could be called “celebrity-time,” or, a time in which the archetype of the celebrity was held to be the ideal to strive for in contemporary youth culture. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari, this might be called a “nomadic time” as it exists outside of the traditional time ascribed to adolescence. This latter time would be a time of education and self-growth, wherein one develops into a responsible adult⁵³ and acquires the skills and qualifications required to enter the work force.⁵⁴ Though this time is often described as individualized and subjective, devoted to personal exploration and growth as one chooses the path they wish to take in life, it is equally a part of the national-time of citizenship. It is a time wherein a subject is legally codified as a student through mandatory education laws, restricting their ontology to that of a student until they reach the age of maturity, at which time they are moved into either the work force, or the academy and vocational school for further training. At this point, the subject transforms from student to worker, and

⁴⁹Shapiro, 85.

⁵⁰Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 46.

⁵¹Ricoeur, 81.

⁵²Ricoeur, 84.

⁵³See Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 127, 137. on the relationship between education and the work force.

⁵⁴Bourdieu, 99.

simultaneously from child to adult. It is, perhaps, no mistake that the age of majority for many civil rights is reached after the normal trajectory of a Western twelve grade educational system. This creates a false binary of the 'child' and 'adult' as two distinct categories that are temporally computed instead of being aspects or characteristics that are temporally fungible, nuanced, progressively emerging, and have subjective meanings. In this celebrity-time, members of the Bling Ring situated themselves as adults by emulating the lives of young adult celebrities as much as possible.

There is no stronger example of this than that of Alexis Neiers: the only other member of the Bling Ring besides Prugo, to have garnered any attention from the media. Neiers met Prugo and Lee through her friend Tess Taylor (who lived with Neiers and who Neiers considered her "sister). Taylor in turn knew Prugo through the "Valley party scene" of high school students,⁵⁵ where he claimed he was a stylist for his father's film company – something which initially explained why he had access to such luxurious clothing.⁵⁶ The two girls were fixtures in the Los Angeles party scene, having an initial way of life closest to that of a celebrity of all the teenagers implicated in the crimes. In some ways, Neiers already considered herself to be a part of the social world of celebrity life, rather than striving to enter it. In fact, when interviewed by Sales, she speaks with a presumption of authenticity when it comes to her life as a celebrity, something that is clear in the way she describes her relationship with Prugo:

He wanted to live like us. He wanted to tag along with us to the clubs we went to, like Apple, Guys & Dolls, Teddy's, Ecco. It was known that we were hanging out with Emile Hirsch and Leonardo DiCaprio – just, like, typical Young Hollywood.

Of course, the "typical Young Hollywood" that Neiers describes is far from the lifestyle of a typical young American.

Neiers attempted to fashion herself as a celebrity, starring in a reality television aptly titled show *Pretty Wild*, which at first centered on her life as a "party girl" in the LA scene before quickly shifting focus to her trial following the burglaries. Surrounded by cameras, she was able to dive deeper into the domain of celebrity life than any of her peers. That said, perhaps more telling of her aspirations and sense-of-self are some of the public statements made before her trial, wherein she evoked celebrities' names in defining herself:

I'm a firm believer in Karma ...and I think this situation was attracted into my life because it was supposed to be a huge learning lesson for me to grow and expand as a spiritual human being. I see myself being like an Angelina Jolie ... but even stronger, pushing even harder for the universe and for peace and for the health of our planet ... God didn't give me these talents and looks to just sit around being a model or being famous. I want to lead a huge charity organization. I want to lead a country, for all I know.⁵⁷

⁵⁵It is worth noting that Alexis Neiers was home-schooled, unlike Taylor, Prugo, and Lee. There is a similar dynamic to her education as there is to that of Prugo and Lee, who did not attend a conventional high school. If this made the pair outsiders from average teenage life by attending an alternative high school, then Neiers is even more of an outsider by virtue of living outside of the frame of the school altogether.

⁵⁶Sales, "Suspects Wore Louboutins."

⁵⁷Quoted in Sales.

Coppola lifts this speech verbatim for her film adaptation. This is not surprising: as Sales notes, Neiers “was sounding almost like a real celebrity.” Such a self-fashioning extends beyond mere words into her very bodily movements, with Neiers described as having “runway-walked into the courtroom as the cameras started rolling.”⁵⁸ At this point, all aspects of her personhood and subjectivity have been reshaped and re-articulated into that of a celebrity, leaving her a teenager only in age. Rejecting the habitus of the teenager, she attempted to recreate her subjectivity into that of a celebrity. Yet there is another interesting facet to Neiers’s monologue: the way she constructs her future. Neiers engenders Deleuze’s notion of becoming in her practice of self-fashioning. Brian Massumi perhaps describes Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of becoming better than they themselves do: it is a process of “continually changing as all those levels [of the self and the human body, affects and intensities] are superposed and actualized to different degrees as the body jumps from one more or less indeterminate threshold state to the next.”⁵⁹ Becoming then refers to the transition of the subject from one ontological state to another in perpetual ephemerality. Zourabichvili in turn joins Deleuze’s notion of becoming with a conception of subjectivity that is articulated through identification, wherein “I sense that I am becoming-other: the subject is always in the past tense [*au passé*], identifying with what he has ceased to be in becoming-other; rather than an ‘I am,’ the Cogito states ‘I was’ – another way of saying that ‘I is an Other.’”⁶⁰ However, in self-fashioning, the Cogito-subject is also future oriented, seeing itself as an “I will be.” Though there are confines that restrict the becoming of a subject (confines which may be so restricting that cognition and free-will are engulfed by the structure of becoming), one cannot ignore the individual’s motivations for how they will construct themselves – even if these motivations are not self-determined, but rather constructed on the pre-personal level of the affective plane. Zourabichvili notes that the subject’s “only identities are concluded from his becomings, an undecided [*indécise*] and open multiplicity that ceaselessly displaces its center by differing with itself.”⁶¹ Therefore, by virtue of becoming something different, Neiers’s new identity had to differ from her previous self, and the mundane subjectivity of an American high school student.

Not all of one’s past is lost in the process of becoming. In truth, the event is not merely a blip in a progression of time, that passes and fades into non-existence. Rather, it is characterized by duration. Ricoeur posits that “the fate of the instant ‘corresponds to’ what is ‘carried along’ ... identical in its being.” However, though it may remain identical, Ricoeur also notes that the instant “is different in its definition,” showing that the subject-in-time always has a degree of ephemerality to its constitution.⁶² If the event is a moment in time, it is the instant “that is the end of the before and the beginning of the after.” The event is therefore a moment when the rules and logic that structure an ontology change. Yet, this change is never fully realized. Zourabichvili argues that “despite its being pure change, the event is static, and is only perceptible after the fact – or else during its effectuation if the

⁵⁸Sales.

⁵⁹Brian Massumi, *A User’s Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992), 83.

⁶⁰Zourabichvili, *Philosophy of the Event*, 123.

⁶¹Zourabichvili, 124.

⁶²Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 20.

latter is long – in an interminable waiting, in which the not-yet and the already remain stuck to one another.⁶³ In this regard, the event is not yet over, leaving its subjects in a flux of fulfillment and anticipation of something that may eventually (pardon my pun) occur. This makes the moment of the event elusive and evasive when asking, when was it that things changed?

Concerning the Bling Ring, there are a few possible moments that could mark an event, or the moment where everything changed. One such moment can be found in the filming of *Pretty Wild*. Sales notes that “it was their ubiquity on the Hollywood club scene that got E! interested in the girls [Alexis Neiers and Tess Taylor] for their reality show.”⁶⁴ What makes the show eventful is not that it represents the fulfillment of Neiers self-fashioning, having successfully recreated herself into a member of the Los Angeles party scene that she dubs “typical young Hollywood” in her interview with Sales. This is only half of the event.

The eventful nature of the program echoes Deleuze’s reading of Lewis Carroll, and the event of Alice’s shapeshifting: “certainly, she is not bigger and smaller at the same time ... but it is at the same moment that one becomes larger than on was and smaller than one becomes.”⁶⁵ The becoming that an event represents is therefore checked by a simultaneous becoming that counters it. So too for *Pretty Wild*; as Sales notes, “the pilot ... includes a wild night in which Alexis and Taylor hit the club Wonderland in Hollywood with their friend, rapper Mickey Avalon.” However, “the morning after ... the L.A.P.D showed up at Alexis’s door with a search warrant,” and Neiers is arrested for crimes related to the Bling Ring robberies.⁶⁶ Needless to say, this was unexpected and completely altered the content of the show itself. As Lindsey Weber and Kyle Buchanan bluntly note, within the pilot itself, “suddenly, the manufactured reality of these Kardashian-emulating lifestyle shows begins to rub up against the very definite reality of a teenager’s descent into criminality.”⁶⁷ The decadence and excess of Neiers’s pseudo-celebrity lifestyle is magnified and amplified by the gaze of the cameras and mass-media production, while she simultaneously faces the consequences of having become unhinged from the ontology of the archetypal teenager and living a life that is “pretty wild.” The other members of the Bling Ring were faced with a similar double-becoming.

Another moment that stands out as a hallmark of the event would be Sophia Coppola’s 2013 film. If the event is known only when it is realized by the human subject, few would know of the Los Angeles robberies and its perpetrators were it not for Coppola’s film. As such, it has dictated the narrative concerning how the event unfolded. Yet her narrative is not held to be true by those involved. For her part, Neiers initially disparaged the film for being “trashy and inaccurate”⁶⁸ before dismissing it in greater detail several years later:

⁶³Zourabichvili, *Philosophy of the Event*, 109.

⁶⁴Sales, “Suspects Wore Louboutins.”

⁶⁵Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 1.

⁶⁶Sales, “Suspects Wore Louboutins.”

⁶⁷Lindsay Weber and Kyle Buchanan, “Before You See the Bling Ring, Watch the Crazy Reality Show That Helped Inspire It,” *Vulture*, June 12, 2013, <http://www.vulture.com/2013/06/pretty-wild-reality-show-that-inspired-the-bling-ring.html>.

⁶⁸Ben Child, “The Bling Ring ‘Trashy and Inaccurate’, Says Real-Life Burglary Gang Member,” *The Guardian*, April 30, 2013, <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2013/apr/30/the-bling-ring-trashy-inaccurate>.

It didn't touch on something that was a common thread with Nick, Tess and myself, which was severe drug addiction (being alcoholics and addicts). I'm not saying that it's an excuse for bad behavior, but I'm saying it plays a part. The movie didn't give an honest depiction of what our lives were really like. I wasn't that glamorous. I was chasing around drug dealers, smoking heroin. I lived in the Best Western on Franklin and Vine, while pretending to live in this huge glamorous house.⁶⁹

The prison coach of alleged ringleader Rachel Lee also finds the narrative improbable as well, stating that "Rachel has a learning disability, she doesn't have a particularly high IQ, and I find it hard to think she could have been the one to instigate the whole thing."⁷⁰ This description is a far cry from the unaffected, manipulative, and greedy character based off her in the film.

Coppola's narrative, then, has aspects of both inclusion and exclusion in the act of dramatization and interpretation. It was an artistic endeavor, not a historical recording. Nonetheless it has contributed to diminishing the personalities and individual psychologies of the teenagers in constructing the event. Rather than exploring the nuances of their lives, the film paints them as greedy and spoiled in one single stroke. It did, however, firmly plant their lives into the frame of the Hollywood film.

Coppola's film ought to be considered as a testament to consumerism in capitalist society, rather than a judgment of the robbers themselves, demonstrating Tiqqun's trope of the Young-Girl as the "model citizen ... redefined by consumer society," given that "adolescence is the 'period of time with none but a consumptive relation to civil society.'"⁷¹ The actions of the *Bling Ring* fall in line with the logos of contemporary society, despite their radical departure from the life of an average teenager. What the film, and the *Bling Ring* themselves, demonstrate is the inherent self-destructive nature of being a subject to celebrity-capitalism. Both in the film and reality, the members were all penalized in some form or another, with key members serving jail time.⁷² While this may be reductionist, ignoring their struggles in becoming integrated into the temporalities of the national-time and mainstream society, it is these aspects and qualities (undeniably present to some degree in all of us) that lead to their incarceration and the destruction of the lives they had lived.

Postscript on Plastic Life

One of the chief aspects of plasticity is the inability to return, and the perpetual and unending nature of the event. This process, and its ability to destroy the possibility of ontological return or un-becoming, continued well after their arrests and subsequent incarcerations, and neither Prugo nor Neiers' lives have returned to normal.

In September of 2015, Prugo was arrested for stalking and plotting the rape of Dawn DaLuise, a "celebrity skin care guru" who became what Marie Lodi terms a

⁶⁹Quoted in Amanda Lauren, "Alexis Neiers: Former Tabloid Target, Current Doula," Ravishly | Media Company, May 11, 2015, <https://www.ravishly.com/ladies-we-love/alexis-neiers-former-tabloid-target-current-doula>.

⁷⁰Hollie McKay, "'Bling Ring' Leader Rachel Lee to Start Jail Sentence, Lifetime Will Re-Air Movie," Text.Article, Fox News, October 21, 2011, <http://www.foxnews.com/entertainment/2011/10/21/bling-ring-leader-rachel-lee-to-start-jail-sentence-lifetime-will-re-air-movie.html>.

⁷¹Tiqqun, *Preliminary Materials*, 15.

⁷²Lindsay Weber, "The Real *Bling Ring*: Where Are Those Crazy Hollywood Thieves Now?," *Vulture*, June 13, 2013, <http://www.vulture.com/2013/06/real-bling-ring-where-are-they-now.html>.

“momager” to Prugo, helping him pitch a reality television show called *High End Heist* where he would teach the public how to better secure their homes. The content of the show makes it clear just how plastic Prugo’s subjectivity truly is: the act of robbing the affluent that had defined his subjected and its respective semiotics within the media continued to persist. There was no returning to a time *before* the Bling Ring.

The harassment began after she dropped him as a client in August of 2013, and gradually increased in intensity until he posted a Craigslist ad claiming that “stated DaLuise wanted to participate in a rape fantasy.”⁷³ Whereas he once was a relatively normal young man, despite his social and mental struggles, and lived a life of a regular teenager prior to the robberies, Prugo’s subjectivity has been altered. Following his arrest, Prugo had been transformed into a criminal, and (though such a reading runs the risk of moralizing) subsequent representations of him in the media continue to be centered on deviance. While undeniably Prugo is to blame and not the media, this arrest is a testament to the permanence of plastic change: though he has not had subsequent appearances in the media (either positive or negative), he was seemingly unable to return to a life without an obsessive attachment to popular culture and the media.

Instead of ontological duration, one could continue to become and move *beyond* such an ontology. Such a shift can be seen in another member of the Bling Ring. Neiers has remained in the public eye, albeit in a much different manner. She took part in a VICE News documentary about her life and addiction, has become a drug counselor, and has also become a doula, advocating for educating women when it comes to pregnancy information. When asked why she chose to remain in the limelight, in a recent interview she stated: “I’ve always had an instinctual feeling to be an activist. It’s part of my personality.”⁷⁴ Perhaps, though, she could *not* return to a life of obscurity, having been focused on being a public figure for so long that it became instinctual. The subjectivity she created for herself is permanent: she has simply managed to harness it in a positive way.

The relationship between plasticity and the event cannot be ignored. The concept of the event is inherently tied to change and becoming-other than what existed before. What makes the Bling Ring eventful is that they demonstrate the sheer power of the event to alter ontologies to an extreme and permanent degree. That both Prugo and Neiers did not return to lives of obscurity is a testament to their plasticity. Moreover, it reveals that, when one departs from a life that is lived according to national-time, this departure is permanent, and one cannot return to what is considered to be a life of normalcy.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Michael Shapiro for his invaluable feedback on earlier versions of this article, and guidance during the publication process.

⁷³Marie Lodi, “Ex-‘Bling Ring’ Member Arrested for Allegedly Stalking, Plotting Rape of Celeb Facialist,” Jezebel, September 25, 2015, <https://jezebel.com/ex-bling-ring-member-arrested-for-allegedly-stalking-p-1732969388>.

⁷⁴Lauren, “Alexis Neiers.”

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Adam E. Foster  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1802-6757>