

CHAPTER 7 MASCULINITIES IN CRIMINOLOGY

A youth worker tells me that on a karting trip with young male joyriders they didn't put each other, or her, down in their attempts to race the karts but encouraged each other.¹ There is no evidence from either the literature or fieldwork that the same positive peer pressure applies when joyriding but this more cooperative side can be seen in motor projects alongside the more stereotypical competitive banter of men. Some of the theories about men, masculinities and crime are discussed below in an attempt to throw some light on why young men are disproportionately involved with car theft and motoring offences. More importantly these theories ask questions of criminology and of male criminologists and their relation to male offenders. As Leonard says:

Theoretical criminology was constructed by men, about men. It is simply not up to the analytical task of explaining female patterns of crime. Although some theories work better than others, they all illustrate what social scientists are slowly recognising within criminology and outside the field: that our theories are not the general explanations of human behaviour they claim to be, but particular understandings of male behaviour. (1982:1-2)

The purpose here is not to resurrect or defend the theoretical criminology that Leonard is so critical of but to extend her critique. Her critique, like those of many 'feminist criminologists' is tied to sex-role theories (Box, 1983:174). My criticism of theoretical criminology is not that it fails to explain male behaviour - though it largely does - but that it assumes what that male behaviour is and assumes - sometimes explicitly but more usually implicitly - what masculinity is. Such an observation is not intended to replace feminist work on the deficiencies of criminology but to add to that critique. Necessarily this involves occasional critical engagement with elements within feminism. Naffine argues:

Not only have criminologists failed to pursue the 'man question' of crime, but they have also been insensitive to the effects of conventional understandings of masculinity and femininity on their own understandings of crime. (1997:6)

Before setting out what can be said about masculinities and crime today it is necessary to review some of the history of theorising about masculinity to establish a context for the very little that has been said about crime specifically. At present the growing literature on masculinities has little to say explicitly about crime and most criminology continues only implicitly to look at masculinities so it will be necessary to reinterpret some criminological classics in the light of thinking on masculinities and to theorize what more current work on masculinities might have to say about crime. Poised between these positions are the works of criminologists like Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin who most explicitly addressed themselves to the joint issue of men (or least boys) and crime (or delinquency) which is why their work was explored in chapter 2. However, as will be shown by deploying a contemporary pro-feminist critique their work is seen to be of the 'real man' variety, where young male criminals are the misguided heroes of the book and the male criminologist the only one who is man enough to empathize with their predicament but also stand in fatherly or avuncular judgement of it.

1. Fiona Factor personal communication 17/5/95

Briefly where theorists have turned their attention to the question of men it has often been in taken-for-granted, 'common sense' ways that rely on stereotypical views of men and what are seen as their obvious differences from women. Sometimes those differences rely on the sexual dimorphism of the human species, others point to the continuing socio-cultural differences or some combination of biology and social factors. The oldest tradition has not been to study men qua men at all but to study 'people' and to make pronouncements on people in a universalising fashion. However, these mainly male (a)theorists were actually studying men and extrapolating from that to people and by reduction back to women. In this tradition women are rarely considered other than for their differences from men. Men were the fixed point and women compared to them. Even in this tradition women's differences should have alerted them to the shortcomings of their theories even if not to the phallogocentric nature of their assumption of a male norm. However, the more women were found to be different the more 'other' they became - so different that the general theory need suffer no embarrassment at its failure to explain women or their difference. Hart (1994) notes the linking of lesbian sexuality to this 'otherness'. Criminology has been criticised roundly by feminists (Heidensohn, 1985, 1987, 1994; Naffine, 1987 and 1997; Smart, 1990) and male pro-feminists (Scruton, 1990) for these failures yet mostly continues to study men as criminals not criminals as men, or as Sim (1994:101) says, "while many of these studies have been academically sophisticated and theoretically advanced they have concentrated on men as prisoners rather than prisoners as men"

It would be tempting to attempt to set out all the biological, psychological and psychoanalytic theories of men and masculinity (see Edley and Wetherell, 1995 for a good guide) before attempting to relate each to crime and criminological explanations. Neither does space permit a separate discussion of anthropological models which "... have examined masculinity cross-culturally, stressing the variations in the behaviours and attributes associated with being a man" (Kimmel and Messner (1995,xv). Discussion of some of those issues will have to be ignored here and others only glossed in passing comment on criminological theories.

Even in the social scientific positivism of Glueck and Glueck (1964) the ghost of Lombroso presides, his presence signalled by denial. The Glueck's quote a review by Mannheim of their work:

Clearly, some of the findings in their earlier book, *Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency* (1950) - notably the considerably higher rate of mesomorphs in the delinquent group - seemed to be crying out for such further study. As the authors are careful to explain, the fact that this particular biological finding was selected for more detailed analysis was not "animated by any notion of respectful reawakening of the somnolent Lombrosian theory". The choice of somatic factors was merely due to their belief that this was to be "a promising focus of attention" (Glueck and Glueck, 1964:7)

Mannheim's contention that this explanation "can be readily accepted" (Glueck and Glueck, 1964:7) would carry more weight if other equally somatic factors - such as being male - were studied too. They moved on from the 'pure' biology of body types to their "five social factors" ('discipline of boy by father'; 'supervision of boy by mother'; 'affection of

father for boy'; 'affection of mother for boy' and 'cohesiveness of family'), and their five "traits of character structure" ('social assertion'; 'defiance'; 'suspicion'; 'destructiveness' and 'emotional lability') and five "traits of temperament" ('adventurousness'; 'extroversion in action'; 'suggestibility'; 'stubbornness' and 'emotional insecurity'. All of these traits are presented as sharply differentiating the delinquent from the non-delinquent.

They use the language of science and medicine, for example, "We state that 'in order to arrive at the clearest differentiation of disease and health, comparison must be made between the unquestionably pathologic and the normal'" (Glueck and Glueck, 1964:269) but the objectiveness of the Rorschach Test and of psychiatric examination would not be universally accepted.² Yet, this scientific attitude is mixed with a moral-political discourse as in this discussion of "the problem of working mothers":

Basically, the time is ripe for a reassessment of the entire situation. As more and more enticements in the way of financial gain, excitement, and independence from the husband are offered married women to lure them from their domestic duties, the problem is becoming more widespread and acute. (1964:57)

This may be seen in the light of Edley and Wetherell's comments on the politics of sex difference research, "Like intrepid detectives, they are after the Truth, whatever its colour. However, in reality it is very often impossible to separate politics from science" (1995:10-11). There are obvious feminist objections too but Walklate (1995) cites the work of the Gluecks as evidence of female activity in criminology into sex differentials in crime and Klein (1973) only gives glancing mention; Heidensohn (1994) makes no mention at all. One explanation may be that, as Downes and Rock - noting that some of the predictive devices resurface in Hirschi's control theory - say:

Unpopular too has been the work of the Gluecks, whose attempts to predict delinquency in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s became associated with the sociological equivalent of Original Sin - a stress on the pathological, the individualistic, and the psychological. (1988:218)

They may also have been 'cast out' in view of comments by the Gluecks themselves, such as:

The most confident and severest critics have been a group whose writings have the tone of fire-breathing chevaliers eager to do battle for that purest queen of the exact sciences, Sociology, to which the authors of Unravelling allegedly did not pay adequate tribute. (1964:263)

This belligerently medieval irony is aimed at Sutherland, Hartung and Terrence Morris. In the same chapter Burgess, Shaw and McKay and Albert Cohen, amongst others, are brusquely quashed. Whilst the Gluecks rely on biological and medical science they do not foreground sexual difference let alone raise the possibility of social or sexual roles

2. Personality testing by interpretation of the subjects response to ten bilaterally symmetrical inkblots.

raised from the 1930s by G H Mead. Aggregating and comparing their studies of male and female delinquents they picked out factors which have a recognisable sex difference but take for granted the naturalness of sex differentiation within those factors though some can be presented as gender neutral, for instance, size of family or birth rank of offender.

Even where the Gluecks criticize their critics, quite rightly, for failing to explain why not all those who live in a criminal area or are subject to an overabundance of definitions favourable to crime actually turn to crime they themselves fail to note that they themselves then fail to explain why it is boys disproportionately to girls. They describe delinquents as being distinguished from the non-delinquent by these means:

(1) physically, in being essentially mesomorphic in constitution (solid, closely knit, muscular); (2) temperamentally, in being excessively restlessly energetic, impulsive, extroverted, aggressive, destructive (often sadistic)...;(3) in attitude, by being hostile, defiant, resentful, suspicious, stubborn, socially assertive, adventurous, unconventional, non-submissive to authority; (4) psychologically, in tending to direct and concrete rather than symbolic, intellectual expression, and in being less methodical in their approach to problems; (5) socio-culturally, in having been reared to a far greater extent than the control group in homes of little understanding, affection, stability, or moral fibre by parents usually unfit to be guides and protectors or, according to psychoanalytic theory desirable sources of emulation and the construction of a consistent, well-balanced, and socially normal superego... (Glueck and Glueck, 1964:255-256)

This reads like the stereotype of much male behaviour and attitudes. However, within the same passage from which the quote above is taken we find this interesting discursive move:

If we resort to an explanation exclusively in terms of somatic constitution, we leave unexplained why most persons of a mesomorphic tendency do not commit crimes...even in underprivileged areas most boys do not become delinquent...if we limit our explanation to psychoanalytic theory we fail to account for the fact the majority of non-delinquents, as well as delinquents, show traits usually deemed unfavourable to sound character development...;the fact that many boys who live under conditions unfavourable to the development of a wholesome superego do not become delinquents but do become neurotics.

So 'persons', 'delinquents', 'neurotics', even 'non-delinquents' become 'boys' when discussed more specifically even though the Gluecks did, unusually, study five hundred women from a Reformatory.

Leaving the Gluecks emphasis on biology and, what they call, the socio-cultural we come to sociology proper. However, as we shall see, the grip of biology is not so easily escaped. Whilst Edley and Wetherell (1995) posit Durkheim as a possible antecedent of sex-role theory and many mention G H Mead all agree on Parsons as the most significant developer of it. His theories were directly developed by Albert Cohen. Merton's strain theory combined with Sutherland's differential association guides the researches of Cloward and Ohlin. These theorists, and others, from Parsons on will be discussed below as will some of the later uses made of sex-role theory by feminists and 'masculinists'.

Connell (1987:47) usefully sets out the five points which form the core of sex-role theory: an analytical distinction between the person and the social position she occupies; a

set of actions or role behaviours which are assigned to the position; role expectations or norms define which actions are appropriate to a given position; they are held by people occupying counter-positions (rolesenders, reference groups); who enforce them by means of sanctions - rewards, punishments, positive and negative reinforcements.

The work discussed below all falls within Connell's definition but is largely discussed in the light of its relevance to masculinities and crime so his and others criticisms of sex-role theory are set out below.

Connell makes the point that the role can be as broad as the 'speaker of a language' or as narrow as 'astronaut'. A more criminological example would be as broad as 'the speeding motorist role' to as narrow as 'the serial killer role'. That is the concept is vague but is attractive when talking about gender because it appears to shift away from biological assumptions about sex and towards psychology in ways that open up socialisation and agents of socialisation to a reforming critique that many feminists have adopted. However, it fails to explain why the role sender should voluntarily conspire to sanction behaviour contrary to role. Underneath it remains a basically biologically determinist account with different social superstructures - and their different dramatis personae - erected on that base. He points out that we do not speak of 'race-roles' or 'class-roles'. The emphasis on the rigidity of the role and the vigilance of the role senders - such as parents, peers or press - occludes the structures of power, substituting in its stead, norms and stereotypes. Additionally these theoretical deficiencies are joined by the presence of countervailing field observations that cast doubt on the norms and stereotypes. Sex-role theory does not so much describe the norm but seeks itself to enforce them. It cannot explain changes in the lives of men but assumes a smooth reproduction of masculinity and femininity. A simple cross-cultural comparison illustrates the variability of 'proper' behaviour for men and women. The Guardian (11 December 1995) - reviewing an anglo-japanese magazine - notes the amazement of the Japanese to see UK men eating chocolate: in Japan only women and children eat chocolate.

Departures from the script are seen to be deviant. As Connell notes, "Sex role theory has a way of accommodating departures from the normative standard case, through the concept of deviance" (1987:52). Both the rigidity and the vagueness of the concept ensures a plentiful supply of deviants but little concept of the effects of power and resistance to power amongst the standard and deviant populations. Much of the criminological literature discussed below runs counter to Connell on this point though. Whilst female criminality, or indeed any slight departure from the norm, marks a woman out as 'deviant', a greater 'spread' or 'range' of behaviour is allowed to men. Much of the feminist criticism that inspires my discussion makes the point that whilst a male criminal may be 'deviant' by the behavioral and legal norm it is not seen to be 'deviant' within his sex-role. Indeed his 'gallant' attempts to meet the demands of the sex-role may be seen as the problem (or cause of 'strain'). Gay theorists might want to also point out the converse. Gay men are seen to be 'deviant' to their sex-role whether they break the law or not and their 'criminality' is not credited with the glamorous air of misplaced resistance to the norms (see also Groombridge, 1997 and Tomsen, 1997).

Some of the criticisms of sex-role theory may be directed at what Connell (1987) calls categorical theories which talk not of sex roles which individuals are socialised into for good or bad but of broad categories which oppose each other. Some feminists drawing on Marx's two class categories talk of men and women as opposing, warring categories. Racial separatists - whether the apologists of apartheid or Louis Farrakhan - would see black and white as race categories. Categories are often deployed politically to raise the consciousness of the oppressed group. Connell's criticism of this strand within cultural and radical feminism - whether of Brownmiller (1975) or Chodorow (1978) - certainly feeds into Messerschmidt's engagement with feminism. Categories need not come from biology but, as with Marx are seen to be structural; and, of course, may need the skilled observer, or political vanguard, to point them out. Connell is critical of feminist categoricism that lays the blame for violence and destruction of the planet at the door of men's sexuality without dodging, for an instance, men's overwhelming involvement. Within feminism, categoricism has been criticised by women of colour, lesbians and those with disabilities.

In the more sophisticated models multi-dimensional categories around divisions of sex, class, age etc can be imagined. For their different purposes the Census and the British and Islington Crime Surveys could be seen to be categorical in their treatment of gender. Left realism rightly seeks to learn from feminism and place experience centre-stage. It has been criticised for its reliance on a method which some feminists see as incompatible with the task of gathering women's experience. Newburn and Stanko applaud the underdog perspective but not its uncritical examination which,

divides the world in to oppressors and oppressed. Thus, all men are oppressors unless they can be located in another oppressed group (elderly men perhaps, victims of racist or/and homophobic attacks certainly, male victims of child sexual abuse probably) (1994:158).

Newburn and Stanko do not cite Connell on this - though they otherwise make much use of his work - but conclude "left realists continue to talk of men and women as if they too were largely homogenous categories" (1994:159, emphasis added). As Connell does note such categorical distinctions make both homosexuality and homophobia amongst men very difficult to explain.

Much of the discussion in this section derives from an engagement with the work of Naffine (1987) and Messerschmidt (1993). A small note has to be made here about the use of Naffine. Her intention, as the subtitle of her book makes clear, is to understand the construction of women in criminology. So why rely on her for a discussion of the construction of men in criminology? For the good reason that the field is so new that only female writers, with the exception of Messerschmidt, have thought to examine the issue critically. As feminism has developed that examination has moved out from simply remedying criminologies deficiencies through empirical studies of women and radicalizing victimology from a feminist standpoint to a consideration of gender whether through the transgressiveness of Cain (1990a) or the postmodernism of Smart (1990). It is these latter

considerations of gender that inform the next section on social constructivism. This growth in feminist scholarship has perforce raised issues about men. The use made of Naffine here is directed to what she says explicitly and implicitly about men and crime. Such is the importance of feminism to the social construction of masculinity that Messerschmidt (1993) spends much of a book on *Masculinities and Crime* on recapping feminist thought and reiterating many of its criticisms of criminology.

In his discussion of sex roles Messerschmidt (1993) commends Sutherland for rejecting “biogenic perspectives on crime” (1993:15) but recognises too, that Sutherland handles gender inadequately despite recognising that nothing “is so frequently associated with criminal behaviour as being a male” but also “it is obvious that maleness does not explain criminal behaviour” (in Messerschmidt 1993:16). What then was the explanation? Messerschmidt quotes from the *Principles of Criminology* :

...the most important difference is that girls are supervised more carefully and behave in accordance with anti-criminal behaviour patterns taught to them with greater care and consistency than in the case of boys. From infancy girls are taught that they must be nice, while boys are taught that they should be rough and tough; a boy who approaches the behaviour of girls is regarded as ‘sissy’. This difference in care and supervision presumably rested originally on the fact that the female sex is the one which becomes pregnant. (Sutherland and Cressey 1960:115)

This illustrates a lot of the difficulties of sex role theorisation. Earlier in the same discussion of “Sex ratios in crime” (1960:111) Sutherland brushes aside the contention that, the higher rate of delinquency of the male sex is due to the biological characteristic of the male. 'This conclusion has no more justification than the conclusion that a death rate of males by lightning six times as high for males is due to biological differences.' (1960:112)

Yet he concludes the section by resort to women’s biology.

Naffine rightly takes Sutherland to task for his failure to develop this and says that “femaleness emerges as an anomaly” (1987:31) in his work. This may be so but his sixth, and central, proposition that ‘a person becomes a delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of the law over definitions unfavourable to violation of the law’ might be taken to apply to women and men alike but women, whether in delinquent areas, in delinquent families, subject to absolute or relative deprivation, as a whole generally receive more definitions unfavourable to the violations of the law. Many of those definitions will be deeply sexist and unfavourable to the violations of the ‘fathers law’ (patriarchy). Indeed much early feminism is devoted to exposing the anomalous position of women and contesting the ‘care and supervision’ they received and the biological tyranny represented by pregnancy. Naffine is right to note Sutherland failed to make these connections himself and attempts to apply his work directly to women have not always been successful.

It is interesting to note that Smart’s early work on female crime is seen by Naffine (1987) to be influenced by Sutherland, for instance,

The women involved in petty property offending have not required training in violence, using weapons or tools, or in specialised techniques like safe-breaking. On the contrary, the skills required can be learned in everyday experience, and the socialisation in a delinquent subculture or a sophisticated criminal organization is entirely unnecessary (1976:15-16).

Those familiar with Smart's post-modernist criticism of criminologies ongoing, but often undeclared, positivism might be surprised to find Naffine arguing "one can find lines of argument which have kinship with Cohen's theory, but the connections are never fully articulated" (1987:49) This critique of Smart's one time position is a sisterly one - Women, Crime and Criminology is called "the most intellectually rigorous and theoretically sophisticated in the field" (1987:49) - and turns on quotes such as "this 'passivity' is in keeping with the woman's role especially where stolen goods are hidden or used in the home" (Smart 1976 quoted in Naffine 1987:50). The corollary of this then is men's 'activity'.

Sutherland and Cressey dismiss Parsons in a footnote:

...girls are less delinquent than boys partially because the girls receive an apprenticeship training from their mothers for the careers into which they are to enter, while boys remain during the same age isolated from the occupational activities of their fathers and this leads to frustration of the boys and consequent delinquency. If this thesis were valid, the delinquency rates of the two sexes should be more nearly alike in rural districts, where both boys and girls receive this apprenticeship. (1960:115)

This sums up much of Parsons argument in respect of delinquency but first this needs to be placed in the context of his wider thinking. He argued that society functioned like an organism and, drawing on Durkheim's mechanical and organic solidarity models of society, argued that societies could be classified by their pattern variables. Those of pattern A were 'expressive' and those of pattern B 'instrumental'. However, within the same society both patterns could be observed in the sub-systems; thus the family was seen to follow pattern A, the expressive. Unlike other theorists in this tradition he draws on Freud to emphasize the importance of early childhood and the function of the family in the integration and stability of society. Unsurprisingly the expressive role fell to women and the instrumental to men. Men were expected to move between the family and the wider society, particularly the world of work, and had the 'boundary-role. So women were not formally inferior in this model but had a complementary role to men and provided both fulfilled their roles harmony would reign. Some of the problems with this schema can be seen in Edley and Wetherell's contention that the roles are contradictory and resonate with sociobiology (1995:78).

So the roles played by men and women are socially useful and socially transmitted but the roles of masculinity and femininity are still played by biological men and women. The processes of socialisation coach the biological male and female into masculinity and femininity. Again childbirth and care is seen to underpin the reasoning behind the sexual division of labour. In this scheme a prime deviance is failing to play the role allotted you by biological and social necessity. Hence Parson's strictures in respect of homosexuality.

Turning to delinquency he notes,

girls are more apt to be relatively docile, to conform in general according to adult expectations to be 'good', whereas boys are more apt to be recalcitrant to discipline and defiant of adult authority and expectations (quoted in Messerschmidt 1993:18).

The reason for this is that girls are brought up in the expressive atmosphere of the family and can identify with the mother and see her role (career) ahead of her whereas boys initially identify with the mother but discover that women are inferior and become anxious and engage in 'compulsive masculinity' by way of compensation and

...refuse to have anything to do with girls. 'Sissy' becomes the worst of all insults. They get interested in athletics and physical prowess, in the things in which men have the most primitive and obvious advantage over women. Furthermore they become allergic to all expression of tender emotion; they must be 'tough'. This universal pattern bears all the hallmarks of a 'reaction-formation'. It is so conspicuous, not because it is simply 'masculine nature' but because it is a defence against a feminine identification. (quoted in Messerschmidt 1993:18)

The reaction-formation element of this quote is taken up in the work of Albert Cohen. Interestingly too, Parson's Freudianism appears to be tending in the direction subsequently taken by Chodorow. The major difference is Chodorow's feminism which leads her to call for equal participation by men in childcare yet Middleton notes "Many feminists fear that Chodorow's theory is a recurrence of the ideological use of psychoanalytic theory to pressure women back into motherhood by blaming mothers for creating the psychic structures of masculinity" (1992:128) Parsons would certainly see women as responsible for those psychic structures and ultimately for social order. Compare Chodorow's analysis of the same issue with Parsons:

Masculinity becomes an issue as a direct result of a boy's experience of himself in his family - as result of being parented by a woman. For children of both genders, mothers represent regression and lack of autonomy. A boy associates these issues with his gender identification as well. Dependence on his mother, attachment to her, and identification with her represent that which is not masculine; a boy must reject dependence and deny attachment and identification. Masculine gender role training becomes much more rigid than the feminine. A boy represses those qualities he takes to be feminine inside himself, and rejects and devalues women and whatever he considers to be feminine in the social world. (Chodorow,1978:181)

Turning now more specifically to Parsons' criminology and to criticisms of it; Messerschmidt notes "it was the first attempt to connect masculinity with the gendered nature of crime" (1993:19) to the extent that Naffine (1987) devotes a chapter to what she calls 'Masculinity Theory' and cites Parsons as its first expounder. According to Naffine "Masculinity theory comprises two ideas: crime is symbolically masculine and masculinity supplies the motive for a good deal of crime. The qualities demanded of the criminal - daring, toughness, aggression all exemplify maleness. The boy or man who engages in crime can demonstrate to the world that he is truly virile." (1987:43).

Naffine is rightly critical of Parsons' sexism but makes no criticism of his method or concepts directly. He is seen to have nurtured a stereotype of women in sociology which is "imported into criminology by Cohen" (1987:59). Cohen is discussed here as the developer of 'reaction formation' as an explanation of working class male delinquency.³ As Naffine puts it:

Vandalism, joyriding and fighting all became means of expressing disdain for the colourless, hard-working and achieving life of the middle class boy...Anti-social activity demonstrates toughness and affirmed one's masculinity.(1987:9)

It, perhaps, takes a feminist to note, or to take seriously, the 'Boys' of the book's title seriously rather than 'delinquency' or 'the gang'. Others emphasize the link with Durkheim "in that sub-culture is seen a functional creation enabling individuals to handle many of the problems created for them by the social structure" (Morrison, 1995:281). Sumner notes,

No one seemed to notice the point that if the delinquent culture was so common in US cities perhaps it was not so 'sub', and few made anything of the fact that its occupants were mostly black. Their blackness, and the blackness of the so called sub-culture, was completely glossed over in the theory (1994:181).

Cohen is explicit that the standards that working class boys aspire to, and largely fail to achieve, are those which are "typically American" (1955:137). Naffine notes "Cohen regards his culture as gendered" (1987:11) but does not pick up on the potentially radical contention that typical American behaviour is the same as "that which we stigmatize as 'pathological' ..The same value system, impinging upon children differently equipped to meet it, is instrumental in generating both delinquency and respectability." (Cohen,1955:137). She concentrates on his sexism and his treatment of masculinity as active as against women's passivity. She quotes the rightly infamous passage:

The delinquent is the rogue male. His conduct may be viewed ...positively ...as the exploitation of modes of behaviour which are traditionally symbolic of untrammelled masculinity... which are not without a certain aura of glamour and romance (1955:140).

She could have noted the next passage where he notes its 'subterranean' presence in "respectable culture as well but only in disciplined and attenuated forms as in organised sports, in fantasy and in make-believe games, or vicariously as in movies, television and comic books" (1955:140). Clearly he could not bring himself to say "and by doing criminology". Clearly, if "boys collect stamps and girls collect boys" (1955:142) then criminologists collect gangs of boys. Cohen fits Naffine's definition of 'masculinity theory' better than Parsons but Cloward and Ohlin fit her view on the 'frustrated offender' (the

3. Naffine discusses him in separate chapters as a follower of Parsons on the one hand but more substantially of Merton on the other hand. This is a little perverse since Merton only rates one footnote mention in *Delinquent Boys*. However, Taylor *et al* (1975:135) note "Cohen denies his theory, despite its parallels with Merton, is an application of anomie".

chapter title).⁴ Naffine also fails to address some class issues raised by Cohen who sees the prolonged dependence of middle-class boys upon their parents as potentially aggravating,

In brief, not only must the middle-class boy overcome an early feminine identification and prove his maleness, even the opportunities to assume the legitimate signs of maleness are likely to be denied him (1955:166).

The 'legitimate signs of maleness' are not just a job but a breadwinner role. The earlier entry of the working class boy could give him an advantage over the middle class boy forever delaying his gratification. Cohen therefore congratulates himself that, modifying Parsons, he can explain both working class and middle-class delinquency. Middle class male delinquency is explained as, "primarily an attempt to cope with a basic anxiety in the area of sex-role identification; it has the primary function of giving reassurance to one's essential masculinity." Whereas, the working class youth, more sure of his 'essential masculinity' has a primary problem "of adjustment in the area of ego-involved status differences in a status system defined by the norms of respectable middle-class society" (1955:168).

Cohen is mealy-mouthed in his policy recommendations in respect of the criminogenic status system he blames for working class delinquency and makes no mention of issues of masculinity for, contrary to Naffine, Cohen sees society not as 'gendered' but 'sexed' as this quote illustrates.

My skin has nothing of the quality of down or silk, there is nothing limpid or flute-like about my voice, I am a total loss with needle and thread, my posture and carriage are wholly lacking in grace. These imperfections cause me no distress - if anything, they are gratifying - because I conceive myself to be a man and want people to recognize me as a fully-fledged, unequivocal representative of my sex. (1955:138)

This could be taken as a heavy-handed compliment to his wife preliminary to describing her as "not greatly embarrassed by her inability to tinker with or talk about the internal organs of a car, by her modest attainments in arithmetic or by her inability to lift heavy objects"(1955:138). Another reading is 'Hey, I may be middle-class but I am a regular guy'. An unkind psycho-analytic reading is that he is unsure of his own sex-role and that 'fully-fledged' and 'unequivocal' have a phallic meaning rendered more patriarchal by his fantastic claim to have conceived himself. Messerschmidt quotes the same passage but presents it more kindly thus,

In a section of *Delinquent Boys*, headed 'What About the Sex Differences?' Cohen revealed his acceptance of Sutherland's and Parsons' idea of dichotomous, biologically based sex roles, by using himself and his wife as examples. (1993:19)

4. It should be noted that Cohen credits, in an endnote (1955:164), two psychoanalysts Alexander and Healy in 1935 with emphasising the role of 'masculine protest' as a factor in anti-social behaviour. However, Connell (1994) credits Alfred Adler with the phrase earlier still, relating overcompensation as a component of neurosis.

Heidensohn, closer to my reading, notes of the same passage, “First he assures us of his own masculinity” (1985:133).

Messerschmidt concludes, “Nevertheless Sutherland, Parsons, and Cohen can be credited for putting masculinity on the criminological agenda” (1993:22).⁵ Feminists might want to argue that they did so by opposing that masculinity to a stereotypical femininity and expelling it from criminology. Messerschmidt partially exonerates these masculinity theorists in the absence of much feminist theorising at the time and the widespread assumption of natural difference.

Cloward and Ohlin are relevant not only because of their long term influence but also because before setting out their own theory of limited legal and illegal opportunities they review some other contemporary theories of delinquency. We shall see what they have to say specifically about “Masculine Identification and Delinquent Subcultures” (1961:48). They set out the basics of the theory and their view of sex differences - which mix, in now familiar fashion, nature and nurture:

Sex differences are not just biological; they also reflect differences in social definitions of masculinity and femininity. Part of ‘growing up’ entails learning the social roles prescribed for the members of each sex. Sometimes young people seeking to make an appropriate sex identification encounter serious obstacles; tendencies toward aberrant behaviour may result. This problem of adjustment arises from efforts to conform to cultural expectations under which conformity is hampered or precluded. (1961:48)

Set out so starkly it is a surprise that these theorists did not also seek to explain homosexuality as well as crime by the same means. The ‘masculine protest’ and even the sexual delinquency of girls - the only crime allowed women by these theories - was however, resolutely heterosexual.

Cloward and Ohlin see Parsons as the key to this school of thought but also mention Cohen and Miller. All are criticised for failing to make “clear definitions of the types of delinquent behaviour that are supposedly explained by problems of masculine identification” (1961:50). Further “An emphasis upon toughness, aggressiveness, and hedonism may or may not result in delinquent acts or norms.” (1961:51). They also doubt,

the distribution of the masculine-identity crisis...As we have noted, there is no firm agreement among theorists as to where in the social structure this problem occurs most frequently or in most acute form (1961:51).

They note that Parsons found female-centred families in all classes whereas Miller emphasised the absence of a male role model in working class families. For Cloward and Ohlin delinquent norms preceded delinquent acts so masculinity theorists “Failure to specify the problems of masculine identification and the emergence of delinquent norms leads to a further theoretical difficulty” (1961:53). However, Cloward and Ohlin do admit,

5. Heidensohn (1985:136) gives this honour to Grosser’s unpublished but widely cited *Juvenile Delinquency and Contemporary American Sex Roles* (1951). She notes the distinction of the list of borrowers at Harvard Library.

There is little doubt that barriers to masculine identification may produce a tendency for adolescent males to assert their fundamental maleness by engaging in aggressive deviant conduct. But there is an important difference between deviant and delinquent acts. (1961:53)

The difference for them is that delinquent acts “evokes a judgement by agents of criminal justice” (1961:3). They also make the relevant point that,

If delinquency rates are increasing, the theorist would have to show that boys are experiencing greater difficulty developing a sense of masculinity; if rates are decreasing, he would have to show that problems of masculine identity are diminishing (1961:53).

They conclude that ‘masculine identity theory’ does explain ‘compulsive masculinity’.

A politically negative aspect of sex-role theory is the emphasis placed by some ‘masculinists’ on the burdens of being a male; such as early death, higher rates of suicide and criminalisation. This is, perhaps, best seen as a male backlash against the imagined or anticipated victory of feminism. It is perhaps a mark of how flexible sex-role theory can be that some feminists have used it to argue a close association between the male sex role and crime. As Oakley says:

Criminality and masculinity are linked because the sort of acts associated with each have much in common. The demonstration of physical strength, a certain kind of aggressiveness, visible and external proof of achievement, whether legal or illegal - these are facets of the ideal male personality and also much of criminal behaviour. Both male and criminal are valued by their peers for these qualities. Thus, the dividing line between what is masculine and what is criminal may at times be a thin one. (1972 in Box 1983:175)

That is the socialisation of men as men is a problem in itself. The strongest version of this radical feminism is Brownmiller’s contention that “When men discovered that they could rape they proceeded to do it” (1975:13-14). It may be this ‘strength’, this ‘kind of aggressiveness’ that Oakley has in mind. However, it also seems that she may have bought wholesale ‘the external proof of achievement’ and Cohen’s ‘criminal as rogue male’ arguments. The reality of crime, like the reality of paid employment, is that the requirements for special male characteristics have always been overemphasised, possibly to keep women out. Much crime requires little strength or aggression and ‘getting away with it’ is the greatest proof of achievement. Similarly women are discovering that the ‘world of work’ beneath and through the ‘glass ceiling’ is easier than men always let on. As Scutt (in Naffine, 1987:61) says:

Could it be that every act of murder is ‘aggressive’? Or that murder ‘with a blunt instrument’ is aggressive, murder by painless poisoning ‘passive’? or non-aggressive? Is writing a false cheque passive? aggressive? Is persuading an American to buy Tower Bridge, or a Londoner to buy the Brooklyn Bridge, or either to buy the Sydney Harbour Bridge, aggressive? Shoplifting aggressive? passive?

Both Box and Messerschmidt quote the passage from Oakley. Box, in a positivistic vein, notes the assumption about the stereotypes of male and criminal behaviour - "the independent variables" (1983:175) - and the subjective meaning of criminal behaviour. That is just as Young (1975) notes the tendency to attack ones opponents through an inversion of their theory so feminists took sex role theory to invert the heroism of the rogue male and picture him as the villain. Messerschmidt notes these problems but is kinder, perhaps because he then uses her observation, "Oakley's argument is not necessarily incorrect; it is clear that criminal behaviour ... may indeed serve as a resource for constructing a particular type of masculinity" (1993:27).

All the sex role theories discussed so far have the 'merit' of addressing, however poorly or implicitly, issues around sex, gender and deviance. Indeed many of the biological ones are explicit. The work of Cohen and of Cloward and Ohlin has been discussed here so extensively because of its engagement with the issue of masculinity and crime. Their work is more usually categorised as 'sub-cultural' and criticised for its functionalism, relevance solely to the USA or failure to address class or 'race' adequately. However,

Rather than simply being dismissed, the sub-cultural 'classics' should be re-read critically so that questions hitherto ignored or waved aside in embarrassment become central. (1991:17).

Whilst McRobbie is talking about Willis and Hebdige her comments can be taken to refer additionally to Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin and unusually for the time, Dorn and South specifically criticize the whole sub-cultural tradition for its failure to attend to gender as an issue. Drawing on, but not attempting any appraisal of, feminist work their "review restricts its critique to the 'mainstream' of studies by young men of slightly younger men". (1983:1). That review, however, does not itself focus evenly on gender issues. The work of Parsons, Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin, Matza and Downes are mainly criticised for failing to address the class/economic issues. It is only where the sub-cultural tradition takes a marxist turn in Britain that Dorn and South concentrate fully on gender with the prompting of McRobbie (1980). Interestingly this is the point where Naffine drew a line - noting only in an endnote that a marxist approach is not examined "for the simple reason that the Left has shown little specific interest in the female offender" (1987:134).

The following discussion of Hall, Jefferson, Clarke, Willis, Phil Cohen, Corrigan and Hebdige draws on both Dorn and South (1983) and McRobbie (1980). Clearly these authors should be subject to the close reading given to Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin but since they did not specifically deal with masculinity they are necessarily dealt with here more cursorily, and as if they formed an identifiable school of thought. A development of this thesis would be a re-reading of the classics of sub-cultural studies around the issue of masculinity of both describer and described. As McRobbie notes:

Writing about sub-cultures isn't the same thing as being in one. Nonetheless, it is easy to see how it would be possible in sharing some of the same symbols - the liberating release of rock music, the thrill of speed, of alcohol or even football - to be blinded to some of its oppressive features. (1980:40)

Dorn and South add to McRobbie's list by drawing,

an analogy, here, between male sociology and male youth cultures...deliberately oafish behaviour, leather jackets, a mateyness between males that was reinforced by a lack of recognition of women's academic work, and sexual comments that would not have been misunderstood amongst Willis' lads (1983:21).⁶

Resistance through Rituals edited by Hall and Jefferson (1993) collects together the work of many of - and more than - those discussed by Dorn and South and McRobbie; it opens with a long theoretical chapter by Clarke, Hall, Jefferson and Roberts. That chapter sets out some useful distinctions between the classless 'common-sense' picture of Youth Culture and youth sub-cultures. Much of their analysis of shifts in the wider economy and local community remains resonant today. Indeed, the changes they described in the 70s sound convincing arguments for explaining crime twenty years later; certainly more convincing than explaining youth sub-cultures then. However, the intention here is not to take issue with whether their class analysis is necessary, appropriate or adequate but to tease out some of the issues of masculinity raised by them in *Resistance* and elsewhere.

Heidensohn takes issue with McRobbie's contentions in respect of these theorists, holding that "most of the work in this genre, like Cohen twenty years earlier, does acknowledge the importance of gender in various forms of 'masculinity' to the (male) youth culture" (1985:139). She illustrates this by quoting Clarke from *Resistance* on the importance of 'masculinity' and territoriality and community in explaining the behaviour of the skinheads he is discussing. However, it could also be said that the use of inverted commas around masculinity (here and in the quotes below) but not around the equally problematic terms 'territoriality' and 'community' are indicative of a certain distaste for a masculinity that runs counter to the politics and practice favoured by the left-wing, would-be-non-violent sociologist. More normal in this 'school' is, as Dorn and South and McRobbie note, a scarcely disguised admiration and even "shared patterns of chauvinism between observer and observed" (Willis, 1978b:27). Those shared patterns can also effect other men in the field of observation. For instance, Willis (1978a:6) notes:

It should also be noted that the alternative standards constructed by 'the lads' are recognised by the teachers in a shadowy sort of way - at least in private. There were often admiring comments in the staff room about the sexual prowess of particular individuals from younger teachers, 'he's had more than me I can tell you'.

It may be the class perspective that prevents Clarke et al (1993) raising the issue until page 44 (the article runs from page 9 to 74) but it is interesting that when it does it does so in respect of "street-corner culture, with its massively 'masculine' focus".⁷ Their next paragraph continues,

Any one of these strategies in the repertoire developed by young working-class boys will stand in complex relation to that of other 'peers'; to 'adult' strategies and solutions; to alternative positions in the same age spectrum (e.g. Skinheads vs. hippies); and to the

6. This chapter and chapter 4 are, in part, an attempt to come to terms with my own 'oafish behaviour'.

7. The alluring alliterative momentum of "massive 'masculinity'" might be worth examining in its own right.

dominant culture in its repertoire of control.

Thereafter the analysis returns to talk of classes and 'the young' or youth sub-cultures so boys get a brief mention but not in any gendered sense and girls no mention at all. Moreover, the word 'repertoire' suggests the unacknowledged influence of sex-role theory. The next mention of masculinity comes without the protective inverted commas but discussing the 'distinctive, different, stylistic' way that sub cultures relate to each other and the parent culture they note "the particular conception of masculinity and male dominance (reproduced in all the post-war youth sub-cultures)" (1993:53). The inverted commas may have gone but the unspoken attitude of the writers comes through. Worse though, in discussing differences in style, they find only similarity in masculinity yet fail to investigate. One explanation for this failure is their 'romanticism' about the working class (Young, 1975), or, more precisely, the men of the working class. Perhaps, influenced by Miller (1958), they saw male youth sub-cultures as overemphasising a masculinity that was otherwise not problematic in itself. Miller is not cited by them at this point but at several points in the section on style they talk of 'focal concerns'.

Though the writers of *Resistance* may romanticise the working class male youth sub culture its presence is only marked by discussions of various styles, leisure pursuits and occasional delinquency whereas when they turn to discuss the issue of whether there are middle class youth sub cultures they produce a chronological table of political and cultural events of the 'counter culture' in the U.K. and U.S. from 1965 "CND anti-Vietnam march" to the "Zen of motorcycle maintenance" (1993:58-59). Feminist women get several mentions. Mirroring Cohen's (1955) observations they note "Middle class youth remains longer than their working class peers 'in the transitional stage'" (Hall and Jefferson, 1993:60) which gives them time to develop sub cultures within the parent culture whereas working class youth quickly join the parent culture at their appropriate class position.

This initial discussion of 'masculinity' in the opening chapter of *Resistance* sets the scene for the specific criticisms of Dorn and South and McRobbie. After a standard introduction to the American and British literature on youth sub-cultures, much of which has already been discussed above, Dorn and South turn their attention to some specifics. They quote from Phil Cohen (1972) - also very influential on the opening chapter of *Resistance* - on how the 'respectable working class were caught between "the ideology of spectacular consumption" and "the traditional ideology of production, the so-called work ethic which centred on the idea that a man's dignity, his manhood even, was measured by the quantity or quality of his effort in production" (Cohen, 1972:45 in Dorn and South 1983:14) but note his analysis excludes "questions of conflicts between men and women, boys and girls...the 'problem' is unrelated to sexual divisions (1983:17).

Dorn and South are tough on the absence of girls "this simply won't do; attention was equally concentrated by and where the majority of sociologists - who were male - bothered to look" (1983:17) whereas women researchers such as Ann Campbell found "the routine and full involvement of girls in 'the whole' of youth culture activities" (1983:18). At this

point they move on to discuss the work of Willis. It is at this point that McRobbie's own critique starts.

As might be imagined from Willis' own acknowledgement of his 'observer' as sharer of chauvinism with the 'observed' that he does recognize some problems and incorporates some feminist insights but as Dorn and South note this "breaks the bounds of its own analysis" (1983:18). Briefly - and we shall return to this - Willis found that the working class boys he was studying for Learning to Labour resist the school through acts of delinquency and disruption but ironically and functionally this fits them for the manual jobs that capitalism requires they do. It also acts historically to remind us that even inadequately educated, badly behaved and poorly motivated students could get jobs then. It may be an irony that motor projects work by providing an industrial experience that is no longer available or relevant elsewhere. Marxist and capitalist might have seen the lads position as manipulators of material within a mode of production (ie working class) whereas now within the present mode of information they are rendered merely information receivers. When they joyride they become part of the spectacle without shattering it.

Specifically the school, all it stands for, and any mental activity are not just seen as middle class institutions to be reacted against like Cohen's 'delinquent boys' but are perceived as 'cissy' whereas their own behaviour is tough. This toughness, of course, is seen to be homologous with the requirements of manual work. At this point Dorn and South rely on McRobbie in pointing out that despite this advance in relating masculinity and crime the authors they discuss still fail to think about how these 'macho' cultural values are passed down from father to son in a family that includes women and girls. The boys sexism is noted but reported in tones which fail to understand the fear they have of women and femininity (effeminacy). As an exposé it could claim to assist feminism but the complicit tone - compounded by his inattention to women as anything other than sex object or mother - reproduces sexism. McRobbie (1980) is rightly trenchant in her criticism of the language of the 'lads' that Willis studied - the calling of women teachers "cunt" and mock masturbation as a disruptive tactic in class.

Perhaps the reason for Heidensohn's kind treatment of Willis (1978b) is the sheer extent to which his work uses the words masculine, masculinity and 'macho'. Yet their usage does not suggest a complex engagement with the subject. 'Masculinity' is used in two ways: it is used descriptively of 'the lads' and analytically in respect of working class culture. Today the book can be read as "one of the early key texts dealing with masculinity and the forms of resistance it entails" (Mac An Ghail, 1996:57) yet it does not come to terms with the masculinities of the 'earoles' (the conformist, but still working class, boys) far less that of the teachers or Willis himself.⁸

The contrast with Corrigan is instructive. Corrigan is rightly criticised for his introductory remark: "At this stage I would hope that the reaction of many ladies reading the book is fairly irate about my failure to mention girls at all to date" (1979:13).

8. Connell (1987) too accepts Willis as concerned, *avant la lettre*, with the plurality of masculinities.

He goes on to give the reasons that caused him to be “restricted to the problems of the working-class MALE adolescent experience of school” (emphasis in original, 14). Despite the capitalised emphasis he makes very little of their maleness or issues of masculinity at all. This casual attitude towards gender continues today but the advance of feminism is such that it requires more explanation. Here is Stanley (1996:146), in a footnote, specifically on the subject of joyriding (and computer hacking):

...I do not specifically deal with the gender element in this analysis. This is not to neglect the importance of the construction of masculinity which is an element in computer hacking and joyriding, but rather my concern here is emphasize the theoretical dynamics of these acts of excess within an alternative remit of analysis. This may be a somewhat artificial response to feminist criticism. I do not deny the importance of gender but rather pursue lines of enquiry regarding the activation of strategies of resistance which may become available to all and which represent moments of de-regulated desire and political resistance deliberately not universal strategies such as feminism.

This is not good enough. Quite obviously joyriding is a ‘de-regulated desire’ but none of the fieldwork or literature reveals any evidence of any ‘strategy’. Indeed the literature and fieldwork strongly suggest that instead of ‘resistance’ joyriding is a submission to car culture. To suggest that joyriding might offer a ‘strategy of resistance for all’, including women, is to embrace the advertisers’ (and Mrs Thatcher’s) ‘Great Car Economy’. It is not even the ‘feminism’ of the film *Thelma and Louise* but that of the Peugeot advert’s pastiche of the film. Stanley therefore joins the long tradition of male writers on crime that romanticise it.

Turning to Hebdige, Mc Robbie notes that whilst he sets his work within the framework set out in Clarke’s chapter in *Resistance on ‘Style’* he actually runs counter to the concern for class shown in that volume by concentrating on the play of signifiers and ‘race’ and presumes no real political intent beneath style. What they do share is the method borrowed from Levi-Strauss of bricolage. Moreover, he is criticised for ignoring women in the field of ‘fashion’ to which they are traditionally consigned. The styles he discusses, and indeed all youth sub-cultural styles, are male styles. It is worth considering whether joyriding has or is a style but this will be taken up in Chapter 8.

‘Masculinity’ features early in Clarke’s Chapter and a discussion of skinhead chauvinism concludes it. Save for a discussion of the effeminacy of ‘mod’ culture the rest of the discussion is about style in the abstract or, if concrete examples are given, it is about ‘teds’, ‘mods’ or ‘skins’ but only male styles of dress are discussed.

The ethos of ‘masculinity’ in football culture, for example, cannot be understood outside the homologous relation it bears to the masculine focus and organization of much industrial production: a ‘man’ like a footballer, has to be able to “take some stick and keep coming back for more”...One of the most complex things in working class leisure and sport is to understand fully this combination of both release from and, reproduction of, the rhythms of work in apparently free activities of leisure. (1993:176)

We won't dwell on the inverted commas round 'masculinity' and 'man' but absence from around "masculine" but here note the assumption that whilst a man's masculinity could not - no crude marxism here please - be reduced to his class position it was homologous with it. However, is the interpretation right in its own terms? Does the man show the same emotional commitment to his team as to his work? Is he a consumer or a producer?

Clarke's commitment to a class based analysis leads him to assume that the stylish bricolage of the young men he describes is made up from "commodities that exist in the market" (1993:178) and the resulting style represents in mediated form the material base of the culture. Interestingly he assumes that the commodities "must be financially within the reach of the style creators" (1993:178). The sub-cultures he was studying clearly bought the clothes in which they outraged the parent culture, rather than stealing them from stores or each other ('taxing').

Clarke notes that "the process of forming the group's identity is as much due to 'negative' reactions to other groups, events, ideas, etc." (1993:180) and gives the examples of mods versus rockers and skinheads versus hippies or the system more generally. The possibility that the 'negative reaction' may be against girls or femininity arises but is missed. He quotes a survey of "Margate offenders" that emphasize the gendered language of derision between Mods and Rockers. For instance, "Rockers see Mods as effeminate. 'They can wear skirts if they like, so long as I don't pick one up as a girl'" (Barker-Little survey 1964:121 in Clarke 1993:181)

This is taken not to be evidence of different masculinities - Mod and Rocker - but just an insult - a censure - (Sumner, 1990a and 1990b) which evidences the oppositional nature of the subcultures. We might want to know what anxieties the Rocker was demonstrating - the fear of being queer or the fear of sleeping with a Mod? The Chapter concludes with the claim that the sexism of the skinheads - yes, he had noticed it - was related to the sub-culture.

One of the aspects of the subculture's lifestyle was a stress on traditional images of 'masculine' behaviour, and one of the forms which this image took was a 'collective chauvinism' towards girls around the subculture. These girls, belonging to the collective world of the group were "available" for collective or individual sexual experimentation, and were known as "slags" or "scrubbers" - distinguishing them from the "good girls". It is only while the leisure arena, and the subcultural form in which it is lived out, remains the dominant focus of the member's lives that this collective chauvinism can be maintained. (1993:190 emphasis in original)

No doubt the subculture was an arena for, and gave support to, their 'collective chauvinism' but it is difficult to imagine that it would not find support in other subcultures or in the parent culture.

Turning now to Hebdige we find that again the word masculine appears regularly and

the discussion of various sub-cultures, including an emerging gay culture, might have been the starting point for a consideration of masculinities; including the assumed masculinity against which Hebdige measures others. In common with all the authors discussed, even on this most 'feminine' topic of style, Hebdige takes the stylistic signification of the sub-culture to be worn by its male adherents. The purpose here is not to attempt an assessment of whether Hebdige is correct in his reading or to replay the criticisms of feminists but to see where Hebdige might have started on the project of dragging masculinities into the criminological gaze. In addition to the mentions of masculinity and the ways in which he could have got into the subject of masculinities Hebdige makes frequent use of metaphors of theft and borrowing which could be applied to joyriding. This can be related to the discussion of Hartley (1994) in Chapter 5.

The first point at which Hebdige might have engaged with this is his own, frequent, engagement with the work of Jean Genet. Genet is quoted regularly for his criminal and sexual transgressions of straight society. Hebdige does not consider whether the 'queer' lifestyle of Genet is compatible with the criminal lifestyle. All of the authors discussed so far have implicitly or explicitly associated masculinity with crime but that masculinity is implicitly heterosexual. Just as it is a stereotype to position women as passive and therefore not criminal so the stereotypical passivity of the gay man should exclude criminality. These are issues that Hebdige could have explored but gay men and ambiguous sexuality are just used to celebrate style or be the subject of the skinhead's 'queer-bashing', which just serves as a change from 'paki-bashing'.

In discussing 'reggae and rastafarianism' he quickly passes over the 'rude boy' - "the lone delinquent pitched hopelessly against an implacable authority" to the "Rastafarian who broke the Law in more profound and subtle ways" (1979:37). Here we see Hebdige's political concerns displaced from the working class onto the consciousness of the Rastas. He does not see that the 'rude boy', the police(men), the Rasta and the Law share common elements of masculinity. One reason is that Hebdige is not only in love with style, but particularly black styles. He lets others speak for him, quoting George Melly's "For us the whole coloured race was sacred" (Melly, 1971 in Hebdige, 1979:44). He shares "the whole mythology of the Black Man and his Culture ... being developed by sympathetic liberal observers" (1979:47, emphasis added) Or, as Adrian Mitchell has it in his poem Goodbye.

He breathed in air, he breathed out light.
Charlie Parker was my delight.

Hebdige sees style everywhere floating free of class in an endless chain of signification but it does have an unexplored relationship to masculinity; for instance, "mods preferred to maintain the stylish contours of an impeccable 'French crew' with invisible lacquer rather than with the obvious grease favoured by the more overtly masculine rockers" (1979:52). He immediately returns to discussing mod style rather than question himself on what is so 'overtly masculine' about rockers or why he thinks - probably rightly - that his reader also knows and also does not question.

The rockers receive scant attention as they are not sufficiently stylish, perhaps, because they are 'overtly masculine' for Hebdige's main interest is in

a more furtive and ambiguous sense of masculinity could be seen to operate. It was the Black Man who made all this possible: by a kind of sorcery, a sleight of hand, through 'soul', he has stepped outside the white man's comprehension (1979:54).

Throughout the book it is clear that Hebdige is fascinated by the possibility that the Black Man, the mod or the punk might have discovered that masculinity which was still masculine but not 'overt' like the mods or the skinheads "dour 'machismo'" (1979:55).

Both Clarke and Hebdige in their different ways are actually talking about masculinities but do so in a coded fashion with Clarke choosing class and Hebdige 'style', particularly black style, as the language in which to do so. It is an irony that the Probation Officers of Los Angeles County Probation Department 'police' the gang affiliations of probationers by monitoring their dress and breaching them for 'dressing down' (Miller:1995)

It is necessary to complete the discussion of criminology's relation to masculinity by examining labelling perspectives. Where sub-cultural theorists have sought to either explain criminality or celebrate resistance the labelling perspective specifically sees criminality as socially constructed so might have been expected to note the social construction of gender. As Leonard says,

There are conspicuous entry points where labelling might have begun a thorough analysis of women and crime, but once again this analysis was not forthcoming. (1982:81) The labelling perspective took a very idealist, not to say idealistic, social constructivist approach. The perspective effectively debunked the pretensions of the agents of social control but remained mystified as to why its 'hippy' theories failed to inform official practice. It should have been able to note the gendered labelling used to enforce sex-roles. Indeed, Becker (1973:17) throws out this thought "it is true in many respects that men make the rules for women in our society". He adds in parenthesis "though in America this is changing rapidly" and, as Heidensohn (1985:138), notes fails to "catch the thought himself".

However, the example of Rock's interactionist contention (reported in Morris,1987:9) that Becker's marijuana user is only 'nominally male' then this is perhaps asking too much. Indeed, as Naffine (1987) shows the jazz musicians Becker studies are male whose 'square' wives and families threaten to force them to leave the business or, at least go commercial: nothing 'nominal' here. Becker's appreciation of his subjects is total. He combines the 'college boy' and 'corner boy' without the danger.

Connell (1987) sets out a critique of current theorising about gender and power and specifically rejecting the radical sex-role theory of some feminists with its immutable and always opposed categories of men and women seeks to build a practice-based theory. He

seeks to build on the work of Bourdieu and Giddens and others who focus on the interconnections between “structure and practice” (1987:62) which allow for “multiple femininities and masculinities” (1987:63). However, Connell argues that the tightness of the link between structure and practice - particularly in Giddens ‘duality of structure’ - fails to allow for historical change. That is ‘multiple femininities and masculinities’ are not fixed - there are no Victorian patriarchs left. Messerschmidt (1997) develops Connell and Giddens to show how ‘race’, class and sex can be salient in explaining both crime and desistance from it. For instance, Malcolm X’s masculinity embraced white hegemonic forms of masculinity, then a black hustler masculinity that demanded ‘respect’. Finally he desisted from crime (though not from being criminalised) in embracing a muslim masculinity.

These ‘multiple femininities and masculinities’ are lived within and create the three main structures of: labour, power and cathexis which operate at the level of the ‘gender order’ - “the term for the structural inventory of an entire society” (Connell,1987:99) and at the level of an institution - the ‘gender regime’. He interprets ‘institution’ broadly, for instance, the street is place where women are harassed and men hang around and “talk about sport and cars” (1987:133), sometimes observed by a male sociologist (e.g. Whyte, 1943 or Parker,1974a)

In practice any analysis would relate the observed practice - ‘doing’ masculinity - within a gender regime to the ‘hegemonic masculinity’ found within the gender order. The sexual division of labour is covered by Connell’s structure of labour. Power is more complex. Men tend to dominate positions of power particularly within what Connell (1987:109) calls the hierarchies of: ‘institutionalised violence’ like the police; those of industry; the state and crucially connecting with the working class emphasis on toughness and machinery. Significant is his contention that,

the most striking feature of this connection is the extent to which it is mediated by machinery, especially motor-vehicles. The gradual displacement of other transport systems by this uniquely violent and environmentally destructive technology is both a means and measure of the tacit alliance between the state and corporate elite and working class hegemonic masculinity.(1987:109-110)

Connell gives some hints as to how his work might be applied to criminality and to attempts to control it:

The state both institutionalises hegemonic masculinity and expends great energy in controlling it. The objects of repression, e.g. ‘criminals’, are generally younger men themselves involved in the practice of violence, with a social profile quite like that of the immediate agents of repression, the police or the soldiers. However, the state is not all of a piece. The military and coercive apparatus has to be understood in terms of relationships between masculinities: the physical aggression of front-line troops or police, the authoritative masculinity of commanders, the calculative rationality of technicians, planners and scientists. (1987:128-129)

This not only suggests that the hegemonic masculinity of the gender order may comprise contesting blocs - aggression, authority and rationality - but that it combines to defeat the aggression, disrespect and irrational subordinate masculinity of the criminal. Connell’s work has been highly influential on those trying to think through what the

possibility of multiple masculinities might mean for criminology. Many of the contributors to Newburn and Stanko's (1994) edited collection *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, masculinities and crime* relate their work to Connell's.

Jefferson (in Newburn and Stanko) problematises the assumption of any smooth socialisation of boys into the predominant conception of masculinity. He notes the gap between ideal and men's actual performance and the anxieties caused to men in striving, but never achieving masculinity. He seeks to explore the internal and external worlds of men and the relationship between them. For Jefferson, the key thinker on the externalities of male subjectivity is Connell but makes the points about structure - followed up below - that lead some to prefer a Foucauldian approach to the social production of what it means to be masculine. He recognises this makes "a systematic understanding of the social whole all but impossible" (1994:16). As this discursive move endangers the subject Jefferson turns to psycho-analytical attempts to understand the inner world.

Rejecting Freud's sexism and ahistoricism but defending the applicability of his theories to the social, Jefferson builds on Freud's idea of a dynamic unconscious and Lacan's reinterpretations which insist on the non-unitary nature of the subject in which the unconscious is structured like language. Moreover, that language - its signifiers and signifieds - are related to a primary signifier, the phallus which represents the Law of the Father. So far, so Freudian, so biological, so conservative but there are other versions of psycho-analytic thought. Jefferson sets out the attempt by Hollway to combine a Foucauldian discourse theory with a psycho-analytic theory where Lacan's phallo-centrism is contained by Klein's maternal emphasis. As he says:

The social order, therefore, is comprised of a multiplicity of discursive practices and the different power relations these inscribe. These produce a corresponding multiplicity of subject positions, all differentially accessed to power. (1994:25)

Moreover, "the production of subject positions is not sufficient for theorising subjectivity" (1994:25) that is, why do we "'chose' to invest in or identify with one discursive position rather than another?" (1994:25). It is here that Lacanian desire for the mother/Other enters the scene but stripped of its phallic universalism which reconnects the Symbolic order to historical discourses. Moreover, Klein's concepts of 'splitting' and 'projection' are incorporated to show how the ego seeks to prevent being contaminated by 'bad' parts by splitting them off and projecting them onto others. Whether anxious about the loss of the breast or death this fear of lack can be seen to fit with Lacan's idea of desire.⁹

That is, specific discourses provide the subject positions and the public signs of them but the individuals desires for or needs for protection from anxiety are unique and may conflict with the available subject positions so splitting off the anxiety-making parts and projection on to others is required. By which means Jefferson explains that "heterosexual men often disown their feelings of vulnerability and dependency by saddling their partners

9. As kd lang sings "Here beneath my skin, Constant craving, has always been" (*Ingénue* (1992) Sire Records).

with them" (1994:27). Jefferson recognises that, however sophisticated this is, it cannot overcome the fact of near-universal male dominance. Jefferson concludes that male anxiety is particularly relevant to considering violence against women and children and many of Newburn and Stanko's contributors concentrate on what might be seen as typically male crimes or ways of dealing with crime (police and prison). The chapter on victimisation usefully opens up the issue of male victimisation but, of course, this is at the hands of other men. Only Levi breaks the pattern with his discussion of white-collar crime. None of these is directly comparable with joyriding, which could be seen as violent but is also not specifically directed against women yet lacks the rationality of white collar crime.

conclusion

Connell uses the term structures to describe the inter-locking effects and causes of labour, power and cathexis. He argues "that these three structures are empirically the major structures of the field of gender relations." (1987:97) yet also recognises they may not be all the structures nor that all are necessary. Despite his empirical certitude he says his "argument rests on the gentler, more pragmatic but perhaps more demonstrable claim that with a framework like this we can come to a serviceable understanding of current history" (1987:97). It is the usefulness of Connell's pragmatism that has seen it so widely taken up within the study of men and masculinities. However, the terminology of structures even when so heavily bracketed with practice may tempt the too pragmatic to simply take the structures and slot masculinities into their appropriate pigeon holes. For this reason 'discourses' of labour, power and cathexis might be preferable to 'structures'. Whilst discourses have a Foucauldian association which brings its own problems they also lead away from the pragmatic and allow for a more complex understanding of the possible and changing interconnections between Connell's three 'structures'.

As Jefferson says "it might prove useful to utilize Connell's three structures as principles for organising the sites of gendered oppression requiring discursive deconstruction" (1994:28). There is also a practical point here. The social observer will often only have access to the structures or discourses that position the individual and not to the meaning of the choices of the individual that might not even be available to them unless in therapy. This has been my position in respect of joyriding. The discourses or structures that create subject positions within the gender order and within car culture are set out but often the only individual to whom these can be related is my own fractured subjectivity (see Chapter 4). Again, as Jefferson says, "Discourses and structures point towards societal and institutional levels of analysis: desiring subjects point towards the importance of life-history research" (1994:29). Joyriders, like all car-drivers are clearly 'desiring subjects' and car advertising clearly subjects them/us to desire.

In conclusion it is, perhaps, worth examining Walklate's conclusions on masculinity and crime.

How and under what circumstances masculinity is the key variable in committing crime, and how and under what circumstances social class might be the key explanatory variable, are questions

which remain to be answered. Raising them clearly posits a theoretical and empirical agenda informed by a concern with the focussed specificity of the relationship between particular crimes and particular contexts rather than a search for broad (and brave) assertions. (1995:182-183)

She is concerned that “the co-usage of the term masculinity/ies becomes the catch-all term for both understanding and explaining different kinds of law-breaking behaviour occurring in different structural and material circumstances” (1995:190). In this respect her concerns are too narrowly criminological. Nothing in this thesis is intended to use masculinities as a catch-all to explain crimes. Like feminism, and in support of feminism, the new sociological interest in masculinities problematises the study of society, disrupts notions of the universal man and of the men who study society.

The thesis presented here uses concepts of masculinities to highlight issues around car culture, joyriding, the criminalisation of joyriding, efforts to treat and punish joyriding and also to interrupt the smooth flow of research into and theorising about crime. It is in this sense that this work is transgressive. It goes beyond criminology as currently constituted - even in its radical and critical versions - not to explain joyriding but to embrace the facts of joyriding and its intimate connection with car culture. Concepts of masculinities have been used throughout not just to throw some light on crime or deviance but especially to criticize the very practice of criminology from within by a middle-aged man studying young men and not from without, like Smart (1990). If it had remained within conventional criminological bounds then it could only attempt to explain crime and fall victim to Walklate’s doubts about using masculinity as an explanation and to Smart’s wider criticism of criminology.

Just as criminology has avoided or badly explained women’s crime and the masculinities of men’s crime so the sociology of masculinity has failed to address itself to the issue of crime and deviance. It may therefore be that where Smart has taken refuge in the sociology of law others must take refuge in the sociology of masculinities whilst awaiting the post-disciplinary.