

# **(Br)others in crime: Masculinities, Crime and Criminology**

A paper given at the British Criminology Conference, Queen's University, Belfast 15-18 July 1997 by Nic Groombridge, Department of Historical, Cultural and Social Studies, St Mary's University College, Strawberry Hill, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4SX. Telephone 020 8240 4176  
[groomn@smuc.ac.uk](mailto:groomn@smuc.ac.uk)

*This paper offers a re-reading of the 'classics' of American and British sub-cultural criminology. It notes the move from the authoritarian criminology that takes the criminal as Other to the fraternal criminology that takes the criminal as 'bad young brother'. The sub-cultural tradition in criminology says as much about youthful masculinities as it does about crime and as much about criminology as about 'criminals'. Both crime and criminology offer ways of 'doing' masculinity.*

...the academics' desire to find rationality and purpose in the deviance of youth (despite its surface appearance of senseless crime) was possibly itself a desire to find in those youth the very qualities which the academic male still most admired in himself - intellectual reason rather than, say, animal spirits or something deeply alien, perhaps deeply different which could not be encapsulated in an academic treatise. (Naffine, 1997:43)

Recently attention has been called to 'masculinities and crime' (Messerschmidt 1993 & 1997 and Newburn and Stanko, 1994). Feminist writers have drawn extensive attention to the deficiencies of criminology in its treatment of women specifically and gender more generally (for example, Smart, 1990 and Naffine, 1987 & 1997). Morgan (1992) also wonders if male intellectuals and academics idealise 'gritty' ways to be a man. Yet also Walklate (1995:76) notes "...much criminological work hides men's fears and their thrills". This article takes the critique further by drawing on Messerschmidt's conception of 'crime' as a resource for 'doing' masculinity by contending that criminology also offers a resource for 'doing' masculinity.

Broadly two attitudes have been taken by male criminologists to male criminals. First the positivist, empiricist, correctionalist attitude of the Father which sees the Criminal - like the Woman and the Homosexual - as Others in need of correction. Secondly, the appreciative attitude which sees the Father as oppressive and takes the side of the (rebellious or misguided) younger brother. Naffine is critical of both strands:

Criminologists of the empirical sort are, therefore, committed to a traditional ideal of objectivity. When they study an object, they must strive to get themselves out of the field of vision, out of the line of enquiry - and they believe it is feasible to do this. (1997:22)

Of appreciative studies, Naffine says:

It is, therefore, unlikely that these efforts of the new men of criminology to bridge the cultural gulf between themselves and the working class offender were ever entirely successful. Certainly, there was no real sense of the criminologist going native, abandoning the privileges and cultural advantages of the academic male (and neither has this academic female). (1997:42)

Her parenthetic comment signals that she is not claiming a superior understanding to those who 'were there' or 'got their hands dirty'. Perhaps she is suggesting that they should have 'gone native'. My experience of fieldwork at motor projects (Groombridge, 1995) was not sufficient for me to

speaking about youthful working class joyriders, let alone for them. However, I recognised that I was already a native of the world of men, car users and consumer of cultural products such as car adverts and film. I had during this time also become a native of the world of criminology.

Criminological discourses of masculinity will be explored through a revisiting some of the classics of criminology with the specific intent of excavating the discourses of masculinity. It is argued that neither discourse is hegemonic, and that in reality much male criminology is deeply ambivalent about male offending seeing the criminal as both Other and Brother, hence '(Br)other'. Another familial metaphor might make this avuncular criminology. Tony Blair's 'Tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime', his version of 'zero tolerance', much tabloid ranting on law and order and the more measured output of Home Office researchers might all be placed on the side of the Father in criminology and criminal justice. Here the emphasis is on the (Br)otherly or avuncular criminology. First we look at the Parsonian American sex role tradition - represented by Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin - through the critiques of Naffine (1987) and Messerschmidt (1993).

### **Views from the Good Old Boys: the USA**

Naffine is critical of Parsons for nurturing a stereotype of women in sociology which is "imported into criminology by Cohen" (1987:59) in which:

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 Cohen's book title seriously. Naffine notes "Cohen regards his culture as gendered" (1987:11). She concentrates on his sexism and his treatment of masculinity as active as against women's passivity but also crime as glamorous. 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).

I might add "and by doing criminology". Clearly, if "boys collect stamps and girls collect boys" (1955:142) then criminologists collect gangs of boys. 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 who delays his gratification, or has it denied. 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 sees society as 'gendered' or, at least, naturally 'sexed' as this infamous 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"(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 talks about the same passage in a kinder light:

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)

Heidensohn notes, of the same passage, "First he assures us of his own masculinity" (1985:133). Messerschmidt concludes that all these criticisms aside "Sutherland, Parsons, and Cohen can be credited for putting masculinity on the criminological agenda" (1993:22). Feminists might want to argue that they did so by opposing that masculinity to a stereotypical femininity which was expelled from criminology. Messerschmidt partially exonerates these masculinity theorists because of the absence of feminist theorising at the time and the, then, widespread assumption of natural difference. That defence is no longer open to some of the later contributions to this canon.

Preparatory to their own argument, Cloward and Ohlin review contemporary theories of delinquency including "Masculine Identification and Delinquent Subcultures" (1961:48). They helpfully set out their view of sex differences and the basics of the theory:

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 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).

For Cloward and Ohlin delinquent norms preceded delinquent acts so Parsons and his followers

"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,

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. (1961:53)

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).

It is 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 overplayed - 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. 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).

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. Some of these criticisms - particularly those of class - were taken up in the United Kingdom. This tradition is examined with the help of Mc Robbie (1980 and 1991) and Dorn and South (1983)

## Views from the Boys: the UK

Very unusually for the time - and therefore deserving of praise and a wider audience - 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 - prompted by McRobbie (1980) - concentrate fully on gender. Interestingly this is the point where Naffine (1987) draws a line in her work - 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 and McRobbie. For brevity these individual and joint authors are often dealt with here collectively, as if they formed an identifiable school of thought, of which 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)

*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 make 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 distancing from masculinity that runs counter to the politics and practice favoured by the left-wing 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, 1978a:27).

Those shared patterns can also effect other men in the field of observation. For instance, Willis (1978b: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* raising the issue so little and so late but it is interesting that when it does it does so in respect of "street-corner culture, with its massively 'masculine' focus". 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 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 masculinity: a masculinity that was otherwise not problematic in itself.

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" (pp 58-59). Feminist women get several mentions. Unconsciously mirroring Cohen's (1955) observations they note "Middle class youth remains longer than their working class peers 'in the transitional stage'" (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).

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.

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. Dorn and South rely on McRobbie in pointing out that despite this advance in relating masculinity and crime Willis still fails to incorporate them into thinking about how these 'macho' cultural values are passed down from father to son in a family that includes women and girls. Willis may note the boys sexism but reports it 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 their sexism. McRobbie is rightly trenchant in her criticism of the language of the 'lads' - the calling of women teachers "cunt" and mock masturbation as a disruptive tactic in class.

Perhaps the reason for Heidensohn's 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 complete 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 does not come to terms with the masculinities of the 'earoles' (the conformist, but still working class, boys) let alone that of the teachers or Willis himself.

The contrast with Corrigan is interesting. 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).

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 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 represents 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 my fieldwork or literature reveals any evidence of any 'strategy' (Groombridge, 1997). Indeed the literature and fieldwork strongly suggest that instead of 'resistance' joyriding is a submission or accommodation to car culture. To suggest that joyriding might offer a 'strategy of resistance for all', including women, is to embrace the 'Great Car Economy' of the advertiser's and Mrs Thatcher. It is not even the 'feminism' of *Thelma and Louise* but of the Peugeot advert's pastiche. Stanley therefore joins the long tradition of male writers on crime that romanticise it.

'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 a 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. 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 (See also Hartley, 1994).

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 gay or '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 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'.

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)

## **Conclusion**

As we have seen Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin did, in their different ways, address themselves to issues of masculinity within the sex role paradigm of the time. Later commentators and summarisers have made little of this and feminists have rightly criticised the sexism. Many in the UK tradition mention or can be seen to talking about masculinities. This paper is critical of the glancing mentions and the sexism but is most concerned to reread this work as part of the pre-history of the re-established concern for masculinities and crimes. This concern does not, like some

versions of feminism or even conservatism, see the etiology of crime in masculinities, the male sex role or biology but recognises the gendered element in male offending, crime control and criminology. The UK traditions concern with style - particularly Clarke and Hebdige - is clearly about masculinity yet remains fixed respectively in their marxist and semiotic problematics. The intention here is not to simply replace these with gender as a problematic. Indeed Messerschmidt's (1997) 'structured action' seeks to incorporate class, race and gender and laments his failure to include sexuality. This paper has mentioned some points at which others might also have taken up these issues. Elsewhere, I have proposed a 'queer criminology' (Groombridge, forthcoming)

Whilst McRobbie is talking about Willis and Hebdige her comments have been taken here as an inspiration to refer additionally to Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin and also of the British tradition. She says:

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).

This paper has sought to make this 'embarrassment' central and, like Naffine, questions "what has gone wrong with the discipline of criminology that it should remain so reluctant to reflect critically upon its own worldview." (1997:9). She continues:

What we are observing is the reign of an often unreflective science of criminology, which neither examines its own particular ideologies (its own specific world view) nor speculates about the consequent intellectual and ethical value of the criminological enterprise (why it is doing what it is doing). We see, instead, a pre-occupation with the scientific study of criminal man... But the gaze is unidirectional. Criminology examines criminal man but does not look back at himself to discover the nature of its own identity and how it shapes the very nature of the scientific process, including the very identity of criminal man himself. (1997:28-29)

Not only has this paper drawn out some of the gender themes of existing classics it has also sought to problematise the gender of the male criminologists by turning its gaze away from 'the criminal' (male) and panned round to 'the criminologist' (male). However, as Naffine notes, this also requires reflection. As feminists it was right of Smart (1990) and Naffine (1987) to initially turn the microscope from the objects of criminology to the subjects of criminology. Male criminologists felt uncomfortable under this gaze but left the work to women. Now it is time for men to share the emotional and domestic work of keeping criminology's house.

Perhaps male criminologists need to take a break *from* criminology. However, they need not - as Smart (1990) recommends to feminists - make a break *with* criminology. Only by reflecting upon his own masculinity can the male criminologist come to terms with this; only then can he get on with 'doing' criminology. Clearly such reflexivity does not permit the 'politically correct' solution of remembering to add a masculine prefix when talking about 'criminals', 'offenders', 'youth' or 'prisoners' let alone 'police' or, even, 'criminologist'. Such a move would simply enable both 'boys' to return to 'doing the business' of crime and criminology, thereby turning their backs once again on the insights of feminism .

## **Bibliography**

- Box S (1983) *Power, Crime and Mystification* Routledge
- Brownmiller (1975) *Against Our Will* Secker and Warburg:London
- Campbell A (1984) *The Girls in the Gang* Blackwell:Oxford
- Clarke J (1993) 'The Creation of Style' *Resistance through Rituals : Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* Routledge
- Clarke J, Hall S, Jefferson T and Roberts B (1993) 'Subcultures, Cultures and Class: A Theoretical overview' Hall S and Jefferson T (eds) (1993) *Resistance through Rituals : Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* Routledge
- Cloward R A and Ohlin L E (1961) *Delinquency and Opportunity: a Theory of Delinquent Gangs* Routledge:London
- Cohen A K (1955) *Delinquent Boys* New York Free Press
- Cohen P (1972) 'Sub-Cultural Conflict and Working Class Community' *Working Papers in Cultural Studies* No 2
- Connell R W (1987) *Gender & Power* Polity Press:Cambridge
- Corrigan P (1979) *Schooling the Smash Street Kids* Macmillan:London
- Dorn N and South N (1983) *Of Males and Markets: A Critical Review of 'Youth Culture' Theory* Research Paper No1 Centre for Occupational and Community Research Middlesex University
- Groombridge N (1995) 'Torque talk: Masculinities and Crimes, some reflections on men researching men' A paper given to the British Criminology Conference:Loughborough July
- Groombridge N (1997) 'The Car and Crime: Critical Perspectives' Unpublished PhD Middlesex University
- Groombridge N (forthcoming) 'Letter to the Editors' *Theoretical Criminology*
- Hall S and Jefferson T (eds) (1993) *Resistance through Rituals : Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* Routledge
- Hartley J (1994) 'Twoccing and joyreading' *Textual Practice* Vol 8 No 3 Winter 1994
- Hebdige D (1979)*Subculture: the Meaning of Style* Methuen
- Heidensohn F (1985) *Women and Crime* Macmillan
- Mac An Ghail M (1996) *Understanding Masculinities* Open University Press: Buckingham
- McRobbie A (1980) 'Settling Accounts with Subcultures: A feminist critique' *Screen Education* 34:37-49
- Messerschmidt J W (1993) *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualisation of Theory* Rowman and Littlefield:Maryland
- Messerschmidt J W (1997)*Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class and Crime in the Making*Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Miller J (1995) 'Struggles Over the Symbolic: Gang Style and the Meanings of Social Control' in Ferrell J and Sanders C R (eds) (1995) *Cultural Criminology* Northeastern University Press: Boston MA
- Miller W B (1958) 'Lower-Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency' *Journal of Social Issues* Vol 14 No 3 5-19

- Morgan D (1992) *Discovering Men* Routledge:London
- Naffine N (1987) *Female Crime, the construction of women in criminology* Allen and Unwin: Sydney
- Naffine N (1997) *feminism and criminology* Polity Press: London
- Newburn T and Stanko E (eds) (1994) *Just Boys Doing Business? Men, Masculinities and Crime* Routledge:London
- Parker H (1974) *View from the Boys* David and Charles Newton Abbott
- Smart C (1990) 'Feminist approaches to criminology or postmodern Woman Meets Atavistic Man' in L Gelsthorpe and A Morris (eds) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology* Open University Press
- Stanley C (1996) *Urban Excess and the Law: Capital, Culture and Desire* Cavendish Publishing:London
- Walklate S (1995) *Gender and Crime* Prentice Hall
- Willis P (1978a) *Profane Culture* Saxon House:London
- Willis P (1978b) *Learning to Labour : How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs* Saxon House:London