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ABSTRACT

‘Sexuality, Identity and the Clothed Male Body’ is a PhD by Published Work that draws together a collective body of work that deals specifically and significantly with the dressed male body. This thesis presents a case for the collection of publications included in the submission to be viewed as a coherent body of work which makes a contribution to knowledge in the fields of fashion studies and cultural studies, in which the works are situated. The body of work consists of two monographs - Don We Now Our Gay Apparel: Gay Men’s Dress in the Twentieth Century (Berg, 2000), and The Story of Men’s Underwear (Parkstone International Press, 2010) - and two chapters in edited books - ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag: Gay Men, Dress and Subcultural Identity’ (2008) and ‘Hair and Male (Homo)Sexuality: Up-Top and Down Below’ (2008).

Through an examination of the major themes addressed throughout the submitted body of work – sexuality, identity, subcultural formation, men’s dress and masculinities and clothes and the body - this thesis demonstrates that the published work contributes to knowledge through its two major foci. Firstly, the means by which gay men have utilised their dressed bodies as a situated and embodying practice to articulate identity, masculinity, and social and sexual interaction, and secondly an examination of men’s underwear’s specific function in the covering, exposing and representation of men’s bodies. These were, until recently, relatively neglected areas of fashion studies and dress history, and by explicitly bringing together these areas to present a comprehensive investigation this thesis serves to provide a new contribution to knowledge in these areas. Taking an interdisciplinary approach, that is common in both fashion studies and cultural studies, the specific combination of research methods that is employed throughout the body of work, has provided a unifying element that further enhances this contribution to knowledge.
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INTRODUCTION

This critical review fulfils the regulations laid out by the University of the Arts London as part of the submission for the award of PhD by Published Work. It accompanies the four published works that form the body of this submission and serves to defend this work by introducing each piece of work, explaining their coherence as an original body of work, situating the work within the appropriate and relevant fields and existing literature in those fields, and establishing its originality and contribution to knowledge, through critical reflection and evidence based analysis.

Collectively this body of submitted work is situated within, and at the intersection of, the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies. Both areas are contested in terms of their disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity but have common areas of investigation and methodological approach that I will address in this review. The title of this collective body of work and critical review, ‘Sexuality, Identity and the Clothed Male Body’, serves to indicate and summarise the cohesion of the pieces of work when considered together, as well as indicate the areas in which it provides originality and new knowledge.

This collective body of work, which comprises two monographs and two chapters in edited books, has explored the dressed male body and the ways in which the sexual subject can be understood as historically and spatially contingent and formed in relation to terms of gender, class and ethnicity. This was until recently a relatively neglected area of fashion history and this body of work, as I shall demonstrate, serves to fill a ‘gap’ in that knowledge. The two main areas of focus of ‘Sexuality, Identity and the Clothed Male Body’ are firstly, the means with which gay men have negotiated their dressed bodies as a situated and embodying practice (Entwistle 2000) to articulate identity, social and sexual interaction, and, secondly, the ways in which men's underwear plays a specific function in the clothing and representation of the dressed male body.
This body of work was published over a period of ten years, 2000-2010, whilst I was employed at two different institutions, the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) and London College of Fashion, University of the Arts London (LCF), where the publication of my research was encouraged as part of my roles as curator at the V&A and as Research Fellow and later as a Course Director in the Graduate School at LCF. It should be noted that I worked on other publications and exhibition projects in the years between the publication of the first submitted work in 2000 and the next in 2008. Whilst these are not included in the submission of this body of work, and I will therefore not address them directly in this critical review, they do contribute to the ‘story’ of my research journey and the development of my approaches and perspectives.¹

This critical review is comprised of five chapters that will outline and demonstrate the ways in which the four submitted works form a cohesive body of work and how this sits within, alongside and contributes to scholarship and knowledge in the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter One is a summary of each of the submitted works that also serves to explain the scope and context of each work. It will explain the interrelationship of the works, their coherence as a body of study and outline the grounds for showing how the individual publications and the whole body of work that they comprise have contributed to an overall body of knowledge and the development of research. Chapter One will also serve to indicate how, as one of the few scholars working on gay men’s fashion and men’s underwear, this body of work has been utilised and reproduced in edited works thus furthering its availability and reinforcing its continued relevance to the fields. Chapter Two

¹ The Curriculum Vitae included at the beginning of this thesis lists those published works not included in this submission that were published between 2000 and 2012. The two main projects that I worked on between 2000 and 2008 were the Black British Style exhibition held at the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) in London in 2004 and the book Dialogue: Relationships in Graphic Design published in 2005 and their significance in the development of my approach to and understanding of the areas covered in this submitted body of work is noted where relevant in the main body of the thesis.
sets out the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies in which my work is positioned. It will discuss and provide evidence of the ways in which the works under consideration have made a contribution to these fields and elaborate on how this submitted body of work sits at the intersection of these two areas.

The methods that I have utilised in the research for this body of work will be outlined in Chapter Three, where the interdisciplinary nature of my approach will be addressed. It will highlight how the specific combination of research methods has enhanced my contribution of scholarship in the fields of study, as well as reflect upon the way in which my approach to research methods has changed and developed over the course of the period covered by the submitted works. Chapter Four will critically examine the five major themes that I have explored within the submitted body of work: sexuality; identity and dress; subcultural formations; men’s dress and masculinity; clothes and the body. This chapter will address the ways in which I have adopted and articulated these themes within this body of work and how these works can be viewed in relation to other works on these subjects, in order to demonstrate the ways in which this body of work has furthered the development of these areas of study. The critical review will conclude by summing up the submission and indicating how this body of work will be built upon in the future.
CHAPTER 1. SUMMARY AND CONTEXT OF SUBMITTED WORKS

1.1. The Works Submitted


1.1.1. Don We Now Our Gay Apparel: Gay Men’s Dress in the Twentieth Century

This book grew out of research that I initially undertook for the Victoria and Albert Museum’s (V&A) exhibition ‘Streetstyle from Sidewalk to Catwalk, 1940 to Tomorrow’ (1994-95). This research ascertained that there was a paucity of writing that specifically addressed the way in which gay men used their dressed appearance as a signifier of identity. Up to the point of the publication of *Don We Now Our Gay Apparel* in 2000, the subject of gay male dress had been dealt with only incidentally in works on gay history and biography or discussed briefly as a negative statement or denials about, specifically heterosexual, male interest in fashion in books on men’s fashion and dress history.

The primary aim of this book was to investigate and demonstrate the ways in which gay men had used clothing and their particular choices of certain
garments or combinations of garments to make a statement about their sexuality and negotiate their identities as gay men. A secondary aim was to examine the ways in which changing legal, moral and social conditions throughout the twentieth century impacted upon such decisions and practices. My objective was to draw upon a range of existing sources that mentioned gay male clothing choices, citing published novels, biographies, autobiographies, as well as unpublished manuscripts, newspapers and magazines held in various archives, to create the first critical and analytical narrative of the relationship gay men have had with clothing and appearance throughout the twentieth century. This material offered unique and separate insights and opinions on gay men's dress and style and it was key for me to bring these together to present a thorough picture of the subject. It was also my objective to record the reminiscences of older gay men in order to preserve the personal histories of gay men's engagement with their appearance, as well as note the influence that gay men's dress choices had on broader hegemonic men's fashions.

*Don We Now*, which was the nineteenth book in Berg’s ‘Body Dress Culture’ Series, consists of fourteen chapters that are organised in a thematic fashion over 212 pages, with themes arranged chronologically as they are first identified. Thematically *Don We Now* addresses class, masculinity, effeminacy, signifiers and codes, cross dressing, visibility and invisibility, subcultures and subcultural interaction, gay liberation, the body, swim- and underwear, public presentation and nightclubs and private spaces. The book begins by introducing the late nineteenth century identification of homosexuality as a form of social and cultural identity by psychiatrists and sexologists such as Karl Heinrich Ulrichs and Richard von Krafft-Ebing and the political and social advocacy of ‘masculine’ same-sex love by philosopher Edward Carpenter and social reformer Havelock Ellis.

The first chapter examines notions of social class, identifying how within the working classes an overtly effeminate appearance had a particular position in which a gay man could operate as a ‘pseudo-woman’. This was contrasted with a more ‘authentic’ masculine appearance advocated by some middle and upper
class men. The concept of the binary polarisation between overt femininity and hyper-masculinity is one that pervades *Don We Now*, and subsequent work presented in this thesis, and I argue was an ever-present dilemma and cause for intense concern for gay men throughout the twentieth century. Just as mainstream, usually women's, fashion has swung between more obvious expressions of femininity and male dress-inspired styles, so 'trends' in gay style have oscillated between these two extremes but have also taken up various points in between. My examination of this 'swing' is highlighted by sociologist Tim Edwards (2011) in his assessment of the 'politics of dressing up'. The examination of overt femininity is continued in the second and third chapters of *Don We Now* where I specifically address the notions of effeminate stereotypes, cross dressing and drag as a gay-specific performance. In addressing the 1970s post gay liberation expressions of Radical Drag and Gender Fuck and other gender ambiguous style signifiers in the 1980s I invoke Judith Butler's theories around performativity (1990, 1993).

The role and presence of gay men in both the American and British punk subculture is one that I explore, not to argue that punk was a gay subculture but to investigate how gay men’s presence within the subculture impacted upon its development and how transgressive subcultures offered a physical and ideological space for young gay men to experiment with their appearance and identity and the relationship between the two. This chapter and the one that examines early 1980s club culture drew heavily upon biographies with key players in these subcultures and oral history interviews conducted with gay men who frequented the London nightclub scene of the period between the late 1970s and the mid 1980s, so entering the realm of my methods which I will explore further in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Gay presence in the formation of subcultures and subcultural identity prior the 1970s is addressed in the book through the identification of the Molly subculture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Bray 1982, Norton 1992) and established gay subcultural activity in major cities across Britain, North America and Europe in the early twentieth century. Through an
examination of the interaction between gay men and mods I identify the fluid boundaries of subcultural identities as well as the role of certain gay-owned and gay customer focussed shops in London and New York.

In the wake of gay liberation, gay male dress choice emphasised presentations of overt masculinity, most specifically and particularly through and in the gay clone. The chapter entitled ‘Macho Man’ examines how gay men knowingly subverted hegemonic men’s styles to create a new gay visual identity; that whilst drawing upon elements of traditional working class male clothing, the clones subverted these to become signifiers of gay masculinity. Once again utilising first hand observations from participants in clone culture from oral history interviews, contemporary gay newspaper and magazine articles and gay novels, the impact of this hyper-masculine ideal is highlighted. That particular chapter has been significantly cited in the works of others demonstrating its standing in the field of fashion/dress and lesbian and gay studies (see Appendix A). Karaminas and Geczy’s proposed publication *Queer Style* identifies this chapter as significant: ‘[f]or the best analysis of gay male fashion clones see Cole “”Macho Man”: Clones and the Development of a Masculine Stereotype’ (Karaminas and Geczy 2013). Continuing expressions of overt masculine appearances in the 1980s and 1990s are examined alongside how the dress of the gay leather Sadomasochist subculture was adapted in the wake of the AIDS pandemic from the early 1980s onwards.

This post-liberation overt masculine visibility is compared and contrasted with the need in earlier decades for gay men to remain far less visible due to legal, social and moral factors. The fourth chapter of *Don We Now* specifically analyses how, prior to gay liberation, many gay men seemingly followed hegemonic male dress codes in order not to be identified by mainstream society as gay and adopted subtle secret signifiers to indicate sexual orientation. It is this exploration of the importance of public and private signs and signifiers that

---

2 This chapter was also published in a slightly modified form in peer reviewed journal *Fashion Theory* in 2000, and was reproduced in *The Men’s Fashion Reader* (2009).
3 This book is due for publication on 15 August 2013. Quotes are taken from the manuscript copy I was invited by the publishers to review.
dress historian Elizabeth Wilson identified in her review for *History Workshop Journal* as one of the ‘most interesting aspects of Cole’s research [in *Don We Now Our Gay Apparel*]’ (2001: 281).

The desire to appear masculine also led to a rise in interest in body-culture amongst gay men and I address this through the importance of physique magazines in gay popular culture from the 1950s onwards and specifically in a chapter which charts the rise of gay body-building and gym culture. In arguing that the ‘muscle-mary’ became the archetype and indeed stereotype of the nineties urban gay male, I address the impact of HIV and AIDS on gay men and their appearance and the beginnings of a new subculture, ‘bears’, that while remaining overtly masculine in appearance advocated a very different body image to the muscle mary. *Don We Now* concludes with a speculation around the ‘clarity’ of recognizing gay styles at the end of the twentieth century and reflects on how gay and straight male dress choices have become virtually indistinguishable.

*Don We Now* was seminal in that it specifically addressed in detail the ways in which dress was a significant means of self-identification for gay men throughout the twentieth century. It specifically identifies and examines for the first time in a consistent cohesive manner the ways in which Anglo-American gay men have negotiated their identities through both the subtle and blatant use of clothing, accessories and forms of body modification. The publication of this research is something that dress historians Wilson (2001) and Lou Taylor (2002, 2004) have both identified as being a significant contribution to the field of dress and fashion studies, and I will elaborate on this contribution more fully in Chapter Three of this thesis. In his review for *Fashion Theory* dress historian Peter McNeil (2004:106) noted that this ‘deftly written and superbly-researched’ book was ‘the first extended text to map together this history of queer male sexuality and the history of men’s dress’ that ‘takes a compulsory place in the burgeoning field of academic dress studies’ (2004:108), reinforcing the significant contribution to knowledge made by this book. Similarly, and in the context of the social and economic history of dress and fashion, Taylor
points out that ‘for the first time, analysis of gay culture and its impact on mainstream dressing’ is introduced into the discussion of men's clothing and constructions of masculinity through the publication of Don We Now Our Gay Apparel (2002:81-2).

Two chapters from Don We Now - “‘Macho Man”: Clones and the Development of a Masculine Stereotype’ and ‘Invisible Men?’ - have been reproduced in Peter McNeil and Vicki Karaminas’s 2009 The Men's Fashion Reader and in both editions (2007 and 2011) of Linda Welters and Abby Lillethun's The Fashion Reader, respectively. A version of ‘Invisible Men’ that predated and informed the chapter in Don We Now, and specifically drew on and addressed oral history methods in relation to my gathering of information, that originally appeared in Amy de La Haye and Elizabeth Wilson's 1999 Defining Dress: Dress as Object, meaning and identity, has also been reproduced in Hazel Jackson and Jeananne Coop's 2012 edited volume A Cultural Perspective of Dress. The inclusion of these chapters in these key fashion readers reinforces the importance and ongoing relevance of this original contribution to this relatively young and underexplored area of research, and as such sees it included within broader international discussions of fashion and dress.

1.1.2. Butch Queens in Macho Drag: Gay Men, Dress and Subcultural Identity

Don We Now's investigation and coverage ceased at the very end of the twentieth century. The aim of my 2008 book chapter 'Butch Queens in Macho Drag', published in Men's Fashion Reader (2008), was to identify and analyse specific ‘masculine’ gay subcultures that emerged in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, within the context of their subcultural capital (Thornton 1996). This chapter focussed specifically on style-based subcultures that emphasised a masculine appearance, following a trajectory from the hyper-masculine clones of the 1970s into the early twenty-first century. This is set in the context of the binary oppositions of masculine and feminine that have concerned gay identity and appearance, and the negotiations between these
that occurred pre-liberation. Here, I argue that the appropriation of the hyper-masculine style of the clone impacted upon subsequent gay subcultural appearance, and I identify four particular subcultures – ‘muscle boys’, ‘bears’, ‘scallys’ and ‘homothugs’ – that developed a specifically masculine approach to style and dress. In identifying each of these subcultures it was my objective to articulate ideas about what it means to be a gay man in contemporary Western society.

Although muscle boys were addressed in *Don We Now*, in ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ I bring the discussion of the continuation of this body conscious style up to date and contrast it explicitly with the development of bear culture in the early twenty-first century (Suresha 2002, Hennen 2008). It is the negotiation of the body and the ‘manipulation’ of the body through gym-based artifice or attitudes and management of aging bodies that ties together these two sections of my argument; directly adding new knowledge to the field. In discussing bears I touch on class based identity and this becomes much more explicit in the discussion of the British white working class scally (Hardy 1996, Flynn 2005) and the African-American and Hispanic homothug (Wright 2001, Philip 2005). In both of these subcultures there is a negotiation with the notion of ‘passing’ (Garber 1997, Levine 1998, Wald 2000) in mainstream straight society and I identify how, in the case of homothugs, this is specifically related to entrenched attitudes about homosexuality in the African-American and Hispanic communities (Constantine-Simms 2001). While homothugs and scallys are specific to the United States and the United Kingdom respectively, there are common stylistic elements of dress that are related to sportswear and the global spread of hip-hop music. In relation to muscle boys and bears, both of which originated in the United States I identify the spread of these styles throughout the world.

This chapter also began to engage more fully with the interrelationship between sexuality and race, particularly as a result of investigations undertaken for the
A groundbreaking *Black British Style* exhibition held at the V&A in 2004-5. Although it is not specifically included as part of this PhD submission, this exhibition was important in the development of my approach to my research. Taking time away from the specific study of gay male dress but remaining within a subject that addressed the role of clothing and appearance in the formulation of identity allowed me to reflect upon my previous work and to consider such subjects more broadly. That the exhibition had an equal focus upon men's as well as women's dressed appearance led me to consider more broadly aspects of masculinity and the interrelationships between the various individual elements that constitute an person's identity and impacted upon the areas investigated in 'Butch Queens in Macho Drag', specifically those relating to class and race.

---

4 I co-curated this exhibition with Carol Tulloch, now Professor in Dress, Diaspora and Transnationalism at Camberwell, Chelsea and Wimbledon (CCW). At the time of the *Black British Style* exhibition Tulloch was Research Fellow jointly at Chelsea College of Art and Design and the V&A.

5 *Black British Style* specifically explored issues of race, ethnicity, age and gender and how they were negotiated via dress choice, through the display of men's, women's and children's clothing. The exhibition was groundbreaking in that it was the first time that a British National Museum had dedicated space to a major exhibition that dealt with dress practices amongst black people in Britain from the late 1940s to 2004. It drew on and fed into the V&A’s remit to engage with new audiences and to address and record fashion, style and identity within areas that had previously been neglected by the Museum, reflecting the redressing of neglect in the study of gay male dress in my published works. The exhibition challenged stereotypes associated with black aesthetics and identities, particularly around the situating of black dress within subcultural and street styles, and placed the dress choices made by individuals to define their sense of self in a historical context. In her review for *Costume*, dress historian Lou Taylor noted that “this thoughtful and intelligent exhibition” was “the star event” of the V&A’s ‘Access Inclusion and Disability Strategy’ programme (2005: 136). *Black British Style’s* cultural significance and contribution to the field of knowledge was extended nationally as it toured to four regional museums in the UK and internationally as it was the inspiration for the exhibition ‘Black Style Now’ (2006) at the Museum of the City of New York. While the *Black British Style* exhibition looked more broadly at identity and dress among the black British population there was an element that considered the “‘mantra’ of race, gender and class” (Mercer 1994:204) that has underpinned much consideration in cultural studies and in relation to dress and identity. Some of the considerations that were explored within the exhibition in relation to male dress choices were around the relationship between gender and sexuality and how that manifested itself within and through other elements of black cultural experience such as music, clubbing and religion. See also Tulloch 2004.
1.1.3. Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality: ‘Up-Top and Down Below’

The chapter ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’, which appeared in an edited book on cultural approaches to hair entitled *Hair: Styling Culture and Fashion* (2008), aimed to address power and social control in relation to masculinity and sexuality as expressed through gay men’s hair grooming regimes. The role of hair and the practices engaged in to control head, facial and body hair in relation to gay identity was an area of managed appearance (Kaiser 2013) that I initially examined in *Don We Now* and the aim of this book chapter was to examine this in greater detail.

Situating my argument within Judith Butler’s (1990) and David Gauntlett’s (2002) propositions on identity, gender and the body and Grant McCracken’s (1995) articulation of hair as a symbol of ‘self-invention’ I address some of the ways in which gay men have managed their hair as a marker of their sexual identity. I particularly examine the ways in which this management is dominated by strategies of both subversion of, and conformity to, hegemonic ‘straight’ masculinity (Connell 1995). Considering how the negotiations of the distinctions between shaving or cutting and growth are part of a broader historical continuum, where long hair for men has historically had associations of effeminacy and degeneracy and where shaved heads symbolized criminality, these practices are situated in relation to the history of gay male appearance management. In relation to the controlled presence or absence of body hair I compare the 1970s idealised hairy macho man with the bear of the early twenty-first century and contrast this with a comparison between the shaved and groomed muscle boys and the predominantly heterosexual *metrosexual* man (Simpson 1994a and 2002) and their shared body management and consumption of grooming products. It is this articulation of gay male masculinity and/or effeminacy through hair that marks this chapter’s new contribution to knowledge, discussed further in Chapters Three and Four.
1.1.4. The Story of Men’s Underwear

*The Story of Men’s Underwear* (2010) was simultaneously published in English, French and German. This book, consisting of six chapters over 256 pages, offers the first full and comprehensive history of Western men’s underwear. The aims of the research for the book were to:

- examine the historical development of men’s undergarments from the early modern period to the early twenty-first century;
- chart technological developments on the design and manufacture of men’s underwear;
- explore the significance and representation of men’s undergarments in changing cultural contexts;
- analyse the relationship between attitudes towards masculinity and male sexuality in relation to the design and consumption of underwear.

The objectives that followed these aims were firstly the examination of technical processes, secondly, charting and analysis of references to underwear in literature and other printed sources and thirdly the analysis of the representation of men’s undergarments in advertising imagery.

*The Story of Men’s Underwear* acknowledges and draws upon the existing studies on men’s underwear, usually included as a secondary and less ‘interesting’ aspect of fashion history, by dress scholars such as Cecil Willet and Phillis Cunnington (1951), Jeremy Farrell (1992), Valerie Steele (1989, 1996), and Alison Carter (1992) and the work specifically addressing male underwear advertising by Richard Martin (1992, 1995), Bruce Joffe (2007) and Paul Jobling (2003, 2005). My awareness that women’s underwear had been studied and explored by a large number of academics and historians and that men’s underwear was usually dealt with as an addition to women’s in the more serious works or was dealt with in a humorous or trivialised fashion in relatively short books, led to my undertaking the research that underpinned this publication.
However, it is here that my book offers a new contribution to the scholarship on underwear in that it redresses this previous imbalance in scholarship by providing a thorough history of the manufacture and design development of male undergarments and situating this within a cultural and social history context that is related to the presentation, merchandising and consumption of such garments. The research that underpinned *The Story of Men’s Underwear* draws methodologically upon the pluralistic approach to methods and sources that has become a key aspect of both fashion studies and cultural studies, which I will address further in Chapter Two.

Each of the first four chapters of the book, which are arranged chronologically, addresses the development of the various garments that comprise men’s underwear and their place in social history and contemporary society. The fifth chapter, like the ones that preceded it, offers a chronological history of men’s hosiery that parallels that of the other garments in chapters one to four. The final chapter of the book takes a different approach, focusing specifically on the advertising of men’s underwear, considering the language and images, how these have both been used to sell the garments and have made specific commentaries on approaches to masculinity and the changes in the presentation of the male body throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Addressing the specific styles of undergarments for both the upper and lower body in the medieval period the first chapter investigates notions of morality and cleanliness related to the body and the coverings that were worn in direct proximity to it. This, alongside other themes, such as considerations of social class, health, technological and industrial development, and new fabrics, is explored throughout the book. That technical innovation has had an enormous impact upon the development of the hosiery and underwear industries is key to

---

6 For the purposes of this book I identify underwear as any garment which is worn completely or partially under an outer layer of clothing, including items, such as the shirt, which although not considered underwear was historically regarded as such, and hosiery and socks which due to a shared technological development with other knitted undergarments are relevant to this story.
my arguments presented in this book. The introduction of new knitting machines in the seventeenth century and technological innovations following the industrial revolution that impacted upon men’s underwear in terms of the machinery used to produce the fabrics or construct the garments, such as industrial sewing machines, the discovery of new materials and processes in the nineteenth century are explored and placed in a cultural context. Like the late nineteenth century, the mid twentieth century saw an explosion of new technological and scientific experiments and discoveries that led to the use of new manmade fibres in men’s underclothes and the importance of this is examined.

The role of the shirt as an underwear and nightwear garment and its stylistic development is a running theme throughout the first three chapters. In considering the white shirt as a signifier of class based stylistic choices, a broader overview of the silhouette changes in men’s fashion is undertaken. While this may appear to be digressing from the focus of the book, it does highlight how the shape and volume of male undergarments was involved in a symbiotic relationship with outer garments, where one impacted upon the other in terms of the appearance and comfort of the wearer.

The developmental change of lower body garments from the fifteenth century onwards in Europe allowed a consideration of comparable garments continuously worn outside of ‘Euromodernity’, for example in both the Sikh religious communities and in Japan. The first part of the third chapter examines specific types of garments: the union suit or combination and relates it to the Mormon temple garment; shorts, both knitted and woven; and the progression of the T-shirt from under to outer wear and its icon status as a symbol of a new post-war youthful masculinity. The stylistic and decorative changes in men’s hosiery and underwear up to the nineteenth century is reflected in both historic documentation and accounts in contemporary novels and plays that I use as sources for my discussion. Indeed such resources were key to the recounting of particular styles and modes of dress throughout the entire book, as I shall demonstrate in Chapter Three.
Two key case studies in the book are Jockey and Calvin Klein. Coopers Jockey Y-front, launched in 1935, marked a significant moment of change in men’s underwear, both stylistically and in terms of promotion. Calvin Klein and his influential entry into the men’s underwear market in 1982 precipitated a significant shift to designers creating underwear ranges alongside the traditional undergarment manufacturers and the associated advertising campaign that has had an enormous impact upon the presentation of the male body. The latter part of the fourth chapter focuses upon an examination of socio-cultural considerations in relation to men’s underpants: notions such as tight-fitting garments and male infertility, the introduction of enhancement techniques to promote a more virile and well-endowed appearance; and deliberations on the gender and sexual orientation of the consumer and buyer - a considered division of definitions - of men’s underwear.

The change in approach from chronology of garment developments to a thematic analysis of advertising in the final chapter reflects to an extent the change in the field and approach to the study of underwear from the more traditional dress history approach with a focus on the garments to a more cultural studies approach that concentrates upon the social and cultural contexts, in particular here the promotion and representation of men, masculinity and the clothed, or unclothed, male body. Although Martin (1992, 1995), Joffe (2007) and Jobling (2003, 2005) had covered aspects of underwear advertising, *The Story of Men’s Underwear* brings this together with a broader overview of the development of the garment for the first time. Using a wide range of specific examples of British, American and European advertisements, predominantly print, the thematic areas in the final chapter cover the details and specific features of the garments and the scenarios and locations, such as dressing rooms, bedrooms, and locker rooms, in which the portrayed men are placed. Other sections specifically examine the ways in which the male body is either hinted at or specifically revealed in the adverts. Taking the 1982 Calvin Klein launch of the as a key change moment, I analyse the increasing sexualisation of the male body in relation to both the female and the
sections develop such a notion by considering the humour in adverts to subvert
the homoerotic gaze and the use ambiguity and camp to target a specific but
undeclared knowing homosexual viewer.

Continuing the theme of previously neglected or underexplored areas of dress
history The Story of Men’s Underwear was a full and detailed investigation into
the history and cultural implications of men’s underwear. This was the first
time that a serious scholarly book had been dedicated solely to the subject of
men’s underwear and in her review in Costume, dress historian Jill Salen notes
that this book ‘allows men’s underwear to have a place on the bookshelf, rather
than a small chapter in the history of underwear’ (2012: 254), thus pointing to
the contribution to knowledge made by this book. The importance of the
publication of The Story of Men’s Underwear was marked by The New Yorker
when their London correspondent, Lauren Collins, reported on a lecture I gave
as part of the 2010 ‘Inside Out’ festival, organised by The Culture Capital
Exchange (TCCE) noting that it ‘covered nearly everything ...from the Japanese
fundoshi to moisture-wicking microfiber trunks’ (Collins, 2010:34). The book
was also highlighted in Times Higher Education (Reisz 2012) in relation to its
launch as part of the TCCE festival, as a key example of the way in which
academic work is exchanged and promoted to a non-academic audience. Brian
E. Coutts, a former advisor to Jockey underwear company and selector of the
‘Best Reference Books of the Year’ for the American Library Journal, called the
book ‘a tour de force of men’s undergarments’ that is ‘likely to become a
collector’s item’ (Coutts, 2010).8 Coutts also selected the book as one of the best
books on Clothing and Dress in the 2010 annual roundup in the American
Library Journal in April 2011, alongside Berg’s nine-volume publication
Encyclopedia of World Dress and Fashion (2010).9

7 The Culture Capital Exchange is a membership organisation dedicated to promoting
the exchange of knowledge through a network of Higher Education Institutions and the
cultural and creative sectors in London.
9 I contributed an entry on ‘Lesbian and Gay Dress’ to Volume 8: Western Europe of this
Encyclopedia.
1.2. The Interrelationship of the Submitted Works

This collective body of work deals specifically and significantly with the clothed male body and this is the primary element in drawing the four works together as a cohesive body of work. While each of the publications takes a slightly different standpoint on its approach to the dressed male body, addressing the body in relation to sexuality and identity serves as a unifying component throughout the overall body of work.

The ways in which men, predominantly gay in the case of this body of work, have used dress to articulate expressions of identities is also a key factor in tying these four publications together as one body of work. The visible expressions and articulations of the multiple aspects that make up an individual’s identity that were initially explored in *Don We Now* (2000) were subsequently developed. Investigations into identities and their relationship with aspects of masculinity were central to the book chapters ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag: Gay Men Dress and Subcultural Identity’ (2008) ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality: “Up-Top and Down Below”’ (2008) and to the monograph *The Story of Men’s Underwear* (2010).

The reactions and responses of gay men to hegemonic impositions of male dress also provide a clear linking thread throughout this body of work. These tie into the examination of, and challenges to, ideas around binary oppositions and polarisations that have underpinned both dress choices and the examinations of men’s dress, and flow through the body of work. Examinations of subcultural expressions of identity feature throughout this body of work, thus providing a connection through notions of resistance, as it was a key term in subcultural theory. These works also particularly address subcultural identity through adherence to traditions of Western masculinity, or reactions against these through overtly effeminate expressions through dress. In turn these make a link to the place of undergarments as ‘appropriate’ male clothing and in the public representations of masculinities through underwear advertising and other forms of visual culture explored in the works.
That gay history was, until the late twentieth century, a hidden history (Duberman et al 1991, Gelder 2007) is significant. Homosexuality was often invisible, or visible only to those who knew how and where to look. In articulating a set of arguments and propositions around the binary between the ‘visibility’ and ‘invisibility’ of gay men, through a series of analyses of dress choices, I make a connection with the ‘invisibility’ of undergarments. I examine this in terms of their position on the body below outerwear and in terms of a recognised and comprehensive telling of its history. This move from invisibility to visibility is similarly mirrored in the explosion of advertising images of underwear-clad men that emerged from the late 1980s onwards, concurrently with greater public prominence of gay men. This negotiation between seen and unseen, visible and invisible, that runs through the body of work provides common and unifying strand.

The final connecting factor that ties these four works together as a cohesive body of work is my approach to and use of methods of research. While this will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three, it is the gathering of lived experiences and oral testimonies used in conjunction with the analyses of images and texts, that I will argue provide a unifying element to this body of work.

1.3. The Standing of the Publishers

Berg Publishers was founded in 1983 and quickly gained a reputation for scholarly excellence in visual arts subjects, in particular fashion studies, a field which it has significantly helped to define over the last twenty years. In 1997 Berg launched the pioneering refereed journal Fashion Theory and the ‘Dress, Body, Culture’ series of books, with Joanne Eicher, authority on the anthropology of dress, as the series editor. Berg also led the way in online scholarly publishing with its multi-award winning Berg Fashion Library.10 Don

---

*We Now* (2000) and the edited volume in which the chapter ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ (2008) appear were both published by Berg.

In 2008 Berg was acquired by Bloomsbury Publishing, a leading international academic publisher and now makes up part of Bloomsbury’s Academic and Professional Division, one that has won and been shortlisted for a number of prestigious awards. All Berg and Bloomsbury Academic books are peer reviewed at both proposal and manuscript stages.

Fairchild Books, established in 1910 and who published *Men’s Fashion Reader* (2008) in which my chapter ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ appeared, was until its acquisition by Bloomsbury Publishing in 2012, a market-leading publisher of textbooks and educational resources on subjects including fashion, merchandising, retailing and interior design. Fairchild Books publications are peer reviewed at both proposal and manuscript stage books and this will continue to be the case now they are part of Bloomsbury’s Academic and Professional Division.


---


1.4. Conclusion

This chapter provided a summary of each of the four publications submitted for this PhD by Published work. It explained the aims and objectives of each of the publications and offered an overview of the themes and areas of investigation contained within each book. For each publication a context in which the book or chapter was published, including outlining existing literature in the areas addressed within the publications, was offered. This chapter also served to indicate the reception of both *Don We Now* and *The Story of Men’s Underwear* and outline the standing of the publishers of these works. The next chapter will expand upon and extend the situating of these works by outlining the fields of study in which this body of work is situated and to which it contributes.
CHAPTER 2. POSITIONING THE BODY OF WORK IN ITS FIELDS OF STUDY

My published work has predominantly dealt with ideas about how male identity is communicated through dress and appearance and this is where my major contribution to knowledge lies. There has been a considerable amount of writing, much of which has come from sociological and anthropological disciplines and positioning (Konig 1973, Polhemus and Procter 1978, Wilson 1985, Roach-Higgins, Eicher and Johnson 1995, Finkelstein 1996, Crane 2000, Entwistle 2000) that has dealt with the notion of fashion, dress, appearance and identity. In 1999 de la Haye and Wilson noted that the 'sociological study of dress has shifted to incorporate the study of the human body [which is understood] as a social construct producing multiple meanings' (1999: 3). Although the four works under consideration in this thesis took into consideration the sociological and anthropological approaches that have been applied to fashion and dress, my submitted body of work which has a particular focus upon men, masculinity, the body and sexuality, as outlined in Chapter One, is situated within the ‘fields’ of cultural studies and fashion studies, and particularly at the point at which these two areas overlap.

2.1. The Intersection of Cultural Studies and Fashion Studies

The point at which cultural studies and fashion studies intersect and the relationships between aspects of these two fields has most recently been highlighted and explored by Professor of Women and Gender Studies at University of California, Davis, Susan B. Kaiser in her 2012 book *Fashion and Cultural Studies*. Kaiser opens her book by pointing out that it draws on concepts and models of feminist cultural studies and fashion studies, specifically those that ‘challenge simple or oppositional (either/or), linear (straight), and
essentialist (predetermined, fixed bounded) ways of thinking’ (2012: 2). She uses the term fashion studies to cover the complex range of concepts that are encompassed by the three terms fashion, dress and style and as such invokes and utilises Carol Tulloch’s 2010 amalgamated term, ‘style-fashion-dress.’ Tulloch herself described this term as one which ‘signifies the multitude of meanings and frame-works that are always “whole-and-part” of dress studies’ (2010: 275). Relating specifically to the way in which I see my own research as being interdisciplinary, further demonstrated in Chapter Three, Kaiser highlights how fashion studies and cultural studies are both interdisciplinary fields that ‘require the perspectives of multiple fields, theories, methods, and practices’ (2012: 8).

A significant precursor to Kaiser’s position can be found in Breward (1995) where he used cultural studies approaches alongside art and design histories to introduce both a new interpretation of fashion history and to ‘provide a fluid framework for the study of fashion in its own right’ (Breward 1998: 303). To emphasise concepts that are key within cultural studies Breward’s 1998 essay has two subsections dedicated to ‘Fashion and signification’ and ‘Pleasure and Politics’, subjects which I address in more detail in relation to my own positioning within the field of cultural studies below. Breward significantly noted that ‘cultural studies offers a way of studying objects as systems rather than as the simple product of authorship’ and that this could be applied to dress

---

12 In relation to Kaiser’s use of the word ‘studies’ it is interesting to note that in his examination of the relationship between the study of culture, cultural studies and fashion written in 1997, Breward highlights his own use of the term ‘dress studies’ over dress ‘history’ (1997:309), as it offers an opportunity for broader contemporary, social and cultural readings of dress and fashion rather than a more reductive chronological historical approach.

13 In his 2011 work What’s Become of Cultural Studies? Graham Turner offers the following basic definition of and differentiation between inter- and multidisciplinary: ‘At its simplest, a multidisciplinary approach incorporates multiple disciplinary perspectives, independently and discretely applied, whereas an interdisciplinary approach involves a degree of mixing and collaboration between the disciplinary perspectives and thus a way of allowing them to “talk” to each other’ (Turner 2011:38).
studies, a term Breward preferences over dress history, to situate dress in its broadest contexts (1998: 306).

Australian fashion theorist Jennifer Craik also addressed cultural studies in her 1994 book *The Face of Fashion* that examined the relationships between high fashion and everyday dress. Of the nine chapters in her book, one ‘Fashioning Masculinity: dressed for comfort or style’ specifically addresses men’s clothing and its relation to changing notions of masculinity both in the West and outside. A further chapter ‘States of Undress: Lingerie to Swimwear’ does address the clothed male body, but is given lesser focus than women’s. It is this imbalance that I have redressed through the extensive examination and specific focus of men’s undergarments in *The Story of Men’s Underwear*, as discussed above in Chapter One, and that marks my contribution to scholarship. Craik’s other six chapters deal almost exclusively with women’s clothing and fashion, reinforcing that at that time ‘fashion’ was closely equated with women’s clothes.

This is an issue that Kaiser (2012) raises, noting that despite the increased growth in research and publishing on menswear, it still plays a secondary role to women’s. I will discuss my contribution to redressing this imbalance in Chapter Four. Apart from underwear and swimwear, which are dealt with in their own chapter, Craik’s ‘masculinity’ chapter attempts to deal with parallel issues to those in the other female focused chapters. Craik’s consideration of

14 While it recognised that cultural studies was essentially British in its early formations, there was also developments outside of the UK significantly in North America and Australia. American cultural studies significantly grew out of American Studies, which began in the 1930s, exploring what it could mean to be American through the lens of identifying the unique American experience, as well as the intersections and crossing of disciplinary boundaries to create an ‘interdisciplinary methodology, with its own distinctive working practices’ (Campbell and Kean 1997:1). Simon During (2005) identifies the work of Michael Denning as being significant and how the ‘left-wing intellectual tradition’ influenced ‘seminal feminist Betty Friedan… whose work feeds into cultural studies as we know it today’ (24). This particular focus upon ‘American-ness, the American experience and the link with American studies highlights how ‘area studies’ is particularly strong. This interdisciplinary study of particular regions pays a particular attention to ‘authority and authenticity of native experience’ (Harootunian 2000: 41) Although Breward is British and Kaiser American they are both focussing on the relationship between fashion and cultural studies in a broad global and international sense and in light of this I write about them together here for this concentration on the intersection between fashion and cultural studies.
men's outer and underwear informed my own writing. I particularly drew on Craik's set of denials about men and fashion to articulate arguments presented in the introduction of *Don We Now* (2000) and her examination of underwear informed my approach in this book's chapter on gay men's under-and swimwear and *The Story of Men's Underwear* (2010) in that I examined how men's relationships to clothing and appearance have altered throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Following her situating the interrelationship between the fields of fashion studies and cultural studies in the first chapter, Kaiser (2012) outlines assumptions around subject formation, intersectionality and transnationalism. The chapters that follow are each dedicated to a particular subject position: nationality, ethnicity and race, social class, gender, sexuality and time/age and space/place. Despite each of these chapters having a particular focus Kaiser is at pains to articulate how each of these subject positions relate to the others. It should be noted that these subject positions are ones that I have dealt with either individually or in combinations within the work submitted for this PhD and will be addressed in more detail in Chapter Four, that outlines and unpacks the key themes – sexuality, identities, subcultures, men's dress, masculinities and the clothed body.

In her chapter entitled ‘Sexuality and Style-Fashion-Dress’, Kaiser specifically references and uses my published works as key examples to discuss the ways in which sexual orientation as a subject position has impacted upon style-fashion-dress choices amongst gay men. In the section ‘Binary “beginnings” and reversals’ she uses *Don We Now* to situate eighteenth century homosexual “mollies” use of female clothing for identification and sexual liaisons (152). Moving into the late twentieth century she notes that ‘Cole (2000) contends that the cultural discourse linking fashion to homosexuality began to diminish with the “menswear” or “peacock” revolution’ (159) and reproduces the opening lines of my book, drawing on my situating of class and aesthetics in the first chapter of *Don We Now*. Kaiser concludes this paragraph with my exploration of the practice of “passing” amongst gay men (Garber 1997, Levine 1998).
later returns to this in relation to the relationship between questioning of sexual identity in dress choices.

2.2. Disciplinarity and the Future of an Un- or Non Discipline

Before going on to situate my work within ‘fashion studies’ and ‘cultural studies’ it is worth addressing the notion of disciplinarity and how this impacted upon my submitted work as it is situated at the intersection between these two ‘fields’ that are still being debated in terms of their position as ‘disciplines’. Anthropologist Daniel Miller has noted that there are ‘many advantages to remaining undisciplined and many disadvantages and constraints by trying to claim disciplinary status.’ (1998:4), while sociologist, Diana Crane (2010) proposed the creation of ‘trading zones’ between fields and ‘clusters of fields’ that would facilitate interdisciplinary discussion without the need for the creation of new disciplines.15

The one day workshop ‘The Future of Fashion Studies: A Fashion Network’ held at Warwick University on April 30, 2009 16 in which I participated, discussed ‘methodologies and research agendas of the growing area of fashion studies’

15 James Chandler, Director of the Franke Institute for Humanities at the University of Chicago has been at the forefront of discussions within the humanities about the concept and meanings of discipline. In his introduction to a special edition of the journal Critical Inquiry he notes that disciplines are located within an ‘institutional framework’ where they can be ‘mediated and effected’ and offer ‘professional attachment’ and ‘a sense of belonging’ and goes on to identify the ‘development of new fields that might be called shadow disciplines’ including ‘cultural studies, gender studies race studies, performance studies, film studies, media studies, ethnic studies, and science studies’ from the late 1960s onwards (2009: 737).

16 Convened by Giorgio Riello and Stella Bruzzi and attended by amongst others, Elizabeth Wilson, Eugenia Paulicelli (City University of New York), Louise Wallenberg (Centre for Fashion Studies at Stockholm University) and Christopher Breward (V&A). Although most of my quoting from this workshop is based on McNeil’s report in Fashion Theory (2010), it is also informed by my attendance at and contribution to the workshop. In her editorial in the 2010 inaugural edition of the journal Critical Studies in Fashion and Beauty Efrat Tseëlon discusses a lack of consensus on canonical lists of key players in the various areas of dress and fashion studies: ‘Every branch (representing different core disciplines, or different linguistic communities) has its own list of star performers and every new ‘fashion studies reader’ or encyclopaedia is trying to rewrite history as they see it, and to place a different set of celebrities at the core of the narrative. (Tseëlon 2010: 11)
and whether ‘fashion studies’ constituted a field or a discipline in its own right. (McNeil 2010:105). Francesca Granata (2012) reiterated this position in her comparison of the multi-methodological approach required by fashion studies to other emergent disciplines, such as film and performance studies. In the introduction to The Uses of Cultural Studies feminist cultural theorists Angela McRobbie notes that cultural studies is not ‘a tightly defined discipline’ but rather ‘a shifting terrain, a site of dispute and contestation’ (2005: 2). Much of the writing that has examined cultural studies addresses the positioning of cultural studies in relation to the notion of disciplines and disciplinarity. While this relates in many cases to the methods that can and have been employed by and within cultural studies I will deal with this in Chapter Three, which examines the methods of research I have employed in my work.

---

17 It is notable that today in the UK cultural studies has a particular position as a ‘supporting’ area that underpins the study of other more traditional disciplines and practice-based study in areas of art and design. It is significant that the majority of fashion courses - particularly at undergraduate level all require the study of cultural studies to underpin the practice based elements of such courses. By fashion courses I refer to the full range of vocational courses that can include fashion design, fashion journalism, fashion promotion and so on. Courses or units that deal with cultural studies have varying names according to institutions, for example at London College of Fashion they come under Cultural and Historical Studies and at Brighton University Cultural and Supporting Studies. Indeed my own teaching practice is situated within a broad framework of cultural studies in my role as Course Leader for MA History and Culture of Fashion at London College of Fashion.

18 Taking up the idea of disciplinarity Simon During asks: ‘Is cultural studies a specific discipline or does it exist across or outside established disciplines? ... such questions have helped to generate the discipline itself’ (2005: 10). While During seems to conclude here that cultural studies is a discipline, others contend and contest this notion. Graham Turner (2011) for example dedicates a whole chapter to ‘The Undiscipline: Cultural Studies and Interdisciplinarity’ where he argues for the strength of cultural studies remaining outside of becoming an established discipline building on his earlier 1993 work where he discusses the ‘virtues of being an “undiscipline”’ and emphasised the importance of cultural studies as an undisciplined, contestatory, fluid field of theory and practice’ (1993; 12). It is generally acknowledged within the writings on cultural studies that the work has been produced predominantly within the confines of academic institutions, despite the fact that in its earliest manifestations it was often a reaction against the traditional disciplinary structures of institutions (cf. During 2005, Hall in McCabe 2007, Turner 2011). But the fact that cultural studies has remained outside of a disciplinary definition, Tony Bennett argued, could be seen as an institutional failure but despite that ‘cultural studies has all the institutional trappings of a discipline’ (1998: 530). Graham Turner acknowledges a value for cultural studies as a ‘resource’ for disciplines (2011:157) while Simon During notes the position of cultural studies as ‘a site where different disciplines meet: it gestures at a cross-disciplinarity rather than at even an inter-disciplinarity’ (During 2005: 12).
2.3. Cultural Studies

The writings on cultural studies are numerous and the creation of academic works that outline the history, continuing development and changes within the area, as well as those outlining the uses and methodologies associated with or adopted within cultural studies, is a whole industry in itself, as is noted in recent works (Barker 2012, Durham and Kellner 2012, Grossberg 2010, Highmore 2009, Ryan 2010, Turner 2011). The first book to attempt to give an overview of the development of cultural studies was Graham Turner’s 1990 *British Cultural Studies: an introduction*. It is therefore beyond the remit of this thesis to attempt to present a history of cultural studies; instead this section will address key thematic areas - power and the politics of identity; queer studies and queer theory; masculinities; and representation - in order to situate my submitted body of work within cultural studies and demonstrate where I make a contribution to the field.

2.3.1. Power and Politics of Identity

The concept of power ‘has become a (if not the) key term in cultural studies’ (Longhurst *et al* 2008: 144) and the explorations of the ways in which power has been examined in relation to ‘culture’ in its broadest sense has underpinned the breadth of work encompassed by the term cultural studies. As Michel Foucault argues, ‘power comes from everywhere’ (1990: 93) and thus permeates all social relations. For Michel de Certeau (1984) there is a marked distinction between strategies of power and tactics of resistance: a notion that was key in British cultural studies, particularly following Hall and Jefferson's

---

19 Turner’s work and was quickly followed by works by Patrick Brantlinger’s *Crusoe’s Footprints: Cultural Studies in Britain and America* (1990), Martin Barker and Anne Beezer’s *Reading into Cultural Studies* (1992), and Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan’s *Studying Culture: an introductory reader* (1993). In the second edition of *British Cultural Studies* Turner notes that while the book acknowledges the initial developments of cultural studies in Britain it does not deal exclusively with British cultural studies but looks at other, significantly European, influences and developments, while in his 2011 *What’s Become of Cultural Studies?* he discusses the criticism he received for this title and explains how this was the publishers decision to ensure that the book sold to an American market.
1976 edited volume *Resistance Through Rituals*, and one that I have addressed in my body of work in relation to the ways in which gay men have used their dress practices to ‘resist’ perceptions of homosexuality and to make statements of resistance in relation to the hegemonic men's fashion.

Academics at the University of Birmingham’s Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) describe Italian Marxist theorist Antonio Gramsci’s use of the term ‘hegemony’ to ‘refer to the moment when a ruling class is able, not only to coerce a subordinate class to conform to its interests ... so that the granting of legitimacy to the dominant classes appears not only “spontaneous” but natural and normal’ (Clarke *et al.*, 1975: 38). That this definition appears in the first essay of *Resistance through Rituals* (1976) is significant in that giving an overview of how Gramsci utilised the concept, it also specifically situates the term within the study of subcultures. Barker (2003) highlights how in subcultural theory the notion of ‘resistance’ to dominant cultures is foregrounded and that initially this was manifested through discussions of social class but later broadened to include race, gender and, I would argue to a lesser extent, sexuality. That analyses of subcultural styles, particularly youth cultures, in Britain gained precedence in the work of the CCCS is significant and my own work was informed by subcultural studies, a subject I will return to in Chapter Four. The notion of resistance to hegemonic diktats within, and as a key part of, lesbian and gay history also informed how I undertook my early research, leading to a thorough examination of how gay men either fitted into or stood outside recognised and acceptable dress codes for men in this body of work.

Postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha’s particular contribution to cultural studies is to stress the ways in which class must necessarily give way to and be superseded by multiculturalism and community. Thus the notion of resistance is particularly prominent in his reconceptualisation of the stereotype as a

---

20 This connects to the way in which my own work initially developed out of research for the V&A’s *Streetstyle* exhibition that was underpinned by the subcultural writings and explorations of the CCCS, as discussed in Chapter One.
'complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation' (1994: 22). While Bhabha is considering the racial stereotype in light of colonialism and the coloniser, the idea of stereotype does feature within this submitted body of work and pushes forwards debates about the currency of stereotypes. This body of work particularly addresses how effeminate and subsequently hyper-masculine stereotypes pervade the representation of gay men and impact upon the way in which they chose to dress to either conform or negate those stereotypes in Don We Now (2000) and ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag (2008). The stereotype also appears in my examinations of masculinity in relation to the underwear clad male in The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010).

The notion of a non-Anglophone cultural studies (During 2005, Turner 2011) raises the question of the ways in which cultural studies has developed ideas around race, ethnicity, the post-colonial and multiculturalism. 21 Cultural critic Kobena Mercer’s Welcome to the Jungle (1994) specifically focussed on the idea of black cultural studies and an examination of how racial identity and ethnicity could be examined in relation to masculinities. He also coined ‘the mantra of race, class and gender’ that has become prevalent in discussions of identity (1994: 204). While my book Don We Now did not initially consider in any detail the notions of race and ethnicity, ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ has examined the place of racial and ethnic background in relation to sexual orientation and representation of the ‘other’ ‘queer’ body. 22

Often implicit in the discussion of power is the notion of the ‘political’ and ‘if we take "politics" as the realm of power relations in general, then "politics" has expanded its definition to cover all social and cultural relations’ (Longhurst et al

21 These concerns were discussed in depth by Stuart Hall in a large body of both singly (1992, 2000, 2001) and jointly authored and edited published work (Hall et al 1978, Hall and Jefferson, 1976) and by Paul Gilroy in his trilogy of books (1987, 1993, 2000) that developed arguments around sociology of race and race relations, the lived experience of racialism, and black expressive culture.

22 This is particularly important in the light of works such as Robert F. Reid-Pharr’s Black Gay Man (2001), Patrick Johnson and Mae Henderson’s Black Queer Studies: a critical anthology (2005) and Why I Hate Abercrombie and Fitch (2005) by Dwight A. McBride, as well as work that has addressed African diasporic fashion and black masculinities such as that by Van Dyk Lewis (1996, 2003) and Monica L. Miller’s Slaves to Fashion: Black Dandyism and the styling of black diasporic identity (2009).
then it follows that all examination of culture and everything that takes place within ‘culture’ is political.\textsuperscript{23} Significant to both cultural studies and this body of work is that of the ‘politics of identity’ and/or ‘identity politics’. This is, of course, a complex area but one that did arise from feelings of oppression and a desire to articulate and fight against hegemonic oppression and thus was bound up with new social movements, significantly women’s liberation and feminism, civil rights and anti-racism and the lesbian and gay liberation movement, all of which brought an element of the idea that the ‘personal is political’ to their arenas of concern and protest. For my own work the writings that dealt with the gay liberation and gay rights movements, such as Jeffrey Weeks’ \textit{Coming Out} (1977) and \textit{Sex, Politics and Society} (1981), Dennis Altman’s \textit{Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation} (1974) and \textit{The Homosexualization of America} (1981) and Ken Plummer’s edited volume \textit{The Making of the Modern Homosexual} (1981), were significant in underpinning how identity and the expression of identity through dress and appearance was a political stance.

\textbf{2.3.2. Queer Studies and Theory}

The development of gay and lesbian politics into queer politics has also been significantly addressed within cultural studies as queer politics is ‘one of the most interesting developments in identity politics’ to emerge from the proposal that identity is performed (Longhurst \textit{et al} 2008: 142). In proposing that performance is ‘that discursive practice which enables or produces that which it names’, Judith Butler (1993: 13) advanced sociologist Erving Goffman’s (1969 [1959]) exploration of the performance of identity and self. Butler (1990, 1993) proposed that gender and sex should be understood in terms of performativity, a concept Butler adopted initially from Jacques Derrida, but later reflected upon in relation to its use in the language theory of John L. Austin (1975), whose

\textsuperscript{23} American feminist writer bell hooks relates power and politics specifically back to the cultural when she writes that ‘Vigilant insistence that cultural studies be linked to a progressive radical cultural politics will ensure that it is a location that enables critical intervention’ (hooks 1991: 9)
work Derrida (1988) had also used in his conceptualisation of the term.

Butler is one of the key theorists of queer theory, a term first used by Teresa de Lauretis in 1990 (Halperin 2003), and an area of study that first emerged from post-structuralist critical theory. While a complex and contested field, it initially critiqued issues of sexual identity and the construction of normative ideology as well as the notion that categorisations of gender and sexuality are fixed. In addressing ideas of sexual and gendered identity within this body of work, the development of queer theory has had an impact upon my approach, even though I have not explicitly explored the complexities of the subject. It would be more accurate to describe my work as sitting within the crossover between lesbian and gay studies and queer studies where they form a part of the broad church that is cultural studies. This position is noted by visual culture and fashion theorist Malcolm Barnard, in a section of his overview of fashion studies in which he outlines contributions to work on identity: ‘Within what has become known as “queer studies”, Shaun Cole’s (2000) Don We Now Our Gay Apparel is probably the best source for a cultural historical account of gay men’s dress’ (2012: 414).

Queer theory built upon both queer studies and women’s studies, developing the challenges that feminists posed to the idea that gender is a part of the essential self.24 Significant in this debate is the fact that McRobbie has described Butler’s work as ‘feminist cultural studies’ (2005: 69) and how, therefore, Butler’s theories and propositions have underpinned recent approaches to cultural studies from a feminist perspective that has fed into Butler’s contribution to queer studies and theory. The notion raised by Butler

---

24 Longhurst et al have noted that ‘feminist accounts of the role of culture in gender inequality’ have, ‘been central to the development of cultural studies’ (2008: 820) and in Off-Centre: Feminism and Cultural Studies (1991) Franklin et al elaborate upon the similar concerns of feminism and cultural studies: a critical stance on more established disciplines such as sociology; connections with social and political movements outside academia; a desire to produce knowledge of, and by, oppressed and marginalised groups.
that we perform both sex and gender and that therefore femininity and masculinity is performed offers a particular theoretical approach that follows and underpins ideas of exploration around the subject of masculinity, or masculinities, an area which I have explored in this body of work. For example, my analyses of gay hyper-masculine dress styles in ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ (2008) and the overtly feminine hairstyles of certain gay men and gay male grooming rituals in ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ (2008) both start from the notion that sex and gender are performed.

2.3.3. Masculinities

Informed by feminist writings and addressing a perceived set of social responses by men to the rise of feminism, a branch of cultural studies-related research that explored masculinity and the male experience as something specific rather than the norm against which all other experiences were judged began in the late 1980s. Chapman and Rutherford's *Male Order: Unwrapping Masculinity* (1988) was particularly significant in the context of the development of my body of work as it addressed fashion in relation to masculinity and the presentation of the new media construct of the new man and how this linked to ideas of feminist thought. These debates underpin my

---

25 These ideas were very much a challenge to the division and distinction between sex/gender that had been prevalent in socialist feminism from the late 1960s onwards, through work such as Ann Oakley’s 1974 *Sex, Gender and Society*. Butler was preceded in her challenge by amongst others Moira Gates and French feminist writers like Julia Kristeva and Hélène Cixous, who were influenced by psychoanalytic theory.

26 In 1992 British sociologist Anthony Giddens specifically noted a ‘problematic “masculinity”’ that was being experienced for the first time by men in Western cultures and his ideas were furthered in discussion about the crisis in masculinity (Payne 1995). Giddens was not alone in writing about the male experience and contemporary masculinity, other significant works included Connell 1995; Farrell 1994; Johnson and Meinhof 1997; Metcalfe and Humphries 1985; Seidler 1989. The field of study into masculinities has significantly grown since this period and as well as investigations of contemporary masculinities there has been a surge in publishing of works addressing notions of changing masculinities across a broad spread of historic periods (Adams 1995, Finucci 2003, Edwards 2006, Emig and Rowland 2010).

27 This book also featured an essay by Frank Mort preceding his 1996 work *Cultures of Consumption* that dealt with both representation and cultural economy in relation to fashion, and a jointly authored piece by Kobena Mercer and Isaac Julien that looked specifically at black masculinity and sexuality. Sean Nixon also deals with the notion of
own research, but I have been specifically concerned in this body of work with where and how sexual orientation enters these debates and how gay male sexuality occurs within and is a part of, or a separate element of, debates about masculinity, as well as how notions of gay or queer masculinities manifest themselves through dress. Relating ideas of varying masculinities both to self presentation and specific garments in historic and contemporary contexts is a theme that runs through The Story of Men’s Underwear and ensures that masculinity is discussed specifically in relation to managed appearance and garment consumption, an area not always addressed in the range of books on masculinities, thus providing new scholarship in this field.

2.3.4. Representation

That explorations of ethnicity, gender, femininity and masculinity have, within cultural studies, been articulated through discussions of representation is key. Feminist sociologist Mary Evans declared in 1997 that ‘gender politics were absolutely central to the very project of representation’ (306-7). Barker meanwhile suggests that questions of representation are central to cultural studies through the ways in which ‘the world is socially constructed and represented to and by us in meaningful ways’ (2003:8). Propositions in Hall’s edited 1997 volume Representation and particularly Sean Nixon’s essay ‘Exhibiting Masculinity’ in that volume underpinned the development of my own analyses of representation, from specific investigations into gay male dress in visual and literary culture to the underexplored area of men’s underwear. The last chapter of The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010) was an exploration of the ways in which men, masculinity and the male body have been represented both in a commercial and cultural sense, returning to representation’s identification as one of the five ‘major cultural processes’ that make up the ‘circuit of culture’ (du Gay et al 1997:3).28

28 The other elements of circuit of culture being identity, production, consumption and regulation.
2.4. Fashion Studies

A number of writers, including Breward (1995, 1998) and Taylor (1998, 2002), have explained how the study of clothing and fashion featured in a lowly position within the academe and museum collections, where clothing was initially collected either for its ethnographic value or to demonstrate particular qualities of the textiles from which they were made. It has also been well documented (Breward 1998, Cumming 2004, de la Haye and Wilson 1999, Taylor 2002, 2004) that it was within the discipline of art history that historic dress was first seriously used in academia to date clothing and its representation in paintings in the post war period.

2.4.1. Dress History and Dress Studies

As noted above much of the work on fashion and dress has come from more university based academic traditions of sociology and anthropology. The conference Dress in History: Studies and Approaches held at the Gallery of Costume at Plat Hall in Manchester in July 1997, specifically addressed the

---

29 Simultaneously costume began to be collected and studied more systematically as examples of important surviving material culture within museum collections. The development of museum costume/dress/fashion collections is dealt with in considerable detail by Lou Taylor in Establishing Dress History (2002) and Valerie Cumming Understanding Fashion History (2004).

30 Books which dealt with the specific details of historic clothing by collectors and curators such as Cecil Willet Cunnington, Phillis Cunnington, James Laver, Norah Waugh and Anne Buck, along with the Costume Society of Great Britain's journal Costume from 1967 reflected this growth. It was this particular form of study that was criticised. Senior Lecturer in Economic History at University College, London and Director of Pasold Fund Negley Harte deemed "backward" in 1977 in that it ignored concerns of social change, consumption and was studied completely separately to textiles, which was deemed a much more valid and academic study. In a similar vein in 1993 social and economic historians Ellen Leopold and Ben Fine criticized dress history for an over concentration on 'every flounce, pleat, button and bow' (Fine and Leopold 1993:94). Harte, however, was responsible for two innovative interdisciplinary conferences, The Pasold Conference on the Economic and Social History of Dress in London in 1985 and Social Aspects of Clothing at Tilburg in the Netherlands in 1992, which brought together scholars from old and new universities and museum curators 'for the first time' (Taylor 2002: 68).
‘divergence’ between object-based museum and collectors’ study and ‘academic’ university studies of dress and fashion, ‘usually based on written sources, images and statistics, but rarely on the real thing’ (Jarvis 1998: 300) but was intended as a bridge building exercise. Two years earlier the Association of Art Historians Conference held its first ever ‘dress stream’ which brought together established pioneering scholars and new researchers to ‘assess the advances’ in the field and explore ‘the convergence of perspectives from art and design history, sociology and anthropology’ (de la Haye and Wilson 1999: 8). The chapters in the subsequent book presented a ‘sample of the rich diversity and validity of various approaches and areas of enquiry now being explored by those engaged in the study of dress’ (ibid 1). Although it is not included in the submission as part of this PhD thesis, the essay – ‘Invisible Men: Gay Men’s Dress in Britain, 1950-1970’ – that I contributed to de la Haye and Wilson’s publication arising from this conference utilised the research that also fed into Don We Now, particularly the chapter that examined how, in a period of moral, social and legal objection to male homosexuality, gay men developed a system of secret semiotic signalling that allowed them to find one another whilst remaining ‘invisible’ to the broader society. The chapter in Don We Now specifically differed in that it also investigated similar practices in the United States as well as Britain, allowing me to make international comparisons and broaden the understanding of gay male semiotic practices.

In the introduction to The Study of Dress History Taylor notes that dress history was benefitting from new methodologies and ‘innovative cross-disciplinary academic approaches’ (2002: 1). It is significant, I believe, that the term used in both conferences and in Taylor and de la Haye and Wilson’s books is dress rather than fashion. Of the six authors included in the ‘methodology special issue’ of Fashion Theory (1998) that emerged from the Platt Hall Conference, it was Breward who specifically and explicitly used the term fashion. In raising this I am not trying to argue that the term ‘fashion’ was not being used but
instead to situate the debate that leads to the current position of what is still debatably termed ‘fashion studies.’

2.4.2. The Turn to Fashion Studies

The move towards the explicit use of the term ‘fashion’ alongside, and at times synonymously with, the term ‘dress’, or indeed ‘costume’, in this theoretical and positioning context is also important in where I position myself within this debate and field. Whilst my work does discuss fashion, particularly The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010) that examines the development of men’s undergarments within the commercial contexts of the changes in fashionable clothing from the late medieval period to the present day, I initially aligned myself much more closely with the term dress, to the extent of using it in the subtitle for Don We Now Our Gay Apparel (2000), as it included not just clothing but also more broadly modifications and supplements of and to the clothed or unclothed body (Roach-Higgins and Eicher, 1992). In articulating her conception of her amalgamated term ‘style–fashion–dress’, Tulloch noted how the three individual terms were often mixed and used as synonyms for one another and without ‘delineation of the meanings’ of the three individual terms within given contexts (2010: 275), but that ‘as long as the precision of their meanings are clear, they are always connected’ (274).

Historians Giorgio Riello and Peter McNeil note that ‘it was dress not fashion that was at the centre of historical attention [and] until recently, what had been central was not the study of fashion as a concept, but the study of the material forms (dress and costume) through which fashion itself was materialised’ (Riello and McNeil 2010: 5), which goes someway to account for the choice of the term in these instance. Building on the success of the academic positioning of the word ‘fashion,’ it was specifically used in the titles of two symposia held in 2006: the Fashion Institute of Technology's annual symposium 'Museum Quality: Collecting and Exhibiting Fashion and Textiles' which 'aimed to explore the notion of “quality” in fashion' (McNeil 2008: 66); and 'Fashion Studies: Perspectives for the Future,' held to coincide with the launch of the Centre for Fashion Studies at Stockholm University which positioned ‘fashion studies as more closely affiliated to cultural studies, film studies, queer and feminist theory' (McNeil 2008: 69).

Tulloch’s term, and Kaiser’s (2012) explicit use of it, has offered me a new possibility of considering how to think about my approach to the interrelationship between the precision and use of the individual terms in relation to this body of work but also to contemplate applying her term in future directions in, and discussions of, my research.

---

31 Historians Giorgio Riello and Peter McNeil note that ‘it was dress not fashion that was at the centre of historical attention [and] until recently, what had been central was not the study of fashion as a concept, but the study of the material forms (dress and costume) through which fashion itself was materialised’ (Riello and McNeil 2010: 5), which goes someway to account for the choice of the term in these instance. Building on the success of the academic positioning of the word ‘fashion,’ it was specifically used in the titles of two symposia held in 2006: the Fashion Institute of Technology's annual symposium 'Museum Quality: Collecting and Exhibiting Fashion and Textiles' which 'aimed to explore the notion of “quality” in fashion' (McNeil 2008: 66); and 'Fashion Studies: Perspectives for the Future,' held to coincide with the launch of the Centre for Fashion Studies at Stockholm University which positioned ‘fashion studies as more closely affiliated to cultural studies, film studies, queer and feminist theory' (McNeil 2008: 69).

32 Tulloch’s term, and Kaiser’s (2012) explicit use of it, has offered me a new possibility of considering how to think about my approach to the interrelationship between the precision and use of the individual terms in relation to this body of work but also to contemplate applying her term in future directions in, and discussions of, my research.
It is in the area of the crossover that more debate is happening and the future of ‘fashion studies’ lies. Riello and McNeil (2010) and Tseëlon (2010) have emphasised the richness of an area that combines a wide range of methodological approaches and has developed from connected research in and around the boundaries of other established disciplines to create an identifiable ‘interdisciplinary field in its own right’ (Tseëlon 2010: 9). Granata notes most recently that it is ‘more precise to call the study of fashion multi-methodological rather than interdisciplinary’ (2012: 75) and that the debate about whether fashion studies is a discipline or an interdisciplinary field is ongoing, as was evidenced in the discussion at Warwick University (McNeil 2010).

The legitimization of the field of dress and fashion studies is tied up in the growth of peer-reviewed journals33 and the publication of anthologies and readers that deal specifically with fashion subject matter.34 However, it is worth noting that the proliferation of encyclopaedias, readers and handbooks on a subject, whilst demonstrating a demand amongst readers, is not always seen in a positive light, and that this could in fact be masking a lack of new research in the field. Tseëlon (2010) has criticised the way in which these compilations and journals often seem to create or rely on certain cliques of

33 Although Fashion Theory - to which I have contributed articles, see Curriculum Vitae, page four - is still the leading journal and Costume and Dress, the journal of the Costume Society of America, which began in 1975, continue to publish a broad range of articles, other newer journals address similar subject matter. Fashion Theory’s sister publication, Fashion Practice (from 2009) covers contemporary design and manufacture and invites interdisciplinary investigations from design theory to the impact of technology, economics and industry on fashion practice. Critical Studies in Fashion and Beauty examines fashion and beauty systems in a critical and theoretical manner, while Film, Fashion and Consumption – to which I contributed an essay, see Curriculum Vitae, page 4 - invites investigation in the fields of film, fashion, design, history, art history and heritage and the crossovers between these fields.

writers and researchers and that particular editors return to specific sets of contributors.35

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the ways in which both cultural studies and fashion studies have developed and has allowed me to situate my published body of work within and at the intersection of these fields. That the status of both fields as ‘disciplines’ is contested is important in the way in which I situate myself within them, taking from both areas an underpinning interdisciplinarity of methodological approach, which I will discuss in the following chapter. Cultural studies, as I have demonstrated here, has been a ‘site’ in which style-fashion-dress has been studied and has informed and latterly intersected with the way in which this continually growing area of study has developed. In exploring specific thematic areas of cultural studies that have informed and situated my research and by placing my research within fashion studies, as it develops from and continues to operate alongside dress studies, I have set the scene for both the discussion of the research methods I have employed and the thematic areas that form the foci of this submitted coherent body of work that will follow in Chapters Three and Four.

35 Similarly, in discussing cultural studies, Turner notes that we are in the age of the ‘edited “handbook”’ with a demand for ‘something between a work of reference and a textbook’ with short entries or ‘authoritative but synoptic’ contributions to the specific field (2011: 25).
CHAPTER 3. CRITICAL REFLECTION ON METHODS OF RESEARCH

For the purposes of this PhD submission I am not making claims that my use of methods is a new contribution to knowledge. However, it is important here to outline the ways that the methods I have chosen to employ in a scholarly fashion in my research are the tools that I have used to advance my claims to the production of new knowledge. The intellectual thrust and theoretical context of the submitted body of work are situated within a number of traditions and areas of study: sexuality, identities, subcultures, menswear and masculinity, and the dressed body. In this respect my approach to methods of research can be aligned with those of both cultural studies and fashion studies, particularly as I have taken an interdisciplinary approach within this submitted work.

In relation to my approach to interdisciplinarity it is worth noting here that pedagogist Lisa Lattuca (2003) has, informed by other works on the subject, identified four typologies of interdisciplinarity. Informed disciplinarity is where research questions are informed by theories or methods drawn from other disciplines. Synthetic interdisciplinarity occurs when research questions span disciplines and issues are identified in the intersections of disciplines or in the ‘gaps’ between disciplines. Transdisiplinarity, which others, such as Turner (2011), have argued is different and separately identifiable from interdisciplinarity, occurs when methods, theories and/or concepts are applied across disciplines, transcending disciplines to create an overarching synthesis. Finally, conceptual interdisciplinarity, Lattuca identifies as questions and issues that need to be answered using an assortment of disciplines, but that a critique of disciplinary understanding may operate as a motivation in the research or outcome. In light of this I would situate my own research for this body of work...
within and as synthetic interdisciplinarity as it falls into the interstices of history, fashion studies, cultural studies and lesbian and gay studies.

In his 2008 book *Research Methods for Cultural Studies* social scientist Michael Pickering notes that the philosophy behind research within cultural studies is ‘pluralist in that it advocates using mixed methods, taking an eclectic approach to research topics rather than confining research activity to any single avenue of investigation’ (2008: 4). Writing in 1997 Canadian dress curator Alexandra Palmer advocated a ‘multidisciplinary’ methodology believing that combining an analysis of documents, including magazine and newspapers, and artefacts with oral histories, material culture analysis and theory drawn from a range of fields including ‘design and social or cultural history, economic history and gender studies’ led to the fullest and most productive results and understanding of dress and fashion. (1997: 302). Following Palmer’s identification of particularly useful materials for analysis, I have made the fullest use of such materials alongside other printed and visual sources, examined through both textual and image analyses and combined these with oral history to offer the fullest exploration and recounting of histories within my submitted body of work.

The various ways that pluralisation could be seen as an issue within cultural studies and how the debates about cultural studies position as a non- or undiscipline have been addressed in the previous chapter. Johnson et al note the history of cultural studies as a ‘practice’ has ‘anti-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary aspects’ (2004: 26). Situating my own body of published work within the fields of cultural and fashion studies has led me to take an interdisciplinary approach to my research. As such I follow the

36 In the same year, in his introduction to his edited volume *Cultural Methodologies* social theorist Jim McGuigan highlights that cultural studies is ‘eclectic’ in its use of methods drawn from social sciences and humanities (1997:1) and in this sense interdisciplinarity is key to the methodological approach to cultural studies. Douglas Keller (1997), who contributed an essay on critical theory and cultural studies to McGuigan's edited volume, stated that cultural studies should be 'multi-perspectival' thus taking a range of perspectives from other established disciplines to create a new means of investigation.
way cultural studies theorist Pertti Alasuutari applies the concept of ‘bricolage’ (Lévi-Strauss 1972, Hebdige 1979) to cultural studies methodology, highlighting that a cultural studies researcher should be ‘pragmatic and strategic in choosing an applying different methods and practices (Alasuutari 1995:2).37 There are however two specific areas that I will explore in more depth in this chapter: oral history initially and significantly used within Don We Now Our Gay Apparel (2000) and analysis of texts and images that while utilised throughout the body of work were fully and specifically utilised in The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010).

### 3.1 Lived Experiences and Oral History Testimony

In terms of a cultural studies methodology McRobbie has identified three key elements ‘the empirical, the ethnographic and the experiential’, with the emphasis being placed on lived experiences in which ‘human subjects ... reflect on how they live through and make sense of’ change and their lives (1997: 170) and a recording of lived experience was key to much of my research. For Don We Now I conducted twenty-four oral history interviews with British gay men whose ages ranged from thirty to eighty-nine. The reflections on their own life stories, their individual engagements with fashion and dress, and their strategies for negotiating their clothed appearance within the social, moral and cultural conditions across their lives formed a vital part of my propositions about the role of dress for gay men in the twentieth century. Drawing on Arlene Stein and Ken Plummer’s observation that ‘there is a dangerous tendency for the new queer theorists to ignore “real” queer lives’ (1994:184), queer theorist Judith Halberstam suggests an approach that combines ‘information culled from people with information culled from texts’ (1998: 12), a method I follow throughout this body of work.38

---

37 Discussing bricolage in the context of youth and subcultures, John Clarke describes it as “the reordering and recontextualistaion of objects to communicate fresh meanings” (Clarke, 1976: 177).

38 Halberstam describes a ‘queer methodology’ as ‘a scavenger methodology that uses different methods to collect and produce information on subjects who have been...
Perks and Thompson have highlighted how oral history has been key for members of ‘cultural minorities’ to record ‘their own interpretations of history’ (2006: ix). As such the collection and use of oral history testimony or the recording of lived experience had since the days of gay liberation been a key methodological approach in redressing the balance of the previously hidden history of gay lives. Recording important personal reminiscences, particularly amongst older participants, was vital in order to ensure that their stories and experiences were not lost and forgotten, and because they formed part of a narrative of gay lives and dressed appearance. Lesbian historian Elizabeth Kennedy noted that the importance of the variety of secondary printed sources, such as letters and newspaper accounts, arose from them being based upon interviews, recollections and other first person accounts; she observed how many social historians ‘have transcended the polarization between the reliability of social facts derived from written sources ... and from oral sources’ (1995: 345). Throughout this body of work there has been a similarity and consistency in my use of particular methods, especially in the use of oral history testimony and the recording of the experience of purchasing and wearing clothing in relation to the expression of minority identities in late twentieth and early twenty-first century Britain, alongside other sources identified by Kennedy.  

Cultural historians Geraldine Biddle-Perry (2005), Clare Lomas (2000, 2007) and Taylor (2002) have all investigated and advocated the importance of oral history in the recounting of fashion/dress history. Lomas (2000) includes my own approach alongside those of Barbara Burman, Frank Mort and Angela 


---

39 For example, all of the clothing displayed in the Black British Style exhibition was supported by statements from the wearers (or sellers where outfits were compiled for the exhibition) following an oral testimony tradition – something Lou Taylor highlighted as a strength in her review in Costume (2005). Liz Mason, in her review of the exhibition in Art Design and Communication in Higher Education identified that ‘the curatorial and academic analysis evident in this exhibition ... spoke to a wide academic audience and could have been used as a methodological model’ (2005: 76).
Partington in addressing its value to fashion history. In her 2007 essay that specifically deals with gay men, masculinity and shopping, Lomas again invokes my work, this time specifically citing my investigations into Vince Man’s Shop and Carnaby Street in *Don We Now* to situate her own oral history approach. This element of investigation into fashion and dress use continued in the research for other works in this submission. For the chapter ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ (2008), for instance, I asked gay men to reflect specifically upon the ways in which their hair grooming practices may differ according to the parts of their body in question and in relation to the role hair played for them in sexual attraction.

Perks and Thompson (2006) highlight the importance of oral recollections in transforming history but they along with Batty (2009) and Atkinson (1998), note particular pitfalls inherent in the ‘inconsistency of memory (Batty 2009:111) and the need to be aware of the ‘subjective reality’ of such an interpretation (Atkinson 1998: 60). Bearing this in mind I balanced my oral history reminiscences with analysis of other, admittedly still potentially subjective, written and visual sources. These visual images were selected from a combination of museum and archival holdings, those included in contemporary newspapers and magazines and personal photographs. Pairing analyses of images of hairy gay men and personal commentary on grooming practices in ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ (2008) allowed for a situating of experiences in relation to the perceived and represented images of gay and metrosexual male appearance. For ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ images and descriptions of particular gay masculine subcultural styles that had been presented publicly were aligned with commentary from participants to understand the adherence and challenge to stereotyped presentations and understandings. During the research for *Don We Now* visual and textual materials, provided by interviewees or by me, were used as triggers or points of discussion in interviews to understand the subjectivity of personal experience and situate it in broader gay cultural context.
3.2 Analyses of Written Texts

French philosopher Paul Ricoeur (1991) argued that history-writing and fiction can be viewed as complementary narrative forms that allow the reader/researcher to grasp temporal dimensions of living and offer supporting interpretations of the social world. In assessing Ricoeur’s perspective in relation to cultural studies methodologies Johnson et al argued that ‘it is possible for fiction to be a form of history and for history to be a kind of fiction as both will offer a story of some kind, ... and will inevitably articulate a range of discourses’ (2004:188-9). As such one of my methods of investigation throughout the submitted body of work has been through the use of fictional descriptions of dress. Taylor has noted how dress historians have ‘used literary sources to lend accuracy and historical “feel” to their work’ (2002: 90).40

Taylor’s term ‘literary sources’ covers more than just novels and plays and encompasses period press and journals, autobiographies, diaries and letters and in The Story of Men’s Underwear literary descriptions served to situate the ways in which men wore and responded to their undergarments, but also highlighted the ways in which such garments were described and the changes in the language associated with male underwear. The use of descriptions of dress in gay novels or novels dealing with a gay subject was also a key source in my research, first and foremost because clothing, along with adornment and demeanour, has been a primary method of identification for and of gay men. This central thesis of my investigations within this body of work was initially demonstrated in the discussions of appearance in the early chapters of Don We Now. The novels used fell into two categories: those written by gay men, for example Garland (1953) and Picano (1979), that, whilst fictional, often reflected a sense of autobiographical experience as a gay man; and those written by non-gay authors who made observations about the ways in which the, often

40 The importance of fictional description has been highlighted in more recent works by Aileen Ribeiro (2005), Clair Hughes (2006) and Peter McNeil, Vicki Karaminas and Catherine Cole (2009).
‘outsider’, gay character utilised dress as a marker of identity or as tool to move forward a narrative that concerned his sexuality and relationships, including Niles (1932) and George (1963). The bringing together of lived experiences and literary sources has underpinned all of my research investigations for this body of work. In her review of Don We Now, Elizabeth Wilson pointed out that ‘oral history and empirical textual research is given a coherence by the clear way in which [Cole] integrates debates about dress with this material’ (2001:282).

Johnson et al have noted that the common experience of being misrepresented and misrecognised as a woman, gay man, black person, in public media or advertising ‘often quite directly fuelled a kind of cultural study that interrogated dominant representations and hegemonic cultural formations’ (2004:15). That cultural studies was concerned with notions of power led to many cultural studies-based investigations examining the manner in which groups such as those cited above reacted and responded to the ways which they had been unfairly or prejudicially represented. Within this submitted body of work this has manifested itself as an examination of the ways gay men adopted or reacted against overly overtly feminine stereotypes both within the media and in everyday life, though adoption of particular behavioural mannerisms and styles of dress. My examination of the ways in which gay men have been discussed and represented and the deliberate juxtaposition of the variety of printed and unpublished sources has allowed for a new reading of gay male engagement with managed appearance and dress.

Cultural theorist Lynne Joyrich has further expanded upon these concepts within a queer theory framework. She argues that while ‘alignments between a politics of sexuality and politics of gender and race [are] clearly an important goal’, a belief that ‘sexual orientation should be made as indelibly “visible” as race and gender ... carries dangerous assumptions, taking this visibility for granted and not acknowledging [sexual orientation] as itself a construction’ (2009: 17). It is within this tradition that much of my work is situated and reflects and relates to the ‘interdisciplinarity, inclusiveness, attention to multiple forms of power associated with the triad of class, gender and “race”’.
My work also adds to this notions of ‘sexuality’, that Mercer (1994) had also engaged with, and the ways in which they have increasingly been addressed within the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies.

3.3. Images and Visual Representation

As well as written representation, my work is concerned with and has drawn upon images of the dressed male body. In his essay on fashion for The Handbook of Visual Culture, theorist Malcolm Barnard states that ‘the visual has remained relatively neglected in fashion studies’, noting that while there is a plethora of picture and coffee table books, ‘critical analysis of the visual’ is ‘underrepresented’ (2012: 416).

However, imagery and the representation of the clothed body have been important to the study of fashion. Frequently whilst conducting oral testimony interviews I was shown photographs that illustrated the points that were being made or acted as triggers for discussions about particular styles and approaches that I analysed within this body of work. For me it was important and significant that The Story of Men’s Underwear was fully illustrated with colour illustrations, in order that the reader could see the examples being described and discussed and have a fuller understanding of both the development of the garments and their representation. Images had formed an important aspect of my earliest research, and while there is a good set of arguments put forward for the importance of the examination of the object/garment (Küchler and Miller 2005, Steele 1998, Taylor 2002), in the particular areas that I have researched – gay men’s dress and men’s underwear – for various reasons, there have not always

---

41 Interestingly in the introduction to her 2005 book Fashion-Ology, sociologist Yuniya Kawamura makes a specific point about the lack of illustration or images in her book, as she is taking a theoretical standpoint on the investigation into fashion. This is a criticism that has been levied at many books on fashion; that for a visual subject there is very little illustrative material. Fashion Historian Caroline Evans raised this as a significant issue at the ‘The Future of Fashion Studies: A Fashion Network’ held at Warwick University on April 30, 2009, noting how many publishers did not have budgets to pay for illustrations, and where academics were expected to cover the cost of image usage rights, these were prohibitive. See McNeil 2010.
been a vast collection of extant garments to inspect. This is not to say that there are no garments worn by gay men that could be inspected but that often the garments that were associated with particular gay males styles have not been kept by wearers. In the case of men’s underwear, there are undergarments in many museum collections and some of these appear as images in *The Story of Men’s Underwear*. However they tend on the whole to belong to the upper classes or were for special occasions and much everyday underwear is worn until it is no longer fit to be kept, or was not until recent years deemed to be important.

My focus has therefore often been upon images or representation of garments and clothed bodies. In *The Story of Men’s Underwear*, I undertook an investigation that employed techniques of image analysis in order to understand the ways in which underwear had been represented in visual culture particularly in the twentieth century.\(^42\) An in-depth examination of men’s underwear advertising formed the final chapter of the book and looked at the development both in physical form of the advertisement and the juxtaposition of text and image. This chapter built upon the discussion of the development of the garments and the way in which they were worn by male consumers through an analysis of the representation of ‘ideals’ of male body form and masculine identity and their development since the late nineteenth century.\(^43\) My ongoing interest and in, and examination of, visual representation outside of the

\(^{42}\) The use and inclusion of photography and film in the *Black British Style* exhibition as a tool to enliven the garments and articulate the particular ways in which black Britains wore garments led me towards an even greater investigation into, and use of, visual representation in my research.

\(^{43}\) It is also worth noting here that, although it is not a part of this PhD submission, I did undertake a research project that dealt specifically with ideas of the visual, during 2004 that manifested itself in *Dialogue: Relationships in Graphic Design* (2005). This investigation into the ways in which graphic designers collaborate to produce their end product offered me a new perspective into visual culture that subsequently informed the way in which I considered visual materials. In terms of methodology for this book, I undertook a series of in-depth semi structured interviews with twenty-three designers, their collaborators and clients, continuing my interest in oral testimony and the verbally related experience.
scope of this submitted body of research will be addressed in the conclusion to this thesis.

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the methods of research I undertook to produce the submitted body of work and has situated my use of the combination of these methods within the existing literature on their uses. The combining of methods that is common within the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies as well as those that have been utilised in the revealing of hidden gay history has been integral to undertaking the research for this submitted body of work. This work has identified specific ‘gaps’ in these fields, particularly related to the dressed male body and identities, and use or lack therein of the importance of visual imagery, and as such utilised the above discussed methods to draw out the stories and propositions that contributed to scholarship. The following chapter will review and reflect upon the themes that have run through my submitted body of work, and that have been drawn out through the employment of the above-identified methods of research.
CHAPTER 4. REFLECTION AND REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEMES WITHIN THE SUBMITTED WORKS

This chapter will critically examine and reflect on the five major themes that I have explored within my submitted published works: sexuality; identities and dress; subcultural formations; men’s dress and masculinities; and clothes and the body. These subsections will each articulate how I have addressed these themes in my own writing and how these works have sat in relation to other works on these subjects to demonstrate how my work has furthered the development of these areas of study.

4.1. Sexuality

The work by historians and sociologists such as Jeffrey Weeks (1985, 1991a) and Alan Sinfield (1994, 1998) in the UK and George Chauncey (1995) in the United States dealt with the history of sexuality, and for my work this tied closely to the work that had redressed the balance of previously hidden histories. At the point at which my research began there was a clear interest in the gay lived experience and the fact that the research for Don We Now Our Gay Apparel (2000) initially stemmed from that undertaken for the Streetstyle exhibition (1994-5) meant that my research was grounded in subcultural investigations.

My initial research for Don We Now was situated within a tradition of lesbian and gay studies, that had been pioneered by scholars such as Karla Jay (1972) Jonathan Katz (1992[1976]), Weeks (1985, 1991a, 1991b) and Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus and George Chauncey (1991). The mid to late 1990s saw an increase in academic research and publications in lesbian and gay studies and the field was expanded to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender
studies, as discussed by sociologist Joshua Gamson (2000). Media arts theorist Mandy Merck has identified one of the differences between lesbian and gay studies and queer studies/theory as their academic sites of development, where the former were ‘pioneered in Anglo-American departments of history and social studies’ and the latter ‘driven by critical theorists in literature, visual culture and rhetoric’ (2005: 188-9). This reflects the two aspects of interest in my approach and methods: historical investigation, and the visual representation and textual descriptions of male dress and identity, discussed in the previous chapter.

My book chapter ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ (2008) specifically examined the ways in which certain groups of gay men explored their sexual identity through the adoption of hyper-masculine clothing signifiers and forming of subcultural groups, as discussed in Chapter One, broadening Don We Now concern with gay identity to explore broader relations to contemporary masculinities. Whilst offering an historic exploration of the ways in which gay men have managed and presented their head hair to articulate a particularly effeminate form of masculinity, the chapter ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ examined the comparative grooming practices of gay and straight men in a post-metrosexual world and in this way links to the analysis of presentations of the sexualised male body in underwear advertising in the final chapter of The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010).

Although queer theory had emerged in the early 1990s, the expansion of its application in research in the twenty-first century has had an impact upon the

---

44 By the fourth edition of the Handbook of Qualitative Research (Denzin and Lincoln 2011) in which this essay appeared it had been replaced by an essay entitled ‘Critical Humanism and Queer Theory: Postscript 2011: Living With the Tensions’ by sociologist Ken Plummer, who has written extensively on sexuality.

45 In both editions of his key work Masculinities (1995, 2005) R.W. Connell addresses the relationship between gay male sexuality and masculinities, and I acknowledge that while I have split them up for the purposes of this exploration of themes in my work, there is a very close relationship between the two areas. In this body of work I was particularly concerned with the ways in which gay men have articulated their sexual orientation and masculinity, to conform to or react against hegemonic masculinities (Connell 1995, 2005) and specifically gay approaches to the performance of masculinity or male femininity.
way in which sexuality and identity has been critically engaged with and debated in light of this theoretical standpoint. This has inevitably informed the ways in which my critical engagement with subject matter has developed, as previously noted.

4.2. Identities and Style-Fashion-Dress

As indicated in Chapter One my investigation into identities and dress began with *Don We Now* where the primary thesis was to investigate how gay men used particular clothing choices to make statements about their sexuality and identity. Barnard has noted that the construction and communication of identity through clothing choices is ‘absolutely central to a lot of work in fashion studies’ (2012: 412) and as such my interest positions me within, and aligns me to, that aspect of fashion studies. It is a marker of the development of my understanding of the breadth and complexity of the subject that I have moved from the use of the singular ‘identity’ in *Don We Now* to the plural in reflecting upon my work in this area. In the chapter ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’, for example, I examine how certain gay men affiliate themselves with specifically gay subcultural groups but that it is not only their sexual orientation but also their class, race and economic situation (Grossberg 1996, 2010) that impact upon their context-specific understandings of their identities. Kaiser (2012) explicitly points out the coming together of a variety of subjectivities and subject positions that create not one identity for an individual but a series of coexistent identities, ‘made up out of partial fragments’ that ‘can be seen as either historical or constitutive’ (Grossberg 1996: 91).

Of particular concern in my earliest work, I realise in retrospect, are the concepts explored by sociologist Fred Davis (1992): notions of ambiguity and ambivalence run through many of the dress choices that I examine in my body of work. These are supplemented by other sociological propositions around ideas of authenticity and artifice, initially undertaken by Richard Sennett in *The Fall of Public Man* (1977) and later expressly related to fashion by Entwistle.
(2000). In this body of work I was specifically concerned with these notions in relation to the ‘performance’ of masculinity and the negotiations around class undertaken by gay men. These considerations of social class also opened up discussions within my work on the place of imitation and differentiation (Simmel 1957). I have dealt with this specifically in examining how gay men have looked to, as well as undermined, hegemonic male fashions, exploring the ways in which they have striven to blend into the heterosexual mainstream and broader gay community, as well as to stand out and specifically present an individual gay or queer appearance.

Although traditional class based theories of fashion, particularly around the trickle down theory have been challenged by, amongst others Herbert Blumer (1969), Elizabeth Wilson (1985) and Ted Polhemus (1994), there was still an important element to be considered in the way in which gay men interpreted class based styles or negotiated their own class(less) identity through their dress choices, as has been outlined earlier in Chapters One and Two. Importantly in Don We Now and ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ I examined the authenticity of participants in working-class related ‘subcultures’ such as skinheads, bears and scallys and the ways in which gay men have been able to move between classes, particularly aided by their adoption of specific class identified garments.

In Chapter Two, I have already reflected upon my use of the term dress in relation to this body of work and how these terms are used more broadly by other scholars, but it is worth reiterating my reliance upon the term when discussing my approach to gay men and their clothing in my work. While I have touched on ‘fashion’, i.e. the place of clothing within a ‘fashion system’ (Barthes 1983, Vinken 2005, Kawamura 2005), this is an area that I have not given the fullest of attention to in relation to gay men. Indeed the role of gay men within the fashion industry, while often referenced or alluded to, has not been studied in any great depth.46 I was interested in how gay men were perceived to be

---

46 A notable exception being Ross Higgins 1998 work on gay men in the fashion industry in Montreal in the 1950s and 1960s. This area is also being explored in the
ahead of fashion or to set trends that were then copied by their heterosexual counterparts. ‘Fashion’ is a term that is much more relevant to, and utilised within, The Story of Men’s Underwear, where I critically engage with changing fashions in men’s undergarments through the social and technological developments that affected the design, manufacture and consumption of male undergarments and the place of these within men’s fashion more broadly.

The significance of my published work on gay male dress and identity, as well as that on men’s underwear, has also been noted by Valerie Steele, Director of The Museum at Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT) in New York in her invitation to contribute to the book which will accompany her ‘A Queer History of Fashion’ exhibition at FIT in autumn 2013: ‘Since your books – Don We Now Our Gay Apparel and the Underwear book – are so important, we’d be honored to have you contribute to our book’ (Steele to Cole 2012. See Appendix B).

In Don We Now I was particularly concerned with the engagement of ‘gay’ teenagers in traditional recognised subcultural groups. Drawing on sociologist Michael Brake’s comment that ‘Subcultural studies of youth never mention homosexuals’ (1985: 11) and journalist Murray Healy’s 1996 investigation into gay skinheads, I was particularly interested in the ways in which teenagers who were beginning to deal with, accept or deny their sexual orientation, did so through dress practices. Also of particular interest for me in relation to age was the ‘myth’ or idea that the majority of gay men were/are at great pains to hold onto their youth or present a youthful image despite their age. It is worth noting that there has been some investigation into the ‘myth’ that gay culture perpetuates a desire for an eternal youth (Signorile 1998, Harris 1999, Bergling 2004) and that in terms of behaviour and appearance gay men do not act or dress in an age appropriate fashion. Halberstam raises the issue of age, specifically in relation to the ways in which youth cultures have been seen as


47 The fact that Steele will be curating the first international exhibition on gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and queer (GLBTQ) fashion and style at a major museum and publishing an accompanying book demonstrates a renewed interest in the under-researched area of gay male style and dress.
‘stages on the way to adulthood’ (2003: 328) and invokes a notion of ‘queer time’ to situate queer subcultural participants outside of normative heterosexual temporality structured by reproduction, making queer subcultural participation a life-long commitment rather than a life stage (2005: 152-187). I examine these concerns in ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ and 'Hair And Male (Homo) Sexuality' (2008), particularly in relation to the muscle culture that became synonymous with the Western gay ‘scene’ from the early 1990s onwards and the emergence and development of the bear ‘subculture’.

4.3. Subcultures and Subcultural Formations

As noted in Chapters One and Two, my Streetstyle exhibition research report was the initial basis of the research that underpinned Don We Now. As such I grounded much of that initial research in the idea that gay male dress was subcultural -following definitions set by the CCCS researchers, particularly the premise that subcultures were a ‘compromise solution between two contradictory needs: the needs to create and express autonomy and difference from parents … and the need to maintain the parental institutions’ (Cohen 1997, 91) - in that certainly up until the late 1980s, gay men were, in certain aspects of their life, operating outside the main or dominant culture and that their dress was a means of setting them apart and making them identifiable through certain widely understood or more secretive dress indicators. I was also particularly interested in the ways in which gay men operated or negotiated their identities through engagement with recognised youth subcultures and in highlighting the formative role that gay men had played in the development of certain subcultures, such as New Romantics and Goths, even if there was no intention to make them into predominantly gay subcultures, and sexual orientation was arguably in some ways incidental. This interest has continued throughout this submitted body of work.

The published work that has examined subcultures and subcultural styles is broad and complex. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss all of these
works and the development of the study of subcultures, which is dealt with in works such as *The Subcultures Reader* (1997, 2005) and Ken Gelder’s *Subcultures: Cultural Histories and Social Practice* (2007). However, this section will examine my own engagement with subcultures and the acknowledged and recognised theoretical approaches that have been taken to describe, discuss and explain subcultural practice and style. In light of the above introductory setting out of the origins and starting point of my own published body of work the key questions that underpin my work in relation to the study of subcultures are: Where are the queers in subcultures?; Are gay men subcultural?; Are particular gay styles subcultural?

Gelder’s inclusion and discussion of historical gay and lesbian subcultures in both his 2007 *Subcultures* and the second edition of *The Subcultures Reader* (2005) clearly demonstrate an attempt to redress the former imbalance, that I identified in the introduction to *Don We Now* (2000) where gay men and lesbians were left out of studies of subcultures.48 Although I did pay attention to the adoption of subcultural identities by, and the place of, young gay men within subcultures, my propositions around the existence and identification of dress styles within gay subcultures were not solely predicated on the idea of youth involvement.49 My ongoing analysis of gay male subcultural practices in this submitted body of work, has identified how, within the context of non-heteronormative behaviours and identities, age does not necessarily form a conditional factor for ‘subcultural’ involvement, for example although bear culture, addressed in *Don We Now*, ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ (2008) and

---

48 This was also identified by Brake in specific relation to young people, and so furthering the association of the young with subcultures, that ‘young gay people are swamped by the heterosexism emphasis they find in peer groups and subcultures’ (1985:11).
49 Again Gelder (2007) is useful here in his articulation of the presence of, and writing about, historical subcultures that were not necessarily predicated on youth. It is also worth noting here that when the term youth subculture is discussed it most often refers to teenage years into the early twenties, and recently published work such as Bennett and Hodkinson’s *Ageing and youth culture: music, style and identity* (2012) question the age specifics of subcultural affiliations, how youth cultures develop when the participants age and the increasing presence of “post-youth cultural territ[ories]” (2012: 6). Jodie Taylor (2012) specifically addressed the idea of post-youth participants on the queer scene in Brisbane, Australia, drawing on queer theory and marking out the importance of ‘nonnormative’ and non-heteronormative aging and behaviour that she identifies in this queer scene.
'Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality' (2008), was originally predicated on the acceptance of the aging male body, subsequent subcategories have allowed for an engagement regardless of age.

Halberstam, has also raised issues of the 'queer' within subculture, noting '[q]ueer subcultures illustrate vividly the limits of subcultural theories that omit consideration of sexuality and sexual styles' and how queer subcultures are even less easily located in relation to 'so-called parent cultures' as they question the very definition of parent cultures and the relations to 'cultural expression' within and outside any cultures that could be identified as hegemonic and/or ‘parent’ (2003: 320). In relation to age and ‘subcultural’ or subgroup affiliation within gay culture, I have, particularly in Don We Now, analysed the ways in which gay men pass through certain stages, especially one of the display of overt femininity through behaviour and dress, as a means of establishing and articulating the gay/queer aspect of an individual’s identity. While it would be tempting here to talk about the establishing and articulating of identity, I bear in mind the work that has discussed how each individual is made up of a potential series of identities and that these are culturally, temporally and spatially manifested in different ways at different times, hence my use of ‘gay/queer aspect’. Similarly in relation to notions of age and the fact that initially work on subcultures focussed upon youth subcultures. In both Don We Now and ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’, I have examined aspects of gay dress and gay subcultural affiliation that has manifested in a pursuit of a youthful appearance, particularly that associated with gay muscle and circuit club cultures, drawing on the work of such authors as Daniel Harris (1999) and Michelangelo Signorile (1997).

One of the concepts that has underpinned my examination of how gay men have dealt with identity is that, whilst we could argue that we are post-, after, or beyond subculture (Muggleton 2000, Muggleton and Weinzierl, 2003, Bennett and Kahn-Harris, 2004, Huq, 2006), the fact that gay culture is now perceived as hegemonic in its own right - rather than being ‘subcultural’ as argued previously by the likes of Weeks (1991b) and Bray (1982) - has led particular
groups of gay men to create new masculinised ‘subcultures’, such as those I investigate in my ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ chapter, within and opposed to a more mainstream gay culture. This relates back to original observations (Hebdige 1979, Hall and Jefferson 1976) that defined subcultures in opposition to and against ‘mainstreams’ and to the way in which I have argued that gay men’s dress choices and creation of, and participation in, subcultural groups could be seen both as a marker of collective identity and resistance, reflecting Simmel’s ideas of fashion as a combination of differentiation and imitation (1957).

That the work of sociologist Michel Maffesoli (1996) has been influential in subcultural studies has perhaps most clearly manifested itself in his definition and use of the term ‘tribes’ and has been used in relation to predominantly gay groupings by participant observer commentators such as Geoff Mains (1984) and Peter Hennen (2008) in their work on Leathermen. Although I do not specifically use the term tribes, I do acknowledge how this term can be applied and utilised in relation to my work. Schofield and Schmidt (2005) created a tribal tree diagram of gay male styles in which the ‘tribal labels’ were derived from terms I used in Don We Now alongside terms used by their participant interviewees. They subsequently cite my work on subcultural formations to elaborate on community, shared tribal and individual identities that gay men express through dress.

In her review of Don We Now for the Journal of Material Culture (2002) social anthropologist Sophie Woodward observed that the ‘particular virtue of the book’ is that ‘Cole understands gay men in relation to and often overlapping with mainstream and other subcultures’ (2002:347). The blurring and

50 Peter Hennen also significantly investigates Bear and Radical Faerie tribes or subcultures, which reflect areas that I have investigated in relation to gay men and style. 51 Ross (2010) further utilised this interpretation of my work to define different gay audiences for her study of customization and websites, as well as specifically mentioning my exploration of the 1970s Clone subculture in Don We Now. That this chapter of Don We Now has been heavily used and cited in others works clearly provides evidence of the impact of the submitted body of work in the fields of fashion and cultural studies. See appendix A for list of citations of my published works in that of others.
breakdown of boundaries and distinctions between dominant mainstream cultures and subculture due to the ‘plurality of lifestyle sensibilities and preferences’ (Bennett and Khan-Harris 2004: 47) continued to be an area of interest in works included in this submission. The book chapters ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ and ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ both also began to address the notions that sexuality is less specified and demarcated in the twenty-first century than in the twentieth and explores crossover relationships and two-way influences in the post-metrosexual age. Along with Don We Now, these works situate gay male identity and dress and appearance choices within the contexts of (post)subcultural identities and heterosexual male hegemonic dress and identity.

One of the criticisms levied at traditional subcultural studies, particularly CCCS, by post-subcultural theorists rests around methods and methodology, particularly the ways in which CCCS relied upon semiotic readings that ‘neglect the meaning of the subculture for its participants’ (Longhurst et al 2008:237). New moves were to take a much more empirical approach that engages directly with subcultural participants to understand their involvement from their own perspective. It was my intention within my study of gay subcultural groupings and participation to incorporate the real lived experiences and perspectives of men involved within the identified groups, as previously discussed in Chapter Three. That the study of subcultures was an attempt to tell histories from below underpins how I have tried to redress balances of untold stories of gay male experience in relation to their dressed bodies to respond ‘to the way homosexuals have been elided from historical research’ (Gelder 2007: 20). This also connects to the relatively neglected study of men’s underwear.
4.4. Men’s Dress and Masculinities

This body of work has been primarily concerned with men and dress. As Breward has noted, until the early 1990s ‘historians interested in issues of manliness and their relationship to fashion seemed to be few and far between’ (2010: 301). Although, as Breward also notes, there has been a considerable change in this position with men’s fashion and male dress being explored by a range of scholars from a variety of disciplines, the subject is still in its adolescence and there is much work to be done to redress the imbalance between studies on male and those on female dress and fashion. The importance of the study of men’s fashion in the new millennium was marked by two readers on men’s fashion (Reilly and Cosbey 2008 and McNeil and Karaminas 2009), which cover a broad range of historical and contemporary approaches to the subject. The continued relevance of my research within this growing field is demonstrated by the reproduction of the chapter on the development of the gay clone from Don We Now in McNeil and Karaminas (2009) and a newly commissioned essay, ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag,’ in Reilly and Cosbey (2008).

As I argued in Don We Now, gay male dress has been marked by a vacillation between masculine and feminine and in his 2011 work Fashion in Focus, Edwards cites my research which he describes as a ‘detailed study of the diversity of “gay” styles’ (108), that discusses the association between masculinity and femininity in gay men’s dress. ‘Hair And Male (Homo) Sexuality’

---

52 Through exploring how notions about subcultural and mainstream identity, the relationship between music and dress and the negotiations of everyday dress choice could be presented in the context of a multicultural Britain in the Black British Style exhibition, I became aware of how my previous work, particularly Don We Now had focussed upon a white gay male experience. This was at the time partly due to a reluctance on the part of any non-white gay men to discuss their dress choices in relation to their sexual orientation for various cultural reasons, but is something that one section of ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ (2008) attempted to redress and that certainly deserves greater exploration, in the light of publications such as those by Reid-Pharr (2001) and McBride (2005).
(2008) also specifically examined the ways in which some gay men feminised their appearance through their hair. The subcultural post-queer revival of an overtly feminised or gender-fuck based appearance is worth exploring further, especially in light of the appearance of new ‘sensitive’ male ‘types’ such as the metrosexual, as these are all indicators of the ongoing complexity of discussions around masculinity, which Edwards (1997, 2006) has situated historically, culturally and sociologically. I continued my analysis and situating of the metrosexual in The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010) as the fluid boundaries of what constitutes late twentieth and twenty-first century masculinity can be explored through the consumption of underwear and its advertising.53

The Story of Men’s Underwear grew out of the very same imbalance between serious study of men’s and women’s clothing and fashion as discussed in Chapter One. In the later chapters of that book I return to my particular interests in masculinity and male sexuality and how these are negotiated through both the wearing and in the advertising of such garments.

4.5. Clothes and the Body

This body of work is also significant in one other area – the direct and close relationship between clothing and men’s bodies. While I have seemingly created a division between these ideas and those raised at the beginning of my earlier outline of dress and identities, the two are in fact closely linked. Indeed, Entwistle states, gender and sexuality are closely related to identity and the body and these need to be considered together producing an understanding of ‘situated bodily practice’ (2000: 5). As noted in Chapter One, gay men’s bodily management and relationship with their body, face and head hair and relation to perceived notions of masculinity addressed in ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’, was situated within Butler’s notions of gender performance and performativity (1990). Synnott’s theories of the oppositional nature of hair

53 Also, significantly two of the best-known manifestations of the metrosexual, footballers David Beckham and Freddie Ljungberg, have both appeared as underwear models and such images of each of them are analysed in The Story of Men’s Underwear.
(1993) were also relevant here and fitted with an overarching theme of investigation in my body of work on oppositional binaries that are apparent within dress, the body and identity. This exploration enabled me to articulate the ways in which men consciously and unconsciously conform or react against hegemonic masculinities (Connell 1995). I was then able to develop this further in *The Story of Men's Underwear* to situate the relationship between the clothed and semi-clothed male body and perceptions of maleness.

The investigation of men's undergarments in *The Story of Men's Underwear* is inevitably connected to the male body; they touch the body most intimately and provide a form of protection both to and from the body and while, unlike much of women's underwear, they have not traditionally been primarily about supporting the shape of outer clothes or manipulating the body shape, they have increasingly in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries been designed to offer a sense of body management seemingly reducing or enhancing elements of the male physique. In this respect male underwear is inextricably linked with ideas of eroticism and sexual attractiveness to the opposite and same sex.

The subject of advertising men's underwear was the focus of the last chapter of the book and as such draws on notions of representation of the body and investigates the negotiations around how to represent these intimate garments whose presentation fell into the interstice between the fully clothed man and the male nude, thus questioning what constitutes a clothed or dressed body (Entwistle 2000, Entwistle and Wilson 2001, Calefato 2004). The thematic arrangement of this final chapter of the book addressed specific locations or scenarios in which the male body was presented and the male types that were being presented: the statue, the sportsman, the 'rock' and the 'languid leaner' (Bordo 2000). For parts of this investigation my proposals were situated in light of discussions around the media construction of the new man in the 1980s (Edwards 1997, Mort 1996, Nixon 2003), the metrosexual and the increasing visibility of the male body, gay and straight, in both niche and mainstream
marketing and advertising: something that was also considered in the other three works in this submission but with a different emphasis.

My concern with the materiality of the ‘garment’ as well as men's relationship to their clothes was first explored in *Don We Now*, continued through ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ and was more fully expanded upon in *The Story of Men’s Underwear*. 54 I had dedicated a chapter of *Don We Now* to the ways in which gay men had made choices about their underwear and swimwear, and the semi-clothed gay male body was an underpinning presence in parts of the ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ and the ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ book chapters. 55 As noted above, *The Story of Men’s Underwear* engaged with the body but also addressed the design and manufacture of men's undergarments and the developmental changes from the middle ages to the present day. This previously underexplored subject was situated within the ever-growing field of work around masculinity and men’s fashion that had previously been the poor relation in terms of study and academic approaches. The increase in work on men's dress, identity and consumption by writers such as Breward (1999), Edwards (1997, 2006), Jobling (2005), Mort (1996) and Nixon (2003) also offered a tradition in which to situate my approach to my exploration of the clothed male body, dress and fashion and to push it forward into a more coherent situated investigation that manifested itself in this body of work, as well as the subsequent publications that I will discuss in the thesis' conclusion.

### 4.6 Conclusion

54 The staging of the *Black British Style* exhibition as well as the underpinning research had been concerned with the physicality of the body and its presence (or absence) and representation, a key concern within curation of fashion and dress exhibitions. The ‘identity’ of wearers was still a very real concern within *Black British Style* the collection and consideration of garments, as it had been for the *Streetstyle* exhibition (de la Haye and Dingwall 1996). This exploration while not part of this submission was key in my ongoing engagement with this concern.

55 This had also led to an investigation into the history of jockey shorts, published in *Encyclopedia of Clothing and Fashion* (Steele 2005).
This Chapter has outlined the five thematic investigations – sexuality, identities, subcultures, masculinities and the clothed body – which have been central to this body of work and has also served to tie the four individual pieces together as a cohesive investigation. While these themes have been addressed separately in this chapter there is a crossover between and within each of these themes and it is the way in which these themes have been woven through this submitted body of work that renders this work a significant and unified contribution to scholarship and new knowledge.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

This critically reflective review has provided an overview of the submitted body of work, and its constituent parts, and argued for its cohesiveness as a single body of work, its originality, importance and contribution to scholarship in the fields of fashion studies and cultural studies. Although each of the four individual submitted works had particular aims and objectives that were pertinent at the time of research and publication, as described in Chapter One, they are all connected through the overarching aims of this submission ‘Sexuality, Identity and the Clothed Male Body’. These aims were: to explore the influence of sexuality and masculinity of men's dress choices and managed appearance; to examine the presentation of the clothed male body in relation to male sexuality and; to analyse the developments of undergarments in relation to technical, cultural and social factors.

Thematically this body of work has explored male sexuality, specifically that of gay men, in the context of lesbian and gay studies, queer studies, fashion studies and cultural studies. As Chapter One outlined, Don We Now Our Gay Apparel (2000) was the first book to specifically and comprehensively deal with gay men and dress, filling a void in existing literature, as noted by McNeil (2004), Wilson (2001) Woodward (2002) and Taylor (2004). Its ongoing relevance and importance in the above mentioned fields and the impact it has exercised on other people's approach is evidenced by the scope of citations and references that are made in published works, outlined in Appendix A. The breadth of this impact is visible through the range of subjects addressed by these authors, from sexuality and gay history, through gendered manifestations of identity to contemporary consumption habits and practices. Similarly, The Story of Men’s Underwear (2010) was the first full and comprehensive history of men's underwear that, while drawing on the existing publications dealing with men's undergarments, brought together the design, manufacture, merchandising, representation and consumption of men's underwear in one volume, as discussed in more detail in the first chapter of this thesis.
Chapter One of this thesis provides a summary of the two book chapters which make up this body of work: ‘Butch Queens in Macho Drag’ and ‘Hair and Male (Homo) Sexuality’ both published in 2008. It also presented a case for the interrelationship of the four pieces of work and argued for their cohesiveness as one body of work, initially through the visible expressions and articulations through men’s fashion and dress choices and the managed appearance. It explains how the articulation of binary oppositions, and reactions and resistances to hegemonic impositions in male dress has run through the body of work, presenting a connecting thread. The body of work also significantly addresses areas of previously hidden history, initially that of gay men and their appearance, but also to the ‘invisibility’ of men’s underwear both in terms of the actual garment and the articulation of its history and cultural positioning in academic writing. Breward (2010) has noted the changes and growth in the study of men’s fashion and dress over the seventeen years in which he has been working on the subject. Indeed my own body of work has been a part of this increase in the number and variety of explorations into men’s ‘style-fashion-dress’ (Tulloch 2010). My ongoing engagement with research into gay men’s dress specifically addresses an area that was under researched and my parallel investigations and explorations into men’s underwear both as garments and through representation serve to broaden the published knowledge on these subjects.

Chapter Two serves to position this submitted body of work within the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies. As well as situating this body of work within the debates and development of each field it presents a case for the intersection and cross over between the two. How four major thematic concerns of cultural studies – power and politics of identity, masculinities, representation and queer theory and studies – have developed and been engaged with in this body of work forms a central part of this chapter. A further connecting element within the body of work is my use of research methods and this is explored in Chapter Three. Here I make a case for my combining of methods, specifically the recording and use of oral history testimonies and other
recorded lived experiences and analyses of textual and visual sources. Within this chapter I also consider my interdisciplinary approach and tie this into discussions around the value and place of interdisciplinarity in both the fields of cultural studies and fashion studies.

Thematically, this body of work has explored male sexuality, specifically in parts that of gay men. Connected directly to sexuality, both broadly and specifically in this body of work, are explorations of identities and dress and masculinities. Cultural studies has offered up contextual explorations of each of these areas of investigation that have underpinned my research, but in purposely connecting them within my work I have offered a new and valuable approach to these areas and their position within cultural studies. That my work also contributes to these areas in fashion studies is clearly evidenced in Kaiser’s (2012) discussion of my work. Here she uses Don We Now as a key source for, and example of, discourses linking fashion and dress to male homosexuality and how sexual orientation operates as a subject position in style-fashion-dress choices. My engagement in the field of cultural studies is also significantly marked by my recent appointment as Associate Editor of the new journal *Fashion, Style and Popular Culture* where I was specifically invited for my British and European perspectives, my curatorial background and the specific areas of knowledge that are outlined in and covered by this body of work.

An analysis of my explorations of sexuality in this body of work forms the first part of Chapter Four of this thesis, which presents the five major themes that run through the body of work. In terms of situating and arguing the importance of my own research and writing within this field and the acknowledgement of my contribution to knowledge within this field, it is worth highlighting that I was commissioned to write new essays for *Men’s Fashion Reader* (2008), which is included in this body of work, the new third edition of *Meanings of Dress* (2012), entitled ‘Queers and Mods: Social and Sartorial Interaction in London’s Carnaby Street’, and the Western Europe volume of the *Berg Encyclopedia of World Dress and Fashion* (2010).
While the relationship between sexuality and racial and ethnic identities is touched upon in this body of work, is an area that my future work on gay men's dress would specifically address. Perhaps one of the failings of *Don We Now* was its concentration on white gay men. The Western, and especially Anglo-American focus of my published work has been predicated by access to primary sources, such as interviewees, and English and American archives, magazines, novels and diaries. In future work this is an imbalance that I would consider attempting to redress, after careful consideration of availability of primary sources.

My explorations of fashion, as opposed to dress, has subsequently been linked to an ongoing engagement, initiated in *Don We Now*, with teenage gay sexuality in the peer reviewed journal article 'Television's Fashion Gay Teens: Justin Suarez and Kurt Hummel' (2012). In this essay I explore how a keen knowledge of the fashion industry and wearing high fashion designer men's clothing is used as a means of initially identifying the two teenage television series characters as gay and subsequently as a tool for negotiating the complexities of teenage gay male identity in the twenty-first century.

Although subcultural studies has been a key component of cultural studies and has recently been marked by a critique of early studies and the emergence of post-subculture studies, my body of work has made a contribution to this debate. Tied to this area of investigation and indeed pervading my work on gay men's dress was a concern with the spatial locations in which gay men moved and the ways in which dress was worn in both private and public spaces. In *Don We Now* and 'Butch Queens in Macho Drag', I specifically addressed the nightclub as a safe private space that allowed for subcultural expressions of style. These explorations and specifically the chapter 'Express Yourself' in *Don We Now* that dealt with clubbing in the 1980s led to my being commissioned to

---

56 This is particularly important in the light of works such as Robert F. Reid-Pharr’s *Black Gay Man* (2001), Patrick Johnson and Mae Henderson’s *Black Queer Studies: a Critical Anthology* (2005) and *Why I Hate Abercrombie and Fitch* (2005) by Dwight A. McBride, as well as work that has addressed African diasporic fashion and black masculinities such as that by Van Dyk Lewis (1996, 2003) and Monica L. Miller’s *Slaves to Fashion: Black Dandyism and the Styling of Black Diasporic Identity* (2009).
write an essay on the interrelationship between fashion and nightclubs in London in the 1980s for the catalogue of the V&A exhibition ‘Club to Catwalk: London Fashion in the 1980s’ (2013) and to act as a special advisor on the club section of the exhibition. While this essay did not specifically address gay clubs, the fluid and embracing nature of London’s nightlife did mean that this constituted a significant place in this essay. Nightclubs also feature as sites for dressed expressions of sexuality in my ‘Queerly Visible: Gay Men’s Dress and Style 1960 – 2012’ essay commissioned for the catalogue of the exhibition ‘A Queer History of Fashion’ exhibition at FIT in autumn 2013.

As stated above and in Chapter Four, men’s dress has been the poor relation to women’s fashion in terms of research and publications, but my body of work has contributed to these adjacent and interconnected areas of men’s dress and masculinities and clothes and the body, as identified by Edwards (2011), Taylor (2002), and Wilson (2001). The Story of Men’s Underwear is most obviously explicit in discussing this close physical relationship between corporeality and garments and makes a very direct link between this section of the thesis and my analyses of imagery, discussed in Chapter Two. My research into men’s underwear advertising that began in The Story of Men’s Underwear has continued and my forthcoming book chapter entitled ‘Men’s Underwear Advertising’ that examines notions of comfort in the presentation of the underwear clad male body in advertisements in the 1940s and 1950s will be published in the edited volume Fashion Media: Past and Present, for which I am also co-editor. In this essay I am particularly interested in the relationship between the images of the clothed or absent body in the images and the language used in the text of underwear advertisements from the mid 1930s to the late 1950s. Considering how I might continue to develop my research in men’s underwear there is, I believe, a research project that would more fully utilise museum collections to create a list of extant men’s undergarments, building upon the research undertaken by and updating the lists created by Cunnington (1951), thus exploring in more depth the particular construction techniques and design of men’s undergarments.
That *The Story of Men’s Underwear* was published in French and German as well as in English means that its value as contribution to new knowledge is extended beyond the English-speaking world. As a mark of the importance of my contribution to scholarship on men’s underwear I was invited to contribute an essay on new styles of underwear and notions of virility to the catalogue of the *La Mécanique des Dessous* exhibition opening at Les Arts Decoratifs museum in Paris on 5 July 2013.\(^{57}\) A further marker of my contribution to knowledge on men’s underwear has been marked by the invitation to be guest editor of an underwear themed special edition for the second issue of the journal *Critical Studies in Men’s Fashion* \(^{58}\) that will be published in 2014.

Since the publication of my groundbreaking book *Don We Now* there have been a number of new investigations into gay men’s dress, in academic journals or as sections of books, that have addressed shopping and consumption habits, hyper-masculinity, and effeminacy and cross dressing, all of which have cited my own contributions to these areas. The forthcoming book *Queer Style* by Geczy and Karaminas, mentioned in Chapter One, further opens up explorations of gay male dress and contributes to the area of subcultural study and queer dress and appearance. While their book does deal with a broad range of historical and theoretical issues that explore the breadth of what could be termed queer and gay style and situates this within a subcultural framework, my own work is heavily cited, particularly in the chapter that deals with late twentieth century gay men’s dress.

The major event in the public dissemination of gay male style is the forthcoming *A Queer History of Fashion* exhibition at FIT in New York in September 2013. As an acknowledgement of my exiting contribution to the subject I was invited to sit on the advisory panel for the exhibition and to write an essay, as previously noted in Chapter Four. This essay continued my explorations of the conversation between expressions of masculinity and femininity in gay men’s

\(^{57}\) I was also interviewed as an expert on men’s underwear for BBC’s *One Show* in 2010 for the online magazine *collectorsweekly.com* and Barcelona’s leading newspaper *La Vanguardia* in 2013

\(^{58}\) I am on the editorial board for *Critical Studies in Men’s Fashion*. 
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dress and, utilising fourteen new interviews with American and British gay men, explored the ways in which gay men negotiated their clothed appearance and the gay or queer aspects of their identities in the twenty-first century. While this essay looked at personal choice in fashion-style-dress of gay men, my work on visual representation will also continue, as I have been commissioned to write an essay for a special themed issue of *Fashion Theory* that will look at pornography and fashion. For this I will be examining the use of clothing in the films of the American gay porn film studio Colt and relating this to expressions of masculinity amongst gay men in the 1970s and early 1980s, thus further developing this ongoing theme in my work.

The body of work that comprises 'Sexuality, Identity and the Clothed Male Body' has articulated the complex negotiations between men, their bodies, the subject positions that make up identities, and clothing. In bringing together these areas of exploration, and by situating them within, and at the intersection of, the fields of fashion studies and cultural studies, I have hopefully been able to make a significant contribution to new knowledge. The combination of explorations of garments and their mode of consumption, along with the examination of the multiple articulations of sexualised gendered identity, has allowed me to present a fresh perspective on what Breward (2000) described as ‘social identity [that] is entirely contingent on historical circumstances’ with ‘varied characteristics [that] work both at the level of representation and through the physical trappings of material culture’ (2000: 371). I look forward to pursuing this idea further in future.
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Appendix B: Email from Valerie Steele

Queer Style exhibition at FIT & book
VALERIE STEELE [VALERIE_STEELE@exchange.fitnyc.edu]
You forwarded this message on 08/03/2012 11:48.

Sent: 22 February 2012 20:18
To: Shaun Cola
Cc: FRED DENNIS [FRED_DENNIS@exchange.fitnyc.edu]; VANESSA VASQUEZ [VANESSA_VASQUEZ@exchange.fitnyc.edu]; TANYA MELENDEZ [TANYA_MELENDEZ@exchange.fitnyc.edu]; PATRICIA MEARS [PATRICIA_MEARS@exchange.fitnyc.edu]
Attachments: [Queer Style proposal.doc (13 KB)] (Open as Web page)

Dear Shaun,

Fred Dennis and I are co-curating an exhibition, Queer Style, which will open at The Museum at FIT in September 2013. See attached for a brief description.

We are also co-editing a book to accompany the exhibition, and wonder if you would be willing and able to contribute an essay. Sadly, we don't anticipate being able to pay for the essay — or no more than $500 — but we'd hope to pay speakers a $500 honorarium plus flight and hotel to come and talk at our 2013 symposium in NYC.

Since your books — Don We Now Our Gay Apparel and the Underwear book — are so important, we'd be honored to have you contribute your book, Queer Style. We'd need text by January 2013.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

best,

Valerie

Director and Chief Curator
The Museum at FIT
212 217 4533

http://www.fitnyc.edu/museum