

Queer Fashion Practice and the Camp Tactics of Charles Jeffrey LOVERBOY

Fenella Hitchcock, Independent Scholar

Jay McCauley Bowstead, London College of Fashion UAL

Abstract

This paper focuses on the collections of London based Scottish designer Charles Jeffrey who has won plaudits for his spectacular, subversive, theatrical, and highly camp catwalk shows. His label LOVERBOY – having grown out of an East London club-night of the same name – brings together eclectic historical references, with the stylistic bricolage of the queer scene from which it emerged.

Using a combination of image analysis and ethnographic interviews with the designer himself, this paper investigates how Jeffrey has blurred the boundaries between nightclub and runway, collective and named designer to formulate a distinctly queer mode of fashion practice. In this way, the utopic possibilities of the nightclub; the heightened emotion of the dance floor; and the embodied, affective, temporal qualities of queer sociality are transposed onto the catwalk.

Camp aesthetics and queer nightlife have played a crucial role in the history of fashion – perhaps most notably during the 1980s when designers like Bodymap, Jean Paul Gaultier, and Stephen Linard drew extensively on queer signifiers. However, the contemporary success of LOVERBOY marks a shift in contemporary cultures of gender as discourses of queerness and performativity reach a new point of amplification. After the seriousness, refinement and minimalism of millennial fashion, the liminality, polysemy, and exuberance of camp has again reasserted its transgressive potential.

Keywords

Expanded fashion practice, queer fashion practice, camp, subculture, nightlife, dancefloor.

Introduction

In recent years, a variety of new designers and labels – including Hood By Air, Gypsy Sport, ART SCHOOL and Charles Jeffrey LOVERBOY – have emerged out of the tungsten twilight of clubland and into the full glare of the media spotlight. Despite a degree of geographical separateness, these up-start fashion houses share core aspects of their methodology and philosophy: namely, a strong connection to nightlife, subculture, and the dressed-up, bricolage aesthetics of the club, along with the tendency to use of non-professional models (often friends and collaborators) with a variety of body shapes and gender identities. It is beyond the scope of this article to explore all of these brands in detail, but by investigating our case study – the Scottish, London-based designer

Charles Jeffrey and his label LOVERBOY – we hope to shed light on what we characterise as ‘queer fashion practice’ more generally.

In the context of fashion media, the rather vague umbrella term ‘queer fashion’ has come to refer to a set of aesthetic practices that unsettle expectations of gender, sexuality and the body¹. Existing scholarship on queer fashion, style and dress has a tendency to focus on clothing and bodily styling as a means of concealing or revealing sexual identity and as a site of contestation of hegemonic gender norms (Steele 2013; Geczy and Karaminas 2013). Important and valid though this work is, we hope to expand this view to encompass a more practice-oriented account. Through a focus on Jeffrey’s work and the conditions under which it is produced and shared, we explore queerness as expressed not only through style but also in relation to social and historical factors. How might these contribute to critical interventions in contemporary fashion?

Focusing on the early collections of Charles Jeffrey for his label LOVERBOY, we combine a personal interview with the designer, and analysis of specific works to investigate how his practice blurs the boundaries between club and catwalk, collective and named designer, menswear and womenswear in order to formulate a camp style. In doing so, we aim to bring together ideas surrounding art and design practice with a particular experience of LGBTQ+ social space. In this way we consider how camp engenders, in Richard Dyer’s words, “identity and togetherness, fun and wit, self-protection and thorns in the flesh of straight society,” (1992: 136).

Queer Fashion Praxis and Camp

To understand the significance of LOVERBOY as a creative endeavour, it is helpful to refer to what curator and writer Caroline Stevenson and designer and researcher Ruby Hoette (2019) have termed “expanded fashion practice”. Alternative ways of producing and practicing fashion that point towards new possibilities outside of the conventional hierarchical structures of the industry, or as they describe:

“emergent practices that propose alternate value systems and thus different ways of thinking, doing and being fashion. These are... experimental methods, curiosity and criticality that have the ability to interrogate the social, cultural, political and environmental impacts of fashion.” (Stevenson and Hoette, 2018).

The collaborative, postproduction mash-up style that LOVERBOY adopts (with its roots in the queer sociality of the dancefloor, collective structure and the expanded view of gender) can all, therefore, be characterised as a form of expanded practice or, in our words, queer fashion practice. This way of producing fashion is one that draws upon earlier forms of clubbing culture and political agitation, while simultaneously

¹ The term is usually used in reference to young or youth-oriented brands and as an allusion to the sexual and/or gender identity of the designer at the helm of the label

making use of the contemporary digital context. Integral to these queer ways of doing fashion – and specifically our case study LOVERBOY – is camp. As an ethic, aesthetic and sensibility, camp’s emphasis on ostentation and theatricality, foregrounds the performative nature of identity while gesturing to the liberating nature of queer sociality. It is therefore crucial to making sense of Jeffrey’s practice, and to situating it within a lineage of LGBTQ+ cultural expression.

In *Culture Clash: The Making of a Gay Sensibility* (1984), Michael Bronski describes how a queer aesthetic and worldview emerged over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As he argues, this sensibility existed both as a space of imagination and fantasy – through which an aggressively patriarchal and heterosexist society could be escaped – and simultaneously as a mode of political reasoning through which same sex attraction could be reconceptualised as a virtue rather than as a sin or pathology. An emphasis on sentiment, profound feeling and a refuge in art, theatre and literature provided lesbians, gay men and other queer people with a way of reimagining the world as a less hostile place. As Bronski (1984: 41-2) suggests:

“The difference between power and value is important. Because gay sensibility was an expression of powerless people, its creators tried to find new ways to present and understand the culture in which they lived, making it represent and respond to their lives. Refusing to accept the world as it is, gay sensibility has often imagined it as it could be. This visionary tradition has become known, through a host of manifestations, as “camp”.”

This definition of camp connects to Susan Sontag’s essay *Notes on Camp* (1964) of twenty years earlier in which she discusses camp in terms of theatricality, imagination, an emphasis on style and a celebration of artifice. Sontag (1964) also draws attention to the way in which a camp sensibility encompasses a rejection of traditional hierarchies of taste and structures of gender through a love of things being slightly ‘off’ and a tendency towards androgyny. She states:

“Camp sees everything in quotation marks. It’s not a lamp, but a ‘lamp’; not a woman, but a ‘woman.’ To perceive Camp in objects and persons is to understand being-as-playing-a-role. It is the farthest extension, in sensibility, of the metaphor of life as theatre,” (Sontag 1964: 280).

But while Sontag’s seminal essay conceptualised of this sensibility as apolitical, more recent discussions of camp such as Moe Meyer’s *Politics and Poetics of Camp* (1994) and Katrin Horn’s *Women, Camp and Popular Culture* (2017) have argued for this queered way of seeing the world as a crucial mode of resistance. By the early 1990s, the dramaturgic nature of camp, which has seemed to Sontag to divorce it from politics, was instead alive with radical possibility. Under the influence of Judith Butler’s (1990) theory of gender performativity and in the context of queer activism appearing in response to the AIDS crisis, camp came to be seen as a crucial political strategy. Seen

in a post-structuralist light, camp's tendency to "[see] everything in quotation marks" (Sontag 1964: 280) can be construed as an early form of anti-essentialist practice. In this sense, camp functions as a set of queer signifying practices that overturn common sense meanings and that mark out subaltern identity and these qualities have rendered the sensibility implicitly political from the very outset.

LOVERBOY as both label and club night is, of course, operating in a very different legal, ethical, religious and economic context to these earlier historical moments. However, it is possible to draw connections between such proto-camp cultures and contemporary queer practice, particularly in the collapsing together of high and low culture, and in the cosmopolitan, omnivorous cultural references common to both.

Reflecting upon Charles Jeffrey's work, the fashion historian Shaun Cole linked it to an explicitly political moment of gender transgression in the 1970s noting that:

"whilst the gender play club costumes and fashion designs of Jeffrey... are not as overtly political as the genderfuck strategies adopted by the radical drag queens of the 1970s, they still contribute to a personal and political consideration of queer sartorial choices" (2017: 168).

But perhaps one of the clearest connections that characterises LOVERBOY as belonging within a queer, camp tradition is found in its origins amongst the tawdry glamour, sticky floors and neon lights of clubland. Camp's affinity with theatre, the decorative arts and with nightlife lies in the possibilities that these forms of creative and social practice provide for the creation of autonomous worlds, worlds that operate according to their own logics and that invert or reject dominant value systems. Queer club nights – particularly those which emphasise dressing up, flamboyance and playing with binary gender categories – are sites of alchemical transformation. Here, the shy, unpopular, odd-looking (or just plain weird) can potentially reinvent themselves anew, becoming spectacular, daring, gorgeous and desirable. The excitement, pleasure and perhaps also sublimated emotional pain that Jeffrey poured into this night can be discerned in an interview that we conducted with the designer where he stated:

"It would be so stressful at times when we were trying to get things together and to outdo ourselves, but it was so fab, looking back. It was just so juicy and poignant... There would be some nights where I would cry. The music would be right, the set would be at a certain level of destruction and it would be such a *moment*," (Jeffrey 2018).

The Origin of LOVERBOY

Jeffrey came to the attention of the British fashion press on graduating from the Central Saint Martin's MA Fashion course in 2015. In the years since, he has won plaudits for his spectacular, subversive and theatrical collections and amassed an array of industry accolades, most notably Emerging Menswear Designer of the Year at the 2016 British Fashion Awards. The first LOVERBOY *club night*, however, was held some years

earlier in August 2014 at the East London queer arts community venue, VfD². Early on in his career, Jeffrey received much praise from fashion journalists who claimed that he had resuscitated the relationship between fashion and London nightlife (Allwood 2015, Gonsalves 2016; Flynn 2017). While it would be inaccurate to give Jeffrey sole credit for re-asserting the importance of the relationship between fashion and the dance floor, the excitement that surrounded the brand (and, by association, contemporary queer club culture and its contributions to fashion) is entirely understandable. Jeffrey's night emerged out of a period of frequent LGBTQ+ venue closures in London (Campkin and Marshall 2017) and during an uncertain time in the UK economy. It therefore represented a powerful manifestation of resistance and proof positive that creative endeavour on a shoe-string was still possible, against the odds. And there was also alignment between LOVERBOY's origin story and existing, romanticised narratives of art school creativity and the role of nightlife in creative practice.

LOVERBOY was conceived in part as a way of funding Jeffrey's postgraduate studies but also, more simply, as a way of having fun and socialising. Born out of frustration with a more homonormative and 'masc' gay clubbing experience on offer – which did not present opportunities for feminised, flamboyant modes of self-display – the night was also inspired by Jeffrey's experiences of the last gasp of the club night *Ponystep* and an earlier interest in nu-rave, designers such as Gareth Pugh and the *!WOWOW! Collective*³. These types of clubbing experiences were and are complex in their blurring of the professional and personal. On the one hand, they provide spaces in which clubbers can “express themselves and feel an affiliation with others, forging and reforging their self and group identities,” (Malbon 1998: 266). On the other, they are integral sites of networking, self-promotion and the trialling of ideas, particularly for fashion. Historian Shaun Cole (2013) and writer Kasia Maciejowska (2016) both emphasise how London-based designers have frequently blurred the distinction between club and catwalk and used the dancefloor as a site for testing and displaying their work.

Angela McRobbie (1989, 1994, 1998) has described how, in the latter half of the twentieth century, subcultural participation became a form of unofficial training for careers in the creative industries and the experimental nature of youth culture in British art schools, clubs and retail spaces has now gone on to influence major trends within the fashion industry at large. Significantly, many of the clubbers who attended LOVERBOY were, like Jeffrey, students of art and design. McRobbie (2016) has also highlighted how clubbing and its related networking practices are understood by

² Formerly known as *Vogue Fabrics*.

³ There are also clear connections between LOVERBOY and 80s club cultures such as *Blitz Kids*, but though these continuities are in retrospect obvious, they were not at the forefront of Jeffrey's mind when the club night was first conceived of.

university tutors as an essential part of creative work (as opposed to a separate form of promotion). She argues that:

“the new relation between art and economics marks a break with past anti-commercial notions of being creative. Instead, young people have exploited opportunities around them, in particular, their facilities with new media technology and the experience of ‘club culture sociality’ with its attendant skills of networking and selling the self and have created for themselves new ways of earning a living in the cultural field,” (McRobbie 2016: 22).

Despite the organic and serendipitous emergence of LOVERBOY as a clubnight, the above is certainly true of Jeffrey. The now established connections between his work in fashion and nightlife were initially occurred by chance:

“I was literally just throwing a party, my only intention was to be creative... The worlds of fashion and clubbing were never meant to collide. It’s just something that I did on the side,” (Jeffrey 2018).

But the club night enriched Jeffrey’s creative practice to a significant degree, as it allowed him to produce a body of work in a spontaneous manner, something which would have been impossible under the conditions of fashion education (Jeffrey 2018). So in addition to generating income and enabling a group of like-minded clubbers to come together, LOVERBOY also allowed Jeffrey to work through ideas in an informal environment, and in an immediate, experimental manner which directly informed his work as a designer.

The Contribution of Others

In LOVERBOY’s Spring/Summer 2017 menswear collection, the catwalk was dusted with sand and strewn with vibrant blooms by anonymous assistants. Proceeding down the catwalk to an orchestral score, models appeared in grey handkerchief skirts; corset-laced shirts; work boots; leg of mutton sleeves; and wasp-waist peplum jackets that alluded to Christian Dior’s 1947 New Look. So arrayed, in kabuki-white maquillage they stomped, minced and sashayed. As the tempo sped up, a model in nineties platform trainers and legging-like spats swaggered along the runway. A spiked chain choker, a laddered Bretton knit, and plaid boxer shorts embellished with ring-pulls, artificial pearls and satin ribbon completed an ensemble that spoke simultaneously of glamour and aggression. The resultant dragged up, genderqueer spectacle was profoundly queer and camp, and spoke directly to the looks one would find on LOVERBOY’s dancefloor.

For Jeffrey, the club also functioned as a mode of primary research and his garments and styling work continue to draw upon a visual lexicon developed with a core group of revellers, co-conspirators who also assisted with the production and promotion of various outputs including garment, accessories, sets and props. The complex intertwining of the personal and professional, and interwoven lines of aesthetic

exchange, are exemplified in Jeffrey's collaborations with artist Jenkin van Zyl. Van Zyl was a regular attendee of LOVERBOY and appears in many documentary images, both in early promotional campaigns for the night and latterly as a model in catwalk presentations. He also produced a promotional film for Jeffrey's Spring/Summer 2019 collection *Emergence*, comprising of an immediate, collaged, cod-naive aesthetic; abject bodies and absurdist pronouncements that made references to the rules of entry to a nightclub. Intriguingly, the first of these rules declared that "LOVERBOY never was and never will be a nightclub" suggesting that the name encompassed a more amorphous creative grouping or happening. In our interview with the designer, Jeffrey commented on the fluid, mercurial nature of LOVERBOY and in a sense, one might consider the name to be a unifying label for all of Jeffrey's work, both within the field of fashion and within other adjacent disciplines (for instance, his solo exhibition *The Come Up* at London's NOW Gallery in 2017).

In his description of the famous Paris discotheque *Le Palace*, Roland Barthes described the venue as existing "not as a simple enterprise but as a work" in which "those who have conceived it may regard themselves with good reason as artists," (1992: 48). We might, therefore, consider LOVERBOY in all its various forms and mutations as a unified artistic work – a *gesamtkunstwerk*. After all, the nightclub is always a collective endeavour, a performed event that exists only when it is populated, danced in, and animated by music. Similarly fashion, particularly the sort favoured and practiced by Jeffrey, is performative and embodied, a fact reflected in the ways that LOVERBOY catwalks function as dramatic 'happenings' rather than simple parades of garments. As Varvara Stepanova might say "the clothing of today must be seen in action" (Stepanova 1923 in Bartlett 2019).

Figure 1: Gareth Wrighton, Jenkin van Zyl in LOVERBOY #8 Campaign, 2015. Photograph. London. Courtesy of Charles Jeffrey.

Van Zyl's flamboyant ensembles recall some of the early looks created by 1980s club figures and artists Leigh Bowery and Trojan, yet his look is also very much his own – less abstract in silhouette than his forebears and also somehow more eclectic. Synthesising various anomalous elements - the brocade and velvet of theatrical costume, golden lycra, platform shoes, latex and costume jewellery – the outfits he wears produce a strange, otherworldly allure that is part amateur dramatics, part fetish club, part alien invasion and part Vaslav Nijinsky in *L'apres Midi d'une Faune*. It is a look that revels in its constructedness, theatricality and epicinity, simultaneously exquisite, disturbing, and slightly 'off' - in a word, camp.

Jeffrey identified van Zyl's oeuvre as a "massive inspiration for what we do, and a sort of catalyst for some of the historic referencing that we have in the show" (Jeffrey 2018). And aspects of van Zyl's approach to dress, for example his fondness for Tudor doublets and Elizabethan ruffs, have found their way into LOVERBOY's collections. These references are then transformed when processed through the expressive, post-

impressionist sensibility of Jeffrey, his love of mark-making that manifests itself in hand-painted fabrics, freely drawn calligraphic make-up and intarsia knit reminiscent of Henri Matisse. For example, for the Autumn 2018/19 collection, a series of elegant, pared-back tailored pieces gestured to a sixteenth century silhouette, including the opening look – black wide hemmed shorts, with a beautifully cut, matching waist-length jacket rounded at the shoulder. Later, a whimsical shearling flight jacket, cut to resemble a mid-renaissance jerkin appeared. These historical elements were joined with writhing dancers in dirty body stockings, huge papier-mache costumes and a model – like some sort of pagan reveller – painted black and with an enormous headdress masking his face.

Many of van Zyl's ensembles are assembled from pieces purchased at sales of theatrical costume and immediate connections to childhood games of dress up are of course pertinent to the ludic approach both practitioners adopt. But Jeffrey also points out that the culture surrounding costume, unlike 'fashion proper' encourages a relaxed, creative method to putting together an outfit or look: "there's something about taking those clothes and applying your imagination," (Jeffrey 2018). Van Zyl's sensibility for dress in the context of LOVERBOY's twilight gatherings also speaks of the tensions between fashion and costume found in nightlife (in his case, one that reaches into his everyday dress). In this sense, everything worn to a club is a costume of sorts. Membership of the nocturnal demi monde is always, to some extent, about assuming a different persona and through this an expression of desire, fantasy, play and becoming.

Collaboration and Post-Production

As well as studying specific garments from paintings or artefacts held in archival collections, Jeffrey also uses existing pieces to resolve and rework ideas in an instinctive, immediate and collaborative manner, using work from previous seasons as well as 'scrap' fabric and materials. Both in his preparatory work and final pieces there is a tendency to celebrate what others may write off as waste or 'rubbish'. This inversion of conventional systems of valuation is common not only to subcultures but also to a certain queer sensibility and to camp.

Producing outfits with support from his core team, these looks are then documented and often published online following the eventual release of the collection. Traditionally, fashion brands have had an aversion to exposing the means of production, especially the creative process, instead choosing to veil design practice in the mystique of the lone genius. Jeffrey is unusual both in the way that he draws attention to the iterative methods through which his collections are built and also in his acknowledgement and emphasis of design as a collaborative process and effort. Jeffrey's practice reflects an awareness of his own alleged "shortcomings" in terms of production and, more importantly, indicates his ability to find creative solutions by "styling, the body and bringing in people who I'm really inspired by" (Jeffrey 2018). While the brand does use

Jeffrey's name, LOVERBOY is also a helpful way of referring to the broader network of clubbers, pattern cutters, models and perhaps even the consumer who share the brand and contribute to it in a variety of ways, thus making the collaborative nature and origins of the work explicit.

LOVERBOY is perhaps also a way of understanding fashion that has been facilitated through the visual culture of social networking and image sharing platforms such as Instagram and Tumblr through which historically incongruous and divergent references (nevertheless somehow connected at a level of sensibility) are shared and integrated. This serendipitous, recycled, collaborative methods, draw attention to techniques of bricolage and upcycling as pragmatic approaches to limited resources. Given Jeffrey's close connection to the club and discotheque it is apt that the combination and re-combination of anomalous elements in his work resemble the spontaneity of the disk jockey. Indeed, the theorist Nicolas Bourriaud (2002) has described the dominant mode of aesthetic production of late modernity as that of 'post-production', that is, the re-combination of pre-existing elements common to digital art and music. This tendency towards allusion and reference in contemporary art and design, Bourriaud suggests, responds to ways of creating cultural products and the increasing saturation of visual culture. In this way, Jeffrey operates like the DJ or programmer, who reuses existing lines of code and sample tracks to craft something new. Clearly this tendency towards postproduction is not entirely without precedent - Dadist artists favoured collage, Cubists incorporated *objets trouvés* into their artworks and in the late 1970s the notion of bricolage developed by Claude Levi Strauss was itself repurposed by Dick Hebdidge (1979).

Perhaps then, the significance of these collaged, multifarious camp catwalk aesthetics such as that described above lies in the way that they speak to the mainstreaming of a set of camp, drag-inflected representational strategies that have become much more accessible and widely diffused in the context of digital culture and, relatedly, as popular discourses surrounding gender have undergone a set of profound shifts. It is interesting to note that (despite including women and non-binary people in his shows) Jeffrey's first collections post-MA, from 2016 onwards, were supported by the menswear incubator MAN. His work of this time, therefore, speaks to a particular moment in men's fashion, a period in which the innovations from the turn of the millennium and early 2000s – pioneered by designers like Hedi Slimane and Raf Simons – were being developed in more radically androgynous directions by a new crop of practitioners including Grace Wales Bonner and Jonathon Anderson.

Conclusion

In drawing attention to critical practices and to fashion in the expanded field, scholars such as Stevenson and Hoette, have underlined the potential for fashion to sit outside the conventional structures and hierarchies of the industry. Of course, all practitioners, Charles Jeffrey included, are obliged to create an economy for their practice: a fact that sometimes leads to tensions between commercial realities and expressive intentions.

In this article, we have sought to illustrate the ways in which LOVERBOY (in common with a number of contemporary labels and design collectives) has emerged from a queer scene with strong links to nightlife: the sociality and shared experience of the dance floor remaining visible in the collaborative, fluid design methodologies that Jeffrey adopts. In this way, the connections between fashion and clubbing as social practices strongly implicated in community, communication, recognition, pleasure, imagination and the body become clear. Nightclubs are essentially commercial spaces – reliant upon the sale of drink and entrance fees to sustain their existence – but the communal, social, and expressive significance of such spaces, far outweighs their commercial function. LOVERBOY demonstrates how “the sweaty spaces of raves and nightclubs” facilitate a “socialised field of cultural production”, one which is ripe for collaboration and the sharing of resources (McRobbie, 1998: 9). Whether LOVERBOY retains its current collaborative and fluid structure or evolves into a more conventional fashion brand remains to be seen, but what such labels as Gypsy Sport, Hood by Air and LOVERBOY have demonstrated, is the hunger for meaning, community, and collectivity in the world of fashion – the necessity of queer fashion practice.

As we have argued, LOVERBOY as a nightclub, as a label and as a collective not only represents a set of alluring styles and spectacular happenings but, just as crucially, a set of interwoven social and creative practices. A crucial aspect of the glistening lamé that issues from this interweaving is the camp sensibility that underpins LOVERBOY’s design ethos.

Ken Gelder (2007), refers to Esther Newton’s *Mother Camp* (2001) to suggest that “drag queens deal with their alienation through *camp*”. Clearly, the fashion and clubbing praxis of Loverboy differs significantly from the mid-twentieth century drag milieu described by Newton: but there are strong continuities between the approaches of Jeffrey, van Zyl and their ilk, and those of contemporary and historical drag culture. Such ambiguous approaches to gendered dress are, as Kasia Maciejowska (2016) describes, “draggy”.

Drawing on the sociology of Erving Goffman, Newton describes a ‘camp ideology’ that enables queer people to ‘deal with an identity that is well defined but loaded with contempt’. She argues that Camp has three aspects to it: *incongruity* (the juxtaposition of things or features - or sexualities - not ‘normally’ meant to go together), *theatricality* (the performance of that juxtaposition, its exaggeration, its ‘stagey’ quality) and *humour*. In this way camp is understood as an ideology - a set of tastes, an aesthetic, a way of living, even a kind of politics - that is specific to queerness. Camp fashion having reached its apotheosis in the 1970s and 1980s was to wane at the turn of the millennium. But the sharply polarised politics of the contemporary moment seems to have resuscitated camp as a mode of dissent.

In this way, the practices of queer fashion that we have explored in this paper are activated by the inherently camp, and performative milieu from which they emerged. The nightclub as safe haven in a hostile world, the solidarity, sociality and affect of the dancefloor – the look as an encapsulation of agency and desire: all of these continue serve – as Newton suggests – as an inoculation against alienation. These qualities, so

readily perceived in the queer fashion practice of Jeffrey and his co-conspirators connect it to a powerful legacy of resistance.

References

- Allwood, E. H. (2015) 'Meet the ringleader of London's next generation of club kids', *DAZED*, 15 June, <https://www.dazeddigital.com/fashion/article/25087/1/meet-the-ringleader-of-london-s-next-generation-club-kids>. Accessed 15 August 2019.
- Barthes, R. (1992) 'Le Palace', in *Incidents*. University of California Press.
- Bartlett, D. (2019). Overalls: Functional, Political, Fashionable. In: J. Tynan and L. Godson, ed., *Uniform: Clothing and Discipline in the Modern World*. London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts, pp.201-219.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Post Production*. Prato: Gli ori.
- Bronski, M. (1984) *Culture clash: The making of gay sensibility*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Butler, J. (1990) *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cadogan, S. (2017) 'Charles Jeffrey teases SS18 with pigs and wooden penises', *DAZED*, 10 June, <https://www.dazeddigital.com/fashion/article/36284/1/charles-jeffrey-teases-ss18-with-pigs-and-wooden-penises>. Accessed 15 August 2019.
- Campkin, B. and Marshall, L. (2017) *LGBTQ+ cultural infrastructure in London, night venues: 2008 - present*. Available at: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/urban-lab/sites/urban-lab/files/LGBTQ_cultural_infrastructure_in_London_nightlife_venues_2006_to_the_present.pdf (Accessed: 19 July 2018).
- Cole, S. (2013) 'New styles, new sounds: Clubbing, music and fashion in 1980s London', in Stanfill, S. (ed.) *80s fashion: from club to catwalk*. London: V&A Publishing.
- Cole, S. (2017) 'Gay Liberation Front and radical drag, London 1970s', in *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking*, 4 (3), pp. 165-169.
- Dyer, R. (1992) *The culture of queers*. London: Routledge.
- Geczy, A. and Karaminas, V. (2013) *Queer style*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Gelder, K. (2007). Bar Scenes and Club cultures: sociality, excess, utopia. In: K. Gelder, ed., *Subcultures: Cultural Histories and Social Practice*. Routledge: New York.

Gonsalves, R. (2016). London's latest menswear shows have funk-ed-up big names and emboldened fresh faces; But Britain's capital has its own preconceptions to battle with. *The Independent*.

Hebdige, D. (1979) *Subculture: the meaning of style*. London: Routledge.

Horn, K. (2017) *Women, camp and popular culture: serious excess*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jeffrey, C. (2018) Conversation with Fenella Hitchcock and Jay McCauley Bowstead, 16 December.

Maciejowska, K. (2016) *House of Beauty and Culture*. London: Institute of Contemporary Arts.

Malbon, B. (1998) 'Clubbing: consumption, identity and the spatial practices of every-night life', in Skelton, T. and Valentine, G. (eds.) *Cool places: Geographies of youth culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Malbon, B. (1999) *Clubbing: dancing, ecstasy and vitality*. London: Routledge.

McRobbie, A. (1989) 'Second-hand dresses and the role of the ragmarket', in McRobbie, A. (ed) *Zoot suits and second-hand dresses: an anthology of fashion and music*. Hampshire and London: MacMillan Education.

McRobbie, A. (1998) *British fashion design: Rag trade of image industry?* London: Routledge.

McRobbie, A. (1999) *In the culture society: fashion, art and music*. London: Routledge.

McRobbie, A. (2016) *Be creative: making a living in the new culture industries*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Myer, M. (1994) *The politics and poetics of camp*. London: Routledge.

Newton, E. (2001). *Mother Camp*. Chicago, Ill: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Sontag, S. (2009 [1964]) 'Notes on camp', *Against Interpretation and other essays*, London: Penguin, pp. 275-292.

Steele, V. (2013) *A Queer History of Fashion: From the closet to the catwalk*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Stevenson, C. and Hoette, R. (2019). *Modus : A Platform for Expanded Fashion Practice*. Eindhoven: Onomatopoe office and project-space.

The Come Up (2017) [Exhibition]. NOW Gallery, London. 30 November 2017 - 11 February 2018.

Young, S. (2017). ANARCHY IN THE UK; This season the menswear shows were rife with subcultures that harked back to decades past. *The Independent*, p.35.