DRESS & FASHION RESEARCH

ADVERTISING MENSWEAR

MASCULINITY AND FASHION IN THE BRITISH MEDIA SINCE 1945

PAUL JOBLING

BLOOMSBURY

ADVERTISING MENSWEAR

The bold *Dress and Fashion Research* series is an outlet for high-quality, in-depth scholarly research on previously overlooked topics and new approaches. Showcasing challenging and courageous work on fashion and dress, each book in this interdisciplinary series focusses on a specific theme or area of the world that has been hitherto under-researched, instigating new debates and bringing new information and analysis to the fore. Dedicated to publishing the best research from leading scholars and innovative rising stars, the works will be grounded in fashion studies, history, anthropology, sociology, and gender studies.

ISSN: 2053–3926

ADVERTISING MENSWEAR

Masculinity and Fashion in the British Media since 1945

PAUL JOBLING

BLOOMSBURY
LONDON • NEW DELHI • NEW YORK • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

Bloomsbury is a registered trade mark of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2014

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: 978-1-4725-5811-4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jobling, Paul.
Advertising menswear : masculinity and fashion in the British media since 1945 / Paul Jobling.
pages cm. — (Dress and fashion research)
ISBN 978-1-4725-3343-2 (hardback) — ISBN 978-1-4725-5810-7 (epub) — ISBN 978-1-4725-5811-4 (epdf) 1. Advertising—Men's clothing—Great Britain—History—20th century. I. Title.
HF6161.M38J6195 2014
659.19'687—dc23 2013045221

For **Michael F., Jude, Christopher, Bruno, Patrick** and **Max.**

Thanks for the memory.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As usual, researching, writing and producing a book like this would not be possible without the generous support of others and I owe a debt of gratitude to many people. To the students on the MA History of Design and Material Culture, University of Brighton, with whom over the years I shared my research in illuminating seminar discussions. To all the producers, advertisers and archives that very kindly granted me permission to reproduce the advertisements included. In particular, to Anna Wright and Hannah Crump at Bloomsbury, for helping me to keep faith in the project through thick and thin, and the anonymous peer reviewers of the draft manuscript, for their unstinting words of encouragement and appreciation.

INTRODUCTION

While there have been many changes, it should be recognised that they have had more to do with the structure of the fashion and textile industries, the development of a mass consumer market and new techniques in marketing and retailing than with specific phases of creative activity on the part of individuals. (Anne Gardener, *Did Britain Make It?*, 1986)

People look at ads. They don't necessarily read them . . . It is more likely they are going to be stopped by a visual or a combination of both picture(s) and word(s). (John Hegarty, 'Why Creativity Must Lose Its Straightjacket', *Campaign*, 30 March 1979)

This book is the first study about British advertising for men's clothing since 1945. It encompasses the onset and vagaries of affluence and youth culture after 1955, and what is commonly regarded as the golden age of creative British advertising from the mid 1960s until the global impact of the economic downturn following the Al-Qaeda bombings of the United States of 11 September 2001.[1] During this period, print advertising for the likes of Tern shirts and televisual promotions for jeans brands Levi's, Brutus and Wrangler were often the recipient of Design and Art Directors Association (D&AD) awards, which were introduced in 1963; campaigns for Levi's also won awards at the Cannes and New York film festivals on seven occasions between 1976 and 1994, as well as a Royal Society of Arts Grand Prix in 1994 (see Appendix IV). Consequently, this study deals with print, television and cinema publicity—principally for suits, trousers, jeans, shirts and underwear—and picks up the thread, chronologically and thematically, of *Man Appeal: Menswear, Advertising and Modernism* (2005) in which I examined the period 1900–45.

The overarching objective that I expressed there for undertaking that project was 'to elaborate a dialectical exposition of the material in question . . . such that any technological, economic and social changes in the production and

consumption of men's wear and any corresponding changes in the advertising industry can be seen to coalesce in, or give rise to, new forms and styles of clothing publicity'.[2] In common with its companion volume, therefore, *Advertising Menswear* is concerned with two key issues: first, the representation of clothing, or how the material object is translated into words and images; and second, the complex interface between advertising and design issues, the dress preferences and spending patterns of the fashionable male, and gender theory. Yet this is not to argue that the two projects simply tell the same story at different points in time. For, alongside traditional forms of press and poster publicity, after 1945 other channels of advertising came into their own—principally, cinema and commercial television—and, thus, the volume of menswear publicity in circulation increased exponentially. So too, debates about the form and content of advertising and its relationship to the male consumer—in particular, the style-conscious youth culture—intensified both within the professional literature and in academic writing without.

Any study of the rhetoric of menswear publicity, whether print or televisual, inevitably involves an initial analysis of the concomitant tension between 'image-clothing' and 'written clothing' that Roland Barthes evinced in *The Fashion System* (1967).[3] Publicity designed by Ashley Havinden for Daks, for instance, negotiated a balanced integration of copy and illustration and it won the first Layton Advertising Trophy on this basis in 1955 (Figure 6), whereas by the mid 1980s 'image-clothing' began to hold sway and a common stylistic trend in campaigns for jeans and formal attire alike was the postmodern aesthetic of simulation and retro styling (Figure 45). But, as Barthes also insisted in his essay 'The Advertising Message' ([1964] 1994), when it comes to decoding the verbal and visual rhetoric of publicity there is an additional tension to consider between the use-value of the product being promoted and its symbolic or exchange value. Thus, in interrogating how menswear advertising denoted the functional and connoted the symbolic qualities of various items of clothing by 'reconverting function into spectacle',[4] I enlist Jean-Marie Floch's semiotic square as an overarching methodology. Floch elaborated the analytical model of the semiotic square in his assessment of a series of ads for Citroën between 1981 and 1985, postulating that it involved a 'generative trajectory . . . from what is simplest to what is most complex'.[5] Accordingly, he argues that advertising rhetoric elicits the chiastic interpenetration of four types of oppositional but complementary coordinates: a practical valorization, based on utilitarian values, that is diagonally opposed to a ludic valorization, based on 'non-utilitarian values' such as ideas of luxury, escapism and refinement; and a critical valorization, based on 'non-existential values' such as benefits, quality and cost, that is diagonally opposed to a utopian valorization, based on 'existential' values such as the identity and lifestyle of the subjects in the ad, and by implication the spectators of it. In turn, a practical valorization complements a critical one, whereas a ludic valorization complements a utopian one.[6]

As we shall see, the synthesis of the practical and the symbolic that Floch propounds is evident to one degree or another in much of the publicity addressed in this study. However, to illustrate at the outset what the semiotic square entails, it is worth briefly singling out the copy and image of one advertisement here—a 1966 promotion for Byford beach wear, 'Men in Orlon' (Figure 1). In regard to the garment's practical valorization, for instance, the copy informs us that the Orlon shirt 'has minimum upkeep costs', and this message is diagonally opposed to its ludic valorization that states, 'Men in ORLON love life and luxury'. In regard to its critical valorization, the copy relates that the shirt 'looks expensive' but is priced 'about 75s',[7] and this point is diagonally opposed to its utopian valorization,

Figure 1 'Men in Orlon', Byford beachwear, full-page colour advertisement, *Men in Vogue*, 15 March 1966. Permission of Du Pont, USA.

connoted in the way that the copy refers to the south of France as the 'natural habitat' of men in Orlon. The different types of valorization addressed in the copy are also expressed in the colourful photograph of a male model wearing shorts and shirt as, hands on hips, he straddles a canoe at the water's edge. But the overall tone and content of both text and image give emphasis to the ludic and utopian messages of the ad that foreground a playboy lifestyle of untrammelled hedonism to promote Orlon, an acrylic substitute for wool pioneered by Du Pont in 1949; thus, as Floch argues, the ad's tone and content enable a free exchange of associations and fantasies through which 'we dream of joining "what is useful with what is pleasant"'.[8] Accordingly, the semiotic square proffers a general paradigm to analyse the rhetoric of menswear publicity. Yet, it is only a springboard for a deeper examination of the more specific socio-economic and cultural contexts surrounding the creation, circulation and interpretation of the advertisements that I consider in each of the three thematic parts that constitute this study.

In Part 1, 'Going for a Burton', I focus on the period 1945–57, at which time clothing itself and press and poster publicity for it were equally constrained by material shortages, rationing and the Utility scheme. Notwithstanding this situation the British public was still shopping for clothes and, according to government statistics, in 1949 sales of men's and boy's garments totalled £271 million. And yet, as I also argue, there were regional and class differences within this general picture, and it was not until 1953 that household expenditure on clothing, regardless of earnings, levelled at 11 per cent of annual income.[9] (Again in common with *Man Appeal*, I give the contemporary reader some indication of the value of the earnings, prices and currency cited for the period—much of it pre-decimalization—by providing the 2000 equivalents and including such details in the footnotes. These equivalents are not, however, intended to convey actual earnings or cost of any product in 2000.) Amongst the male population the suit in particular remained as popular as it had been before the war. A survey about post-war hardship published in the *Sunday Pictorial* in July 1946, for example, revealed that the majority of men were 'especially put out by not being able to buy a suit'.[10] This meant that tailors across a wide class spectrum—Burton's, John Collier, Austin Reed, and Daks Simpson—were just as keen to continue promoting their wares in the daily newspapers and popular weeklies such as the *Radio Times*, *Punch* and *Picture Post* as they had been during the interwar period, even though the overriding ludic message of their publicity was one of delayed gratification (Figure 5).

Simultaneously, therefore, I trace the efforts of the advertising agents, artists and copywriters who were responsible for generating the rhetoric of such publicity and whose handiwork was often subject to intense critical scrutiny in the trade press. (A representative sample of seventy-three menswear labels and retailers, alongside the advertising agents they employed between 1945 and 2000, is

shown in Appendix I, and a sample of artists, illustrators and photographers in Appendix II.) Between 1945 and 1957 there were three methods or styles of pictorialization in print advertising: hand-drawn illustration, scraperboard and photography (Figures 4–6). Illustration was by far the most prevalent, with photography not beginning to make some impact until the mid 1950s; however, of great import in debates of the period was the relationship of advertising to art. In this respect both Milner Gray and Mary Gowing adumbrated Barthes' concern for the intertexuality of copy and image, asserting that 'the art in advertising is the whole advertisement—not just the picture, not just the type, and not just the text, but all three together'.[11]

In the post-war period print advertising was also challenged by cinema and the onset of commercial television, which was enshrined in the Television Act of 1954. In autumn 1952, for example, Pathé screened 'Man About Town', a short fashion advertising feature, and the first television clothing ads appeared on the Rediffusion channel in London in autumn 1955. (Appendix III lists all the menswear retailers and brands that resorted to broadcast advertising between 1955 and 2000 that I could trace.) Consequently, choosing the right medium in which to advertise was strategic and, as C. R. Casson (whose advertising accounts in the 1950s included Peter England shirts) argued, the preparation of any advertising campaign involved three key considerations: 'Will it be seen? Will it be remembered? Will it be "accepted"?'[12] Hence, I ask why and how the new media effectuated audience engagement and identification with the products being advertised in any ways that were different from press and poster publicity. In dealing with these issues, I explore the impact of consumer psychology and motivation research and enlist the handful of quantitative and qualitative surveys that were conducted, such as those by Mass Observation for the Advertising Service Guild in 1949 and by the London Press Exchange in 1953. Although neither of these two surveys was conducted to infer that the psychological impact of advertising could act as an enticement to purchase a particular product, the correlation between reading or viewing and consumption was precisely the concern of Viennese psychologist Ernst Dichter, who in 1951 had exhorted advertising agencies to realize they were 'one of the most advanced laboratories in psychology'.[13]

In British advertising culture the precepts of consumer psychology were promulgated by agencies such as Greenlys Ltd and McCann Erickson, with the research director of the latter, Harry Henry, stressing that the agency's purpose was to realize the difference between promoting needs and promoting wants.[14] Stereotypically, motivation research was conducted to find out what made the female consumer tick, and yet the rhetoric of much menswear publicity is uncompromisingly and exclusively addressed at the male consumer. By this measure, one of the seminal tropes that advertisers relied on to appeal to men was heroic masculinity; witness the designs by F. Whitby Cox, Alexis Delmar and Poul

Sprøgøe (Figures 3 and 9). In particular, Sprøgøe's illustration of an ebullient male gymnast and the caption 'Look good . . . feel good' in a 1954 advertisement for Lyle and Scott's y-front underpants epitomizes this ideal, while also symbolizing the phenomenological pleasure that men would get from simultaneously wearing or 'being touched' by the garment in question and seeing it, or being seen in it. Thus cloth, and in particular cloth worn on the human body, obviously has an instrumental part to play in such an imbrication of touch and sight—not only for the person in the ad who sees and feels him- or herself wearing it, and is seen wearing/feeling it, but for the spectator as well who, in looking at how the cloth is worn, can sense what it would also feel like to be clad in it him- or herself. It is this idea of haptic visuality, through which French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty argued we encounter 'the two "sides" of our body, the body as sensible and the body as sentient',[15] that is further addressed in Parts 2 and 3. There I analyse publicity for Dormeuil, Austin Reed, Viyella and Levi's jeans.

By the early 1950s a new type of consumer—the teenager—had begun to emerge and to be hotly contested in the critical discourse about both fashion and advertising. An editorial in *Men's Wear* in April 1951 stated that 'its [the teenager's] taste is flamboyant, with an eye on colour' and this was the challenge that longstanding and new retailers and brands had to face in the design of both their merchandise and publicity.[16] In 1954, for example, the advertising agency Crawford's introduced a more relaxed attitude in symbolizing male desire in publicity for Burton's, shifting attention from the homosocial space of the shop floor to youthful scenes of flirtation and romance (Figure 7). But, as Frank Mort has aptly argued, Burton's new role model was 'decidedly not a teenager'.[17] Rather the youth market embraced men in both their teens and twenties, and the rise of independent boutiques such as Vince Man's Shop and John Stephen's His Clothes, which originated around London's Carnaby Street, was instrumental in catering to their needs. While Mort also maintains, 'The relationship of affluence to regional and generational change within working-class communities, its effects on women's roles and experience and on the crystallisation of new youth identities, has been studied almost obsessively,' the same cannot be said when it comes to menswear advertising.[18] Accordingly in Part 2, 'Thinking Young', I concentrate on the period 1958–78 and consider the changes that occurred in the marketing and promotion of menswear under the influence of youth culture.

In the first instance, market researchers were preoccupied with finding out how young people spent their income and leisure time. Investigations by Mark Abrams and Stanley Orwell between 1956 and 1961 had indeed revealed that there was considerable affluence among 15- to 24-year-old males, but also that two-thirds of the youth market were working class, belonging to social groups D and E.[19] Although these young men may have had a predilection for more colourful, Italian-styled clothing, nevertheless the suit remained a popular garment with young men of all classes, accounting for 30 per cent of menswear

sales in 1964. Thus even clothing chains such as Hector Powe and Austin Reed designated departments for the young male consumer in their Regent Street stores. At the same time, where to advertise and to whom once more challenged menswear retailers and their advertising agents. The latter had long relied on the baseline socio-economic classifications of groups A–E, first formulated in the United States in the 1920s by Paul Cherington for J. Walter Thomson, afterwards espoused and modified by the Incorporated Society of British Advertisers (ISBA) in 1936 and currently adopted by the National Readership Survey (NRS),[20] to help them target both the optimum audience and advertising media (see Table 1). But the appearance of the new colour weeklies *Weekend* (founded 1957) and the *Sunday Times Magazine* (founded 1962) contested the NRS class boundaries, much as the consolidation of affluent youth markets had done. For example, *Weekend* was targeted at class C–D readers and the *Sunday Times Magazine* at classes A, B and C, but campaigns for class C–D retailers like Burton's and class B–C retailers like Sabre leisurewear appeared in both titles. Surveys by Pearl and Dean, Associated Television (ATV) and Target Group Index (TGI) on the nexus of cinema and television viewing to buying habits similarly suggest that there was considerable class permeability; it is tempting to believe, therefore, that cinema and television publicity had democratized the audiences for menswear advertising. By 1960 television publicity was not necessarily more expensive to produce or screen than other forms of advertising, but it was harder for advertisers to know whether audiences paid attention to the commercial breaks. Moreover, as colour advertising on television did not become widely available across Britain until summer 1971, the majority of menswear retailers and brands concentrated their publicity in magazines and posters; in any case, clothing advertising did not come into its own as a televisual event until the widespread promotion of jeans brands such as Levi's and Wrangler from the late 1970s onwards.

In this part, therefore, I propound a modulated assessment of the relationship between advertisers, the media and the public, considering the cultural affiliations of taste of distinct consumers in relation to their age and profession—what Pierre Bourdieu terms *habitus*[21]—and how advertising exploited this. The boutiques themselves did not tend—or even need—to publicize their products, more often relying on window displays and word of mouth for sales. By contrast, mainstream retailers and brands did rely heavily on advertising in men's titles such as *Man About Town* (founded 1954), *Men Only* (founded 1960) and *Vogue for Men* (founded 1965), as well as the dailies, popular weeklies, and colour supplements such as the *Sunday Times Magazine*. As R. Taylor appositely framed the last publication type: 'The Sunday colour supplements have been enormously important to the development of advertising—the understated, the elegant, the urbane, the witty, the pleasantest advertising of all to look at and read.'[22] Flicking through the pages of the *Sunday Times Magazine*, *Daily Mirror* and *Men in Vogue*, it soon becomes apparent not only how much the image of

youth culture had seeped into menswear advertising but also how prevalent the pivotal stereotype of the male peacock was in campaigns for the likes of Austin Reed, John Collier and Van Heusen (Figures 15–16 and 19). But it would be misleading to argue that age differences no longer mattered or that menswear advertising managed to appeal seamlessly to new and traditional markets alike. Thus the visual and verbal rhetoric of a press advertisement, 'Is your father stopping you going to Hector Powe?' (*Sunday Times Magazine*, 27 September 1970), pinpointed the dilemma menswear multiples faced in performing a delicate balancing act to build cross-generational brand loyalty while respecting the different needs, tastes, and desires of both young and traditional clienteles at the same time.

Furthermore, many of the men who appear in the advertising of the period are depicted as both spectator and spectacle, and so I interrogate the extent to which such visibility in campaigns for Burton's, John Collier, Lyle and Scott, and Bri Nylon troubles the heteronormative dynamics of (male) looking and (female) being looked at (Figures 16 and 25). Finally, I examine how advertising during the 1960s and 1970s dealt with the practical and ludic valorizations of artificial fibres such as nylon and Terylene in comparison to cotton and wool. In regard to the latter, the centrepiece of my argument is the egregious press campaign 'Cloth for Men' for Dormeuil mohair, which appeared in 1973 and 1974 (Figures 26–9). In them, the German model, Veruschka von Lehndorff, wears 1930s-styled clothing and 'doubles up' to play both 'male' and 'female' parts, while the copy and *mise-en-scène* of the ads evoke a nineteenth-century sensibility. Hence, I take the opportunity to analyse how the gender ambiguities and criss-crossing of time connoted in the rhetoric of the ads perform what Jane Gaines has called a kind of 'homosexual/heterosexual flip-flop',[23] and how the knowing transvestism, style and visual décor they represent overlap with Susan Sontag's notion of camp as 'Being-as-Playing-a-Role'.[24]

To a large extent the relationship between identity and masquerade is also the leitmotiv of Part 3 of this study, 'Leader of the Pack', where I examine advertising for jeans since the 1960s. By 1965 jeans had begun to challenge the clothing hegemony enjoyed by the suit, and sales were in the ascendant well into the 1990s; in 1980, for example, 25 million pairs were bought in the United Kingdom.[25] More than any other item of clothing jeans had also latched onto the potential of cinema and television advertising. Campaigns for most brands were promoted through these channels from 1972 onwards, but the key players were Levi's, Wrangler, Brutus and Lee (Appendix IV lists the details of Levi's cinema and television campaigns). Furthermore, starting in the 1980s and continuing until the early 2000s, these brands tended to represent jeans as male or masculine attire in their publicity, even though they were popular with both men and women, and across generations. There are two related factors that contributed to this gender bias: the promotion of Levi's in a series of award-winning campaigns

by the independent advertising agency Bartle, Bogle and Hegarty, which had won the account in 1982; and the epiphany of the style-conscious new man, which had been typologized in McCann Erickson's *ManStudy* Report in 1984. Of course, the 'new man' itself was not a new concept at the time: his advent had been heralded previously in 1919 by Sidney Garland and 1953 by Geoffrey Gilbert. But, in trading on the message 'looking good . . . feeling good', by the mid 1980s he was symbolic of a more sexualized and narcissistic masculinity that appealed to male and female spectators/consumers alike and that was exemplified in the seminal Levi's 501 campaigns first aired in December 1985: 'Bath' and 'Laundrette'.

One of the key issues I examine in Part 3, therefore, is the imbrication of sex and pleasure in objectifying the male body in jeans advertising. But the impact of such publicity—from the revivalism of the 1950s/1960s in 'Laundrette' to that of the 1850s/1860s in 'Settler's Creek'—is attributable also to its mythological, hyperreal image of the past that, according to Dick Hebdige, 'is played and replayed as an amusing range of styles, genres, signifying practices to be combined and recombined at will' and thereby treats history as nothing more than 'a series of masks'.[26] In televisual publicity for jeans this ludic or escapist postmodern historicism is achieved not only through images but also through the use of a pop or classical music soundtrack, which came to replace entirely the jingle, dialogue or voice-over. Accordingly, I consider the extent to which music, such as 'I Heard It Through the Grapevine' (Levi's), 'Crosstown Traffic' (Wrangler) and 'The Anvil Chorus' (Lee), contributes to the narrative arc of the campaigns it orchestrates. And yet, one is left to ask, is such style raiding and the seamless recycling of history merely gratuitous and totally devoid of deeper signification? Janice Winship, for instance, has argued that the period revivalism of 'Bath' and 'Laundrette' resonated with young people in the 1980s because they viewed the 1950s and 1960s as a time of youth rebellion and of opportunities for personal expression denied to them under the Thatcher government. Likewise, the way that both ads engendered the male body as a 'new sex object' can be regarded as a political act challenging the patriarchal values of the gaze.[27] It is not for nothing, then, that Mark Jones cavilled that the striptease performed by Nick Kamen in the 'Laundrette' ad 'gave agencies a charter to demean and exploit men's bodies'.[28] With this point in mind, I address the ambiguous sexual charge of the new man in publicity for jeans and other apparel, and the slippage between straight and gay male identities, which Susan Bordo argues is enacted through a supersession of 'leaners', that is: 'male bodies that do not assert themselves aggressively, but ask to be admired, loved, or sexually dominated'.[29]

At the same time, jeans publicity was among the first to represent non-white subjects, and I take the opportunity in Part 3 to examine also the persistent colour-blindness of the advertising industry in Britain since the Second World War. A significant problem for menswear promotions was the dearth of black

models, something that was transcended initially by the use of well-known sportsmen such as boxer John Conteh in the 1970s (Figure 38) and footballer David James in the 1990s. As photogenic role models of dual heritage, however, both men conform to the hegemonic white stereotype of the 'noble savage', and they bolster bell hooks's assertion that '[a]ds are a primary vehicle for the dissemination and perpetuation of white-supremacist and patriarchal values'.[30] Certainly, some jeans advertising can be accused of this objectification; non-white subjects make only a token appearance, for instance, in Levi's 'Tackle' and 'Campfire' campaigns of 1993. But, as we shall see, the treatment of racialized sexuality in 'Taxi' (1995) was singular in comparison and, as I argue, the way that it intertwines the otherness of race and gender identities invites a nuanced analysis of the Manichean ambiguity of being 'the same but not exactly the same'.[31] Consequently, I interrogate here the strategy of mimicry that the ad and publicity for other menswear labels such as Ben Sherman and Hush Puppies mobilize, and the extent to which this proffers a consideration of the pros and cons of non-white representation (Figures 39 and 40).

By extension, the racial mimicry and double-coding of ads such as Ben Sherman's 'A man should be judged by the colour of his shirt' brings us to the final point addressed in this study: the shift from advertising rhetoric intended to appeal to the new man to that for the new lad. In January 1991 a press release for *GQ* announced that 'New Man has officially been laid to rest', and in 1994 the launch of *loaded* seemed to be the last nail in his coffin. As Robert Connell has contended, however, 'To recognise diversity in masculinities is not enough. We must also recognise the relations between different kinds of masculinity: relations of alliance, dominance and subordination.'[32] His perception is a valid one because the two male/masculine stereotypes not only coexisted but there was also considerable overlap between them, not least an intense interest in sex, clothing and appearances. Certainly, an advertisement such as 'No guts, no glory' for Base shoes in 1997 in its depiction of leery heterosexual desire is not dissimilar to scenes of chauvinistic and hedonistic flirtation in Katharine Hamnett's 1988 press campaigns, though it is a world apart from the sensitive portrayal of a man getting dressed in a Russell & Bromley shoes ad in 1986 or the barefooted gigolo represented in a 1998 promotion for Yves Saint Laurent Rive Gauche (Figures 36 and 45). Consequently, if this book achieves anything it is to embrace the sense of diversity and similarity that Connell emphasizes, not just in regard to masculine identities between 1945 and the turn of the millennium but also in the form and content of menswear publicity across the same period as well.

A Note on Sources

Several authors have contributed original and illuminating perspectives on men's fashion in the 1950s and 1960s (Breward, *Fashioning London*, 2004; Cole, *Don*

We Now Our Gay Apparel, 2000; Cohn, *Today They Are No Gentlemen: The Changes in Englishmen's Clothes Since the War*, 1971; O'Neill, *London—After a Fashion*, 2007); style culture and the new man in the 1980s (Mort, *Cultures of Consumption*, 1996; Nixon, *Hard Looks*, 1996); and the advertising profession in the 1960s (Nixon, *Advertising Cultures*, 2003). Yet Mort and Nixon also tend to dwell on a handful of menswear advertisers (to wit Burton's, Levi's and Next), and in this study I wanted to achieve a more rounded and representative analysis of a broad spectrum of promotions for male dress since 1945 in their cultural and socio-economic contexts. This has been a monumental undertaking, not least in regard to the myriad menswear advertisements circulated during the period. To bring a sense of order to such complexity, therefore, I decided it would be necessary to include and exclude certain material.

In the first instance, I wanted to continue the advertising story of some of the retailers and brands I had already initiated with *Man Appeal*, namely, Austin Reed, Simpson Daks, Hector Powe, Burton's, and the Fifty Shilling Tailors, rechristened John Collier in 1954. This led me to trawl through the press media analyses conducted by Legion Publishing until its demise in 1976 and through articles in the trade literature such as *Advertiser's Weekly*, *Outdoor Advertising*, *Campaign*, *Man and His Clothes* and *Men's Wear*; as well as to search for advertisements in a sample of periodicals and newspapers aimed at diverse readerships, chiefly *Picture Post*, *Man About Town*, *Men in Vogue*, *Reveille*, *Weekend*, *Sunday Times Magazine*, *The Face*, *Arena*, the *Daily Mirror*, the *Daily Express* and *The Times*. In the process, I was also pointed in the direction of some other important or interesting advertising campaigns that I have included for analysis here: Burberry's; Rael Brook, Tootal, Rocola and Ben Sherman shirts; Lyle and Scott y-fronts; Terylene and Bri Nylon; C&A; and Dormeuil 'Cloth for Men'. In terms of cinema and television publicity the picture becomes clearer because the lion's share of advertising has been for the different brands of jeans I address in Part 3. To this end, both advertising agents and manufacturers, as well as the History of Advertising Trust, were extremely cooperative in helping me to trace and view television campaigns for Brutus, Lee, Levi's and Wrangler.[33] Overall, then, this research project has proved to be a Sisyphean task, though the opportunity to pore over the kind of ads aimed at my father's generation in the 1950s and 1960s as well as to revisit those aimed at my own in the 1980s was also the source of much pleasure and a certain amount of mirth.

With the notable exception of Emporio Armani underwear and Yves Saint Laurent Rive Gauche (Figures 44 and 45), publicity for designer labels is conspicuous by its absence in this study. This is largely explained by the fact that, for the period under discussion, many of them had comparatively small annual advertising budgets in comparison to mass-market retailers and brands—less than £500,000 per manufacturer in 1997—or did not want to lose their cachet through widespread advertising.[34] Absent also is any consideration of publicity