

Call the (Fashion) Police

How fashion becomes criminalised

James Treadwell, *Leicester University*

Abstract

This paper examines and reviews how fashion comes to be associated with crime and deviance, and postulates that contemporary fashion, dress and style are an important, yet frequently overlooked, dynamic with which criminologists ought to engage. It begins by looking at the evolving way in which fashion trends have traditionally been linked with crime and deviance (and control) before charting the emergence of contemporary concerns regarding forms of dress focusing, particularly on the 'hoody' and a more niche variant, the 'goggle jacket'. Drawing upon cultural criminology, the paper examines the stylistic presentation of the self (Goffman, 1990 [1959]) through attire and clothing. Finally it examines a contemporary paradox whereby the fashion industry makes capital out of branding its items so to make them seductive by virtue of their links with deviant image; yet paradoxically those wearing such items can face the consequence of increased surveillance and social control.

Key Words: fashion, crime, hoody, goggle jacket, cultural criminology, urban space

Introduction: 'Fashion crime'

An allegation made of those who would align themselves with the emergent perspective termed 'cultural criminology' is a tendency towards seeing the quite recent past as a 'golden age', now lost to the late-modern period (O'Brien, 2008). There may be some truth in that allegation, as when examining the 'new', multiple and various ways in which crime and crime control intertwine with the 'new' cultural dynamics born out of late-modernity, it is easy to overlook historical continuity.

For instance, on Monday 5 July 1736, before the Rt. Hon. the Lord Hardwick, Lord Chief Justice of England, James Baylis and Thomas Reynolds were tried by a special jury. After a case lasting some time (four hours was

then a lengthy trial) the pair were found guilty of a capital crime. On 10 July, both men received the sentence of death. Baylis sentence was later reprieved. Reynolds was sent to the gallows (Ordinary of Newgate, 1723).

In London on the 26 July 1736, the execution of Reynolds was spectacularly bungled. After his 'death' on the rope, his 'lifeless' body was cut down. However, as the executioner attempted to close his coffin, the 'executed' man thrust back the lid. Block and Hostettler (1997) tell of the hangman's attempts to make good his former failing, but the crowd angrily interjected and carried Reynolds to a local public house. He vomited three pints of blood and was given brandy, but still died a short time after. While Reynolds' execution has received much attention because of its exceptional nature (Ordinary of Newgate, 1723; Block and Hostettler 1997:31) his crime was also something quite different.

The sentence of death had been passed on Reynolds because he had violated the 'The Black Act' (or the Waltham Black Act). Reynolds had been involved in a Turnpike riot in Ledbury, Herefordshire. There, it was alleged, he had disguised himself in a woman's dress and hat, and deliberately 'blackened his face' (Reynolds refuted these details, but testimony at his trial told he had purchased the items only shortly before committing the offence). It was that act of disguise, rather than riot or violence which ultimately cost him his life.

To press this point further it is perhaps worth providing more detail on the Black Act. Passed in 1723 while Sir Robert Walpole was Prime Minister, it was enacted, principally as a means of protecting royal parks and forests, and the property of the nobility (Block and Hostettler 1997:20). Pre-empting its passing, a group of deer poachers had been apprehended in the Epping and Windsor Forests near Waltham. The bandits had blackened their faces, which gave both the group (the Waltham Blacks) and the subsequent Act their names. The act added fifty new capital offences to statute, including 'damaging ponds to allow fish to escape' and 'cutting down or otherwise destroying any trees in any avenue, garden, orchard or plantation'. Other categories of offences included people who were found to be:

- Armed with swords, firearms or other offensive weapons, and having their faces blackened
- Armed and otherwise in disguise
- Having their faces blackened
- Otherwise disguised

It is also the case that the carrying of weapons was regarded as less significant than having ones face blackened, with the later clearly the most offensive to the state (Malcolm, 2002). While it might seem strange that I begin this piece by considering the bizarre case of Reynolds, I feel that the Black Act tells us something of the recurrent concern that links offenders with what Goffman would term 'dramaturgical accomplishment' while

involved in crime (Goffman, 1990[1959]). It suggests there is long held concern with offenders' fashion, particularly concerning disguise. The types of attire that have concerned the state have varied, for 'Waltham blacks', the Edwardians' Peaky blinders (Pearson, 1983) and now in contemporary Britain, the hoody and the 'goggle hoody' jacket.

A quick read through early descriptions of criminals shows clearly the way in which 'offenders' and 'criminal classes' have long been regarded visibly different – for example note Lombroso's concern with the tattoo which he read as a mark of atavism, a stigmata on the body that could be helpful in identifying the criminal (see Morrison, 2004). Yet making fashion synonymous with criminality is not my aim here. Instead, what I propose is that it is not so much the study of fashion as a sartorial style that is of merit to criminologists, but rather it is the case that, once we move beyond the attire, we can see something more of the social structure. This is not new; take for example Cohen's observation that:

The Mods and Rockers symbolised something far more important than what they actually did. They touched the delicate and ambivalent nerves through which post-war social experience in Britain was experienced (Cohen, 1972:192).

It is in this spirit of inquiry that cultural criminology has re-discovered 'style' (Ferrell, 1995), recognising that style can tell us something of the contemporary moment. Clothing-as-fashion is one of the prime conduits for the construction of identity (Niederer and Winter, 2008). Fashion and its particular icons communicate non-verbal cultural and social ascriptions, and fashion apparel, most notably clothing, is clearly one of the foremost features of demonstrating affluence, or lack thereof. Fashion is integrated in people's everyday lives, it is one 'of the ways ... in which the social order is experienced, explored, communicated and re-produced' (Barnard, 1996, *cited in* Niederer and Winter, 2008:690). Fashion theory, as an extension of social theory, 'can be used to explore conflicts involving class, race, religion and sexual preference – all of which are cultural issues of politics, consumption and identity' (Niederer and Winter, 2008:691), which in turn, are all issues with which cultural criminologists engage.

Traditionally cultural scholars who infused criminology with their qualitative work suggested fashion styles could be interpreted as acts of 'resistance' (Hall and Jefferson, 2006 [1976]). A number of these early qualitative studies (often the product of academics aligned to the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies) noted the role of consumption in the construction of working-class youth subcultures beginning in the post war. Academics such as Hebdige examined the ways in which distinctive styles (such as punk and skinhead) were mobilized as forms of resistance to the marginalization of the working classes in the context of economic uncertainty. This work served to demonstrate the significance of consumption in the construction of identity, the struggle for

status and the negotiation of social position. However, the symbolic resistance that accompanied the punk's safety pin and the skinhead's Doc-Martins was seen largely as a bottom-up process, whereby young people inverted and manipulated cultural symbols for their own purposes (Hebdige, 1979).

Of course with the benefit of time and hindsight it is possible to suggest that such a view tends to neglect the origins of punk, as 'sold' from Malcolm McLaren and Vivienne Westwood's *SEX/seditionaries* boutique on 430 Kings Road, Chelsea. It can be argued that punk might have been more a product of art college privilege than any genuine working class solidarity. It would follow that punk was as much top-down fashion, generated from above and adopted by the streets, as it was about resistance or the creation of authentic sub-culture by young people (Jewkes, 2004:79).

This is something some cultural criminology seems to have recognised. In focusing on consumer culture, cultural criminologists have noticed that the generation of fashion is in part a corporate-driven process (see Hayward, 2004; Hayward and Young, 2007). As an emergent perspective cultural criminology has retained a concern with resistance, symbolism and style, but has also added recognition of the more consumer and market driven nature of contemporary life.

In many ways, it is continuing the traditions of early cultural scholars, but reworking them for a new late-modern epoch (Hayward and Young, 2007). Cultural criminologists for the most part have preferred the term 'style' to fashion, as its scope is broader and it captures more than fashion alone, and is:

... embedded in haircuts, posture, clothing, automobiles, music and the many other avenues which people present themselves publicly. But it is also located between people, and among groups; it constitutes an essential element of collective behaviour, an element whose meaning is constructed through the nuances of social interaction. Style defines the lived experience of ethnicity, social class and other essential social (and sociological) categories... in moments of lived experience style becomes the medium through which social categories take on meaning (Ferrell, 1995:170).

Yet clothing as fashion is clearly one of style's core conduits. As a period 'unique [because of] the way that the creation and expression of identity via the display and celebration of consumer goods have triumphed over and above other more traditional modes of self-expression' (Hayward, 2004:144), style in late-modernity is inescapably linked to consumerism. The clothing industry is one of the core conduits of this consumerist phase. Selling what has been termed 'the charade of self improvement' (a term that captures the mood of the times where individuals can create identity through purchase and acquisition of consumable items, yet paradoxically are driven by narrow need for conformity - see Hayward, 2004:72). Elsewhere Hayward and Yar (2006) have demonstrated how this charade

is played out, as forms of consumption bring with them exclusion. They examine the emergence of 'chav' (a term used to describe young people associated with excessive consumption of some fashion branded items). They argue:

... the 'chav' represents a popular reconfiguration of the underclass idea. However, we are also keen to note the way in which the concept of social marginality is reconfigured in this substitution ... the discourse of the underclass [is] turned crucially upon a (perceived or real) pathology in the working classes' relations to *production* and socially productive labour. Its emergent successor, the concept of the 'chav', is in contrast oriented to purportedly pathological class dispositions in relation to the sphere of *consumption* (Hayward and Yar, 2006:9, emphasis in original).

Socially excluded groups, it seems, are no longer regarded with disdain because of their seeming pathological lack of attachment to work, but rather, disapproval is now premised upon their style and preference for vulgar and conspicuous displays of 'mainstream' fashion apparel.

In this paper I draw on this cultural criminology in interpreting fashion and criminalisation, specifically focusing on the 'hoody' and 'goggle hoody' jacket. A possible criticism is that this risks, as Cohen (1972) has noted, an 'over-reading' of style and signs. The point of Cohen's observations was that, traditionally, sub-cultural scholars had demonstrated a tendency to privilege the spectacular and resistance at the expense of the ordinariness of sub-cultural life or alternate readings of sub-cultures. However, for the most part, my argument here does not hint at a single reading. I certainly do not see - to use Cohen's terms - the hoody wearer as either 'frustrated social climber' or 'cultural innovator and critic'. Indeed, I see little commonality between my position in this paper and that of Birmingham Centre scholars (e.g. Hall and Jefferson, 2006 [1976]), other than a broad concern with fashion. Unlike them, I argue that there is little authentic resistance. And as I hope I make clear, the resistance that I allude to is, for the most part, *purchased* sartorial resistance that is manufactured more in the boardroom than on the streets. In this paper I take the view that the main reason young people purchase and wear hoodies and goggle jackets is not symbolic resistance, but conformity with stylistic convention. Yet I appreciate there are other readings that might be made of the hoody and goggle hoody. I accept, therefore, that my line is but one reading.¹

¹ For example, I have no doubt that for some the hoody and goggle hoody are useful devices in the commission of crime, and for some wearers it might be to achieve power and, potentially, to exploit and bully other outsider groups. However, I do not see the fashion industry or sub-cultural display as resistance. Indeed I am closer to the belief that in contemporary consumer society there is little authentic resistance; rather I take a view that every fashion fad and foible is the product of consumerism, even when it seems quite ardently anti-consumerist (for a more detailed contemporary argument see Hall et al. 2008).

My interest in fashion and crime commenced in the 1990s when buying *Stone Island* to wear to football matches. Much of what is presented here builds on this personal experience and is best described as a multi-method approach, drawing on various ethnographic fieldwork projects with active offenders and young offenders (in an array of settings), interviews with security staff in shopping centres, interviews with those involved in and around the fashion industry, and content analysis of newspapers. What is presented forms only a small part of far more substantive material gathered during a number of empirical fieldwork projects, some more background detail of which appears in Williams and Treadwell (2008).

The emergence of the 'goggle hood'

Popular representations have long held that youthful groups associated with particular stylistic fashions constitute the greatest threat to civil order; indeed in criminology this is a recurrent theme (Pearson, 1983). The most recent of this long legacy of concern, and perhaps the single most relevant to those examining contemporary constructions of 'deviance', is the 'hoody'. This is a sartorial choice that serves, in the eyes of many of the public, as a hide-the-face declaration of criminality.

The hoody (a term used to describe hooded sports apparel principally worn by young people) and the goggle hoody (a more niche variant that can cover the face partially or fully and includes goggle lenses affixed to the hood - see Figure 1) are not uncommon on British streets as fashion wear amongst young people. I shall on occasion shift in discussion between the hoody and the goggle hoody. While the later is a less apparent and has been less discussed than the former, both articles of dress are essentially similar and variants on one another - the goggle jacket has been cast (as this piece suggests) as a 'hoody' and subject to many of the same connotations.

Figure 1. Example goggle hoody



In late 2007 British newspapers began to report what they referred to as an ‘alarming new development’. The stories concerned the growth in popularity amongst ‘young wearers’ of the ‘goggle hoody’. Alternative descriptions included the ‘super hoody’; ‘gas mask hoody’, and perhaps most interestingly *The Times* newspaper’s label, a ‘burqua for boys’ (Tahler and Hind, 2007). These reports surfaced at a time when there had already been an established concern with ‘the hoody’ as a fashion choice amongst young people for some time. The goggle hoody was variously described as the ‘new uniform for the ASBO generation’, ‘essential thug/ yob wear’ and an ‘intimidating fashion trend’. Reportedly, it was selling at what was at ‘an alarming rate’. In the space of one week, seven national tabloid and broadsheet newspapers ran stories on the topic. There was similar widespread reporting on local television and newspapers. The newspaper the *Metro* (which now has the highest circulation of any daily newspaper in the UK and is given away free in various public places) placed a prominent story on its emergence noting that:

Anyone who feels intimidated by youths wearing hoodies should probably look away now - it’s the goggle jacket... The latest incarnation of the hooded top... appears to have more in common with a gas mask than designer wear, leaving just small plastic discs for users to see through (Metro, 2007).

Many of the stories were reproduced on websites. Blog and comment sites linked to the newspapers publishing the story quickly began to receive public comments, many of which described unease at the jackets; for instance:

These jackets are ridiculous! my son is 11 years old and has just been dragged to the ground and mugged of his mobile phone by three youths of about 15 years old he cannot identify them and cant [sic] stop crying he is afraid to go to out. now you are telling me these jackets are nice. i dont think so they make it easier for people to commit crimes and get away with it it [sic] is damn discusting [sic] and i am going to start a petition and get it to parliment [sic] and get these BANNED! (Posted on *Metro.co.uk*, 9 December 2007²).

Ooh yay, give the chavs something to make themselves COMPLETELY anonymous. Now they don’t have to worry at all about being recognised and caught when they’re mugging/raping/killing/stealing. GREAT idea’ (Posted on *The Student Room*, 12 December 2007³).

² Available at: www.metro.co.uk/news/article.html?in_article_id=79052&in_page_id=34

³ Available at: www.thestudentroom.co.uk/showthread.php?t=495536

In keeping with Cohen's 'Moral Panic' thesis (1972), it is interesting that such public expressions have been made at a time where there are broader connected anxieties about youth and crime, in particular a spate of fatal stabbings among young people. Yet I will argue that the 'goggle hoody', and its wider adoption by a significant section of youth, can be read as significant in its own right, indicative of wider late-modern processes in relation to the marketing of crime and transgression, and social practices concerning the increased relegation, monitoring and control of male youth where public space is concerned.

Interestingly the goggle hoody so lamented by the press is not new. British youth are being sold clothes that are inspired by the criminal imagery of the football hooligan, blended that with American gang culture. The goggle hoody is by no means a recent creation, indeed ironically it is the product of Italian high-couture. The first goggle hoodys (then called the 'Mille Miglia') arrived on the shores of the UK with little comment in the late 1980s; a homage to the protective clothing worn by Italian drivers in the road race from which the product took its name.

The designer of the jacket, Massimo Osti, had established his name amongst discerning football hooligans with his revolutionary jacket designs for the Italian Sportswear Company *Spa*, sold as *Stone Island* (a label still synonymous with British football violence). Arguably, this is where the association linking the goggle hood to criminality becomes most obvious, as *Mille* jackets - and a later full-face covering version called *The Explorer* - came to be 'must have' items for football lads in the 1990s (Thornton, 2003). Thornton has noted the football casual movement, which commenced in the 1980s, drew heavy inspiration from other youth cultures such as mod, skinhead, suede head and soul boy, while also having its origins in British youths travelling to European football matches, where they began to seek out exclusive brands as a form of competition and a means of demonstrating regional superiority. He suggests 'the scene':

... brimmed with vibrant self confidence and optimism, and yet was all too often disfigured by needless, internecine violence ... Scally/Casual has always been a lifestyle that operated on the margins of criminality and gangsterism (Thornton, 2003:10).

For football hooligans the underpinning logic of adopting expensive clothes was avoidance of police attention - and using designer ware and comparatively more expensive modes of transport ('intercity', rather than football special trains) ensured this. Moreover, they could readily identify others dressed like them, but following other clubs, who would be willing to fight - but also demonstrate the ability to acquire core items most admired by peers (see Hobbs and Robbins, 1991).

The new 'goggle hoods' now present on the streets of the UK drew stylistic expression from that source, with reworking by way of American street/gang culture. In the United States, circa mid 1980s, sports clothing was adopted as part of the street image of young black men and women.

The 1986 hit track by *Run DMC*, 'My Adidas' confirmed the sport brand had similarly landed in the US (Polhemus, 1994:107). Sports clothing, and combat attire, became uniform for 'street gang members, which in turn was subsumed into emergent rap music scenes on the East and West coast. Sportswear for American football and basketball teams was often based upon iconography of ferocity and raw strength, and this uniform became synonymous with individual gangs, as Miller notes:

Georgetown shirts mean 'gangster'. Raiders mean outlaw. Um, The Bulls, because of the violence of the Bull, it means, uh, you know to run over people. You will find that a lot of gangs have taken up the sports clothing and it's a really big industry right now, and you'll notice that a lot of them wear the violent-type animals, like the bulls and the bulldogs. And you see, like the Raider, you see the eye patch with the eye, you know it's a pirate, outlaw, you know, outcast from society (Miller, 1995:221).

Such styles seem to have become increasingly influential on British youth culture (Hayward, 2004). The current goggle hoods bought by young men in the UK owe as much to the culture of the ghetto as the 'high fashion' culture of 'the casual'. Newer goggle jackets made by clothing companies such as *Projekts NYC*, *Location* and *Goi-Goi* elude to the fusing of these two sub-cultural influences into a uniquely British product. We arguably live in a time when:

... masculinity is seen to increasingly depend upon matters of style, self-presentation and consumption as opposed to more traditional models of masculinity centred on work and production or, to put it more simply, masculinity is perceived to be increasingly predicated on matters of how men *look* rather than what men *do* (Edwards, 2006:111, emphasis in original).

For young men in British urban spaces, sportswear tinted with a hint of militarism could be regarded as apparel that is suggestive of more traditional form of masculinity. Stylistic choices are not simply predicated upon social exclusion which strips away all fashion choice, as some accounts argue (see McAuley, 2007). Rather, it is possible that such styles are encoded with messages. The goggle hoody might be regarded as epitomizing many of the qualities that urban youth would like to suggest that they possess - its association with extreme sports and therefore physicality being the most obvious. That such fashions are increasingly being adopted at exactly the same time many traditional pursuits and avenues for making such masculinity (via work or involvement in sports leisure) have become ever more limited (Winlow, 2001; McAuley, 2007) is perhaps significant.

The goggle jacket, or goggle hoody can be seen simply as a new variation on traditional stylistic tendencies of youth. But it can also be seen

as reaction to new extreme surveillance that now permeates British cities (e.g. Armstrong and Norris, 1999). One British company *Bench* - which markets hoodys and urban fashion ware to British youth - have aptly demonstrated this through their own marketing (see Figure 2). Logging on to the *Bench* website now sees potential purchasers met with loading screens that ask them 'Stalked by CCTV?', before flashing up text suggesting 'There is now one camera for every 14 people', before they finally come to the main message as part of 'The campaign'. Furthermore, according to their website:

It is human nature to be inquisitive and curious. We are all voyeurs by nature. The increasing use of CCTV in public places has caused a debate over public surveillance versus privacy. This campaign aims to evoke feelings of intrusion on the subject's city lifestyle and almost a feeling of voyeurism on the viewer's behalf as we live in this CCTV generation (<http://www.bench.co.uk/home.php>).

Figure 2. *Bench* shop front



Arguably, before CCTV putting your hood up was likely to be regarded as 'un-cool'. Now it has been reworked into the statement 'I am the kind of character who needs to stay out of sight and off the (security) camera' (Calcutt, 2006). The hood can be used as a statement of willingness to transgress convention, to not abide by or to reject repressive and restrictive practices. Yet alternate readings of the 'hood', as Calcutt notes, reveal that it is a mixed mass of contradiction. Although affording anonymity, it functions as an 'alternate identity card' (Calcutt, 2006). It conveys a sense of anonymity and anti-consumerism, suggesting at low-culture, while tipping a nod to the high-end Italian fashions that inspired it, and suggesting the wearer has appetite that is 'low culture, voracious and hedonistic' (Calcutt, 2006). There may be a final reading, in that in a context where for young people personal security has never been more important, youthful 'hoodys', more generally, seem to secure themselves as 'one of the

gang' (Calcutt, 2006). Their attire suggests at self-reliance and self-preservation at a time when such things are socially ascribed as dominant near hegemonic values for many urban male youths in their peer groups. Perhaps in some way the take up of the 'goggle hoody' by young men eludes to that fact that they feel they have to take responsibility for their own self-protection? Yet ironically, might it be that while wearing it seemingly affords anonymity and ensures conformity, paradoxically it stands out as non-conformist and brings both attention and real exclusion.

Crime sells... but who is buying?

I have already argued that the emergence (or return) of the hoody and goggle hoody at this given moment is significant. I intend here to examine in further detail the social context that forms the backdrop to the goggle hood. A key point here is that crime is being increasingly used as a means of 'marketing' at the same time that we are subject to increasing social controls, including in less overt and more subtle forms (Presdee, 2000; Hayward, 2004). As Hayward notes, while crime has long sold, in contemporary consumer society it is being used to sell more than ever. That selling seems, for the most part, to be being targeted predominantly at young men through a connotation with overt, 'ladish' masculinity.

At a general level the fashion industry continually courts controversy and pushes the boundaries, engaging in its own forms of transgression, but only very infrequently citing a higher purpose than to sell products. For example one of the few attempts to utilise such images for political purpose (besides selling) is the now infamous *United Colours of Benetton* advertising campaigns which deliberately courted controversy from as early as the late 1980s by using images such as an electric chair (1992), the blooded fatigues of a Bosnian soldier (1994), a black woman breastfeeding a white baby (1989), and black and white hands 'cuffed' together (1989). Yet it is much more common to find the fashion industry trading off images and iconography drawn from drug cultures, or making use of transgressive images linked to underage sexuality, anorexia, or bondage (Young, 2007:13). Perhaps amongst the best known example of fashion borrowing from crime was the movement which became known as 'heroin chic', a term used by the media to describe the way in which the fashion industry adopted and emphasised an emancipated, drug addled look for models in the mid-1990s (black smudged eyeliner became seemingly ubiquitous in advert campaigns for major fashion houses, notably in *Calvin Klein* posters featuring Kate Moss). The reaction to the movement included a response from then US President, Bill Clinton, 'you do not need to glamorise addiction to sell clothes'.

Yet when fashion wants to sell to young men, it often encodes its products with subtle (and not so subtle) references to criminality. Fashion brands such as *Goi-Goi*, created on the back of Manchester's illegal warehouse rave scene, openly celebrate drug use and hedonism, often

using slogans full of double meaning that elude to the appeal of recreational drugs on their t-shirts. Elsewhere the British clothing company *Criminal* drew much of its inspiration from the iconography of crime to sell its products (it only recently ceased trading after the death of its founder Reza Dehghani). Its high-end fashion products were adorned with images of flick knives, baseball bats, knuckledusters and AK-47s. It also used images of graffiti and experimented with hiding identity with full zip hoody type garments. Such was the appeal of the brand that even with a 'no-advertising' policy it supplied to 1,700 stores and had developed a worldwide annual retail turnover of £10 million. Elsewhere brands such as *Section 60* (named after a controversial police power to stop and search, used for the most part against football supporters suspected of violence) and *One True Saxon* (a brand that with obvious imperialistic overtones has become a contemporary football hooligan's chic with its t-shirts emblazoned with 'Smile, you are on CCTV' and 'Stars of CCTV' slogans) have made plays on criminal imagery. These are but a few examples of fashion drawing on crime (space prohibits further discussion, but there are numerous others).

Crime, of course can be used to sell to other groups. A most interesting turn on how fashion sells through crime is the emerging use of the fear of crime to sell fashion apparel. For example, *Bladerunner*, a UK-based company which traditionally manufactured garments for the security industry, has just completed a lucrative move into the children's market, where it is selling bullet proof and stab proof hooded garments aimed at those as young as seven. Elsewhere *Karrysafe*, another British company, combined preventative ideas based on the notion of designing out crime in order to produce a range of anti-crime garments, such as bags and cases, designed so as to be difficult to steal from the person. Their advertising specifically targets business women. The first lucrative deal to stock the product was with Selfridges, the high-end department store.

Outlaw of the shopping mall

The examples above are just a few drawn from the fashion industry's reliance upon the transgressive and criminal image. While crime is being used to sell, paradoxically, some fashions and styles associated with crime are again being subject to an increased range of social controls. In this respect, today's fashion police are the private security and police officers who enforce aesthetically driven exclusionary practices; for instance according to a former homeless person cited by Millie et al. (2005:32):

Every Friday night I walk in Soho and I see [people] kicking the shit out of each other and the police don't seem to be handing out anti-social behaviour orders to them. They're handing out anti-social behaviour orders to people who are homeless and badly dressed rather than people in suits yeah ... They're effectively isolating

people who are already pretty isolated. These are social discrimination orders.

As Millie notes elsewhere (2008:383), 'how we use and enjoy our urban spaces is largely dictated by our expectations and understandings of others' behaviour' (2008:383). People hold radically different expectations and understandings of what is acceptable or unacceptable, and this is true even where clothing is concerned. It follows that with competing demands, the young are policed not just because of their behaviour, but because they are judged sartorially acceptable as defined by dominant 'adult' groups strongly influenced by sensory or *aesthetic* cues (Millie, 2008).

Presdee has noted, much public space is contested, but over the last two decades the shopping mall has become one of the most contested of all public spaces:

For many young people, especially the unemployed, there has been a continuing congregation within modern shopping centres... At the mall... young people push back the limits imposed on them... young people, cut off from normal consumer power, invade the space of those with consumer power. They become the 'space invaders' (Presdee, 1994:182, *cited in* Hayward 2004:189).

Hayward has countered that the twenty-first century shopping centre has evolved, and:

... no longer functions in the way it used to as a (albeit unintended) transgressive landscape for young people, who are easily identified by new crime control apparatus and technologies. These spaces are now 'hermetically sealed' private places where anything but the aesthetically acceptable is banished (Hayward 2004:189).

Young men are the principal targets of aesthetic exclusion. The goggle hoody is not alone in being increasingly restricted and monitored on the streets because of its association with youthful, male criminality. Increasingly, we witness in city centres and public places, 'policing by attire' to an ever greater degree. Lusher (2005) noted the negative association that could be borne out of choosing to wear expensive 'Prada high-tops trainers'; while attempting to access a range of nightspots only to be turned away. He quotes a professional DJ who notes that, 'Prada... is for posh scallies, mate, drug dealers, council' (Lusher, 2005). Elsewhere pubs in Leicester *The Parody* and *Varsity* banned a range of items due to their association with criminality (particularly football violence) including *Burberry*, *Henri Lloyd* and *Stone Island* (BBC News Online, 2004). For the most part, it is young males conforming to particular types that are excluded.

In 2005, Adam Sheppard, a nineteen year old male, was convicted under laws prohibiting religious hatred after he was arrested when a

woman complained to the police about a t-shirt he was wearing. The shirt, for the band *Cradle of Filth* depicted a nun masturbating with a crucifix and was emblazoned across the back with the words 'Jesus is a c**t'. When Shepherd refused a police request to cover the garment (which he had purchased in a high street chain store nearby) he was arrested. When he appeared before magistrates he was given 80 hours of community service and £40 costs.

Elsewhere the Bluewater shopping centre in Kent (like a number of others) stipulates it prohibits any persons 'deliberately obscuring their faces', although the garments it prohibits remain on sale in the centre itself. Tony Blair similarly supported the centre's actions by advocating any clampdown on youthful anti-social behaviour (BBC News Online, 2005). Interestingly, this in itself is indicative of a fusing together of young people, dress and anti-social behaviour into a homogenous entity, something which it seems is becoming more apparent. Take the following:

Britain was mourning the latest innocent victims of violent crime last week after a spate of senseless murders. In every case, the killer's sullen face was hidden beneath the disguise of feral society - the hooded top. Across the country, violence, vandalism, theft and disorder are an everyday menace, created by faceless gangs of youths with little fear of ever being caught. Streets, trains, buses and shopping centres have become no-go zones for terrified citizens who have been intimidated by hoodys for too long ... Today the *Sunday Express* calls for a crackdown on this terrifying trend and demands that police officers get tough and order hoods to be removed in public places Just as banks ban people from wearing crash helmets on their premises, we believe high streets and public transport would be safer if hoods were outlawed and exclusion zones imposed (Drake, 2008:1-4).

So launched the *Sunday Express* campaign to 'ban the hood for good!', an appeal to create laws that prohibited the disguising of one's face on public transport, on the streets and in shopping centres by wearing of a hood. Keen to demonstrate that they were not indiscriminately criticising hooded tops the *Express* noted that hooded garments were quite appropriate when walking one's dog on a blustery day on the local common, braced against a chill wind. Instead, the hood becomes 'deviant' and inappropriate only when it is placed in context where it is connected to youth and public space.

Conclusions

We need to consider very carefully what becomes the target, why is it the hood? Indeed we ought to ask why we often ascribe to the youthful 'hood' the label of 'criminal', while fashion houses perpetrate very real criminality using slave and child labour with impunity? (Klein, 2000). Yet

instances of the control of this ‘fashion crime’ are far less than that targeting young people who elect some forms of fashion (whether they actually commit any crime or not).

Yet I think it holds that if one wants to understand what a criminal looks like, we should think about the men in suits, the type that sit quietly behind the exclusionary and corporate practices could easily be regarded just as deviant. Sutherland (1949) long ago suggested something similar. It is for that reason I finish with this anecdote. I know a ‘professional shoplifter’, though few people on the affluent street where he lives would recognise that this is his vocation. His house is well maintained, his car is a top of the range Audi TT. He, like businessmen, wears a suit to work, but in his case not because his choice of employment demands it. Rather, he does it because, he says, it distracts CCTV operators and the security staff. He will tell how they are far more interested in ‘youths’, ‘scruffy looking sorts... you know smack addict types’, and ‘young moms with pushchairs’. He knows that few are likely to closely scrutinise well groomed man, even if he is stealing thousands of pounds worth of property. Of course, such manipulation of popular perception is easy once one knows what to avoid looking like, and he has told me with no hint of sarcasm or irony that, ‘the thing is mate, if people really knew what criminals looked like, then they might catch a few more of them’.

References

- Goffman, E (1990 [1959]) *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Armstrong, G and Norris, C. (1999) *The Maximum Surveillance Society*, Oxford: Berg.
- BBC News Online (2004) *Pub goers facing ‘Burberry’ ban*. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/leicestershire/3583900.stm>
- BBC News Online (2005) *Mall bans shoppers’ hooded tops*. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/kent/4534903.stm>
- Block, B and Hostettler, J (1997) *Hanging in the Balance*, Winchester: Waterside.
- Calcutt, A (2006) ‘Hijab in the hood: Religion, pop culture and public policy’, *Rising East Online*, Issue 4.
- Cohen, S (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, London: MacGibbon and Kee.
- Drake, M (2008) ‘Ban the Hood for Good!’ *Sunday Express* 30 March 2008, pp.1-4.
- Edwards, T (2006) *Cultures of Masculinity*, London: Routledge.

Featherstone, M (1994) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernity*, London: Sage.

Ferrell, J (1995) 'Style matters: Criminal identity and social control' in Ferrell, J and Sanders, C (eds) *Cultural Criminology* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Hall, S., Winlow, S. and Ancrum, C. (2008) *Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture*, Cullompton: Willan.

Hayward, K. (2004) *City Limits: Crime, Consumer Culture and the Urban Experience*, London: Glasshouse.

Hayward, K. and Yar, M. (2006) 'The chav phenomenon: consumption, media and the construction of a new underclass', *Crime, Media, Culture*, 2(1) 9-28.

Hayward, K. and Young, J. (2007) 'Cultural criminology' in M. McGuire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of criminology*, Fourth Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hebdige, D. (1979) *Subculture and the Meaning of Style*, London: Routledge.

Hobbs, D. and Robbins, D. (1991) 'The boy done good: football violence, changes and continuities' *Sociological Review*, 39(3) 551-579.

Jewkes, Y. (2004) *Media and Crime: A Critical Introduction*, London: Sage.

Klein, N. (2000) *No Logo*, London: Flamingo.

Lusher, A. (2005) 'If the name is Prada, you're not coming in', *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 November.

Malcolm, J.L. (2002) *Guns and Violence: the English experience*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McAuley, R. (2007) *Out of Sight: Crime, Youth and Exclusion in Modern Britain*, Cullompton: Willan.

Miller, (1995) 'Struggles over the symbolic: gang style and the meaning of social control', in J. Ferrell and C. Sanders (eds.) *Cultural Criminology* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Millie, A (2008) 'Anti-social behaviour, behavioural expectations and an urban aesthetic', *British Journal of criminology*, 48(3) 379-394.

Millie, A., Jacobson, J., Hough, M. and Paraskevopoulou, A. (2005) *Anti-social Behaviour in London: Setting the Context for the London Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy*, London: Greater London Authority.

- Morrison, W. (2004) 'Lombroso and the birth of criminological positivism; scientific mastery or cultural artifice?', in J. Ferrell, W. Morrison and M. Presdee (eds.) *Cultural Criminology Unleashed*, London: Glasshouse Press.
- Neiderer, E. and Winter, R. (2008) 'Fashion, culture and the construction of identity', in M. Ryan (ed.) *Cultural Studies: An Anthology*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- O'Brien, M. (2007) 'Book Review: Violent Night', *Crime, Media, Culture*, 3(3) 398-401.
- Ordinary of Newgate (1723) *Account of the Behaviour, Confession, and Dying Words, of the Malefactors, who was executed at Tyburn, On Wednesday the 11th of this Instant August, 1736, and Thomas Reynolds, who was executed July 26*. Available at:
<http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/browse.jsp?id=OA17360726n2-1&div=OA17360726#highlight>
- Pearson, G. (1983) *Hooligan: A History of Respectable Fears*, London: Macmillan.
- Polhemus, T. (1994): *Street Style*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Presdee, M. (1994) 'Young people, culture and the construction of crime' in Barak, G (ed) *Varieties of criminology: readings from a dynamic discipline*, Westport CT: Praeger.
- Presdee, M (2000) *Cultural Criminology and the Carnival of Crime*, London: Routledge.
- Sutherland, E.H. (1949) *White Collar Crime*, New York, NY: Dryden.
- Tahler, A. and Hind, G. (2007) 'Burqa for Boys becomes new hoodie fashion', *The Sunday Times*, 9 December.
- Thornton, P. (2003) *Casuals: Football, Fighting and Fashion - The Story of a Terrace Cult*, Reading: Milo.
- Winlow, S (2001) *Badfellas*, Oxford: Berg.
- Williams, K. and Treadwell, J. (2008) 'Similarity and difference: The ethnographer, the subject and objectivity', *Methodological Innovations Online*, 3(1).
- Young, J (2007) *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*, London: Sage.

JAMES TREADWELL is a lecturer in Criminology at the University of Leicester. He has a broad interest in criminological theory, and has undertaken ethnographic research on crime in a range of settings. He is currently writing up his PhD on contemporary football hooliganism.