Chapter 1

The welfare of men?

Jeff Hearn

Do welfare and welfare systems serve the welfare of men? What is the relationship of men and welfare? To explore such questions, it is not enough to rely on the discipline of Social Policy. We need to consider this question within a broad political economy framework, that includes the analysis of production and reproduction, economic life, state development, citizenship and civil society.

In this chapter I consider to what extent welfare and welfare systems might be understood as serving the welfare of men, and how the relationship of men and welfare more generally might be conceptualized. The discussion of these questions is developed through, first, examining the rethinking of welfare and work; then, the impact of feminism on the analysis of social policy; third, the review of recent debates on critical studies on men and masculinities; fourth, the relevance of these various previous debates for rethinking the relationship of men and welfare; and finally, some brief comments on contemporary developments around the place of men in social policy.

RETHINKING WELFARE AND WORK

The British welfare state, that is the Beveridgean welfare state, and the discipline of Social Administration grew up hand in hand in the post-war period. Their primary focus appeared to be the agendered citizen, even though they were implicitly gendered, being based on assumptions of the nuclear family and the unpaid work of women (see Wilson, 1977). This welfare state was based on contributions from what would be assumed to be lifelong employment, and this meant that those who were not able to achieve this—in practice, often women with family responsibilities—received reduced benefits

and provisions (Laybourn, 1995:254). As such, British welfare policy, despite its appearance of universal care from cradle to grave was fundamentally residual rather than institutional in character (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1958). In keeping with the political traditions of Toryism and Liberalism, it was founded on the calculation of individual needs rather than social insurance guaranteeing all citizens equal rights to a decent standard of living (Tyyskä, 1995).

During the 1970s Social Administration slowly transformed itself into the discipline of Social Policy. Social Policy was much more concerned with social division and much more influenced by neo-Marxist political economy than Social Administration. Unfortunately, the traditions of political economy, both classical and modern, did not, at least not initially, do much to emphasize the significance of gendered power relations in society. Their focus was primarily on public domain activities, and often only implicitly on men there. For example, in his landmark work on *The Political Economy of the Welfare State,* Gough (1983) retained malestream (O'Brien, 1981) terminology in speaking of work as occupying economically productive or unproductive sectors. Similarly, in such models the analysis of gender relations was often implicitly relegated to the world of social consumption, social expenses (O'Connor, 1974) and collective consumption (Castells, 1977), or simply went unnoticed. Such distinctions, perhaps unwittingly or perhaps not, transplant the discriminations of patriarchal societies into supposedly radical political economic analysis.

RETHINKING WORK AND WELFARE

Increasingly, attempts have been made to rethink the political economic analysis of society to avoid the pitfalls of merely reproducing dominant definitions and ideologies of the political and the economic. To some extent this is an outgrowth of a long-established concern within welfare economics. Indeed, at the start of the twentieth century Arthur Cecil Pigou, the founder of welfare economics, noted that if a woman, employed as a housekeeper by a bachelor, marries him then national income would fall since her previously paid work would now be unpaid and thus not counted in national accounting (*Human Development Report 1995,* 1995:87).

Of particular importance has been the impact of feminist theory and practice on the theory and practice of economics itself, and the

growth of a relatively small but influential feminist economics. The domestic labour debate of the mid-1970s (Gardiner, 1975; Himmelweit and Mohun, 1977) was a major accomplishment in bringing domestic, private and unpaid labour at least partially into the analysis of political economy. This development was itself open to criticism in using economic categories in ways that are inapplicable to activities that are more than the economic (see Delphy, 1977, 1984). Feminist scholarship and politics around the economic, both domestic and beyond, has above all problematized what is meant by work, in line with broader feminist analysis in politics, sociology and development studies. It has stressed the importance of counting what has previously counted for nothing (Waring, 1988). It has led to a rethinking of state budgets in terms of how they contribute to women's welfare (*Women's Budget Statement,* 1990–91), and by implication men's welfare too. Although economics as a discipline has been resistant to feminist influence, feminist economics is now here to stay (Nelson, 1996).

Also important for social policy is the broadening of the concepts of work and labour beyond what has been called productive labour to include reproductive labour. This point has been argued strongly in a number of contexts, including Canadian feminist political economy (for example, O'Brien, 1978, 1981, 1990; Cummings, 1980). Yet another strand of work is discernible from feminist materialist anthropology, which (following an Engelsian tradition) ranks reproduction as important as if not more important than production (Mackintosh, 1977; Edholm *et al,* 1977; Harris and Young, 1981). I have found all these perspectives immensely helpful in my own work on the structuring of reproduction in patriarchy (Hearn, 1983, 1987, 1992).

These questions have also been taken up in the realm of international politics. For example, the UN has been prominent in refining the measurement of economic activity; for example, through the distinction between productive activities that are market-orientated and included in national income accounts (System of National Accounts) (SNA), and those that are not (non-SNA). These have been measured through time-use studies, in which activities that could be performed by a third person (for example, cooking a meal) are counted as economic, and those that have to be performed by oneself (such as eating the meal or sleeping) are counted as personal and non-economic. In the most recent survey of thirteen individual countries, only 34 per cent of women's work time was spent on SNA

activities and 66 per cent was spent on non-SNA activities, while for men the figures were reversed, 66 per cent of work being spent on SNA activity and 34 per cent on non-SNA activity (*Human Development Report 1995,* 1995: Table 4.2).[1]

The broad, global rethinking of work, economic activity, welfare, gender relations and gender empowerment has set a new scene for understanding not only women and welfare but also men and welfare.

FEMINISM AND SOCIAL POLICY

It is not an overstatement to argue that feminist theory and practice have transformed contemporary understandings of welfare and social policy. This comes from the insistent consciousness-raising of feminist politics and practice; feminist initiatives and politics in, around and against the state; focused feminist studies of the state of welfare and the welfare state; and feminist theory more generally, with its own multiple implications for the understanding and change of welfare and social policy.

Feminist work in and around social policy has increasingly named women in a number of different relations to welfare, the welfare state and its various institutional derivatives. There is now a very large body of work of this kind that makes the case for feminist analysis of social policy. Key works include those by Wilson (1977), McIntosh (1978), Barrett and McIntosh (1982), Finch and Groves (1983), Graham (1984), Dale and Foster (1986), Pascall (1986, 1997), Pateman (1988), Williams (1989), Dominelli (1991), MacLean and Groves (1991), Bock and Thane (1994), Hallett (1996). Accordingly, women have been the focus of much recent research on welfare: as recipients and users of health and welfare services, as the providers of welfare in both the private and public domains, as the target of preventive health and welfare campaigns, and as the victims and survivors of various kinds of diswelfare—violence, abuse, mental illness and so on.

Tyyskä (1995:19–20) has argued that there are two other apparently contradictory strands in feminist approaches to welfare. The first has focused on the critique of the welfare state in view of its patriarchal and/or capitalist assumptions and policies; the second has treated the notion of community caring with suspicion, highlighting how this can be a way of shifting financial and other material burdens from the state to the unpaid work of women. Partly

because of such debates and contradictions, feminist studies of welfare have tended gradually to broaden their analysis from an initial focus on women as a general category of recipients of welfare to the plight of particular groups of women, to the position of women throughout the welfare system, to the examination of gendered processes throughout welfare, and most recently the intersection of gendered processes with other processes, such as those of racialization.

Sainsbury (1994) has argued that '[a] weakness of early feminist studies was a generic view of the welfare state and a lack of attention to differences in state formation.... Gradually feminists have extended the horizons of their theorizing and comparisons, and in the process the welfare state has been superseded by welfare states' (p. 2). She continues, stating that two broad approaches to the gendering of welfare states can be discerned:

> [t]he first has been to problematize several basic concepts in the mainstream literature by inquiring how they are gendered. In effect, this approach seeks to utilize mainstream theories and conceptions, and when necessary to refashion them, so as to encompass both women and men (Orloff, 1993; O'Connor, 1993). The second approach argues that mainstream theories are fundamentally lacking. Because crucial elements are missing, alternative theories and models are required (Lewis and Ostner, 1991; Lewis, 1992).
>
> (1994:2–3)

To some extent these feminist critiques have been developed in response to non-gendered comparative studies of welfare, most prominently that of Esping-Andersen (1990). His classification of welfare states has been based on the extent to which the commodity status of labour is eroded through welfare. Accordingly he distinguished Conservative, Social Democratic and Labour Regime Welfare Regimes. A number of feminist analysts have questioned this approach's neglect of gender relations. For example, Leibfried (1993) and Langan and Ostner (1991) have put forward modified welfare models that spell out gender implications more fully. Interestingly, these (partially) gendered welfare state models (Duncan, 1995) are themselves open to criticism for adding on gender to a fundamentally non-gendered approach (Leira, 1992; Lewis, 1992; Borchorst, 1990,1994). Meanwhile, as Sainsbury has

noted, attempts have been made to argue for and reformulate our understanding of welfare and welfare states by placing gender and gender relations at the centre of analysis. Lewis (1992), for example, distinguishes strong, modified and weak breadwinner states, exemplified by Ireland, France and Sweden respectively (also see Julkunen, 1996; Rubery *et al.,* 1996).

An alternative approach has been proposed by Hirdmann (1988, 1990, cited in Duncan 1994, 1995; Rantalaiho, 1996) in terms of differing gender contracts. The gender system is a general concept that refers to the whole organization of society through cultural super-structure, social integration and socialization; it is equivalent to patriarchy (Walby, 1986, 1990; Hearn, 1987, 1992) or the male-dominated gender order (Stacey, 1986) or the masculine gender system (Waters, 1989). The gender contract is a middle-range concept that in effect puts the gender system into operation—it is the set of rules that operate around what people of different sexes should do, think, be. Using the example of Sweden, Hirdmann distinguishes a housewife contract, a transitional contract and an equality contract in the development of welfare from the 1930s up to the 1980s. Most importantly she argues that the gender contract is not a temporary settlement or compromise between capital and labour, but one between men and women.

Other feminist analyses have focused more fully on gendered differentiation within welfare. For example, Fraser has distinguished different constructions of needs and identities by welfare systems within male-dominated, capitalist society. She thereby summarizes:

> the separate and unequal character of the two-tiered, gender-linked, race- and culture-biased US social welfare system in the following formulas: participants in the masculine subsystem are positioned as *rights-bearing beneficiaries* and *purchasing consumers* of services, thus as possessive individuals. Participants in the feminine subsystem, on the other hand, are positioned as *dependent clients,* or *the negatives of possessive individuals.*
>
> (Fraser, 1989:153)

With all these and similar analyses of welfare states, we can ask the simple question—what are they saying explicitly or implicitly about men, and indeed masculinities? Generally, these conceptualizations of welfare are saying something about men in three main ways: in families (particularly the heterosexual family), in paid work

(particularly full-time employment), and in the state (particularly as managers and decision-makers about welfare). Less usual in these gendered models of welfare are commentaries on men managing the institutions of capital, and men outside the heterosexual family (for example, gay or lone young men).

Although it has been relatively unusual for the focus of feminist analyses of social policy to be primarily on men, recent feminist studies increasingly re-include men, but this time as gendered controllers and citizens (see, for example, Bryson *et al.,* 1994; Daly, 1994). This brings us directly to the question—how is it that men, and masculinities, have come to be increasingly recognized as just as gendered as women and femininities?

CRITICAL STUDIES ON MEN

The recent growth of interest in the study and theorizing of men and masculinities has derived from a number of directions. First, there have been feminist critiques of men. These are inevitably diverse. They include liberal feminist critiques of men's unfairness and privilege; Marxist and socialist feminist critiques of men's economic class advantage; radical and lesbian feminist critiques of men's sexuality and violence; and black feminist critiques of (white) men's sexism and racism.

Second, there has been a very different set of critiques from (male) gay liberation and (male) gay scholarship, and to an extent queer theory and queer politics. These are premised on the assumption of desire for men and the desirability of men rather than the direct critique of men (see Edwards, 1994). What is being critiqued in gay perspectives is not men in general or even men's power but dominant heterosexual men and related masculinities. Queer theory and politics have problematized dichotomous thinking to sex, gender and sexualities even more profoundly, and have argued for activist, constructionist and fluid approaches (for example, Beemyn and Eliason, 1996).

Third, there have been some men's specific and explicit responses to feminism. This includes those with a specifically pro-feminist or anti-sexist orientation; but there is also other work that is more ambiguous in relation to feminism or even is anti-feminist in its perspective. The idea of 'men's studies' is one such ambiguous development, not least because it is unclear how such studies relate to feminism, and whether they are meant to refer to studies by men or of men.[2]

These three kinds of critique of men together make up what has come to be called Critical Studies on Men. Such studies have effectively brought the question of theorizing men and masculinities into sharper relief. Paradoxically, this makes men and masculinities *explicit objects* of theory and critique, and makes men and masculinities *problematic*. These critical studies are relevant to retheorizing welfare and social policy in several ways. First, they have prompted a series of political, theoretical and epistemological set of questions about how to study welfare and social policy. Second, there are questions around the general phenomena of welfare and social policy. Third, there are questions around specific forms of welfare and specific social policies.

In developing Critical Studies on Men, a number of concepts have been specifically developed. First and most obviously, there is the concept of 'men'. Men are a social category, whether this applies to particular men, all men, or the possibility of this category in the first place. Second, the concept of 'masculinity' may be thought of as a shorthand for the indications, the set of signs, that someone is a man, a member of the category of men. Third, the concept of 'masculinities' has been developed (Carrigan *et al.,* 1985; Connell, 1995) to refer to diverse forms of masculinity. In particular, it refers to the way in which particular forms of masculinity persist not just in relation to femininity, but also to other forms of masculinity. Accordingly, different forms of masculinity exist in relations of power, that may be characterized as hegemonic or subordinated in relation to one another.

Having said that, the emphasis upon masculinities does carry with it a number of limitations and these need to be acknowledged. First, there is the danger of the emphasis upon masculinities being a means of forgetting women, of losing women from analysis and politics. Second, the emphasis upon masculinities may divert attention from other social divisions and oppressions, and the interrelations of social divisions and oppressions. Third, the concept of 'masculinities' may be just too imprecise. It may refer to institutional patterns, behaviours, identities, experiences, appearance, practices, subjectivities. The concept is premised on the assumption of a pattern or gloss that can be reasonably summarized (McMahon, 1993; Hearn, 1996).

Among the many areas of current debate that have developed in recent years around the theorizing of men and masculinities, just three that have been particularly significant are introduced here: the

concept of 'patriarchy'; unities and differences between men and between masculinities; and sexuality and subjectivity. In each case tensions between generalizations about men and masculinity and specificities of particular men and particular masculinities may be identified.

Following its central political and theoretical place within Second Wave feminism, the concept of 'patriarchy' was subject to a number of feminist and pro-feminist critiques in the late 1970s (for example, Rowbotham, 1979; Atkinson, 1979). It was suggested that the concept was too monolithic, ahistorical, biologically overdetermined, and dismissive of women's resistance and agency. Despite these critiques, the concept has not been dismissed. Instead, there has been greater attention to, first, the historicizing and periodizing of patriarchy; and second, the presence of multiple arenas, sites and structures of patriarchy. On the first count, particular attention has been paid to the historical movement from private patriarchy, where men's power is located primarily in the private domain as fathers and husbands, to public patriarchy (or patriarchies), where men's power is located primarily in the public domain as capitalist and state managers and workers. The significance of public patriarchy lies partly in the fact that organizations become the prime social unit of men's domination. In the context of welfare and social policy this is particularly important as public domain welfare organizations are often arenas of contestation between men and women. On the second count, there have been attempts to specify the various sites or bases of patriarchy. These include analyses by Walby (1986, 1990) specifying the following sets of patriarchal structures: capitalist work, the family, the state, violence, sexuality and culture. I have specified a slightly different set of structures: reproduction of labour power, procreation, regeneration/ degeneration, violence, sexuality and ideology (Hearn, 1987, 1992).

A second major area of debate has been around unities and differences between men and masculinities. Just as one of the major areas of theory and practice within feminism has been around the extent to which there are commonalities and differences between women, so too men can be usefully analysed in terms of commonalities and differences. In some ways these debates mirror debates on the concept of 'patriarchy', particularly the diversity of 'patriarchies' and patriarchal arenas. One way of understanding such unities or potential unities is through the concept of gender class—

whether seen in terms of biological reproduction (Firestone, 1970; O'Brien, 1981), sexuality (MacKinnon, 1982, 1983) or household relations and work (Delphy, 1977, 1984). All of these and indeed other social relations might be seen as possible social bases of the gender class of men (Hearn, 1987, 1992). However, the idea of a unity of men is *also* a myth. Indeed, one of the ways that men's collective power is maintained is through the assumption of hegemonic forms of men and masculinities as the most important or sole form. The focus on the assumption of white, heterosexual, able-bodied men to the exclusion of other kinds of men remains a major issue for both practical politics and theoretical analysis. Instead of there being just one kind of men, dominant or otherwise, different kinds of masculinities are reproduced, often in relation to other social divisions. In many social arenas there are tensions between the collective power of men and masculinities and differentiations among men and masculinities. Of especial importance are the differentiations between men and between masculinities, defined in part by other social divisions, such as age, class, disability, race and sexuality (Collinson and Hearn, 1994). Social policy and welfare more generally are both constructed through such divisions, and act as and reproduce social divisions between different men and masculinities.

A third area of debate on theorizing men and masculinities has been around sexuality and subjectivity, or more precisely sexualities and subjectivities. The tension between unities and differences, as described above, can be extended to the realm of sexuality. This derives from the increasing interest that has been given to the experience of masculinity and the interrelation of masculinity and identity. These debates on men's sexualities and subjectivities have various relevances for the analysis of welfare and social policy. First and most obviously, welfare and social policy provide significant social *contexts* for men's sexualities and subjectivities. Second, welfare and social policy provide *resources* for the elaboration of men's sexualities and subjectivities, for example, social policies and practices may be used for individual and collective defence by men. Third, there are the *specific enactments or instances* of men's sexualities and subjectivities. Within these contexts, resources and instances, there are recurring tensions—between the domination of heterosexuality and homosociality/homosexuality; asexuality and the sexualization/the eroticization of dominance and hierarchy; coherent identity and fragmented identity; and essentialized experience and deconstruction.

RETHINKING MEN AND SOCIAL POLICY

In the remainder of this chapter, I bring together the preceding discussions on welfare and on men—in rethinking the relationship of men and social policy. This does not just apply to the delivery of welfare services, but also to the dominant notions and forms of welfare. Different feminist perspectives on welfare and social policy in turn have different implications for the analysis of men and masculinities. For example, approaches that argue for the critique of the patriarchal and/or capitalist welfare state as opposed to women's interests are implicitly at least also presenting an account of men. In particular, these include men's relationship to experiences of power in and around the state, whether it is characterized as patriarchal (Pateman, 1988), fraternal (Pringle and Watson, 1990) or a system of masculine dominance (Burstyn, 1983). In emphasizing the patriarchal interests of the (welfare) state, men are implicitly understood as, first, having patriarchal interests as a collectivity, and, second, as occupying different positions in relation to the state—as managers, policy-makers, clients and so on. In emphasizing the capitalist interests of the (welfare) state, another set of distinctions are suggested—most obviously in terms of men's different locations in the capitalist class system, though here again men's differential relation to the state is important. In contrast to both of these approaches, some feminist perspectives have focused on the structuring of care and caring. The critique of community care directs attention not only to women's paid/unpaid care but also men's paid/unpaid care, and men's avoidance and control of care.

While welfare, of women, men and children, is affected by all structures of society, the dominant construction of welfare through the state and the welfare state is much more specific. Dominant constructions of welfare and social policy are centred on the organization of broadly reproductive processes. Policy as a broad social phenomenon is both, a major way of organizing reproduction (in the widest sense of that term), and a way of organizing the public domains, as maintained by the public-private division (or difference). In addition, and perhaps most significantly, social policy represents the public organization of reproduction—of that which occurs materially largely in the private domains, that is then subsequently organized in public. Indeed, such material activity is generally assumed to pre-exist in the private domains. Thus even though more value is usually given by men to public institutions rather than the

private domains, the assumption remains within liberal democratic thinking that the public institutions are organizing pre-existing private domains.

Social policy is thus concerned with the public rule over the private, the placing of reproduction in the private domains into the control of the institutions of the public domains, and thus men. Social policy and the very category 'welfare' are the public organization of reproductive labour. The phenomenon of social policy is itself a representation of organized gender divisions. Without the public-private division/difference there would be no social policy. In trying to understand the structuring of welfare within patriarchy, four dominant institutions are fundamentally important: namely, hierarchic heterosexuality; fatherhood in the heterosexual family; the professions; and the state. Social policy is especially concerned with a variety of activities and constructions between those institutions across the public-private division/ difference.

The full range of experiences that occur within the private domains, including those of life, death, pain, sorrow, and sexual and emotional life more generally, are the focus of reproductive labour and emotional labour. Whereas with most of what is called 'productive labour', people work on objects to produce objects, with reproductive labour and emotional labour people are both the subjects and the objects of the labour. People work involves a social process *throughout*. Women have often been prominent in first of all making reproductive and emotional labour more public, and then transfer some of it and some of its organization and management from the private to the public domains (Hearn, 1982). Much of this process of publicization (Brown, 1981) has meant that reproductive labour becomes more fully under the control of men as a gender class; it is in a sense incorporated by men. In some cases this process has involved the specific exclusion of women, as, for example, with men's control of the professions. Having said that, these movements from the private to the public are extremely complex. For one thing, there is no absolute divide between the private and the public domains (Bose, 1987; Hearn, 1992, 1994). More specifically, the processes of movement from private to public may include the establishment of feminist action; initial incorporation through serving an individual man or an established profession; setting the *status quo* through the development of the patriarchal feminine and the professional code; division of the profession in gender

segregation; and men's takeover through managerialism, men in management and full professionalization (Hearn, 1982). Having said that, the establishment and development of professions can also be subject to contrasting processes of feminization. For example, medicine, still a male bastion in some societies, may be providing posts for increasing numbers of women, especially at the lower levels of the profession.

Throughout the history of welfare, men have often acted in their own collective interests as husbands, fathers, workers and managers and have on occasion acted against those interests, and placed women's interests as a higher priority. The history of the development of welfare can be re-read not just as the extension of agendered citizenship or women's citizenship but also as a story in which men have a number of different locations, positions and interests—as citizens, politicians, workers, managers, professionals, recipients. This mirrors recent feminist Nordic analyses of welfare and the welfare state in terms of women's differential locations (for example, Hernes, 1988a, 1988b; Borchorst, 1990, 1994). In much of this work the emphasis has been on the tripartite relation of women as professionals, workers and clients/recipients. Re-applying this kind of perspective to men involves both synthetic analyses of broad patterns of relationships of different men (that is, men in different social locations as, for example, fathers, husbands, workers, managers) in relation to the welfare system, and more particular analyses of the variability of those relations to welfare, over time, between societies, and by other social divisions, such as age, class, disability, race, sexuality.

Sometimes these distinctions are clearest when one looks back at historical change around welfare. For example, there has been extensive study of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century construction of the heterosexual or homosexual man, inside or outside marriage (Weeks, 1977; Mort, 1987; Hearn, 1992; Collier, 1995). Religion, medicine, science, law and, more specifically, welfare reform were all important in stipulating the 'correct' form of the family (as in the Marriage Act of 1836 and five subsequent Matrimonial Causes Acts up to 1895) or the assumed nature of male and female sexualities (as in the Contagious Diseases Acts of 1864, 1866 and 1869 and their repeal). Sexualities and their construction, and in this context men's sexualities, continue to be of immense importance in the definitions and delivery of welfare, often unevenly between and among women and men.

Meanwhile, another closely connected set of social relations were developed for men in the second half of the nineteenth century. First, the respectable working man was argued to be *prudent,* an obligation which required him to take a range of active steps to secure himself, his family and his dependants against future misfortune: joining insurance schemes provided by trade associations or friendly societies, personal involvement in the selection of benefits and the making of regular payments and so forth (Defert, 1991; Rose, 1996:341). These associative relations were soon displaced by private insurance schemes run for profit, and then at the turn of the century the state intervened with national schemes of compulsory social insurance (Rose, 1996:341). Throughout the twentieth century the place and norm of the working man and the so-called 'family wage' have continued to be crucial in the governance of welfare. In the strategies of government that developed over the twentieth century, the domains of the economic and the social were distinguished, but governed according to the principle of optimization. Economic activity, in the form of wage labour, was given a new set of *social* responsibilities, seen as a mechanism which would link males into the social order, and which would establish a proper relationship between the familial, the social and the economic orders (Rose, 1996:338).

Another set of considerations affecting the relationship of men and welfare derived from the movement to modern welfare and the creation of mass male armies, first with the Boer War and then with the First World War. Boer War recruitment revealed the parlous state of men's health. The late nineteenth century also showed military interest in the control of soldiers' drinking and the creation of institutional eating facilities for them. The external threats of the First World War brought not only an urgent concern for the state of economic, industrial and chemical resources (Gummett, 1980), but also a parallel concern for human resources, and particularly the health of men as workers and soldiers. As Harris (1961:7) puts it: 'the…search for a supply of efficient labour has been one of the few continuous threads in the history of welfare'. The Factory Inspectorate, the Health of Munitions Workers Committee Report of 1916 and the Ministry of Munitions all argued for the beneficial effects of planned nourishment and nutrition. The first Director of the Welfare Section of the Ministry, B.Seebohm Rowntree, noted that 'workers who are in good health are more efficient workers' (quoted in Harris, ibid.). In 1919 the Ministry of Health was introduced very

much as a response to these problems of men as bodies. And meanwhile in the post-First World War period, public housing was expanded to provide homes fit for heroes. All of these changes in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century have contributed to the strong historical associations of men, manhood and the modern nation-state. For some men at least, these connections involved particular senses of imperialist manhood/ nationhood, mediated by age, class, ethnicity and sexuality (see Mangan and Walvin, 1986).

These arguments on men and welfare can be related to debates around the connection of national crises, and particularly war, and the collective willingness or ability to develop the welfare state (Peacock and Wiseman, 1961; Fennell, 1990). For example, Wilensky (1975) traces the inception of the Swedish welfare state in the 1930s to responses to unrest and crisis. While such connections can be re-interpreted within a neo-Marxist view as part of ruling-class concessions to working-class demands, it is more interesting to consider the gendered character of state welfare concessions in the face of internal threat. Welfare reform, and especially that around income maintenance, can sometimes be understood partly as a pre-emptive response by the state—that is, men in the state—to the actual and potential unrest of men, particularly young men. In such developments it is men who overwhelmingly retain control of the state in general and the military in particular, and all the more so at times of crisis, which themselves may tend to involve younger, often working-class men as actual or potential insurgents, police or soldiers. The power of men in the state, army, police and criminal justice sector, with their apparatuses and machinery of violence and potential violence, may contrast abruptly with the power of individual men, small groups of men and even non-state collectivities of men, with their direct interpersonal violence and potential violence. Accordingly, as well as placing women's action and activity as central in welfare reform, it is possible to also distinguish the relative parts played by different groups of men as state politicians, state managers, workers, actual or potential insurgents and indeed beneficiaries.

The impact of the Second World War on the development of new forms of citizenship, of state planning and welfare priorities has been well established (Thane, 1982). These processes are clearly gendered—with men's movement to and return from war; women's involvement in munitions, engineering and other new work and their

loss of such employment; and the evacuation of women and children to new living areas and then their subsequent return (Riley, 1983).[3] While broad correlations can be drawn between expenditure on the military and on welfare—the welfare-warfare state—there are also important exceptions to this trend (Wilensky, 1975). Indeed, heavy military burdens can themselves drain energy, expertise and resources away from domestic welfare programmes, which can in turn lead to further social antagonisms and backlash against welfare, so slowing down welfare state development (Wilensky, 1972). Either way, these macro-arguments on welfare are at least in part about the differential place of men in and around the state—as state decision-makers, military managers, soldiers, workers, welfare recipients. Furthermore, all of these historical changes in men's relation to sexuality and violence, the nation, the family, health, income maintenance, the military and civil unrest were important in the development of modern state forms and patterns of governmentality. These developments did not comprise a coherent programme of 'state intervention', but rather a diverse series of liberal interventions based in governmental knowledge of human conduct, the creation of active subjects, the authority of expertise and reflexivity on the question of rule itself (Rose, 1993).

Just as women have a contradictory relation to welfare, so too do men. Social policy and welfare systems can be a means of providing benefits and services to women formerly unavailable to them; however, at the same time, such systems can be a means of control or constraint on women by reinforcing patriarchal assumptions and practices. Similarly, men have a contradictory relation to welfare, though in a different way from women. On the one hand, social policy and welfare systems can involve the redistribution of resources from men's control, even if men are in operational control of the system; on the other, such systems can increase men's control of women, even if women are in operational control of the system. For example, income maintenance can provide a means of livelihood, albeit characteristically close to subsistence, for women and children from the (patriarchical) state rather than directly from (patriarchal) capitalist or other sources; at the same time, those very systems of income maintenance have frequently involved relative discrimination and disadvantage against women—both in their public, state definitions and delivery, and their private distribution within families.

Furthermore, while women do the majority of care work, both paid and unpaid, there has been considerable debate on the extent of care done by men, particularly older men (for example, Arber and Gilbert, 1989; Chapter 7 this volume). The relationship of men to the provision of welfare services can also be contradictory. In some situations, men may receive preferential treatment over women; for example, at times of family crisis or when it is assumed that men cannot cope. On the other hand, men may tend to use some welfare services less than women. This is most clearly seen in the field of health, both physical and mental. Briscoe (1989, cited in Lloyd and Wood, 1996:9) suggests that, from an early age, girls become orientated towards the tendency to seek medical care for a variety of complaints, whereas boys learn to disregard pain and avoid doctors; hence an association is formed between being feminine and being more concerned with health. This kind of pattern is itself highly complicated, by, for example, class variations among girls and women's use of medical services, and some boys and men's involvement with sport and fitness.

For these reasons men may have quite diverse relations with welfare and welfare services—sometimes as those needing care from others, for example, around depression or addiction; sometimes as those needing control, for example, around violence; sometimes as those absent from or avoiding contact, from care and/or control (Hearn, 1998). Indeed, all of these relations can occur simultaneously for particular welfare agencies and individual men. What is perhaps most interesting is that patriarchical relations can persist and be reproduced through the combination of men's control of welfare, men's need for and sometimes avoidance of care (both of themselves and by others), men's need for and sometimes avoidance of control (both of themselves and by others). To put this more directly, men's power can also involve damage to men, not least in violence between men, accidents, suicide and lower life expectancy. These processes may damage individual men, and even whole categories of men, but paradoxically may assist the maintenance of men's collective power.

Throughout all these discussions of the shifting relations of men and welfare, it is important to ask the simple question—which men are we talking about? Sometimes it is men in the state; sometimes it is employed breadwinning, family men; sometimes it is men who are not employed. In particular, we can usefully ask how these specific relations of men to welfare, whether as policy-makers,

beneficiaries or whatever, apply to black men, men of colour, immigrant men and ethnic minority men. There is clearly no one answer to this kind of question. However, at the very least it is necessary to consider how men's relation to welfare is determined, affected or mediated by legal nationality and by racism in and around the state and in society more generally. Such issues of 'race', racism and nationality may also be intimately bound up with those of sexuality. The state frequently defines citizens, and especially new and potential citizens, in reference to their sexuality, actual or perceived, and their marital status. Marriage is after all a state institution; and the nation-state is dominantly, but not exclusively, heterosexual. Thus men, and especially black and (potential) immigrant men, along with their relatives, may be defined by the state in relation to the presence or absence of heterosexual marriage. Gay marriage is not an easy route to citizenship for men who are not legally national citizens; similarly, gay men who are not married, like lesbians in the same situation, usually find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to receive pensions and housing rights on the death of their partners.

Social policy is of course organized through a number of different policy areas, with their own particular institutional traditions, organizational arrangements, rules and procedures. Each of these provides not just services but also organizational spaces for workers, managers and policy-makers. Men figure differentially in these different policy arenas in these various locations. These social policy institutions and service delivery systems also provide the social spaces for different kinds of men, different kinds of masculinities—for the reproduction and occasionally opposition to masculinism. Just as it has become commonplace to speak of 'femocrats' (Yeatman, 1990; Watson, 1990; Franzway *et al,* 1989) who are simultaneously feminists and bureaucrats, so one might identify 'mascocrats' who are simultaneously masculinists and bureaucrats. Less common are men who are both bureaucrats and anti-masculinist/pro-feminist. These are just some of the ways for men to do masculinity, to be men, in the public domains. Other masculinities may be constructed by men in receipt of welfare services or in other related contexts, such as through the criminal justice system. These structures of welfare of course provide all kinds of possibilities for men to ally themselves with one another, and indeed to oppose, compete with and distance themselves from one another. Alliances, oppositions, continuities and discontinuities

between men can also operate *across* the boundaries between the public and private domains.

CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS

All of the policy areas of social policy—housing, health, education, income support, disability, social services, criminal justice and so on—are relevant for the understanding of men and masculinities. Likewise, men and masculinities are relevant for the understanding of each of those policy areas. The trouble with men remains a practical, political and theoretical issue in each policy area. It raises questions of historical and contemporary dominance by men, men's responses to women's initiatives, men's differential locations and actions in these arenas, and then more sporadically the existence and possibilities for anti-sexist, pro-feminist action there.

Inevitably, men's relationship to welfare is also subject to changing social policies at both governmental and local levels. In particular, recent changes in patterns of governance have included the privatization of welfare services, the introduction of internal markets, the reduction of administrative discretion, the restriction of welfare payments (to the unemployed, young adults, students and others), and the fragmentation of state structures, along with increasing centralization of state financial and policy control. These developments can be seen as linked with other shifts, such as the impact of globalization and the separation of the nation and the economy (Rose, 1996). Some commentators have described the development of advanced liberal government (Rose, 1993), in which there is a new relation between expertise and politics, based on calculative regimes of accounting and financial management; a new pluralization of social technologies; and a new specification of the subject of government as self-monitoring, active agents. In this move from modern to postmodern governmentality, men are constructed in a changing relation to welfare—both as managers and purveyors of expertise around welfare and as self-monitoring customers and clients of welfare systems. The patriarchal/fratriarchal breadwinner state is being transmuted to a more complex, dispersal of the state constructions in which men have a more variable series of locations. This dispersal of the state raises the possibility of a whole range of mini-patriarchies and mini-fratriarchies that in turn construct men in diverse ways, through

state bureaucracies, markets, community initiatives, third sector organizations, quangos and other interventions.

Twenty or even fifteen years ago, information on the specific location of men in relation to welfare was very limited (Hearn, 1980). Now there is a literature on almost all areas of social policy, which both chronicles relevant events of the past and present and puts forward possibilities for further future action—on men and/or by men (Pringle, 1995). There has been a particularly major development of commentaries and suggestions for actions in education and youth work (for example, Equal Opportunities Commission, 1982; Askew and Ross, 1988; Lloyd, 1985; Mahoney, 1985; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Salisbury and Jackson, 1996); social work, social services, probation and the criminal justice system (for example, Kadushin, 1976; Hearn, 1990; Cavanagh and Cree, 1996; Potts, 1996; Wild, 1998). Of special importance is the recognition of the urgency of ending the social problem of men's violence and abuse to women, children and indeed other men.

Men's practice in and around welfare can be understood collectively, by immediate social group, and individually. One can also ask the question, what do men do politically in the face of all these issues? While men's practice in and around welfare can broadly reinforce or oppose masculinization, it may often be more accurate to consider the contradictions that bear on men. Indeed, contradictions and processes of re-incorporation operate in whatever arena men may try to act to change their politics and themselves. These questions of practice apply in private and the domestic area in public working lives, in trade-union and political activity, in campaigns around reproductive politics; in anti-sexist men's activities; in men's relation to women, children and one another. This can mean men both gaining new experiences and losing certain powers, and as such changing men's relationship to welfare and social policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to David Collinson for discussions on some of the theoretical issues raised in this chapter, and to Jeanette Edwards and Jennie Popay for comments on an earlier draft.

NOTES

1 Interestingly, according to the United Nations Development Programme 1995 Report (*Human Development Report 1995,* 1995: Table 3.5), the UK ranks nineteenth in the world, between Hungary and Bulgaria, on the measure of gender empowerment (GEM). The measure is compiled from the aggregation of four sub-measures; of percentage of seats held in Parliament by women (7.4% in the UK), percentage of administrators and managers who are women (22.7%), percentage of professional and technical workers who are women (39.6%), and women's share of earned income (30.8% *[sic.]*).

2 A contrast can be drawn in the US context between those studies that are broadly pro-feminist (for example, Brod, 1987), those that are ambiguous in relation to feminism (for example, Bly, 1990), and those that are anti-feminist (for example, Baumli, 1985). For discussions of the critique of men's studies, see Hearn, 1989, and several of the contributions in Hearn and Morgan, 1990.

3 This pattern was not repeated throughout Europe. For example, Finnish women were not restored to their homes after the Second World War (Rantalaiho, 1996:26).

REFERENCES

Arber, S. and Gilbert, N. (1989) 'Men: the forgotten carers?', *Sociology,* 23(1):111–18.

Askew, S. and Ross, C. (1988) *Boys Don't Cry,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Atkinson, P. (1979) 'The problem with patriarchy', *Achilles Heel,* 2:18–22.

Barrett, M. and McIntosh, M. (1982) *The Anti-Social Family,* London: Verso.

Baumli, Francis (ed.) (1985) *Men Freeing Men,* New Atlantic: Jersey City.

Beemyn, Brett and Eliason, Mickey (eds) (1996) *Queer Studies: A Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Anthology,* New York: New York University Press.

Bly, Robert (1990) *Iron John A Book About Men,* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Bock, G. and Thane, P. (eds) (1994) *Maternity and Gender Policies: Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States 1880–1950,* London: Routledge.

Borchorst, A. (1990) *The Scandinavian Welfare States: Patriarchal, Gender Neutral or Women-Friendly?* Aarhus: Institute for Political Science, University of Aarhus.

——(1994) 'Scandinavian welfare states—patriarchal, gender neutral or women friendly?', *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology,* 31(1).

Bose, L. (1987) 'Dual spheres' in B.B.Hess and M.M.Ferree (eds) *Analyzing Gender: A Handbook of Social Science Research,* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Briscoe, M.E. (1989) 'Sex differences in mental health', *Update* (1 November):834–9.

Brod, Harry (ed.) (1987) *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies,* London: Allen & Unwin.

Brown, C. (1981) 'Mothers, fathers and children: from private to public patriarchy' in L.Sargent (ed.) *Women and Revolution The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism,* New York: Maple.

Bryson, L., Bittman, M. and Donath, S. (1994) 'Men's welfare state, women's welfare state: tendencies to convergence in practice and theory?', in D.Sainsbury (ed.) *Gendering Welfare States,* London: Sage.

Burstyn, V. (1983) 'Masculine dominance and the state', in R.Miliband and J.Savile (eds) *The Socialist Register 1983,* London: Merlin.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (1985) 'Toward a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society,* 14(5):551–604.

Castells, M. (1977) *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach,* London: Edward Arnold.

Cavanagh, K. and Cree, V. (eds) (1996) *Working with Men,* London: Routledge.

Collier, R. (1995) *Masculinity, Law and the Family,* London: Routledge.

Collinson, D. and Hearn, J. (1994) 'Naming men as men: implications for work, organizations and management', *Gender, Work and Organization* 1(1):2–22.

Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities,* Cambridge: Polity.

Cummings, J.E. (1980) 'Sexism in social work: some thoughts on strategy for structural change', *Catalyst,* 8.

Dale, J. and Foster, P. (1986) *Feminists and State Welfare,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Daly, M. (1994) 'Comparing welfare states: towards a gender friendly approach', in D.Sainsbury (ed.) *Gendering Welfare States,* London: Sage.

Defert, D. (1991) 'Popular life and insurance technology', in G.Burchell, C.Gordon and P.Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality,* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Delphy, C. (1977) *The Main Enemy,* London: Women's Research and Resources Centre.

——(1984) *Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression,* London: Hutchinson.

Dominelli, L. (1991) *Women across Continents: Feminist Comparative Social Policy,* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Duncan, S. (1994) 'Theorising differences in patriarchy', *Environment and Planning* 26:1177–94.

——(1995) 'Theorizing European gender systems', *Journal of European Social Policy,* 5(4):263–84.

Edholm, F., Harris, O. and Young, K. (1977) 'Conceptualising women', *Critique of Anthropology,* 3:101–30.

Edwards, T. (1994) *Erotics and Politics,* London: Routledge.

Equal Opportunities Commission (1982) *What's In It for the Boys?* Manchester/London: EOC/ILEA.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism,* Cambridge: Polity.

Fennell, G. (1990) 'The Second World War and the welfare state in Britain: sociological interpretations of historical development', in L.Jamieson and H.Corr (eds) *State, Private Life and Political Change,* London: Macmillan.
Finch, J. and Groves, D. (1983) *A Labour of Love,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Firestone, S. (1970) *The Dialectic of Sex,* London: Jonathan Cape.
Fraser, N. (1989) *Unruly Practices,* Cambridge: Polity
Franzway, S., Court, D. and Connell, R.W. (1989) *Staking a Claim: Feminism, Bureaucracy and the State,* Cambridge: Polity.
Gardiner, J. (1975) 'Women's domestic labour', *New Left Review,* 89.
Gough, I. (1983) *The Political Economy of the Welfare State,* London: Macmillan.
Graham, H. (1984) *Women, Health and the Family,* Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Gummett, P. (1980) *Scientists in Whitehall,* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Hallett, C. (1996) *Women and Social Policy,* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Harris, N. (1961) 'The decline of welfare', *International Socialism* (Winter).
Harris, O. and Young, K. (1981) 'Engendered structures: some problems in the analysis of reproduction', in J.S.Kahn and J.R.Llobera (eds) *The Anthropology of Pre-Capitalist Societies,* London: Macmillan.
Hearn, J. (1980) 'Men's politics and social policy', *Bulletin on Social Policy,* 5:53–7.
——(1982) 'Notes on patriarchy, professionalisation and the semi-professions', *Sociology,* 16(2):184–202.
——(1983) *Birth and Afterbirth: A Materialist Account,* London: Achilles Heel.
——(1987) *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism,* Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
——(1989) 'Reviewing men and masculinities—or mostly boys' own papers', *Theory, Culture and Society,* 6:665–89.
——(1990) 'Child abuse and men's violence', in Violence Against Children Study Group (ed) *Taking Child Abuse Seriously,* London: Unwin Hyman.
——(1992) *Men in the Public Eye: The Construction and Deconstructwn of Public Men and Public Patriarchies,* London: Routledge.
——(1994) 'Men in the public domains', in S.Edgell, S.Walklate and G.Williams (eds) *Debating the Future of the Public Sphere,* Aldershot: Avebury.
——(1996) 'Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/ masculinities', in M.Mac an Ghaill (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Arenas* , Buckingham: Open University Press.
——(1998) 'It's time for men to change', in J.Wild (ed.) *Working with Men for Change,* Basingstoke: Taylor & Francis.
Hearn, J. and Collinson, D.L. (1994) 'Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities', in H.Brod and M.Kaufman (eds) *Theorizing Masculinities,* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hearn, Jeff and Morgan, David (eds) (1990) *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory,* London: Unwin Hyman.
Hernes, H. (1988a) 'Scandinavian citizenship', *Acta Sociologica,* 31(3):199–215.
——(1988b) 'The welfare state citizenship of Scandinavian women', in K.B.Jones and A.G.Jónasdóttir (eds) *The Political Interests of Gender,* London: Sage.
Himmelweit, S. and Mohun, S. (1977) 'Domestic labour and capital', *Cambridge Journal of Economics,* 1(1).
Hirdmann, Y (1988) 'Genussystemet—reflexioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning', *Kvinnnovetenskaplig Tidskrift,* 3:49–63
——(1990) Genussystemet in *Demokrati och Makt i Sverige,* Stockholm: Statens Offentliga Utredningar.
Human Development Report 1995 (1995) New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press for the United Nations Development Programme.
Julkunen, Raija (1996) 'Women's rights in Finland', *Finfo,* 6/96:3–10.
Kadushin, K. (1976) 'Men in a woman's profession', *Social Work,* 21(6): 440–7.
Langan, M. and Ostner, I. (1991) 'Gender and welfare: towards a comparative framework', in G.Room (ed.) *Towards a European Welfare State,* Bristol: SAUS, University of Bristol.
Laybourn, K. (1995) *The Evolution of British Social Policy in the Welfare State,* Keele: Keele University Press.
Leibfried, S. (1993) 'Towards a European welfare state', in C.Jones (ed.) *New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe,* London: Routledge.
Leira, A. (1992) *Welfare States and Working Mothers: The Scandinavian Experience ,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lewis, J. (1992) 'Gender and the development of welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy,* 2(3):159–73.
Lewis, J. and Ostner, I. (1991) 'Gender and the evolution of European social policies', Paper at CES Workshop on Emergent Supranational Social Policy: The EC's Social Dimension in Comparative Perspective, Center for European Studies: Harvard University.
Lloyd, T. (1985) *Working With Boys,* Leicester: National Youth Bureau.
Lloyd, T. and Wood, T. (1996) 'The evidence', in T.Lloyd and T.Wood (eds) *What Next for Men?,* London: Working with Men.
Mac an Ghaill, M. (ed.) (1994) *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
McIntosh, M. (1978) 'The state and the oppression of women', in A.Kuhn and A.M.Wolps (eds) *Feminism and Materialism,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
MacKinnon, C.A. (1982) 'Feminism, Marxism, method and the state in an agenda for theory', *Signs* 7(3):515–44.
——(1983) 'Feminism, Marxism, method and the state: toward feminist jurisprudence', *Signs* 8(4):635–58.
Mackintosh, M. (1977) 'Reproduction and patriarchy a critique of Meillassoux's *Femmes, Greniers et Capitaux, Capital and Class,* 2:119–27.

MacLean, M. and Groves, D. (eds) (1991) *Women's Issues in Social Policy,* London: Routledge.
McMahon, A. (1993) 'Male readings of feminist theory: the psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature', *Theory and Society,* 22(5):675–96.
Mahoney, P. (1985) *Schools for the Boys?* London: Hutchinson.
Mangan, J.A. and Walvin, J. (eds) (1986) *Manliness and Morality Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America 1800–1940,* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Mort, F. (1987) *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in England since 1830,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Nelson, J.A. (1996) *Feminism, Objectivity and Economics,* London: Routledge.
O'Brien, M. (1978) 'The dialectics of reproduction', *Women's Studies International Quarterly,* 1:233–9.
——(1981) *The Politics of Reproduction,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
——(1990) *Reproducing the World,* Boulder, CO: Westview.
O'Connor, J. (1974) *The Fiscal Crisis of the State,* New York: St Martin's Press.
O'Connor, J.S. (1993) 'Gender, class and citizenship in the comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: theoretical and methodological issues', *British Journal of Sociology,* 44(3):501–18.
Orloff, A.S. (1993) 'Gender and the social rights of citizenship: state policies and gender relations in comparative research', *American Sociological Review,* 58(3):303–28.
Pascall, G. (1986) *Social Policy: A Feminist Analysis,* London: Tavistock.
——(1997) *Social Policy: A New Feminist Analysis,* London: Routledge.
Pateman, C. (1988) 'The patriarchal welfare state', in A.Gutman (ed.) *Democracy and Welfare State,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Peacock, A.T. and Wiseman, J. (1961) *The Growth of Public Expenditure in the United Kingdom,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Potts, D. (1996) *Why Do Men Commit Most Crime? Focusing on Masculinity in a Prison Group,* Wakefield: West Yorkshire Probation Service.
Pringle, K. (1995) *Men, Masculinities and Social Welfare,* London: UCL Press.
Pringle, R. and Watson, S. (1990) 'Fathers, brothers, mates: the fraternal state in Australia', in S.Watson (ed.) *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions,* London: Verso.
Rantalaiho, L. (1996) 'Contextualizing gender', in L.Rantalaiho and T.Heiskanen (eds) *Gendered Practices in Working Life,* London: Macmillan.
Remy, J. (1990) 'Patriarchy and fratriarchy as forms of andocracy', in J.Hearn and D.Morgan (eds) *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory,* London: Unwin Hyman.
Riley, D. (1983) *War in the Nursery,* London: Virago.
Rose, N. (1993) 'Government, authority and expertise in advanced liberalism', *Economy and Society,* 22(3):283–99.
——(1996) 'The death of the social? Refiguring the territory of government', *Economy and Society.* 25(3):327–56.

Rubery, Jill, Smith, Mark and Turner, Eloise (1996) *Bulletin on Women and Employment in the EU,* No.9 (October).
Rowbotham, S. (1979) 'The trouble with patriarchy', *New Statesman,* 98: 970.
Sainsbury, D. (ed.) (1994) *Gendering Welfare States,* London: Sage.
Salisbury, J. and Jackson, D. (1996) *Challenging Macho Values: Practical Ways of Working with Adolescent Boys,* London: Falmer.
Stacey, M. (1986) 'Gender and stratification: one central issue or two', in R.Crompton and M.Mann (eds) *Gender and Stratification,* Cambridge: Polity.
Thane, P. (1982) *The Foundation of the Welfare State,* London: Longman.
Tyyskä, V. (1995) *The Politics of Caring and the Welfare State,* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatermia.
Walby, S. (1986) *Patriarchy at Work,* Cambridge: Polity
——(1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Waring, M. (1988) *Counting for Nothing: What Men Value and What Women are Worth,* Wellington, NZ: Allen & Unwin.
Waters, M. (1989) 'Patriarchy and viriarchy', *Sociology,* 23(2):193–211.
Watson, S. (ed.) (1990) *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions,* London: Verso.
Weeks, J. (1977) *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present,* London: Quartet.
Wild, J. (ed.) (1998) *Working with Men for Change,* Basingstoke: Taylor & Francis.
Wilensky, H.L. (1972) 'Intelligence, crises and foreign policy: reflections on the limits of rationality', in R.H.Blum (ed.) *Surveillance and Espionage in a Free Society,* New York: Praeger.
——(1975) *The Welfare State and Equality,* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press .
Wilensky, H.L. and Lebeaux, C.N. (1958) *Industrial Society and Social Welfare,* New York: The Free Press.
Williams, F. (1989) *Social Policy: A Critical Introduction,* Cambridge: Polity
Wilson, E. (1977) *Women and the Welfare State,* London: Tavistock.
Women's Budget Statement 1990–91 (1990) Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Yeatman, A. (1990) *Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats,* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.