34

ADVERTISING AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF VIOLENT WHITE MASCULINITY

From Eminem to Clinique for Men

◆ Jackson Katz

The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, prompted an intense national conversation about violence and its consequences. Commentators in the print and broadcast media frequently observed that these extraordinary events were without precedent in American history. But although the scale of the carnage on September 11 was certainly unprecedented, horrific violence on American soil is hardly a new subject. In fact, long before 9/11, violence was one of the most pervasive and serious domestic problems in the United States.

In recent years, academics, community activists, and politicians have increasingly been paying attention to the role of the mass media in producing, reproducing, and legitimating this violence.[1] Unfortunately, however, much of the mainstream debate about the effects of media violence on violence in the "real" world fails to include an analysis of gender. Although, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (1999), approximately 86% of violent crime is committed by males, newspaper and magazine headline writers continue to use degendered language to talk about the perpetrators of violence (e.g., "kids killing kids"). It is unusual

◆ 349

51

even to hear mention of "masculinity" or "manhood" in these discussions, much less a thorough deconstruction of the gender order and the way that cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity might be implicated. Under these conditions, a class-conscious discussion of masculine gender construction is even less likely.

In the past few years, there has been growing attention paid in media and cultural studies to the power of cultural images of masculinity. This focus is long overdue. But historically, an absence of a thorough body of research and inquiry into the construction of masculine imagery is consistent with the lack of attention paid to other dominant groups. Discussions about racial representation in media, for example, tend to focus on African Americans, Asians, or Hispanics, and not on Anglo Whites.[2] Writing about the representation of Whiteness as an ethnic category in mainstream film, Richard Dyer (1988) argues that "white power secures its dominance by seeming not to be anything in particular"; "Whiteness" is constructed as the norm against which nondominant groups are defined as "other." Robert Hanke (1992), in an article about hegemonic masculinity in transition, argues that masculinity, like Whiteness, "does not appear to be a cultural/historical category at all, thus rendering invisible the privileged position from which (white) men in general are able to articulate their interests to the exclusion of the interests of women, men and women of color, and children" (p. 186).

There has been some discussion, since the mid-1970s, of the ways in which cultural definitions of White manhood have been shaped by stereotypical representations in advertising. One area of research has looked at the creation of modern masculine archetypes such as the Marlboro Man. In the 21st century, it has become apparent that this research needs to be increasingly international in focus. Satellite telecommunications, the Internet, and other technological developments have rendered obsolete the notion of discreet national boundaries for advertising and other

cultural imagery. And as Naomi Klein argues in her groundbreaking book *No Logo* (1999), it is crucial to understand not simply how advertisers create and sell images but how multinational corporations in the contemporary era essentially construct and sell brand identity and loyalty.

But in the midst of these historical developments, there has been little attention paid, in scholarship or antiviolence activism, to the relationship between the construction of violent masculinities in what Sut Jhally (1990) refers to as the "commodity image-system" of advertising and the pandemic of violence committed by boys and men in the homes and streets of the United States.

This chapter is an attempt to sketch out some of the ways in which hegemonic constructions of masculinity in mainstream magazine advertising normalize male violence. Theorists and researchers in profeminist sociology and men's studies have developed the concept of *masculinities*, as opposed to *masculinity*, to more adequately describe the complexities of male social position, identity, and experience. At any given time, the class structure and gender order produce numerous masculinities stratified by socioeconomic class, racial and ethnic difference, and sexual orientation. The central delineation is between the hegemonic, or dominant, masculinity (generally, White, heterosexual, and middle class) and the subordinated masculinities.

But although there are significant differences between the various masculinities, in patriarchal culture, violent behavior is typically gendered male. This doesn't mean that all men are violent but that violent behavior is considered masculine (as opposed to feminine) behavior. This masculine gendering of violence in part explains why the movie *Thelma and Louise* in the early 1990s touched such a chord and still resonates a decade later: Women had appropriated, however briefly, the male prerogative for, and identification with, violence.

One need not look very closely to see how pervasive is the cultural imagery linking

various masculinities to the potential for violence. One key source of constructions of dominant masculinity is the movie industry, which has introduced into the culture a seemingly endless stream of violent male icons. Tens of millions of people, disproportionately male and young, flock to theaters and rent videocassettes of the "action-adventure" (a Hollywood euphemism for *violent)* films of White male icons such as Arnold Schwarzenegger, Sylvester Stallone, Jean-Claude Van Damme, Bruce Willis, et al.

These cultural heroes first rose to prominence in an era, the mid- to late 1970s into the 1980s, in which working-class White males had to contend with increasing economic instability and dislocation, the perception of gains by people of color at the expense of the White working class, and a women's movement that overtly challenged male hegemony. In the face of these pressures, then, it is not surprising that White men (especially but not exclusively working class) would latch onto big, muscular, violent men as cinematic heroes. For many males who were experiencing unsettling changes, one area of masculine power remained attainable: physical size and strength and the ability to use violence successfully.

Harry Brod (1987) and other theorists have argued that macro changes in post-industrial capitalism have created deep tensions in the various masculinities. For example, according to Brod,

> Persisting images of masculinity hold that "real men" are physically strong, aggressive, and in control of their work. Yet the structural dichotomy between manual and mental labor under capitalism means that no one's work fulfills all these conditions. Manual laborers work for others at the low end of the class spectrum, while management sits at a desk. Consequently, while the insecurities generated by these contradictions are personally dissatisfying to men, these insecurities also impel them to cling all

the more tightly to sources of masculine identity validation offered by the system. (p. 14)

One way that the system allows working-class men (of various races) the opportunity for what Brod refers to as "masculine identity validation" is through the use of their body as an instrument of power, dominance, and control. For working-class males, who have less access to more abstract forms of masculinity-validating power (economic power, workplace authority), the physical body and its potential for violence provide a concrete means of achieving and asserting "manhood."

At any given time, individual men as well as groups of men are engaged in an ongoing process of creating and maintaining their own masculine identities. Advertising, in a commodity-driven consumer culture, is an omnipresent and rich source of gender ideology. Contemporary ads contain numerous images of men who are positioned as sexy because they possess a certain aggressive "attitude." Men's magazines and mainstream newsweeklies are rife with ads featuring violent male icons, such as uniformed football players, big-fisted boxers, and leather-clad bikers. Sports magazines aimed at men, and televised sporting events, carry millions of dollars worth of military ads. In the past 20, there have been hundreds of ads for products designed to help men develop muscular physiques, such as weight training machines and nutritional supplements.

Historically, use of gender in advertising has stressed difference, implicitly and even explicitly reaffirming the "natural" dissimilarity of males and females. In early 21st century, U.S. culture, advertising that targets young White males (with the exception of fashion advertising, which often features more of an androgynous male look), has the difficult task of stressing gender difference in an era characterized by a loosening of rigid gender distinctions. Stressing gender difference in this context means defining masculinity in opposition to femininity.

This requires constantly reasserting what is masculine and what is feminine. One of the ways this is accomplished, in the image system, is to equate masculinity with violence, power, and control (and femininity with passivity).

The need to differentiate from the feminine by asserting masculinity in the form of power and aggression might at least partially account for the ubiquity of representations of male violence in contemporary advertising, as well as in video games, rap/rock music and video, children's toys, cartoons, professional wrestling, Hollywood film, and the sports culture.

By helping to differentiate masculinity from femininity, images of masculine aggression and violence—including violence against women—afford young males across class a degree of self-respect and security (however illusory) within the more socially valued masculine role.

◆ *Violent White Masculinity in Advertising*

The appeal of violent behavior for men, including its rewards, is coded into mainstream advertising in numerous ways: from violent male icons (such as particularly aggressive athletes or superheroes) overtly threatening consumers to buy products to ads that exploit men's feelings of not being big, strong, or violent enough by promising to provide them with products that will enhance those qualities. These codes are present in television and radio commercials as well, but this chapter focuses primarily on mainstream American magazine ads (*Newsweek, People, Sports Illustrated, GQ, Maxim, Rolling Stone, Spin,* etc.), from the mid-1990s through 2001.

Several recurring themes in magazine advertising targeting men help support the equation of White masculinity and violence. Among them are the following: The angry, aggressive, White working-class male as antiauthority rebel (21st-century version);

violence as genetically programmed male behavior; the use of military and sports symbolism to enhance the masculine identification and appeal of products; the association of muscularity with ideal masculinity; and the equation of heroic masculinity with violent masculinity. Let us now consider, briefly, each of these themes.

THE ANGRY, AGGRESSIVE, WHITE WORKING-CLASS MALE AS ANTIAUTHORITY REBEL (21ST-CENTURY VERSION)

The rock, heavy metal, and rap-metal cultures of recent decades have produced numerous male artists who perform a White, working-class "rebel" masculinity that embodies all sorts of violent angers and resentments and seeks validation in the defiance of middle-class manners and social conventions. Not surprisingly, advertisers have sought to use this young-White-man-with-an-attitude in their marketing of products to young males. In one characteristic example, a 2001 ad for JVC audio equipment features Nikki Sixx of the 1980s metal band Mötley Crüe with an angry expression on his face. Prominently placed in the foreground (visually "in your face") is a large speaker system and CD/cassette unit. The copy reads "Big, Mean, Loud."

The superstar White rap artist Eminem (nee Marshall Mathers) is the most well-known of the contemporary "angry White males" with attitude who have been skillfully marketed to young people—especially White boys—as antiauthority "rebels." The rage-rock group Limp Bizkit and the metal rapper Kid Rock are other notables in this genre. Compared to their "rebel" actor counterparts from the postwar era of Hollywood cinema (e.g., Marlon Brando, James Dean), these 21st-century artists affect a much more overtly violent and aggressive demeanor.

Eminem, for example, in ads for his music CDs and other projects, is almost always portrayed with scowls on his face or

with looks of grim seriousness. But in the marketing of artists like Eminem, it is important to note that the line between advertisements and editorial copy is erased, because magazine covers and articles about him essentially function as ads for his music, as well as the products he is selling. Sometimes the process is blatant, as in the high-profile cover of the seventh anniversary issue of *Vibe* magazine, which features Eminem pictured next to his mentor, the misogynous African American gangsta rapper-producer Dr. Dre. Eminem is wearing a cap with the Nike swoosh logo prominently displayed—a decidedly unrebellious fashion statement.

In magazine layouts that function as de facto unpaid ads, Eminem is often portrayed in cartoonishly violent guises. In one 2000 layout in the hip-hop magazine *The Source*, he appeared in an old hockey goalie's mask (an homage to the serial murderer Jason from the film *Friday the 13th*), holding a chainsaw. The article was titled "American Psycho"; the page smeared with a bloodied handprint. People who are offended by these sorts of crude displays of violent male rage, including feminists and gay and lesbian civil rights activists who object to Eminem's blatant misogyny and gay-bashing lyrics and public pronouncements, are ridiculed by the rapper's defenders as "not getting it," or not having a sense of humor.

Judging by the number of violent poses struck by Eminem in similar magazine articles and other promotional materials (the tatoo on his stomach, featured prominently and repeatedly in photo layouts, reads "Kim rot in pieces"; Kim is his wife/ ex-wife), it is safe to say that violent posturing is central to Eminem's constructed identity as a rebellious White rapper who's "keepin' it real." But what exactly is a White rapper like Eminem rebelling *against*? Powerful women who oppress weak and vulnerable men? Omnipotent gays and lesbians who make life a living hell for straight people? Eminem's misogyny and homophobia, far from being rebellious,

are actually extremely traditional and conservative. But because his crude profanity offends a lot of parents, kids can "rebel" against their parents' wishes by listening to him, buying his CDs, and so on. The irony is that by buying into Eminem's clever "bad boy" act, they are being obedient, predictable consumers. ("If you want to express your rebellious side, we have just the right product for you! The Marshall Mathers LP! Come get your Slim Shady!") It's rebellion as a purchasable commodity.

Some admirers of Eminem, Limp Bizkit, and Kid Rock argue that their detractors don't respond well to the antisocial disdain and nihilism—found in parts of young, White, working-class male culture—that these now multimillionaires capture so skillfully in their personae and music. There might be some truth to this. But it is also true that advertisers for the music and movie industries are constantly developing marketing strategies to appeal to the lucrative markets of young consumers of all socioeconomic classes. In recent years, one of the most successful of these strategies involves praising young consumers for how media-savvy they are, especially in contrast with their parents and other older people. Then, as the young consumers absorb the props for their sophistication, they are sold CDs, movies, and myriad other products whose sensibilities supposedly prove how "savvy" their purchasers really are. This process would be laughable were it not for the fact that some of the products (e.g., Eminem) often simply reinforce or legitimate violent masculinity—and other cultural pathologies—as rebellious or "cool."

VIOLENCE AS GENETICALLY PROGRAMMED MALE BEHAVIOR

One way that advertisers demonstrate the "masculinity" of a product or service is through the use of violent male icons or types from popular history. This helps to associate the product with manly needs and pursuits that presumably have existed from

time immemorial. It also furthers the ideological premise, disguised as common sense, that men have always been aggressive and brutal and that their dominance over women is biologically based. "Historical" proof for this is shown in a multitude of ways.

An ad for the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, an elite financial institution, depicts a medieval battlefield where muscle-bound toy figurines, accompanied by para-doxically muscular skeleton men, prepare to engage in a sword fight. They might wear formal suits and sit behind desks, the ad implies, but the men in high finance (and those whose money they manage) are actu-ally rugged warriors. Beneath the veneer of wealth and class privilege, all men are really brutes. The text reads "How the Masters of the Universe Overcame the Attack of the Deutschemarks."

An ad for Trojan condoms features a giant-sized Roman centurion, in full uni-form, muscles rippling, holding a package of condoms as he towers over the buildings of a modern city. Condom manufacturers know that the purchase and use of con-doms by men can be stressful, partially because penis size, in popular Western folk-lore, is supposedly linked to virility. One way to assuage the anxieties of male con-sumers is to link the product with a recog-nizably violent (read: masculine) male archetype. It is no coincidence that the two leading brands of condoms in the United States are named for ancient warriors and kings (Trojan and Ramses).

Sometimes products with no immedi-ately apparent connection to gender or violence nonetheless make the leap. A mid-1990s ad for Dell computers, for example, shows a painting of a group of White cow-boys on horseback shooting at mounted Indians who are chasing them. The copy reads "Being Able to Run Faster Could Come in Real Handy." The cowboys are foregrounded and the viewers are posi-tioned to identify with them against the Indian "other." The cowboys' violence is depicted as defensive, a construction that was historically used to justify genocide. The ad explains that "you never know when somebody [read: Indians, Japanese business competitors] is going to come around the corner and surprise you." It thus masculinizes the White middle-class world of the computer business by using the violent historical metaphor of cowboys versus Indians.

An even more sinister use of historical representations involves portraying violence that would not be acceptable if shown in contemporary settings. Norwegian Cruise Line, for example, in an ad that ran in the 1990s in major newsweekly magazines, depicted a colorful painting of a scene on a ship's deck, set sometime in the pirate era, where men, swords drawn, appear simulta-neously to be fighting each other while a couple of them are carrying off women. The headline informs us that Norwegian is the "first cruise line whose entertainment doesn't revolve around the bar."

It is highly doubtful that the cruise line could have set what is clearly a rape or gang rape scenario on a modern ship. It would no doubt have prompted feminist protests about the company's glorification of the rape of women. Controversy is avoided by depicting the scene as historical.[3] But Norwegian Cruise Line, which calls itself "The Pleasure Ships," in this ad reinforces the idea that rape is a desirable male pastime. Whether intentional or not, the underlying message is that real men (pirates, swashbucklers) have always enjoyed it.

USE OF MILITARY AND SPORTS SYMBOLISM TO ENHANCE THE MASCULINE IDENTIFICATION AND APPEAL OF PRODUCTS

Well before the September 11, 2001, attacks prompted an upsurge in advertisers' use of martial displays of patriotic senti-ment, advertisers who wanted to demon-strate the unquestioned manliness of their products could do so by using one of the

two key subsets in the symbolic image system of violent masculinity: the military and sports. Uniformed soldiers and players, as well as their weapons and gear, appear frequently in ads of all sorts. Advertisers can use these signifiers in numerous creative ways to make their products appear manly.

One ad, for *The Economist* magazine, manages explicitly to link the magazine with White heterosexual sexism, military masculinity, and imperialist aggression, all in one page. In the top left-hand corner is a photo of a classic (White) pinup girl from the 1940s at the beach in a bathing suit. The text reads "Sex Symbol." In the top right-hand corner is a picture of a U.S. fighter jet in flight. The text reads "Power Symbol." Front and center is a picture of the magazine's cover, with a distorted map of North America portrayed as towering over Central and South America; Africa and Asia are small and off to the side. The map is headlined "America's world" and features one-word designations of various geographical areas: "Surfin'" in the Pacific; "Huntin'" in northwest Canada; "Exploitin'" in Central America; "Fishin'" in the Caribbean; "Fightin'" in Africa and Asia. The bold text underneath says simply: "Status Symbol." It might as well say, "This magazine is for 'real' men, and real men are sexist and violent."

The now defunct Joe Camel cigarette ads, which also attracted controversy in the 1990s due to Camel's use of cartoon images to lure children and adolescents, featured numerous displays of submarines surfacing or fighter jets streaking by as Joe Camel stood confidently in the foreground. One ad featured Joe Camel himself wearing an air force bomber pilot's jacket. The message to the young boys and adolescent males targeted by the campaign was obvious: Violence (as signified by the military vehicles) is cool and suave. The sexy blond woman gazing provocatively at the James Bond-like camel provided female ratification of Joe's masculinity.

Ads for the military itself also show the linkage between masculinity and force. The U.S. military spends more than $100 million annually on advertising. Not surprisingly, armed services advertisements appear disproportionately on televised sporting events and in sports and so-called men's magazines. Military ads are characterized by exciting outdoor action scenes with accompanying text replete with references to "leadership," "respect," and "pride." Although these ads sometimes promote the educational and financial benefits of military service, what they're really selling to young working-class males is a vision of masculinity—adventurous, aggressive, and violent—that provides men of all classes with a standard of "real manhood" against which to judge themselves.

Boxers and football players appear in ads regularly, promoting products from underwear to deodorants. A black-and-white photo of a young White man in uncovered football shoulder pads adorns some Abercrombie and Fitch advertising layouts. In Abercrombie and Fitch mall stores, a dramatically enlarged version of this photo greets customers as they enter the store. Abercrombie and Fitch does not sell football equipment. Rather, the clothing company—which attracted attention and controversy in the 1990s for its risqué layouts of scantily clad teenagers—is presumably seeking to accentuate its appeal to adolescent males by creating brand identification with the archetypally masculine young man: the football player.

Sometimes athletes are positioned simply to sanction the masculinity of a suspect product. For example, a 1999 ad for a new cologne by Clinique depicts a clean-cut young White man in a football uniform, holding a football and running toward the camera. Standing beside him is a young White woman, in a white dress, holding a white frosted birthday cake with candles. The only copy says, in bold letters, "Clinique Happy. Now for Men." It seems reasonable to infer that the goal of this ad was to shore up the masculine image of a product whose name (Clinique) has feminine connotations. The uniformed football

player, a signifier of violent masculinity, achieves this task by visually transmitting the message: Real men can wear Clinique. The birthday cake in the woman's arms, of course, sends a signal to women that this product is an acceptable present for their (masculine) boyfriends.

Advertisers know that using high-profile violent male athletes can help to sell products, such as yogurt and light beer, that have historically been gendered female. Because violence establishes masculinity, if these guys (athletes) use traditionally "female" products, they don't lose their masculinity. Rather, the masculinity of the product—and hence the size of the potential market—increases. Miller Brewing Company proved the efficacy of this approach in its long-running television ad campaign for Lite beer. The Miller Lite campaign, which first appeared in the early 1970s, helped bring Miller to the top of the burgeoning light beer market and is often referred to as the most successful TV ad campaign in history.

THE ASSOCIATION OF MUSCULARITY WITH IDEAL MASCULINITY

Men across socioeconomic class and race might feel insecure in their masculinity, relatively powerless or vulnerable in the economic sphere and uncertain about how to respond to the challenges of women in many areas of social relations. But, in general, males continue to have an advantage over females in the area of physical size and strength. Because one function of the image system is to legitimate and reinforce existing power relations, representations that equate masculinity with the qualities of size, strength, and violence thus become more prevalent.

The anthropologist Alan Klein (1993)[4] has looked at how the rise in popularity of bodybuilding is linked to male insecurity. "Muscles," he argues, "are about more than just the functional ability of men to defend home and hearth or perform heavy labor. Muscles are markers that separate men from each other and, most important perhaps, from women. And while he may not realize it, every man—every accountant, science nerd, clergyman, or cop—is engaged in a dialogue with muscles" (p. 16).

Advertising is one area of the popular culture that helps feed this "dialogue." Sports and other magazines with a large male readership are filled with ads offering men products and services to enhance their muscles. Often these ads explicitly equate muscles with violent power, as in an ad for a Marcy weight machine that tells men to "Arm Yourself" under a black-and-white photograph of a toned, muscular White man, biceps and forearms straining, in the middle of a weight lifting workout. The military, too, offers to help men enhance their bodily prowess. An ad for the Army National Guard shows three slender young men, Black and White, working out, over copy that reads "Get a Part-Time Job in Our Body Shop."

The discourse around muscles as signifiers of masculine power involves not only working-class men but also middle- and upper-class males. This is apparent in the male sports subculture, where size and strength are valued by men across class and racial boundaries. But muscularity as masculinity is also a theme in advertisements aimed at upper-income males. Many advertisers use images of physically rugged or muscular male bodies to masculinize products and services geared to elite male consumers. An ad for the business insurance firm Brewer and Lord uses a powerful male body as a metaphor for the more abstract form of (financial) power. The ad shows the torso of a muscular man curling a barbell, accompanied by a headline that reads "The benefits of muscle defined." The text states that "the slow building of strength and definition is no small feat. In fact, that training has shaped the authority that others see in you, as well."

Saab, targeting an upscale, educated market in the early 1990s, billed itself as

"the most intelligent car ever built." But in one ad, they called their APC Turbo "the muscle car with a social conscience"—which signaled to wealthy men that by driving a Saab they could appropriate the working-class tough guy image associated with the concept of a "muscle car" while making clear their more privileged class position. In a more recent version of the same phenomenon, Chevy, in a 2001 ad for the expensive Avalanche SUV, shows a close-up photo of the big vehicle turning sharply on a dusty road. The text reads "Rarely do you get to see the words 'ingenious' and 'muscle-bound' in the same sentence."

THE EQUATION OF HEROIC MASCULINITY WITH VIOLENT MASCULINITY

The cultural power of Hollywood film in the construction of violent masculinity is not limited to the movies themselves. In fact, many more people see the advertising for a given film than see the film itself.

Advertising budgets for major Hollywood releases typically run in the millions of dollars. Larger-than-life billboards enhance the heroic stature of the icons. Movie ads appear frequently on prime-time TV and daily in newspapers and magazines. Not surprisingly, these ads highlight the movies' most violent and sexually titillating scenes.

Violence on-screen, like that in real life, is perpetrated overwhelmingly by males. Males constitute the majority of the audience for violent films, as well as violent sports such as football and hockey. It is important to note, then, that what is being sold is not just "violence," but rather a glamorized form of violent masculinity.

Guns are an important signifier of virility and power and hence are an important part of the way violent masculinity is constructed and then sold to audiences. In fact, the presence of guns in magazine and newspaper ads is crucial in communicating the extent of a movie's violent content. Because so many films contain explicit violence, images of gun-toting macho males (police detectives, old West gunslingers, futuristic killing machines) pervade the visual landscape.

Conclusion ◆

Research over the past decade in sociology, media, and cultural studies strongly suggests that we need to develop a much more sophisticated approach to understanding cultural constructions of masculinity. Feminists, who have been at the forefront in studying the social construction of gender, have, historically, focused on images and representations of women. Clearly, we need to continue with a similarly intensive examination of the representation of men—particularly in light of the ongoing crisis of men's violence in our society, and around the world.

This chapter focuses attention on constructions of violent White masculinity in mainstream magazine advertising. But we need also to examine critically a number of other areas where violent masculinities are produced and legitimated: comic books, toys, the sports culture, professional wrestling, comedy, interactive video, music video, pornography. This will help us to understand more fully the links between the construction of gender and the prevalence of violence, which might then lead to more effective antiviolence interventions.

Notes ◆

1. *Violence* refers to immediate or chronic situations that result in injury to the psychological, social, or physical well-being of individuals or groups. For the purpose of this chapter, I will use the American Psychological Association's (APA) more specific definition of interpersonal

violence. Although acknowledging the multi-dimensional nature of violence, the APA Commission on Violence and Youth defines interpersonal violence as "behavior by persons against persons that threatens, attempts, or completes intentional infliction of physical or psychological harm" (APA, 1993, p. 1).

2. Although hegemonic constructions of masculinity affect men of all races, there are important variables due to racial differences. Because it is not practical to do justice to these variables in a chapter of this length, and because the vast majority of images of men in mainstream magazine advertisements are of White men, for the purpose of this chapter, I will focus on the *constructions of* various White masculinities.

3. Some feminist groups did protest the ad, such as the Cambridge, Massachusetts-based group Challenging Media Images of Women. But the protests never reached a wide audience and had no discernible effect.

4. The article cited here was excerpted from Klein's book *Little Big Men: Bodybuilding Subculture and Gender Construction* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993).

References ◆

American Psychological Association. (1993). *Violence and youth: Psychology's response.* Washington, DC: Author.

Brod, H. (Ed.). (1987). *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies.* Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Dyer, R. (1988). White. *Screen, 29*(4), 44-65.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1999). *Uniform crime reports.* Washington, DC: Author.

Hanke, R. (1992). Redesigning men: Hegemonic masculinity in transition. In S. Craig (Ed.), *Men, masculinity and the media* (pp. 185-198). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jhally, S. (1990, July). Image-based culture: Advertising and popular culture. *The World and I*, pp. 508-519.

Klein, A. (1993, January). Little big men. *Northeastern University Magazine,* pp. 14-19.

Klein, N. (1999). *No logo.* New York: Picador USA.