The inter-war years were distinguished by marked changes that affected the lives and neighbourhoods of many working class men and women. These changes would prove to have positive and negative implications for working-class family life. New employment opportunities extended the breadth of jobs open to working class people, especially in the new consumer industries that employed significant numbers of women. Correspondingly, the commercialisation of leisure expanded the possibilities of pleasure. Information on birth control and the greater ease of availability of contraceptives also offered a better potential to postpone marriage and reduce family size. Yet, the new employment opportunities did little to alter the ‘pin money’ wages of women and women’s economic dependency on marriage. Marriage was still seen as an attractive alternative to employment in the longer term. Marriage and motherhood were actively promoted as the natural and fulfilling aspirations for women by the state, state agencies, the clergy, religious organisations and the media. Adding to the appeal was the ideal of the ‘companionate marriage’ in which husbands were expected to share chores, child-care, leisure and provide love and companionship. It seems that this was a ‘fairly normative’ aspiration amongst many sectors of the working class between the wars, at least amongst women. Change, however, was not just ideological. After World War I, the building of ‘homes fit for heroes’ and the growth of ‘new garden cities’, were linked with ideals of the companionate marriage, maternalism, privacy, respectable domesticity and the growth of male home-centred pastimes. This was to be a new way of life in which
women’s roles of homemaker and mother, at least in theory, were to be glorified. However, on Clydeside, continuity was as evident, if not more pervasive, than change and this ensured that there were many marriages marked by conflict in which women experienced immense oppression.

The penetration of new industries on the Clyde was less marked than it was in other regions of Britain. Male employment in heavy industries continued to predominate. The isolated nature of many of the jobs women undertook, in combination with the types of employment undertaken by their husbands proved an impediment against the subjectification of the companionate marital ideal. Couples in such unions tended to replicate the traditional normative family ideal as defined by their parents and their peers. Their relationships were also those most likely to be characterised by the absence of a glorification of domesticity. In fact men and women tended to participate in separate tight knit social groups. In addition, such unions were also those in which women were more likely to face real cruelty.4

The persistence of marriages of conflict was also sustained by relative continuities in housing tenure on the Clyde. 230,000 houses were built in Scotland by local authorities between the wars, 50,000 in Glasgow. Although this was an impressive number of homes ‘housing needs were far greater and conditions far worse’ in Scotland than Britain in general. Home ownership was also impeded by structural factors on Clydeside. Disincentives to private building included high levels of unemployment and the effects of the Rent Restriction Act (1915). In 1911 house ownership on the Clyde represented two per cent of total housing tenure and house ownership in Scotland remained lower than the British average throughout the inter-war years and beyond.5 Intensifying these obstacles was the sharp fall in wages that occurred in the immediate post-war years.6 Although wages generally stabilised, high levels of unemployment continued to mark the Clyde throughout the period, especially in the 1930s. For the majority of working-class families the price of municipal housing was prohibitive. By 1922 many were already unable to afford the relatively low rents of the poorer private accommodation. A demonstration took place in October 1922 to urge Glasgow City Council to petition Parliament to prohibit evictions. It was 300 strong with women accompanied at the rear by unemployed
men. 2168 cases of rent arrears had been brought before the Summary Ejectment Court in February 1922. By October 1922, unpaid rent in the city stood at £250,000. Tebbutt also provides an indication of the levels of acute poverty experienced on Clydeside. She demonstrates that the high point of pawnbroking in Britain was between 1900-1913 with the exception of London and Glasgow. In these cities by 1938 licence figures exceeded those for 1903 and 1913/14. Furthermore, while clothing declined in significance as pledge items in Britain, indicating growing prosperity, clothing as a pledge continued to be used more frequently in the North, where low value pledges were of greater relative importance. She states, ‘chronic unemployment brought grinding pressures which many families had rarely experienced before’. Thus, where municipal housing became available in the 1920s in Glasgow it was let primarily to people employed as teachers, draughtsmen and foremen. Yet, even teachers could find the new housing estates out of their reach in some regions of Clydeside. Mr Graham, a teacher, declared that he was unable to afford a council house in Greenock in the 1930s. Inability to procure such accommodation moderated access to the ideals of privacy, domestic respectability and male home-centred leisure.

However, although access to municipal housing was initially restricted by poverty, low wages and unemployment, government housing policy in the 1930s ensured that slum clearance took precedence. This permitted some mobility and improved living conditions for working-class families. Yet, slum clearance did not necessarily give rise to transformations of culture in all new working-class neighbourhoods. The Glasgow Housing and General Town Improvement Committee agreed to the erection of Possil in Glasgow to clear a nearby slum. Houses were erected, as they were in Possil, to transplant entire neighbourhoods into what were often a reproduction of the tenements they replaced rather than ‘garden suburbs’ which facilitated distance, thus privacy. In fact, as early as 1922, Mrs Laird, President of the Glasgow Labour Party Housing Association, complained that ‘Scotland should not be content with a lower standard of housing than that aimed at in England where demand for cottages were common’. But it was not just building structure that guaranteed that neighbourhood cultures would be transplanted into the new
estates. The policy of a given council and the attitudes towards the people re-housed could contribute. In 1932, at a Conference on Housing and Town Planning, it was noted by the women of the Labour Party that there was a need, ‘to co-opt women on to housing sub-committees’. Labour women felt that, ‘it is evident that men do not understand . . . that when slum clearing, the people should be scattered, so that they really get away from their old associations’.14

These conditions held the potential to mediate access to the ideals of respectable domesticity, privacy and home-centred leisure. Where this occurred, pre-existing forms of the gender division of leisure that often contributed to marital tensions prevailed. Although such conflict was often based on poverty and the capacity for men’s spending to push a family below the poverty line, these tensions were not merely the product of poverty. Studies of the impact of poverty fail to consider the effects on women whose expectations were rising due to the potential for better standards of living between the wars, those whose spouses were in secure and sheltered employment which was relatively well paid. Governments were committed to deflationary policies between the wars and this pushed down the price of food, home ownership and consumer goods. A secure wage could provide access to improved standards of living and the better housing accommodation that was expanding between the wars. This allowed women, and men, privacy, dignity, and enhanced life chances. Economic security was also vital in providing greater access to the ideals of respectable domesticity and companionate marriages. Thus expenditure on male pursuits, especially gambling and drinking, could prove detrimental to both the poorer and more affluent families on the Clyde and elsewhere in Britain, causing tension in homes across a wide spectrum of income groups.

These tensions were evident on Clydeside. Leisure remained gendered and male leisure was rarely home-centred. There is little indication that the companionate marital ideal gave rise to shared leisure pursuits. Furthermore, poverty did not necessarily regulate men’s access to spending on leisure. Access to leisure on Clydeside as will become evident was very much determined by gender in many working-class neighbourhoods, creating conflict between couples and contributing to
an extremely high incidence of domestic violence.

The ruptures created by World War I also dramatically affected gender identities and gender relations between the wars in Britain. Concern over the quality and quantity of the race was linked to its capacity to service industry and Empire and clashed with the force of the pre-war feminist agenda and the potentially liberating political, social, sexual and economic forces opening to women at this time. In an attempt to undermine women’s potential emancipation and promote traditional gender identities the new companionate marital ideal emerged. However, this ideal had to compete with the structural forces affecting working-class life. The gender discourses of the inter-war period were largely incompatible with the economic realities and the imaginative boundaries of many working-class people’s lives. Nevertheless, many Clydeside women aspired to the ideal of glorified domesticity and motherhood being disseminated taking the view that:

A man was brought into this world to be the bread-winner. No wife unless it’s necessary should be out working. She should be at home attending to him and the children.¹⁵

Evidence from oral history indicates that women’s expectations of a ‘good husband’, although continuing to be based on provision, increasingly included the desire to marry ‘a caring sharing’ man, not one who abused the wage or his wife. They wanted help with child-care and shared leisure, a companion, and not merely a provider. Women stated, ‘I’d say a good husband was a man that didn’t drink and considered his wife and family’.¹⁶ A ‘good man’ was ‘someone that handed in the pay-packet and took them to the pictures on a Saturday night’.¹⁷

Men were equally aware of what was expected of the ideal husband. To be a good husband, ‘you’d have to be loyal first of all and true and loving and caring. Ma wife used one word, together. Togetherness was our motto right through our lives’. Mr Jamieson defined a ‘caring sharing husband’. ‘Well a good husband was a man that gave his wife a good allowance, took her out . . . now and again and gave her a holiday.’ These men had the financial security to endeavour to be ‘companionate husbands’. Yet, even these men did not define a good husband as
one who assisted with household chores or childcare. For many women the ideal was nowhere near their reality. Mr Davidson felt that a good husband was, ‘a bloke that’s doing the best he can to keep the house together, the family together. I don’t see how you could look for anything better’. Mr Logan stated, ‘there were plenty of good husbands. Them that didn’t abuse their wives were good husbands.’ Few men were prepared to treat their wives’ roles as different, but equal in status to their own. Thus, women’s expectations were frequently disappointed and marriages of conflict and domestic violence remained highly visible and virulent.

Fundamental to the unfulfilled promise of a companionate husband was male inability or unwillingness to aspire to the ideal, materially and ideologically. For many working-class men, work, masculinity and respectability were interwoven with the ‘breadwinner’ ideal and the notion of men’s ability to ‘provide’. This ‘placed an immense burden on them’. The burden of respectability was not a male preserve. Women were responsible for keeping up the image of a respectable home life. Such a situation ensured that the economic and social priorities of both sexes could converge. It also guaranteed that under particular economic circumstances, especially when the ability to provide was vulnerable, as it was between the wars, that male identity could become fragile. Male insecurity was exacerbated when wives became a ‘reserve army of labour’ because women not only competed with male labour, threatening masculinity bound to the ‘provider ideal’, but they also impinged upon male respectability linked to maintaining women in the home. Such conditions contributed to male insecurity and strengthened the sense of men’s inability to combat social injustice because in these circumstances ‘respectability’, contrary to Crossick’s assertion, could not act as an alternative to wealth.

Structural impediments inhibited the potential for men to unconditionally act as providers and many men experienced vulnerability and guilt. The reformulated marital ideal was a difficult aspiration because it reinforced the symbolism of protector and provider in a period of adverse economic conditions. Work and its associated privileges were being challenged by unemployment, real and potential, deskillling and structural change. Peterson insists that under similar conditions in America
in the 1960s women were seen to be ‘usurping male privilege’ with the result that paternalistic sentiment towards women declined and levels of wife beating rose. Impressionistic evidence suggests that this occurred between the wars. Many of my respondents compared their husbands unfavourably with their fathers when discussing knowledge of men’s wage levels, the handing over of unbroken pay packets, abusive expenditure of family resources and levels of domestic violence. On Clyde-side paternalistic sentiment towards women abated. Women were seen as a threat to men and this resulted in attempts by a number of men to reassert masculinity. Using aspects of male popular culture to achieve this, pastimes thus operated as defensive strategies resisting a ‘process of acculturation’, strategies which also entailed an assertion of control over the resources of the family unit.

Working-class men’s resort into ‘tradition, instinct and orthodoxy’ was a pragmatic narcotic in the face of a lost opportunity, engendered by the prevailing ‘rehabilitation of labour’ and the possibility that monopoly capitalism might penetrate the Clyde and further undermine their position in the work-place. What many of them could not, or were not prepared to accept, however, was the vulnerability of a male-dominance compelled to accommodate and concede compromises to women. These forces ensured that the construction of a working-class society centred on gender conflict permeated the Clyde during the interwar years. There existed a clear sexual division of labour and leisure and little demonstration of compromise or the compassionate marriage. The majority of the men interviewed perceived their wives not as exalted mothers and homemakers, but as a jailer, who would, ‘keep a good clean home and look after you and gave you proper food’. Home comforts were an expectation. Mr Ewart lamented, ‘she didn’t like housework. I said, you’re late in the day telling me that now. That’s what you’re supposed to be isn’t it, to be a real one’.

Women’s definition although similar, differed in complexion. A good wife was, ‘a person that kept the house clean, looked after the food, looked after the children, and looked after the money, because she was always the poor soul that was left with the money’. To fulfil this role, and command respect, women needed to control the family income. Therefore, where men
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failed to live up to women’s expectations, and this was fairly normative, the struggle for control of the family, and family finances, marked gender relations.

This was not the first time that Clydeside women had experienced radical change in their relations with men. Eighteenth-century Clydeside witnessed a period of industrial transition for male employees, one in which competition for employment between the sexes was framed in the usurper imagery, the ‘struggle for the breeches’. This period was impressed by marriages of conflict resulting from the gender-specific, ‘social and economic priorities’ of spouses. Such marriages came under increasing criticism from the newly emerging middle class who defined and differentiated themselves from plebeian culture, not only materially, but also ideologically. Principal features of this differentiation were the ideas of domesticity, the ‘angel in the home’ and her concomitant, the male provider, and the concept of respectability. However, under challenge from early feminists, physical conflict between spouses was increasingly condemned and associated with the ‘animality’ of the lower orders. Yet, some level of ‘correcting’ fractious wives was perceived as acceptable, and thus women who were victims of such abuse came to be stigmatised by the concept of ‘recalcitrance and animality’. Thus, the new ideals may have placed a break on domestic violence, but they also led to invisible crime.

Working-class men were expected to emulate these ideals. Over time, some groups of workers on Clydeside may have embraced the paternalist ideal and other families probably tried to hide the ‘shame’ of family violence. However, the ideological and socio-economic environment of pre-war Clydeside did little to encourage the emulation of these ideals, structurally or ideologically. Working men in general, subject to the insecurity wrought by the trade cycle, were materially inhibited from absorbing this masculine identity. World War I did little to alter this situation. Many working-class women entered employment during World War I and gained greater economic and social freedom. Mrs Stewart stated, ‘I’ll tell you what changed lives more in my lifetime than any other thing was the first war. Women came out of the kitchen then’. These conditions corresponded with the growth of jobs classified as ‘women’s work’ and an economic environment which was compelling women to
work at a time when the employment of the ‘breadwinner’ was precarious. Combined, this was unlikely to stimulate aspirations to be ‘new’ men.

However, such gender relations were not confined to Clydeside. In Liverpool gender conflict revolved around a wife’s ‘good housekeeping skills’ and a husband’s ‘stinginess’ to pursue leisure’.26 It seems wives did not contest this, but they did not have to, to cause conflict. Inability to cope was perceived as sufficient grounds for antagonism, just as objecting to male expenditure in Manchester was regarded as ‘recalcitrance’.27 Ross also demonstrates that it was not until after 1914 that London’s pub culture became ‘poisonously misogynist’,28 denying working-class women shared leisure with their partners. By contrast, in Lancashire, where a culture of two income families existed, wives shared their spouse’s leisure. Apparently, marriages of conflict were less common in this region.29

The pursuit of recreations from which women were culturally excluded remained of immense consequence to many British males between the wars. This entailed spending money. Davies notes how poverty and unemployment did regulate men’s access to leisure. Yet, he also indicates that it is difficult to measure how much money was spent in this way because men’s expenditure created conflict within working-class marriages and thus the amount of money spent was ‘a jealously guarded secret from wives’.30 This was consistent with tradition rather than the ideals embedded in the companionship marriage.

Male pastimes and spending had long been used as a retreat to mediate challenges to male domination, a means of male bonding through combination in leisure and control of money used to strengthen the power of males in the family.31 Men’s expenditure on leisure continued to be an expression of masculinity, and between the wars when the foundations of masculinity became insecure, this became more significant, symbolically, if not quantitatively. Yet, because it impinged upon women’s gender roles as household managers and guardians of the family, such expenditure was often contested.

On Clydeside, this was the basic economic and recreational structure, which caused conflict between the wars. Inability to aspire to the new ideal man, when the foundations of that masculinity were precarious, combined with economic insecurity and
the perceived challenge from women to create intense sexual antagonism, ensured that, ‘it was a normal thing for a man to abuse his wife’. On Clydeside, ‘there really was a lot of wife-battering’. So common was sexual antagonism at this time that respondents openly discussed such experiences in the 1990s and often without resort to direct questioning. Wife assault was an everyday fact of life. Recollections indicate as much. ‘All the people would have a singsong. There were many people that fought and men that were bad to their wives. One man, he was awful bad to his wife. He’d take this stick and near kill her. That didn’t make any difference to us. We’d take her in and watch her.’

Moreover, displays of defiance from women or any suggestion of ‘greater social freedom’ could exacerbate this.

Some of them went too far. We didn’t see anybody smoking in our days. If you smoked in the street you were a tart, and maybe the women were smoking and the men didn’t like it and then there’d be a barnie. Oh there were plenty of barnies about men coming in drunk and different things, spending money, most of it would be money ah suppose.

Women’s defiance, their attempt to express greater ‘social freedom’, along with poverty and sexual conflicts, resulted in a high incidence of wife beating. The age group representing inter-war offspring corroborated this. Mr Agnew’s father beat his mother. Asked if he knew of neighbours behaving similarly he replied, ‘No, bar you saw them with a black eye. I’ve seen scuffles with the neighbours. The man was law’. Inter-war Clydeside spawned a climate in which wife-assault was common and extremely visible. If unsavoury, this was an accepted aspect of family life.

Ma mum had a next door neighbour and he used to knock hell out his wife and she accepted that. Ma father didn’t do it but then that’s what they did and people, never bothered about it. If she’d been getting really murdered people would’ve interfered.

As with women throughout Britain, dependence on a male breadwinner, necessity and the power of religion fused to ensure that Clydeside women were ill equipped to leave an abusive relationship.
Lest such behaviour should be regarded as unrepresentative, Glasgow wives are cited in inter-war publications highlighting poverty, deprivation and the perceived family violence associated with the latter. Dr. Robertson depicted wife beating in Glasgow. A resident of Glasgow’s Gorbals, he went on to become the local general practitioner and was well acquainted with this area’s inhabitants. In response to the Gorbals’ ‘No Mean City’ image and in collaboration with the local beat policeman for the Gorbals between 1923-1930, he wrote *Gorbals Doctor*. In this they argue:

The most common kind of violence was wife-assault, particularly on a Friday or a Saturday night between 11pm and 1am. Normally a child of between eight and fourteen years of age would come rushing into the Southern Division Police Station shouting: ‘Ma faither’s killin’ ma mither’. The *Govan Press* too, is littered with stories of wife-assault, which included the woman viciously beaten as a result of a conflict with her spouse over ‘his’ unemployment benefit.

High levels of wife beating between the wars were exacerbated by various social determinants, which operated as constraints to married women. Mrs Parsonage identified a major factor: ‘the police were never anxious to deal with domestic trouble’. Perhaps the police understood that the penalties incurred by prosecuted abusers often reflected back on their victims in the form of further violence or a loss of income if the ‘bread-winner’ was prosecuted or fined. However, it is also the case that the agencies of social welfare increasingly acted as ‘marriage menders’ and were reluctant to take any course of action which might cause a family breakdown. Conflict in the family was officially hidden.

That such conflict did exist highlights the fact that both sexes had very different social and economic concerns, which, when they were disputed, caused conflict that could erupt into violence. Respondents were asked what caused discord between married couples. They answered, ‘the only thing I could think about would be maybe the man getting over-loaded with drink’. Others maintained, ‘Money. It was always money, you see, money was tight then. There wasn’t many men worked’. ‘Money it was
These interviews were conducted during the zero tolerance campaign against domestic violence in 1996 and men's responses reflect this. Their answers tended to be less composed when detailing the conflict that resulted in domestic violence. Yet, their responses support the more composed answers given by women:

In Clydebank, a lot of men didn't give their wife the wages that they should have, course that would make arguments. They wanted money to run the house and they’d not the money to do it, while they’re away drinking and gambling. These were some of the wrong things and, I’m not trying to make out I’m a great person. I’ve got faults like all the rest.44

In fact, the lack of composure and the assertion, ‘I’m not trying to make out I’m a great person. I’ve got faults like all the rest —’ is, in the local dialect, indicative of an admission, if qualified, of complicity in such behaviour. Thus conflict over the wage ensured that a good husband was equally defined as, ‘a man who brought his pay home and didn’t spend it in the pub on the road’.45 But many men did, so that disputes over money and especially male expenditure on leisure was a major source of tension between couples. The depression heightened the struggle for scarce resources, but other catalysts contributed. World War I and the post-war economic climate threatened the foundations of male identity, intensified by the expectations placed upon males to be ‘ideal husbands’.

Prior to the war the vast number of Clydeside men worked in heavy industry. Many were regarded as skilled workers and most took pride in their ability to endure hard physical toil. Men’s self-image was linked to masculine aggressiveness, synonymous with violence. Davies notes how hardness and masculine status permeated working-class culture in Manchester. It was seen as a virtue. Through the role models of the family man who often embarked on family violence and the alternative model of the hard drinking man this status was re-enforced resulting in a masculine self-assertiveness which legitimised violence.46

Correspondingly, employment was an important medium from which men gained status, respect and a masculine identity
through the ‘breadwinner’ ideal. They also accrued privileges as household heads, especially pocket money, formal and informal leisure and freedom from family and household responsibilities. 1914 heralded a new era. The war introduced dilution schemes. Women were seen as a real threat to hitherto male preserves. Exacerbating the situation was the expansion of ‘women’s work’ and the necessity, which compelled women to supplement their spouses’ income. Intensification, deskilling and the threat and incidence of unemployment reinforced the notion of women as a threat to masculinity. Furthermore, many men had to accept that they were not the sole breadwinners regardless of the identification of masculinity, which deemed otherwise. Mr Ewart recalled, ‘women kept half the houses going’. They were cleaning trams out tae all hours in the morning’. Likewise,

The women worked at scrubbing the boats. They all had part-time jobs scrubbing the boats, but they had to because labourers were only getting £2 a week and a tradesman was £3 6s.47

Fluctuating wage levels and the government’s monetary policy of the 1930s did little to alleviate male vulnerability. Benefits were cut by 10 per cent and a means test was introduced with ‘benefits often dispensed not as a right but as an act of charity’.48 Unemployed people were humiliated frequently by public assistance employees at labour exchanges. The *Govan Press* reported allegations by the Govan Ward Committee against such employees. They cited incidences of public assistants, who asked claimants, ‘are you not ashamed of yourself?’49 To make matters worse, the children of the unemployed in receipt of clothing, were frequently humiliated, ‘The kids at school used tae say, Oh she’s Parish don’t talk to her. I mean it was really, it was cruel’.50 Smout stated of this unemployment that, ‘its devastating quality lay in the fact that it became an expectation, a way of life, not a singular misfortune’.51 Mrs Johnson recalled how,

When they weren’t working they just didn’t bother; they just lay in bed half the day and played cards half the night, anybody that I knew. They were just idle so they just took it for granted the longer it went on.52
However, during World War I and thereafter there was a relative social levelling between the different occupational groups of the working class. This permitted the semi-skilled and unskilled men of the Clyde greater opportunity to express masculinity in terms of the provider ideal. The gains accrued may have been short-lived or precarious due to the specialised nature of the Clydeside economy which ensured that a downturn in the major sectors could send ripples throughout the economy, but they were there.

The status, and its associated privileges that men accrued from employment were comparatively secure until war broke out and this had shored up the breadwinner ideal. Thus a multiplicity of male privileges depended upon the breadwinner philosophy. There had to be a wage packet. This was no longer guaranteed between the wars because of the severity of unemployment. The corporation of Glasgow’s Public Assistance Department’s Abstract of Cases show that in May 1932, among ‘Heads of Households’, there were 874 engineers out of work, 762 semi-skilled engineers and 644 transport workers, along with 5688 general workers out of a total of 10,914 unemployed men seeking assistance. Furthermore, as the 1930s progressed wages in the sheltered industries were curbed and brought into line to some extent with those of other occupations. Thus, even many of the workers who found secure employment often had to accept that their wages were often insufficient to maintain the family unit. Incomes had to be supplemented so that the masculine status based upon sole provision was diminished. This applied to the skilled and unskilled workers alike.

Women on Clydeside, however, had a tradition of supplementing their husband’s incomes, a tradition which was not the preserve of unskilled workers. The image of the female usurper, therefore, indicates that it was the context that changed, rather than the economic structure of the family unit. Thus, it was a combination of economic insecurity; the force of the re-assertion of masculinity as defined by the breadwinner ideal and new opportunities for women in the workplace, rather than men’s ability to provide for and maintain a wife at home, which caused male insecurity and hostility to women.

Masculinity was not only challenged economically. It was also endangered to some extent by the female sexual revolution.
between the wars. Adams argues that the public debate over female sexuality resulted in men internalising fears over their own sexuality. This corresponded with the introduction of contraception and the greater freedoms afforded middle-class women. Combined with the coverage given to the notion of the sexually liberated woman by the clergy and the media, female sexuality was to gain widespread attention. However, working-class women remained relatively ignorant of the availability of contraceptives although knowledge and availability were increasing. Nevertheless, the debate over birth control and the possibility that more working-class women chose to limit family size could have contributed to a crisis in masculinity. For many working-class women the only secure contraceptive or form of family limitation that gave them any control entailed, 'having no more fun'.

The claim that easier access to divorce threatened male dominance is equally contentious. Divorce was extremely costly, exacerbated by women’s dependency on male incomes. Women’s wages continued to be substantially lower than male incomes. Nevertheless, divorces could be obtained with greater ease in Scotland. That aside, the divorce rate for Scotland fell for most of the inter-war years. 776 couples divorced in Scotland in 1920, 451 in 1925 and 498 in 1935. Any possibility that divorce was more accessible was mitigated by the fact that, ‘no factor would give a single woman a house. It didn’t matter what happened it was the women to blame all the time’. Correspondingly, ‘you’d nowhere to go. Your mother couldn’t take you in because they all had big families, so it was impossible to run back to your people’. And, ‘your mother taught you if you made your bed you lie in it. Your mother had a family there, you’d made your bed and you’d just tae lie in it. We were all told that’.

These social impediments were reinforced by the narrowness of women’s lives. Many gained an identity from being a victim of domestic abuse. It was a shared experience with other women and a talking point. Other women, however, placed a new emphasis upon masculinity. Apparently, this was because the Boer War was followed in quick succession by World War I creating an imbalance of the sexes, compounded by ‘ex-soldiers in bad shape mentally and physically’. In Glasgow there were ‘ex-soldiers’ who ‘dragged themselves about, some on crutches
with an empty trouser leg, or a sleeve crudely sewn up swinging in the wind’.\textsuperscript{60} In addition, by 1921, females of fifteen years of age and over out-numbered males in this city by 25,770.\textsuperscript{61} This was not merely the result of war. With the exception of the inter-war years, Scotland was characterised by high levels of emigration. Between 1920-1922, 390,000 more people left Scotland than entered it. The majority of emigrants were young single men.\textsuperscript{62} Clydeside also had a relatively high male mortality rate, a feature of heavy industrial occupations.\textsuperscript{63} Young widowhood was an ever-present possibility. This helps explain Mrs Nicol’s sentiments. She had a ‘good husband’, who was, ‘rough and ready’, one whom she remained, ‘a wee bit frightened of’ throughout her marriage.\textsuperscript{64} In such an environment working class women were attracted to an exaggerated masculinity just as the foundations of working-class masculinity were being undermined by structural and ideological change. At the same time men felt concern over their ‘manliness’ and their ability to ‘provide and protect’. Naturally, this acted as an impediment to men’s subjectification of the readapted ‘ideal’ husband. It was in this context that recreations acted as a retreat into culture. They provided a means of symbolically expressing masculinity as well as an arena from which to absorb male identity. Thus it was not poverty that caused conflict, but rather insecurity that men resolved via the pursuit of time honoured masculine pastimes. This not only intensified levels of poverty but it undermined the aspirations of more affluent women. The ensuing gender conflict and wife beating were thus representations of extreme physical manifestations of masculine insecurity.

Male insecurity stemmed largely from the ruptures wrought by war, especially in the employment sphere. In turn, alternative arenas from which men drew a sense of male identity, including gambling, alcohol consumption and football were used to facilitate, ‘the absorption of manly identity and male affiliation’. They provided a sense of security in adverse economic conditions and at a time when ‘male identities cohering around a notion of toughness associated with the qualities deemed necessary to master heavy industrial work’, were being rendered defunct. Certainly, job security, better housing accommodation and rising living standards caused some relaxation of the sexual division of leisure. Pastimes also became more home-centred.\textsuperscript{65} However on
Clydeside, like Liverpool, London and Manchester, the pub, football and gambling remained ‘central to men’s networks’. They were aspects of popular culture which were ‘used to carve out terrain which were exclusively masculine republics’. These ‘masculine republics’ moderated male insecurity, but they were also a prime contributory to a high incidence of marital conflict. Male expenditure of the ‘family wage’ heightened the different gender priorities of both sexes and the home was the arena where the struggle for resources took place.

Not all men behaved this way. There were alternative masculinities to identify with and also different ‘propensities for male bonding and aggression’ which were influenced by different ‘socialisation’. Recreations, however, can be vehicles of socialisation, which reflect and reinforce the wider society, and hold significance and meanings for the participants. The pub was significant to many Clydeside men. It was also a source of sexual antagonism. The gender-specific social and economic priorities of each sex, the number of families on low incomes, insecure employment, unemployment and the potential for men’s spending to threaten the standards of living of the more economically secure families ensured this. Respondents were asked,

Q: What kind of things caused wife beating?
A: Oh, maybe money matters or too much drink. The man would come in drunk and you would say something and that was it, it had started a barnie . . . They were masters. What they said was law, that’s as sure as God!  

The majority of my respondents maintained that wife-assault, ‘was common, but drink was at the bottom of it’. It was not drunkenness which caused aggression. It was ‘an expectation of aggressive behaviour’ or the ‘provocation to aggress’. Between the wars, because the home was the terrain in which the struggle over resources took place, then the expectation and provocation to behave aggressively, as perceived by many husbands, was a wife’s challenge to his ‘right’ to expenditure. And there were many women who did challenge such expenditure through their expectations of a good husband and directly because this limited what little power they had if they did not. Mrs Campbell, a rag-trader, remembered,
If the man got his pay he would go in for a couple of pints on a Friday night and there was the woman waiting on her pay. See that's how I was busy paying out for rags, because if they waited until he came in, the father, they have to carry out food, but they could get a pound a mince for a shilling at that time. But that was it, the cause of arguments, any agro that was the drink.

Mr Agnew was asked:

**Q:** What was your father like with a drink in him?

**A:** I'd say him and the mother was always rowing about it. As soon as he came in the door she would be, 'Look at the state of you coming in!'

Thus, there were women who determined that 'if a man came into me drunk, by God he would have went out quicker than he came in!' Thus, there were women who determined that 'if a man came into me drunk, by God he would have went out quicker than he came in!'

The identification of the poor husband with drunkenness and violence ensured that men's guilt compounded the situation because they knew what was expected of a good husband. 'She'd be talking about a man that was quite a nice man in his ways and he looked after her n' her children. He done his best in every way to justify them getting married, and never at any time could he do things like striking her.' But he was also, 'a man that went home and took out his pay poke unopened, “Here you are darling. There you are.” Then she would open it and give him his pocket money'. Yet, like many localities in Britain, on the Clyde, ‘disputes over male spending on beer and the innocent flutter were the most common source of discord’. Davies attributed this to the fact that such expenditure could push a family below the poverty line, but he says little of how this expenditure could be a source of male domination and identity.

**Q:** Did your father hit your mother?

**A:** Yes when he was drunk.

**Q:** What was he like sober?

**A:** What was he like sober! He was talking in his sleep, you know, ‘What was I like last night’.
This was not an unusual occurrence and these attitudes were not unique. After stating, ‘I haven’t had a drink of whisky for years, cut it out when ah saw the damage it was doing to my family’, Mr McKenzie responded rather vaguely to the question, did you hit your wife, by answering, ‘to the best of my knowledge, no’. The need for interview composure contributed to this response, but this was a form of disavowal practised by many husbands. Rather than acknowledging abusive and aberrant behaviour, disavowal under the guise of impaired memory, due to excessive alcohol consumption, allowed many men the power of expenditure during a period of depression regardless of the consequences to their families, reinforced by the threat and incidence of violence. This shored up the power and masculine identity of significant numbers of men.

Male working-class leisure had a long tradition as a source of men’s power, privilege and identity, a tradition which swelled in importance between the wars, if not always quantitatively at least symbolically. These pursuits mediated men’s sense of insecurity and vulnerability stemming from the precarious economic climate, perceptions of a female usurper and the concessions to women embedded in the re-formulation of the dominant gender discourse. Thus they were a form of resistance to the transformations taking place in men’s lives, but they were also a catalyst of gender antagonism because of the expenditure such pleasures entailed. For many women such expenditure represented a loss of control of an area of family life identified as feminine, household management. More significantly, when the breadwinner abused the family wages in this manner it caused real economic problems for families. However, for families hoping to take advantage of the opportunities opening to those in secure employment between the wars such expenditure was equally detrimental. It was an impediment to better housing, an improved standard of living and the possibility of effecting privacy and respectable domesticity. Thus such expenditure was a conduct for antagonism.

Between the wars poverty did constrain some men’s access to ‘masculine republics’ while transformations occurred in male culture ensuring that home-centred pleasures became more significant to many men. The consumption of alcohol declined between the wars. Convictions for drunkenness fell along with
the consumption of spirits and the licensing of public houses. However, statistics do not inevitably indicate that Clydeside’s pub culture declined in significance for men, or that poverty and transformations in working-class culture moderated male spending in ‘masculine republics’. By this time few women on the Clyde consumed alcohol. This contributed to the declining levels of alcohol consumption. Of 25 women interviewed only one stated that she consumed alcohol at this time. The male respondents reinforced this. Mr Davidson actually believed, ‘women were barred. They must have been barred because I never mind of seeing a woman’. Women were never legally barred from public houses. It was publicans who created these ‘masculine republics’ because their male customers expected it of them.

In addition to the declining numbers of women drinking, legislation made it difficult for adolescents to consume alcohol. Furthermore, the statistics give no regional breakdowns for alcohol consumption, but ‘working-class inner-city areas continued to hold the most licenses and had the worst drink problems’. In Glasgow there were 1,534 licensed premises in 1921, and 1,511 in 1929. By the 1930s this declined slightly. In 1932 there were 1,480. The public house remained of great significance in cities like Glasgow. Mr Agnew recalled, ‘my dad spent most of his life in the pub. It was maybe half nine before you saw him. He would be away after his tea’. In addition to this, many respondents remembered the persistence of illicit drinking in shebeens on Clydeside. Furthermore, poverty may have regulated spending in public houses, but it did not ensure sobriety. Mrs Jackson remembered, ‘there was a pub on the corner and the unemployed used tae go into it and it was Jungle Juice they called it. See when they got a glass of Jungle Juice, God they were in the Jungle’. Correspondingly, price rises did not prove a deterrent because many ‘men drunk greater quantities of beer to supplement the more expensive spirits’. The Amulree Report stressed that this was often at the expense of family necessities. Mr Gordon’s recollections indicate the means by which this was accomplished.

Q: Did men let their wives know how much they earned?
A: Oh no! That’d have been terrible, your wife knowing it!

Q: What kind of pocket money did men get?
A: As much as they could, I think. I think that’s a fair answer.85

This inhibited women from identifying with the dominant worldview on womanhood that entailed good housekeeping skills.

Q: How much did your husband earn?
A: Nobody told you that wee bit of the story hen, you never knew what your man earned. You got your money and that was it. You had £2 10s. You had to pay your factor, your gas and whatever, but he never asked you what you did with it. He never asked that once, what about his rent book, but there were people that couldn’t pay the rents. People hadn’t the coppers.86

Men’s spending exacerbated this situation. Mr Davidson, rather vaguely and with little composure, recollected, ‘some men would just kind of, they get their pay-packet, they’ll take out what their, he’ll leave in and give the wife the rest. Maybe he’d have as much in his pocket’.87 Furthermore, ‘I never seen a pay packet in my life hen, never, never. I had eleven of us to keep on two pounds ten a week’.88 Mrs O Neil stated that her husband, a skilled tradesman, ‘went off the rails sometimes’. She also recalled, ‘well his wages were three pounds. I got two pounds and he got one pound, but then I couldn’t tell you how much he earned when the wages got bigger. They varied ah suppose’. Describing the difficulties of being a wife she stated, ‘money was a big problem. We used to say to ourselves, how can I make ends meet with this money. Ma husband was a tradesman and still the biggest wage he came home with was three pounds’.89

There were even greater excesses:

I never got a penny off him from the day I got married. I had a good wage. I had worked at a factory. I didn’t need him. He wouldn’t part with anything. I know when my first lassie was getting baptised and we had no gas to make tea and this man came in and
turned the gas on outside. That’s how I lived.90

Concealing the true level of the wage was an important trend. It was integral to the pursuit of masculinity, allowing secret spending on masculine recreations, more so because, ‘cultural constraints restricted male affiliation’. Alcohol was significant in allowing the manifestation of male bonding, particularly in Scotland, where, there is a ‘strong correlation between manliness and the ability to consume a great deal of alcohol’.91 Therefore, while the pub environment provided an avenue to express male identity, disavowal justified abhorrent behaviour during drunkenness allowing its continuance. The pub was an ‘institution where men increasingly had their masculinity recognised and reinforced’, where they ‘learned they were entitled to power’, and ‘how to keep it’.92

Q: What did men do if their wives came into the pub?
A: He wouldn’t be very happy, he wouldn’t do nothing then, but I would imagine there would be a bit of a scuffle outside if he couldn’t control his temper.93

Not only were women culturally barred from public houses, but few women were employed there either. By 1931 entertainment and leisure were the fastest growing industries on Clydeside. At this time there were 238 barmaids in Glasgow and 3173 barmen. The situation prevailed throughout Clydeside. Paisley had 18 barmaids, 150 barmen and Greenock had 6 barmaids and 164 barmen.94 Mr Ewart worked as a barman and he said, ‘oh you couldn’t turn round and say, “Get the hell out of here.” You would say, “Excuse me, you’re not allowed to sell drink to a woman”’.95

Clydeside’s pub culture was associated with manliness. It acted as a consolation when masculine identity was insecure because it permitted an alternative means of expression and absorption. Therefore while conflict over the distribution of the wage may have pre-dated the inter-war insecurity experienced by men, the re-assertion of masculinity, as defined between the wars potentially exacerbated male guilt. Although men justified sexual conflict through denial, excused it as drunken behaviour, conflict was amplified because of their inability to aspire to the ‘ideal companionate husband’ and
this could only lead to guilt. Thus a vicious cycle was created.

Street gambling was also catalytic to the incidence of gender conflict. Gambling has been widely debated. Victorian moralists perceived gambling as an excessive vice, contributing to the poverty, misery and brutality of working-class family life. These views contributed to legislation culminating with the Gambling Act of 1906. The legislation theoretically prohibited working-class gambling, but allowed the upper classes to continue with it unabated. That it did, detracts from a predilection to view gambling as a symptom of poverty. What it does imply is that although gambling is synonymous with a dream of instant wealth, it is also much more. In fact, the rise in the propensity to gamble between the wars might indicate that ‘a belief in luck, chance and fate’, had replaced previous beliefs in ‘progress, solidarity and religious faith’, reflecting a process of ‘individuation, atomisation or anomie’.96

On the Clyde, the adverse economic climate undermined notions of progress and moderated solidarity amongst working-class people, while men were, to a greater extent than women, turning from the churches and chapels. However, the lure of gambling was also its capacity to provide a means of establishing character, the ‘principal attributes of which are ‘gameness, gallantry, courage, integrity, composure and presence of mind’, many of the attributes associated with employment under threat between the wars. Gambling offered ‘the possibility of effecting reputation in a society which had all but arranged action out of everyday life’,97 enhanced by the element of deviance, offering the status of rebel, winner and even a good loser.

Q: Did your husband bet?
A: Oh he loved to, in fact that was his only vice. His whole pocket money went back, although somebody told me he was quite a lucky winner.98

Mrs McQueen recalled, ‘he’d have emptied your purse in a minute. I had to hide all my money. He was a good loser right enough and he didn’t win very often’. Likewise,

A: Oh my man, aye! He would have pawned the shirt off his back.
Q: Have you any idea how much they put on a line?
Men recalled how a win felt, ‘oh you felt like a millionaire. A couple a bob was a lot of money too. Ah pint of beer cost you 4d . . . at that time’. It was, ‘a time of elation’, which, ‘felt champion’. Mr Ewart maintained, ‘when you win you were over the moon’. However, women did not necessarily share their enthusiasm because, ‘it was just a done thing, I mean they would do without food to keep the money for gambling’. Mrs Macintosh worked to supplement her husband’s unemployment benefit. She remembered, ‘it was with him at this corner. I passed and they’d all a drink in them. I turned and said, “what’s left for eating, have you had your pals up?” He came up later and was annoyed at me saying this in front of his pals, and they used to say, “I wouldn’t take that off of her”’.101

Gambling was also linked with the pub culture:

I took a line for my father. You used to get the *Topical Times*, and he picked some horse. He had five horses and they all won. He sent me along with the line. He said, ‘You will maybe not get paid that. It comes to nearly £2 10s’. So I went along and brought the money back. He gave me a dollar. And oh, he was down the pub with all his mates and they were all drunk for days.102

This link between the pub and gambling heightened gambling’s potential to contribute to gender conflict. It was a focus of contested terrain between couples, safeguarded by the violence which was ‘ever present if not indulged’, which Hammerton argues characterised marriages of conflict rather than those of companionship.103

However, Chapman insists that working class gambling was relative to incomes with stakes ranging from 6d to 2/6d.104 Nevertheless, there exists a substantial body of evidence to refute his assertion. Street gambling escalated phenomenally between the wars in Scotland, particularly in working-class communities where it was associated with sport.105 The amount spent at dog tracks in Britain alone rose from £10,000,000 per annum to £75,300,000 between 1927-1938.106 Apparently, the working-
class were ‘running after the bookies’. Mr McKenna lived in Croy, Lanarkshire with a population of around ‘two hundred people’. It had ‘three bookies’. Correspondingly,

Q: Do you remember the bookies?
A: Oh aye. They used to shout - in fact the lady across the road from us they had a parrot and it used to shout, ‘Get the money in, the police are coming’.

In 1929 Forward reported that a bookie responsible for 148 closes in Plantation St. [Kinning Park, Glasgow] took £35 per day prior to 1914. By 1923 he made an estimated £300 daily in the flat season. The Govan Press is littered with accounts of bookies’ arrests. In 1926 it reported on a raid in which 6,000 betting lines and several football coupons were appropriated from a bookie in the Govan area of Glasgow. Therefore gambling held the capacity to push many families to the margins or below the poverty line or to erode their potential to enjoy improved living standards. It was not necessarily relative to income.

Chapman also failed to acknowledge the propensity to gamble in different ways and the large number of men who placed a daily wager. Respondents noted wagers placed on horses, dogs, football coupons, pitch and toss and card playing as among the variety of ways to gamble.

Q: Did your father gamble?
A: He took horse bets, dog bets, football bets and boxing bets, but when he got that done he would drink the winnings. He didn’t know when to stop because it went to his head.

Rather than being relative to income, gambling was intrinsically linked to the pursuit of masculinity, exacerbating marital tension.

Women also gambled, but they did not do so with the same frequency as their male counter-parts. Moreover, it was women’s perceptions of gambling that most correlated to the idea of gambling as a form of working class saving or the ‘dream of instant wealth’ and this wealth could exclude the ‘breadwinner’.

Q: Was there a lot of women that gambled?
A: They used to try but they hadn’t much money. If they had a shilling: try your luck and see if you can win something out of it. If you could get half a crown you could take all your weans to the pictures, five weans and yourself to the pictures.\textsuperscript{111}

Male gambling, however, like the pub was a source of establishing male dominance, and between the wars a source when masculine identity itself was insecure.

The final area of Clydeside’s ‘three cornerstones’ of male working-class culture was football. Many men ‘ate, slept, drank and lived football seven days a week’.\textsuperscript{112} Football, the game, spectating and discussion, facilitated male bonding, and was tied to gambling and the pub. Murray suggests of Glasgow’s Celtic and Rangers Football clubs that they represent a microcosm of Scottish society and that they expanded at a phenomenal rate from 1914.\textsuperscript{113} The growth of Rangers Football Club, initially spurred by rising incomes, increased leisure time and technological developments allowing access to commercial leisure, may also reflect inter-war perceptions of relative deprivation. It was the employment notably associated with skilled Protestant workers, as the football club was, which were most susceptible to the economic climate, whilst sheltered employment, such as municipal work, was often undertaken by Catholic workers. In this environment support provided an outlet for the expression of masculine and religious identity just as employment had done. Correspondingly, the growth of Celtic Football Club may highlight a Catholic counter-response, but it might also demonstrate greater access to commercial leisure being enjoyed by workers benefiting from the inter-war deflationary policies, workers less susceptible to the unemployment affecting the heavy industries.

The inter-war years were also the period of the North/South divide and of the myth of the working-class hero, the poor tenement boy who overcomes the obstacles of poverty to make good through footballing skills. Moorhouse argues that this myth is endemic of the fatalism engendered by relative deprivation. This myth, moreover, was the allegorical equivalent of the Clydeside crafts, encompassing, ‘skills of precision, quality and expertise - rare craftsmanship passed in the blood’.\textsuperscript{114} Hence when the status from employment diminished men may have
found a new outlet, one also providing the vicarious qualities of ‘competitiveness, aggression and instrumentality’. In such a context a team’s defeat was possibly internalised as a personal challenge to masculine identity. Mr Beattie ‘didn’t feel very well when Celtic were defeated’, because being a Celtic ‘man’ meant ‘something worthwhile’.

Q: What did a man’s football team mean to him personally?
A: Oh I think quite a lot, quite a lot. It gives them all an interest.
Q: So how did you feel when your team got beat?
A: Ready for crying.

The bigotry manifest in Rangers and Celtic football support was not restricted to these teams or Glasgow. Brown highlights that a similar bigotry existed between the rival teams of Port Glasgow and Greenock. On the other hand, Mr Ewart maintained that a man’s football team meant, ‘the pub. It can lead you to it’. Thus, ‘many a poor woman was frightened for the match being finished and the man coming home’. As masculinity was drawn from such identification, football and its links with gambling and the pub culture often proved volatile when contested by wives.

The pillars of male working-class leisure had a long tradition as centres of male power, privilege and identity, but this was amplified between the wars, if not always quantitatively at least symbolically. These pursuits mediated men’s sense of insecurity and vulnerability stemming from the precarious economic climate, perceptions of a female usurper and the concessions to women embedded in the re-assertion of the dominant gender discourse. These compromises included glorifying mothers and homemakers and conceding equality to women within the family and the neighbourhood. They also included the expectation of love, respect and provision. These expectations were not inconsistent with the traditional ideals of masculinity, but many working-class men had been impeded structurally from assimilating the ideal of a paternalistic ‘breadwinner’, and, therefore, the ‘companionate husband’ was an equally difficult aspiration. The relative subjectification of the dominant discourse by women, whilst working-class men
could not or would not aspire to be ‘companionate providers’ ensured that intense gender antagonism continued to mark gender relations. Men thus continued to resort to popular culture as a means of expressing and developing a masculine identity and as a form of resistance to acculturation. This put pressure on marriage. Thus women’s expectations were disappointed. The ‘new man’ of the inter-war period remained a myth. Gender antagonism and marriages of conflict, which had marked Clydeside from at least the eighteenth century, prevailed, and were exacerbated by the ruptures wrought by war.

Annmarie Hughes
University of Glasgow

Glossary of Terms and Phrases:
4d: is four pennies.
Agro: a form of conflict.
A line: refers to the accumulated number of horses, dogs or football teams the individual is gambling on.
Barnie: conflict verbal and physical.
Blode: man/male.
Breeches: trousers.
Clydeside was the most highly populated and industrial region of west central Scotland.
Coppers: is small sums of money, usually pennies.
Factors: were landlords or intermediates for landlords.
Govan: a region of Glasgow, a city at the heart of Clydeside. The Govan Press was its local newspaper.
Half a crown: was 12 ½ pennies.
Hen: is a term of endearment.
It went to his head or ‘heid’: is a colloquialism for being overwhelmed.

Jungle juice: refers to cheap and potent alcohol.

Loggerheads: forms of conflict, verbal and physical.

‘Ma father’s killin’ ma mither’: My father is killing my mother, referring to extreme physical violence being inflicted on a wife by her husband.

Parish: within a certain context is a reference to children whose parents were in receipt of means tested benefits and clothing entitlements for their children. The clothing was distinctive and clearly marked out the poverty of the family.

Paying out for rags: refers to the Rag trade in old clothing used by the poor as a strategy to cope with poverty.

Pay-packet or pay poke: refers to a daily or weekly wage.

Pictures: cinema-house.

Pocket money: refers to the sum given to a male ‘breadwinner’ for his sole use.

Rangers and Celtic: Are the two main football clubs in the City of Glasgow renowned for their sectarian rivalry.

Rough and ready: refers to manliness.

Scuffles: physical conflict, generally of a minor nature.

Shilling: was five pennies.

The *Topical Times*: was a paper which covered horse races and provided information on form.

‘Turned the gas on outside’: means bypassing the system that ensured payment for services.

‘Went off the rails sometimes’: refers to occasional bad behaviour.
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