

BEING A MAN, BEING A MEMBER

MASCULINITY AND COMMUNITY IN BRITAIN'S WORKING MEN'S CLUBS, 1945-1960

ABSTRACT By 1960, there were more than 3,500 working men's clubs in Britain, with a combined membership of more than two million people. This article explores their post-war transformation from small homosocial enclaves for drinking and bar-games to larger family-oriented entertainment venues, as they continued to provide social, welfare and educational activities for local communities. Operating on the boundaries of public and private life, they remained alternative sites of domesticity to the home, in which men nurtured relations with both friends and family. Nevertheless, though women and children came to represent a significant presence in the clubs, their cultures remained largely patriarchal and discriminatory. I argue that working men's clubs provided important sources of agency, community and continuity for their members, during a period of social and cultural change.

Keywords: masculinity, leisure, domesticity, family, community

In a 1958 *Manchester Guardian* article about the changing nature of Britain's working-men's clubs, one Durham miner was reported as complaining that he now had to "walk half a mile to find the dartboard".¹ His grievance spoke of the transformations taking place in clubs across the country, where spaces once primarily designated for men, drinking and bar-games were being converted to large-scale concert halls with facilities catering to the whole family. Nevertheless, the dartboard remained. Post-war modernity has been described as a "hybrid affair... assembled as much from tales about the past as of the future";² the Durham miner and his journey to the dartboard might exemplify such hybridity. Traversing the boundaries of public and private space, working men's clubs provided alternative sites of domesticity to the home, and longstanding sources of belonging for multiple generations of men. The clubs valued heritage, tradition and respect for older members while nurturing personal ambition and enterprise as such desires arose; they cultivated strong ties to local industry,

trade unions and the Co-operative movement, but operated outside party politics in democratically participative structures; and they played a multifarious role in community life, providing activities and services spanning welfare, education and leisure, in environments curated by and for their members. Between 1945 and 1960, as pubs were in decline, the number of working men's clubs grew from 2,944 to 3,501, by which time they boasted more than two million members.³ Despite their proliferation they have received little attention within the historiography on class and leisure. This article describes how working-class men and their families negotiated the social and cultural changes wrought by rising affluence, population movement, and changes to home and work life, through the mechanism of associational life.

The years following the Second World War marked acceleration in the growth of Britain's working men's clubs. Starting out in 1862 as abstemious institutions for the betterment of working-class men, the clubs' popularity peaked in the 1970s, by which time libraries and educational debates had largely made way for drinking and a variety of entertainments. Since then, the clubs have been in steady decline alongside the heavy industries and communities that had supported them. Most recently, cheap supermarket beer, 2007's smoking ban, multi-channel TV and the Internet, have all contributed to members and potential members preferring to spend their leisure time at home. In the 1950s, however, they were thriving bastions of working-class social life, with many members attending several times a week.⁴ Though their heartlands were the traditional mining and steel communities of the north of England and south Wales, they also clustered around new car-manufacturing industries in the east Midlands, and elsewhere, from rural parishes to large cities.⁵ For the purposes of this article, a 'working men's club' is defined by its membership structure, subscription model, and affiliation to the Working Men's Club and Institute Union (CIU). My sources, which include the CIU-published *Club Journal*, together with social studies, national newspapers and an interview with club historian Ruth Cherrington, all suggest that the vast majority of working men's clubs shared this affiliation.⁶

The editorial policy of the *Club Journal* was shaped by contemporaneous political and strategic concerns of the CIU, evidenced by the topics that dominated this period: female membership; independence from pubs and breweries; and fundraising for the Union's convalescent homes. The extent to which these issues were shared at club and member level varied; but evidence drawn from social studies and oral testimony highlights instances of inconsistency between CIU rhetoric and lived experiences. A key source of insight is Brian Jackson's *Working Class Community*, in which the author interviewed 100 members across 16 of Huddersfield's 70 working men's clubs during the 1950s and 1960s.⁷ With a focus on communities beyond networks of family and kinship, which had characterized earlier studies by Michael Young and others, Jackson champions the clubs' multifarious roles in working class neighbourhoods. Contrastingly, *Coal is Our Life*, the only earlier study that mentions the clubs in any detail, describes them as dominated by the homosocial activities of drinking and gambling.⁸ Though neither can be read uncritically, their thick descriptions and verbatim quotes combine to paint indicative pictures of everyday club life. Similarly, the only substantial social history of the clubs, Ruth Cherrington's *Not Just Beer and Bingo*, alongside an interview I conducted with the author in 2013, includes rich and colourful oral testimony from past and present club members.⁹ Meanwhile, the smattering of national press stories about the clubs over the period reveals the moments when club culture met national discourse, most notably in connection with issues of gender equality, class-consciousness and the changing nature of mass entertainment.

Post-war Associational Life: Clubs, Pubs and Middle-class Institutions

In 1945, many working-class men craved stability, normality and companionship after the chaos and horror of war. However, changes to their home, family and work environments during their time away meant that for some, this transition was problematic. Pressure to perform normative modes of modern manhood - reliable breadwinner, considerate husband, patient father - required a process of adaption and assimilation from the martial identity of wartime, which did not always come easily or naturally.¹⁰ Scholarship in this area has built upon John

Tosh's notion of nineteenth century men's "flight from domesticity", which, he argues, was borne of anxiety around competing dimensions of masculine identity.¹¹ Martin Francis reframes this description, arguing that after 1945 returning Servicemen experienced a "flight from commitment", in which they would turn to books and films about war and adventure for imaginary homosocial escape from new domestic realities.¹² Less benign strategies have also been identified, concerning instances of domestic abuse and sexual violence.¹³ For Selina Todd, post-war working-class anxieties were representative of longstanding emotional tensions around the requirement to be both family breadwinner and independent, hardy, working man.¹⁴ However, such tensions did not always necessarily lead to escapist or destructive strategies. As Lucy Delap has argued, it can be more useful to acknowledge "co-presences" of enduring components of masculinities, of "commitment to family and home, of action and adventure, of risk-taking and competitiveness, of breadwinning and maturity".¹⁵ It had been Tosh's contention that 'the public demonstration of masculinity occurs in three linked areas – home, work and all-male associations'.¹⁶ Similarly, working men's clubs after 1945 provided male-dominated refuges for men discomfited by demobilization, and changed home and work lives, in which they had space to explore their new and multiple civilian identities.

Central to this process was the familiarity of club environments, in which men would gather to socialize with childhood friends and ex-brothers-in-arms.¹⁷ One Leicester club member, in a passage from his poem *The Clubman: A Portrait*, listed typical terms of endearment to illustrate interpersonal relations between members: "He is Tom or Dick or Harry (rarely mister), but he calls you brother, chum, mate, china, old man, old misery, frog-face or rumble-tummy, with the same degree of affection that he calls you 'worthy member' on dignified occasions."¹⁸ This was seized on by the *Club Journal's* editor who printed the poem in full on the front page, explaining that it "aptly expresses what most of us two million clubmen think."¹⁹ The depiction is likely romanticized, but the sense of friendly semi-formality of club membership is corroborated by other sources, and would have resonated with members' memories of wartime homosocial

camaraderie. The vernacular of wartime was central to the experience of the post-war clubs, many of which chose names to include terms such as “ex-Servicemen” or “Old Comrades”.²⁰ In some cases physical remnants of battle, such as discarded tank repair kits and air raid shelters, would be used to assemble clubs in new neighbourhoods, as men devoted labour and time to building work, carrying out decorating and plumbing themselves to save money.²¹ The redeployment of wartime artefacts as building materials demonstrates how material, as well as oral cultures, provided opportunities for personal and collective catharsis in the aftermath of trauma. The considerable efforts of the members betrayed a strong need for homosocial hubs in displaced post-war communities, which manifested in collectivized, instrumental endeavours to achieve their aims.

The informal solidarities of member collectives were nurtured within formal organizational structures, and this blend was key to the club movement’s success. Individual clubs reported to regional, area and ultimately national governing bodies, but retained considerable local autonomy, with each club’s committee comprising posts of president, secretary and treasurer. Every member paid a small subscription (1d per month in 1951) and became a shareholder with voting rights. In return for a slightly higher subscription men could become *Associate Members*, which gained them entry into affiliate clubs and eligibility for CIU convalescent homes.²² Associate membership was held up as an important signifier of collective identity and commitment to the national movement by the CIU, who stood to benefit from the higher fees. Campaigns in the *Club Journal* encouraged men to “be a Union clubman – not merely a member of a club”²³ and to join “this associate brotherhood”.²⁴ Not all members would become *Associates*, but there is evidence that many felt proud to belong to a national, as well as local, community. CIU ties and pin badges would be worn, awards for long service were common, and it was reported in Huddersfield that most men would occupy a committee post at some stage of their tenure.²⁵ The mixture of local and national identity, informality and infrastructure held appeal for men with recent memories of military service.

In order to assess the purchase of this appeal, it is helpful to locate working men's clubs alongside alternative prominent male-dominated social institutions. For example, the member-only structures of the clubs challenges assumptions that twentieth century associational life was largely the domain of the middle class. The friendly informality of the clubs, where membership was relatively easy to obtain, and opportunities for empowerment and influence were readily accessible, stands in contrast to the secrecy and ritual associated with the middle-class Freemasons.²⁶ Both had long histories, established traditions and hierarchical infrastructures, but working men's club democracies were more participative, and their cultures less reified. Though less shrouded in mystery than the Freemasons, Rotary International also had highly selective admissions procedures, unlike the clubs.²⁷ While the principle aims of these organisations, which focused on professional networking and philanthropy, contrasted with the clubs, which served more as locations of everyday social life, they all shared interests in leisure, welfare and connections with public life. With much broader public appeal, however, membership of working men's clubs outnumbered that of these middle-class associations by several hundred thousand.²⁸

Working men's clubs' participative democratic structures also distinguished them from clubs belonging to corporations, or 'works clubs'. These had become significant social hubs during the inter-war period, as the first wave of communities followed new industries from urban areas to out-of-town estates. Like working men's clubs, they offered opportunities for social bonding with colleagues outside the workplace, via a variety of recreational and educational activities, as well as social events.²⁹ As Brad Beaven has noted, they also provided company-controlled environments in which employers could observe workers' use of their increasing amount of leisure time.³⁰ The desirability for employers of a fit and healthy workforce engaged in wholesome leisure activities including team sports, had also been documented.³¹ However, this led to arguments among employers and workers over the supervision of non-work activities, with both sides conscious of increasing civic scrutiny over the "passive leisure" of the working class. This had been a period in which social reformers were concerned that worker apathy might translate into radical political

activity.³² In working men's clubs, however, such tensions could be avoided because every aspect of club life was determined by the members, with minimal intervention from the CIU head office. Steve Crewe has pointed out that, after the Second World War, "management paternalism" receded in the works clubs, as workers would be encouraged to set up their own teams and societies. However, he concedes that even in such circumstances, the viability of the groups depended on their "coincid[ing] with the interests of the management", who would also provide funding and logistics.³³ He also notes the continuation of symbolic staged events, such as annual balls, as well as the inclusion of perceived middle-class sports, such as table-tennis, which would exclude blue-collar workers.³⁴ It does not necessarily follow that workers might have chosen instead to belong to their working-men's club in order to have greater autonomy over their leisure, and it is likely that some were members of both types of club; however, working men's clubs certainly appeared to thrive in communities around new industries, particularly car manufacturing, after 1945.³⁵ By 1959, the *Club Journal* also reported 29 different regional and national trophies for sports and games, which can be seen as equivalent to works club offerings, including football, snooker, angling, 'quiz', dancing, bowls and horticulture.³⁶

The most keenly felt distinction, however, was between pub and club. Although routinely grouped together in histories of working-class leisure, they differed in several fundamental aspects. While the number of clubs increased by more than 500 during the years 1945-1960, a similar period saw 30,000 pubs close their doors.³⁷ In explaining this pattern, it is instructive to consider the legislative statuses and cultural environments of the clubs, which combined to appeal to members' needs for agency and community, and the CIU's political agenda. For example, unlike the commercially owned pubs and theatres, clubs existed largely beyond the radar of state interference due to their status as private venues, to which only members and guests could be admitted. In 1949, when a local council recommended that clubs, like pubs, be subject to random police visits, the CIU were quick to assert that those "engaged in usefully promoting the social and recreational life of a very large section of the community should not have their

activities curtailed or interfered with.”³⁸ When the issue arose again in 1960, their position had not changed:

Clubs are for the use of members and bona fide guests of members only, whereas public houses and other licensed premises are open to the public generally ... To suggest that Police should have the right of entry to Clubs is tantamount to implying that the Managing Committees of Clubs are incapable of running their Clubs in an orderly and proper fashion.³⁹

The rhetoric unambiguously privileges members over “the public generally” and defends clubs’ governing structures, emphasising the freedoms associated with membership. In reality, such freedoms also served to preserve a healthy illegal gambling culture, with card tables and a ‘bookie’s runner’ regular features of club life; nevertheless, the underpinning values of privacy and independence were central to the CIU’s institutional identity.⁴⁰

This circumscription from the state allowed clubs to operate on the boundaries of public and private life. As private institutions, they were able to select which beer was sold and set prices, which typically matched or undercut pubs. One Huddersfield club member commented, “You go across the road and have a pint at the pub there, and then come and try it here. We’re all shareholders here, y’know, all shareholders.”⁴¹ Clubs were also able to determine opening hours, which would often flex to dovetail with the shifts of local workers; some would even provide rooms for the storage of work tools and baths for men to wash in after work.⁴² Similarly, televisions, credited with a leading role in the trend towards home-centred leisure during the 1950s, also became a feature of everyday club life.⁴³ Members would regularly enjoy news and sporting events out with their friends, and on special occasions such as election nights, extended licences would be attained so members could “relax with a drink while listening to the broadcast results.”⁴⁴ Of course, pubs had televisions too, but, according to members in Huddersfield, they failed to generate the ‘home from home’ atmosphere that was intrinsically bound to membership. One member noted that in pubs, one was required to dress smartly and mix with “society”, but “clubs are

much more sociable like... Ah couldn't rest me legs across a chair in t'pub. Here it's like being at home."⁴⁵ Similarly, the national *Sunday Chronicle* reported that club members could "make [their] own rules... [while] no barman pesters them though their glasses are empty."⁴⁶ The distinctive homeliness of clubs complicates the "flight" narrative within social histories of masculinity. The clubs *were* sites of domesticity, in which men could remain connected to work and public life in a homely setting. In time they would come to welcome wives and children too, albeit conditionally, further blurring the boundaries of public and private spheres.⁴⁷ The considerable success of working men's clubs in this period can in part be attributed to a combination of relaxed and homely cultures, democratically participative membership structures, and private statuses that served to empower and harmonize with working-class communities. It was these qualities that combined to distinguish the clubs from contemporaneous male-dominated institutions of social life.

Support and Solidarity: Politics, Welfare and Education

If the club movement's values were carved out in opposition to competitor institutions of male leisure, they were forged in alliance with politically like-minded organizations. Club members were often also trade unionists and many clubs boasted close links to local Co-operative businesses.⁴⁸ It has been argued that empowerment deriving from trade union membership represented a continuation of inter-war needs for autonomy and control, which were indelibly associated with performances of working-class masculine identity.⁴⁹ Catering to similar desires, working men's club memberships provided access to a homosocial collectivity that was closely related to the trade union movement, in which men could also enact empowering articulations of manhood. Careers in local and national politics were also common; by 1953 the club movement had produced 970 County Councillors, 2,664 Town or Borough Councillors and 176 MPs.⁵⁰ Despite retaining a public position of neutrality at an institutional level, the politics of some of the clubs were laid bare in their names, for example: *Glossop Labour Club*; *Tottenham Radical Club*; and the *Llay Miners Welfare Institute*. The clubs would also feature in parliamentary debates about work and

leisure. In 1953, the contentious subject of “free beer” for club members wishing to celebrate the Queen’s Coronation was raised in the Commons. James Glanville, Labour MP for Consett, seized the opportunity for an attack on the Conservatives. He argued that the “vested interests of the brewers” (and by association pubs) would be unlikely to offer “free beer” because whereas “their money goes to the Tory Party, our clubs’ money gives old people holidays and tea parties.”⁵¹ Responding to the debate, the president of the CIU went even further:

What they mean by ‘free beer’ in our clubs I do not know. That is an impossibility, because the beer already belongs to the members. Should there be an accumulation or surplus of beer for the members of the club, it is only there as beer they have paid for... I do not see that we should have to find any excuse or apology for sharing out something that is already ours.⁵²

He judiciously sidesteps party political argument, but the collectivist rhetoric is clear. Such discourse was common in the pages of the *Club Journal*, and many Labour MP’s made no secret of their pathway to parliament, from club member, via trade union or local council. Alongside the social aspects of the clubs, then, involvement in formal politics represented an alternative source of agency available to club members.

Involvement in education, health and charitable support for members’ families further contributed to the spirit of solidarity and empowerment. In the immediate post-war period, such activities resonated with the “cradle to grave” philosophy that drove the Attlee government’s pioneering welfare policies.⁵³ Working men’s clubs, alongside the Co-operative movement, Friendly Societies, and various voluntary organizations, offered supplementary, or even alternative sources of welfare provision to government programmes.⁵⁴ The CIU claimed that their work made a “tremendous contribution to the welfare of the state”, and in 1954 a young James Callaghan MP praised the club movement for its contribution to the fields of healthcare and education.⁵⁵ Welfare programmes were financed through fundraising initiatives. Most prominent was the perennial

national campaign, spearheaded by the *Club Journal*, to raise money for the CIU's five convalescent homes; the latest had been purchased in 1948 to cater for fresh demand following the war.⁵⁶ The homes were championed obsessively in the *Club Journal*, which customarily deployed triumphalist language such as "beautiful", "glorious" and "magnificent" to describe them. A CIU presidential address from 1960 illustrates typical levels of hyperbole: "I cannot describe 'Our Homes' [sic] sufficiently. They are, as a matter of fact, the envy of all other organizations that profess to have Convalescent Homes. They are doing great work indeed among our sick and injured clubmen."⁵⁷ The shorthand of "Our Homes" was significant; it served to reify the homes as symbols of collective organization, shared responsibility and moral fortitude. However, although members made use of the homes, enthusiasm for their maintenance was not always shared at a local level, at which fundraising events were more commonly held in aid of the type of holidays and tea parties James Glanville cited in parliament.⁵⁸ The homes' symbolism for the national movement's moral agenda was disproportionate to their everyday significance for most club members, but an interest in the welfare of fellow working-class people was common to both.

A spell in a convalescent home might have been one of many significant life-events a man would have associated with his club. He may also have had his Christening and wedding party there, and regularly partaken in family nights, alongside his parents, in the intervening years. As an adult, he may also have taken one of the educational courses provided by the CIU. In 1952, though numbers were falling, more than 1,000 clubs still ran their own libraries, while 784 organized regular lectures and courses of study; subjects ranged from *The Gambling Laws and Clubs* to *Post War Policy in Education and Recreation*, to *The Foreign Policy of the USSR*. There were also annual scholarships and a summer school at Ruskin College, Oxford, together with residential courses at Leicester University.⁵⁹ Though there were regional differences in both availability and levels of enthusiasm for the courses, education remained a significant strand of club life.⁶⁰ In a period during which landmark policies were implemented to improve the educational prospects of working-class children, club membership provided many of their fathers with parallel opportunities via adult education.⁶¹

Like the tea parties, holidays and convalescent homes, educational courses were initiatives that stemmed from reflexive relations between members and clubs, which saw them, at some level, as both curators and beneficiaries. In this respect, it is instructive again to compare the clubs to their middle-class counterparts. Organizations such as Rotary International and the Women's Institute also recognized charitable activities as central to their causes, but such services and support were directed towards people outside the membership, in formulations of altruistic citizenship.⁶² The initiatives springing from working men's clubs, however, were born out of collective sociability. The movement's philanthropy was notable for its solidarity rather than paternalism.⁶³

Clubs for Working Men? Gender, Family Identity and Class-consciousness.

Welfare activities provided typical entry points into club life for women, who represented one third of the membership by 1955.⁶⁴ Women had been a presence in the clubs for a number of years, but from the end of the 1940s the *Club Journal* gave increasing space to campaigns for greater integration, led by male members, members' wives, and prominent council and government figures. As early as 1950, Mary Josephine Dunn, club member and Mayor of Newport, celebrated the clubs' progress in "social, cultural and educational work", describing many as "family institutes engaged in social activities, in which wives and lady friends of the members had a rightful place."⁶⁵ For the CIU, the inclusion of women was a mark of the movement's modernisation, particularly in comparison with the much-derided pubs, where, it was claimed, women were not welcome.⁶⁶ A few months after Dunn's speech, the *Club Journal* made clear its delight in reporting a recent German delegation's comments upon visiting a Leeds club:

We explain [our female guide] has not come, so as not to desecrate the club premises. 'But why?' [the Leeds members] exclaim with surprise and regret, 'Our womenfolk would have been pleased to meet her and have a chat with her': Our first concept of workers clubs goes overboard. Members' wives are as much at home as the members themselves.⁶⁷

Clearly, the integrity of the translation is questionable, but the “surprise and regret” assigned to the Leeds members betrays the CIU’s wish to promote the clubs as inclusive social spaces. In terms of structure and governance, however, they remained patriarchal and discriminatory, with female members unable to vote on club matters, hold committee posts, become *Associates* and, in many cases, restricted to designated rooms and nights of the week.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, women represented an influential minority, even if the rhetoric of the CIU failed to conceal inherent institutional inequalities.

The involvement of women saw the formation of different collectivities within the clubs, leading men to further combine domestic identities with those forged at work and in homosocial environments. In Huddersfield, an increased number of children’s parties, fundraising galas and wedding receptions served to de-masculinise the spaces and make them more appealing to the community, as many clubs gradually became key locations of everyday family social life.⁶⁹ Visits to clubs in other towns were also family occasions. Holidaying Featherstone club members would seek out activities in places “which most closely resemble those provided in Ashton”.⁷⁰ For club historian Ruth Cherrington growing up in 1950s Coventry, the search for the CIU sign was an important family holiday ritual: “If you saw the CIU sign on the door, then that was a sign of quality. I got told when I was a kid, you know, ‘look out for the CIU sign’ – we can go in there, we can go in that one. A feeling of pride, you know.”⁷¹ The pride the CIU sign instilled and the sense of belonging it symbolized apparently permeated the whole family, though membership rules served to ensure that guardianship of it remained with the husband and father; he would be required to sign the family in on every visit. Ruth’s memory reveals both the cultural salience of the clubs in everyday family life and the patriarchal economies of the leisure time they hosted.

The inclusion of children in the clubs was also happily championed by the CIU, who boasted that a man’s club was “a place where the law cannot prevent him taking his wife and children for a Sunday evening’s music and sing-song – and beer”.⁷² Practices of informal childcare provision emerged as parents and

grandparents would take it in turn to “watch” the children of friends and families; in some clubs, in a specially allocated “children’s room”.⁷³ Oral testimony even suggests that the clubs provided a valuable social education for children, as they were able to learn about acceptable and unacceptable drinking behaviours in a controlled environment.⁷⁴ In Huddersfield, some members joined the club primarily to take advantage of the children’s activities on offer, and it was not uncommon to see “a small girl sitting by her father, who called in from his Sunday morning walk.”⁷⁵ As Jackson describes, club members were equally aware of two things: “...On the one hand the necessary privacies and extensions of a particularly masculine life that they required from their clubs, and on the other hand their obligations and indeed yearnings, towards the world of women and children, the world of ‘home’”.⁷⁶ The clubs are thus revealed to be liminal spaces, in which men could reconcile competing interests of family and homosociality. They facilitated workable resolutions for men, who could locate their domestic selves in communal environments in which they felt at ease.

The emergence of working men’s clubs as sites of family leisure coincided with structural changes in society, such as improved housing and increased time for leisure, which created more space for family activities among large numbers of working-class people. The idea of ‘companionate marriage’ pervaded expert discourse and policy, promoting equal partnership between man and wife and recasting the gendered division of household labour. Modern marriages were to be based on ideas of mutual respect and affection rather than husbandly authority.⁷⁷ Accordingly, evidence that men were spending more time in the home, and less out socializing with friends included a surge in masculinized home-based leisure activities, such as D.I.Y. and gardening, fathers taking on more childcare duties, and the sharp decline in the number of pubs.⁷⁸ However, examples of continuities of old divisions, confusion surrounding modern gender roles, the routine working of overtime and considerable variances across individual relationships, have all since complicated the assumption of a general shift towards greater male domesticity.⁷⁹ Working men’s clubs provide an alternative terrain upon which to view these dynamics. They represented a hybrid of private and public spheres, in which family leisure activities could be

experienced outside the home. Writing in 1948, sociologist Ferdynand Zweig observed that when a man's leisure pursuits separate him from his home, group life is strengthened at the expense of family life.⁸⁰ In the decades that followed, some working men's clubs served to integrate the two; homosocial groups and families were encouraged to co-exist in semi-domesticated spaces, albeit bound by rules and cultures which privileged men.

If experiences in the clubs during the 1950s reflected wider societal dynamics of gendered leisure, they also interacted with shifting ideas of class-consciousness. This remains a contested area within the historiography. The numerous social studies commissioned in the late 1940s and 1950s have provided a rich source base for discussions about how class was experienced, as urban populations were dispersed into suburban areas and new housing estates. Traditional classifications relating to types of labour were complicated by the growth in popularity of anthropological approaches, which turned to everyday life and subjective experience for evidence. In a political climate that was permeated by discussions about housing, social mobility and the newly established welfare state, the studies provided valuable empirical bases for policy making.⁸¹ The prevailing themes of rising affluence, decline of communal sociability and convergence of classed identities have since been problematized in the revisionist literature. Examples of continuities of poverty and poor housing, issues surrounding the presumption of social mobility and working-class privatism, and differences according to locality, work and individual family situation, have all contributed to paint a more nuanced picture.⁸² For Selina Todd, recalling E.P. Thompson, social change was something that continued to be experienced collectively, as class-consciousness, in the mid-twentieth century; she cautions that recent turns towards linguistic analyses or studies of selfhood should not obstruct our understanding of what remained keenly felt class identity.⁸³ However, Jon Lawrence suggests vernacular understandings of class were less easy to pin down: "Whereas professional definitions tended to be fixed in order to make the distinction between manual and non-manual employment, in everyday usage, class was a mutable concept – its boundaries were fuzzy, and

its purpose was more to make sense of inequalities in power relations than to assert powerful claims about self-identity.”⁸⁴

These discussions provide context to prominent debates within the CIU during the 1950s. At the 1955 AGM in Leicester, the National Executive proposed a motion to change the organisation’s name from ‘The Working Men’s Club Institute and Union’ to ‘The National Club Institute and Union’. As justification, they pointed out that in addition to the increased numbers of female members, the modern membership brought together men and women “engaged in administrative and clerical positions, such as the Civil Service and Local Government, as well as skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled persons engaged in industry and in manual labour.”⁸⁵ The concert hall and balcony, which was “packed to their fullest capacity with delegates standing like spectators at a football cup final, jammed together”, emphatically rejected the motion by a margin of 1,004 votes to four.⁸⁶ The formulation of the motion – to remove both “working” and “men” – makes it difficult to unravel the specific class and gender politics of the CIU members, but the turnout and size of majority shows how highly these words were valued.

The decision to retain ‘men’ was predictable; though the clubs were becoming more family-oriented, women members still remained a minority and had yet to infiltrate local or national governance. However, feelings towards the class-inflected term “working” bear closer scrutiny. The intentions of the National Executive accorded with a progressivist strand of leftist thinking, that sought to transcend class distinction and promote inclusivity.⁸⁷ They failed in this endeavour, though, because they misjudged the salience of “working” to the very factions of the electorate they were trying to appease. One delegate pointed out that “since the inception of the movement there had been Q.C.s, great Surgeons, Barristers, Magistrates, Clerks in Holy Order, Masters of Art, and last but not least M.P.s, who were all working men.”⁸⁸ *The Times*, a newspaper with a predominantly middle-class readership, was similarly outraged: “surely... a shout [will] go up from Harley Street to Mincing Lane which will be heard throughout the land. Are they not workers also? Real social progress would be

to keep the old title as an exact description of what has come to pass.”⁸⁹ It is also likely that understandings of the term “working men” varied according to region. For example, while in Featherstone, membership extended beyond workers to include colliery deputies, it was noted that elsewhere in Yorkshire separate ‘Officials clubs’ were the norm.⁹⁰ This belief was borne out in Huddersfield, where “[small businessmen have] got their own clubs and political clubs. It’s all working men here”.⁹¹ CIU. Such patterns may have grown organically and are not necessarily measures of either modernizing inclusivity or entrenched class division in particular localities. However, the scale of support for the retention of “working men” is a striking rejection of the removal of themes of labour and gender to the individual and collective identities of members. It also serves to highlight the close relation between club matters and prominent contemporary socio-political discourse.

Changing Communities, Cultural Continuities: Commercial Entertainment and Co-operative Ownership

Towards the end of the 1950s, the clubs became increasingly associated with mass entertainment, concerts and shows. Although sing-songs, variety acts and gambling had been longstanding features of club life, they had never before catered to such large audiences, and it was these post-war manifestations that completed the clubs’ passage from small, male-dominated spaces for drinking, games and conversation, to sophisticated leisure venues catering to hundreds of people at a time. Games of ‘housey-housey’ (bingo), which were aimed at women at least as much as men, combined with a plethora of variety acts, singers and comedians to deliver entertainment to a receptive public. Despite present day associations of post-war working men’s clubs with misogynist comedy and seedy striptease acts, the ‘club circuit’ provided significant artists, such as Tom Jones, Vera Lynn and others, with an a means of reaching live audiences in large numbers, as music halls and theatres declined in popularity.⁹² By 1958, of the eight working men’s clubs in the mining village of Stainforth, near Doncaster (population 6,000), the largest had concert facilities to seat an audience of eight hundred people.⁹³ Nor was it only clubs in established areas of heavy industry

that prospered; while existing clubs ploughed escalating bar-profits into lavish extensions, clubs servicing workers in the new industries were set up as bespoke entertainment venues from the outset.⁹⁴ The material and spatial transformations from the 1940s were considerable. Cloakrooms, sun-lounges and 'powder rooms' were among the new additions, alongside headline-grabbing expensive purchases such as organs, lighting rigs, and lavish new wallpaper and carpets.⁹⁵ Visitors would span generations too, with some clubs providing special "rock'n'roll dances" for children.⁹⁶

While clubs would adapt to these changes at different rates, the more successful were characterized by an acute business acumen on behalf their committee members. Pat Ayres has described the acquisitive formulations of masculine identity that branded teenage Liverpudlians, who spent their pocket money and wages on clothes, records and guitars in order to emulate their new popular music heroes; a comparison might be drawn with older working-class men, who were keen to explore a modern, materialistic exposition of manhood within the burgeoning entertainment economy.⁹⁷ In this sense, the resourcefulness of the clubmen of 1945, who had used remnants of war to build safe havens of homosocial camaraderie had been transposed into business-savvy entrepreneurship, as clubs competed for local market share. The *Manchester Guardian* described the "fiercely competitive struggle" between clubs over comfort.⁹⁸ This new marketization of the clubs ran contrary to the type of culture reported in Huddersfield, serving once again to reveal subtle cultural differences, even within regions. Jackson reported that club life tended to be based on "personality and precedent", where club officers "were not concerned with breaking new ground, but with preserving and with strengthening" and older members were influential in ensuring the survival of customs across generations.⁹⁹ Unsurprisingly, while Huddersfield clubs did have Concert Secretaries, their remit was not as expansive as those in South Yorkshire, "where a club has been known to fly a star over from America, or pay more than the London Palladium."¹⁰⁰

For those clubs that did embrace the new entertainment revolution, committees would deploy strategies to appease different strands of membership. The bar area might continue to host homosocial drinking, conversation and small-scale games such as cards and dominoes, while the concert halls would cater to women and families, for use only at weekends.¹⁰¹ The incongruences created by these new spaces were not lost on older regulars, who, in some clubs, were reported to be seen huddling in corners, gazing in bewilderment into the vast empty space of the concert-hall on non-concert nights. The *Daily Mirror's* 1958 "Cloth-Cap Night Spots" headline encapsulated the convergence of old and new.¹⁰² Continuities of community and collective endeavour were central to the clubs' success in this period. They retained a steady commitment to co-operative ownership, membership subscriptions remained affordable and club management continued to be the responsibility of elected committee members. In the same way that this had distinguished them as institutions of social and welfare provision, from pubs, works clubs and middle-class associations, these values now served to set them apart, as concert venues, from music halls and theatres. When member of husband-and-wife act Palma Joyce staged a 'fall' into the orchestra pit one night, the joke failed because a collier in the front row rushed to check if she was okay. She remembers: "It ruined the gag, of course... but it gives you some idea of what sort of audiences you get in the working-men's club. I believe it's all to do with this idea of 'our' club – I've never yet heard anybody say 'our' theatre."¹⁰³ The retention of a community spirit can be seen as an important source of comfort and familiarity to a generation coming to terms with a modernizing society, particularly those who had been displaced by changes to housing provision.¹⁰⁴ The clubs provided workable means to reconcile the affairs of past and present, in communities that accommodated the intergenerational transmission of cultural traditions alongside modernising leisure practices.

Conclusion

Working men's clubs in the generation following the Second World War defy easy categorization. They provided members with empowering structures and

collectivities, through which they could interact with local and national political communities, access education and welfare support, and shape their social lives. These axes of engagement afforded men agency as they shaped peacetime classed and gendered identities amid post-war trauma, pressures of domesticity, and changing work and leisure environments. Mass entertainment transformed the clubs, but also highlighted their resilience and flexibility in reconciling values of tradition, community and generational folklore, with the materialism and commerciality of the modern leisure economy. I have presented summaries of how these areas contributed to an overarching narrative of change and continuity over this period, but each would profit from further investigation. Peter Burke has suggested that culturally hybrid moments are best described in terms of “appropriation” and “accommodation”, because such words reflect the agency and creativity of the actors involved.¹⁰⁵ They might usefully be deployed to describe working-men’s club culture in the late 1940s and 1950s. The Durham miner’s dartboard illustrates the importance of material continuities in changing times, his “half a mile” walk to reach it indicative of modernising scale and space. Despite considerable modifications to his home and social life, he might have found a vital source of rootedness and belonging in his identity as a *clubman*.

WORDCOUNT: 8,686

NOTES

¹ *Manchester Guardian*, 24 June 1958, p. 5.

² Becky Conekin, Frank Mort and Chris Waters, 'Introduction' in Becky Conekin, Frank Mort and Chris Waters (eds) *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain: 1945-1964* (Rivers Oram, 1999), p. 3.

³ *Club Journal*, 1945-1960. Occasionally the *Club Journal* reported membership numbers. In January 1946 there were 1,500,000; in May 1948, 1,750,000; and in April 1951, 2,000,000. Subsequent figures for this period are not reported, how it seems likely that they continued to increase. The Club Members' Diary lists an increase in numbers of clubs from 3,299 in 1951 to 3,501 in 1960, and the sheer scale of the individual club's memberships in the late 1950s (see section below *Changing Communities, Cultural Continuities: Commercial Entertainment and Co-operative Ownership*) corroborates this pattern; *Club Members' Diary* (WMCIU, 2013)

⁴ *Club Journal*, June 2013; *Ruth Cherrington Interview*, 13th June, 2013.

⁵ *Club Journal*, 1945-1960. Lists of representatives to the Executive Committee reflect a national spread, including Scotland and Wales but excluding Northern Ireland.

⁶ Though there were doubtless similar non-affiliated clubs, institutions and societies, the sheer number of CIU registered clubs and members (see above) gives the source base considerable scale. Where relevant, detail is given on the important distinctions between the clubs and other prominent institutions of male leisure, notably 'works clubs' and pubs (see below).

⁷ Brian Jackson, *Working Class Community: Some General Notions Raised by a Series of Studies in Northern England* (Routledge, 1998).

⁸ Norman Dennis, Fernando Henriques and Clifford Slaughter, *Coal is our life* (Tavistock Publications, 1969). The study is of the pseudonymous 'Ashton', which was actually Featherstone, in West Yorkshire.

⁹ Ruth Cherrington, *Not Just Beer and Bingo! A Social History of Working Men's Clubs* (Authorhouse, 2012).

¹⁰ See, for example Alan Allport, *Demobbed: Coming Home after the Second World War* (Yale University Press, 2009); Joanna Bourke "'Going Home": The Personal Adjustment of British and American Servicemen after the War' in Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (eds) *Life After Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s* (Cambridge University Press, 2003); Pat Thane, in *ibid.* 'Family Life and "Normality" in Post-war British Culture'.

¹¹ John Tosh, 'Imperial Masculinity and the Flight from Domesticity in Britain, 1800-1914' in Timothy P. Foley (ed) *Gender and colonialism* (Galway University Press, 1995).

¹² Martin Francis, 'A Flight from Commitment? Domesticity, Adventure and the Masculine Imaginary in Britain after the Second World War' in *Gender & History*, 19 (2007).

¹³ See, for example, Stephen Brooke, 'Gender and Working Class Identity in Britain during the 1950s' in *Journal of Social History*, 34 (2001), p. 788; Marcus Collins, *Modern Love: An Intimate History of Men and Women in Twentieth-Century Britain* (London : Atlantic, 2003), p. 106; Ross Mckibbin, *Classes and Cultures: England, 1918-1951* (Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 176; Lynne Segal, *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (London : Virago, 1990), pp. 13-16.

¹⁴ Selina Todd, *The People : The Rise and Fall of the Working Class, 1910-2010* (2014b), p. 208.

¹⁵ Lucy Delap, 'Be Strong and Play the Man': Anglican Masculinities in the Twentieth Century' in Lucy Delap and Sue Morgan (eds) *Men, Masculinities and Religious Change in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 122.

¹⁶ Tosh, *Imperial Masculinity*, p. 184.

¹⁷ Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 144; Richard Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-class Life* (Penguin, 1957, 2009), p. 131.

¹⁸ *Club Journal*, February 1954, p. 1.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ For numerous examples, see Cherrington, *Beer and Bingo*.

²¹ Ibid., p. 33.

²² *Club Journal*, August, 1951, p. 3; Jackson, *Community*, p. 57.

²³ *Club Journal*, December 1951, p. 1.

²⁴ Ibid., November, 1945.

²⁵ Ibid. There were numerous stories and notifications of long service in most copies; Jackson, *Community*, p. 57; *Cherrington Interview*.

²⁶ On masonic culture and other middle-class associations, see Helen McCarthy, 'Service Clubs, Citizenship and Equality: Gender Relations and Middle-class Associations in Britain Between the Wars' in *Historical Research*, 81 (2008).

²⁷ Ibid., p. 549.

²⁸ Stephen Knight, *The Brotherhood: The Secret World of the Freemasons* (Grafton Books, 1985), p. 36; McCarthy, *Service Clubs*, p. 535. A rough calculation suggests that there were between 400,000 and 500,000 Freemasons in 1950. Rotary International was much smaller, with 20,000 members on the eve of the Second World War. There were two million working men's club members in 1951 (see above).

²⁹ Steven Crewe, 'What About the Workers? Works-based Sport and Recreation in England c.1918-c.1970' in *Sport in History*, 34 (2014).

³⁰ Brad Beaven, *Leisure, Citizenship and Working-class Men in Britain, 1850-1945* (Manchester University Press, 2005), pp. 5, 148.

³¹ Crewe, *What About the Workers?*, pp. 553-554.

³² Beaven, *Leisure, Citizenship and Working-Class Men*, p. 1.

³³ Crewe, *What About the Workers?*, p. 563.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 560-561.

³⁵ *Club Journal*, 1945-1960. Membership numbers in the Midlands areas, where car-manufacturing drew significant movements of population, were second only to the movement's coalmining heartland of north-east England during the years 1945-1960.

³⁶ Ibid., April 1959, p. 5.

³⁷ Figures are for 1939-1962, quoted in Dominic Sandbrook, *Never Had it so Good: A History of Britain from Suez to the Beatles* (Abacus, 2006), p. 130.

³⁸ *Club Journal*, February 1949, p. 1.

³⁹ Ibid., January 1960, p. 1.

⁴⁰ Jackson, *Community*, p. 50.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 47.

⁴² Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 144; Jackson, *Community*, p. 46.

⁴³ See for example Thane, *Family Life*, pp. 202-203.

⁴⁴ *Daily Mirror*, 17 May, 1955; Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 150.

⁴⁵ Jackson, *Community*, p. 44.

⁴⁶ Quoted in *Club Journal*, July 1953, pp. 1-2.

⁴⁷ For two interesting parallels, see Delap, 'Be Strong and Play the Man'; Amy Milne-Smith, 'A Flight to Domesticity? Making a Home in the Gentlemen's Clubs of London, 1880-1914' in *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006). Delap challenges the 'flight' narrative, describing the heterosocial experiences of men in the semi-public spheres of religious groups. Milne-Smith describes the intimacy, privacy and friendliness of the late Victorian gentlemen's club as providing a form of domesticity for members.

⁴⁸ *Club Journal*, January 1949, p. 2; Jackson, *Community*, pp. 42-44. In some instances trade union membership was a pre-requisite for holding a position on a club committee. Clubs would also typically employ local Co-ops for banking and catering requirements.

⁴⁹ Pat Ayres, 'Work, Culture and Gender: The Making of Masculinities in Post-War Liverpool' in *Labour History Review*, 69 (2004), p. 153.

⁵⁰ *Club Journal*, July 1953, pp. 1-2.

⁵¹ *Daily Mail*, 20 May 1953, p. 3; *Daily Mirror*, 20 May 1953, p. 8.

⁵² *Club Journal*, August 1953, p. 1.

⁵³ The Beveridge report of 1942 and its contribution to the Attlee government's welfare policies is well-documented. See, for example, David Kynaston, *Austerity Britain, 1945-1951* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010), pp. 21, 24-26, 40-41, 43, 148-149; Todd, *The People*, pp. 140, 142-145, 150.

⁵⁴ On alternative sources of welfare provision, see Pat Thane, 'The Ben Pimlott Memorial Lecture 2011: The 'Big Society' and the 'Big State': Creative Tension or Crowding Out?' in *Twentieth Century British History*, 23 (2012).

⁵⁵ *Club Journal*, February 1951, p. 2; February 1954, p. 1.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, September-November, 1949.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, May 1960, p. 3.

⁵⁸ On fundraising for pensioners, see, for example, Dennis, et al., *Coal*, pp. 148-149.

⁵⁹ *Club Journal*, July 1945 p. 5; April 1947, p. 3; August 1952, p. 10.

⁶⁰ For example Dennis, et al., *Coal*, pp. 144, 153. Dennis found little evidence in Featherstone, where the “purchase and sale of beer” was prioritised over “mental and moral improvement”.

⁶¹ On the 1944 Education Act, see, for example, Kynaston, *Austerity* p. 27; Todd, *The People*, p. 216.

⁶² Helen McCarthy, 'Parties, voluntary associations, and democratic politics in interwar Britain' in *The Historical Journal*, 50 (2007); McCarthy, *Service Clubs*.

⁶³ On informal practices of working-class voluntarism, see also Michael Peplar, *Family Matters: A History of Ideas About Family Since 1945* (Longman, 2002), p. 67.

⁶⁴ *Club Journal*, August, 1955, p. 1.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, February, 1950, p. 1.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, July 1959, p. 15. The true extent to which women visited pubs after the Second World War is unclear; see Claire Langhamer, 'A public house is for all lasses, men and women alike': Women, Leisure and Drink in Second World War England' in *Women's History Review*, 12 (2003), p. 436.

⁶⁷ *Club Journal*, October 1950, p. 3.

⁶⁸ *Cherrington Interview*; Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 142; McKibbin, *Classes*, pp. 184-185. For a broad critique of patriarchy in working men's clubs see Barbara Rogers, *Men Only: An Investigation into Men's Organisations* (Pandora, 1988), pp. 52-72.

⁶⁹ Jackson, *Community*, p. 62.

⁷⁰ Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 151.

⁷¹ *Cherrington Interview*

⁷² *Club Journal*, July 1953, pp. 1-2.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, December 1953, p. 2; Jackson, *Community*, p. 56.

⁷⁴ Cherrington, *Beer and Bingo*, p. 44.

⁷⁵ Jackson, *Community*, p. 45.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

⁷⁷ Marcus Collins, *Modern love* (Atlantic, 2001), p. 93.

⁷⁸ See, for example, Janet Finch and Penny Summerfield, 'Social Reconstruction and the Emergence of Companionate Marriage, 1945-59' in David Clark and Jacqueline Burgoyne (eds) *Marriage, Domestic Life and Social Change: Writings for Jacqueline Burgoyne 1944-88* (Routledge, 1991); Laura King, 'Now you see a great many men pushing their pram proudly': Family-orientated Masculinity Represented and Experienced in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain' in *Cultural and Social History*, 10 (2013); Claire Langhamer, 'The Meanings of Home in Postwar Britain' in *Journal of Contemporary History*, 40 (2005); Sandbrook, *Never Had it so Good*, p. 139.

⁷⁹ See, for example, Ayres, *Masculinities in Post-War Liverpool*; Brooke, *Gender and Working Class*; Collins, *Modern Love*, Chapter 4; Angela Davis, 'A Critical Perspective on British Social Surveys and Community Studies and their Accounts of Married Life, 1945-70' in *Cultural and Social History*, 6 (2009); Finch and Summerfield, *Companionate Marriage*; Langhamer, *Meanings of Home*.

⁸⁰ Ferdynand Zweig, *Labour, Life and Poverty* (V. Gollancz, 1948), p. 115.

⁸¹ For a critical summary of the various methodologies and outcomes see Jon Lawrence, 'Class, 'Affluence' and the Study of Everyday Life in Britain' in *Cultural and Social History*, 10 (2013).

⁸² See, for example, Brooke, *Gender and Working Class*; Davis, *Critical Perspective*; Finch and Summerfield, *Companionate Marriage*; Selina Todd, 'Affluence, Class and Crown Street: Reinvestigating the Post-War Working Class' in *Contemporary British History*, 22 (2008).

⁸³ Selina Todd, 'Class, Experience and Britain's Twentieth Century' in *Social History*, 39 (2014).

⁸⁴ Lawrence, *Class, 'Affluence' and the Study of Everyday Life*. Recent studies that also nuance understandings of class-consciousness in mid-twentieth century Britain include, Stefan Ramsden, 'Remaking Working-Class Community: Sociability, Belonging and 'Affluence' in a Small Town, 1930-1980' in *Contemporary British History*, 29 (2015); Jack Saunders, 'The Untraditional Worker: Class Re-Formation in Britain 1945-65' in *Twentieth Century British History*, (2014).

⁸⁵ *Club Journal*, August, 1955, p. 1.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, August, 1955.

⁸⁷ See Jon Lawrence 'Labour and the Politics of Class, 1900-1940' in David Feldman and Jon Lawrence (eds) *Structures and Transformations in Modern British History* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

⁸⁸ *Club Journal*, August, 1955, p. 1.

-
- ⁸⁹ *The Times*, 22 June 1955.
- ⁹⁰ Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 142.
- ⁹¹ Jackson, *Community*, p. 44.
- ⁹² Cherrington, *Beer and Bingo*, pp. 70, 78; Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 148.
- ⁹³ *Daily Mirror*, 18 October 1958.
- ⁹⁴ Cherrington, *Beer and Bingo*, pp. 67-82; Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 146; John Taylor, *From Self-help to Glamour: The Working Man's Club, 1860-1972* (History Workshop, 1972), p. 76.
- ⁹⁵ *Daily Mirror*, 18 October 1958, p. 13; *Manchester Guardian*, 24 June 1958, p. 5.
- ⁹⁶ *Club Journal*, April, 1960, p. 14. The Bletchley and Fenny Stratford W.M. Social Club, Bucks, were reported to hold these events to counter the draw of home based entertainment provided by radio and television.
- ⁹⁷ Ayres, *Masculinities in Post-War Liverpool*, pp. 159-160; Taylor, *Self-Help to Glamour*, pp. 72-75.
- ⁹⁸ *Manchester Guardian*, 27 July 1956, p. 5; See also Taylor, *Self-Help to Glamour*, p. 79.
- ⁹⁹ Jackson, *Community*, pp. 44, 56, 59.
- ¹⁰⁰ Jackson, pp. 52-53.
- ¹⁰¹ Dennis, et al., *Coal*, p. 142; Jackson, *Community*, p. 61.
- ¹⁰² *Daily Mirror*, 18 October 1958.
- ¹⁰³ Taylor, *Self-Help to Glamour*, p. 85.
- ¹⁰⁴ See Joanna Bourke, *Working Class Cultures in Britain, 1890-1960: Gender, Class and Ethnicity* (Routledge, 1994), p. 137; Todd, *Affluence*, p. 514; Hoggart, *Uses*; Chris Waters, 'Representations of Everyday Life: L. S. Lowry and the Landscape of Memory in Postwar Britain' in *Representations*, 65 (1999).
- ¹⁰⁵ Peter Burke, *Cultural Hybridity* (Polity, 2009), p. 55.