University of Southampton

Faculty of ARTS & HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

‘The Jew has been persecuted because he is a Jew’: The Discursive Construction, Disruption, and Reconstruction of ‘The Jew’ in Race Relations Legislation and Situation Comedy, 1965–1976

by

Christopher Stephen Byrne

ORCID ID 0000-0002-2480-3655

Thesis for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

January 2025

University of Southampton

Abstract

Faculty of Humanities

History

Doctor of Philosophy

‘The Jew has been persecuted because he is a Jew’: The Discursive Construction, Disruption, and Reconstruction of ‘The Jew’ in Race Relations Legislation and Situation Comedy, 1965–1976

Christopher Stephen Byrne

This thesis examines constructions of Jewish ‘difference’ in two sets of sources produced between 1965 and 1976 in the United Kingdom—parliamentary sources produced during the passage of the Race Relations Acts 1965, 1968, and 1976, and two situation comedies, *Till Death Us Do Part* (1965–1975), and *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width* (1967–1971). It will demonstrate that while the construction of Jews as an ‘Other’ is evident, though not consistent, in parliamentary sources, the representations of Jews in *Till Death Us Do Part* and *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width* point to a disruption of ideas of Jewish Otherness and of the structures of power and thought that underpin them; concurrently these sources also demonstrate a competing construction of Jewish Otherness that rests on ideas specifically rejected in the parliamentary sources. Utilising Foucauldian-, Hallsian-, Bhabhaian, and Bakhtinian-informed ideas and methodology, this thesis offers a reassessment of the ways in which the Race Relations Acts’ constructions of Jews operated, not as a form of protection, but of power. This thesis further posits that situation comedy functioned as third space site of discursive hybridism to this. Consequently, this thesis extends the origins of Martin Barker’s ‘new racism’ and Etienne Balibar’s ‘neo-racism’ further into the past than previously understood. By exploring the four ‘criteria’ by which difference was defined in these statutes—‘colour’, ‘race’, ‘nation’, and ‘ethnicity’—assessing the ways in which Jews were spoken about within each of these discourses in order to create the polyvalent discursive construct of ‘the Jew’, this thesis demonstrates: the artificiality of these four structuring concepts; a contemporary redrawing of the bounds of ‘Same’ and ‘Other’ to adapt the British State to changing social realities; and, through similar explorations in situation comedy, the emphasis on concretising the ‘Other’ as a consequence of this aforementioned domestic expedience in Parliament.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

To Gemma, and my Mum and Dad.
For you, always, this will stand.

And for Rufus
(1 August 2009–23 November 2024)
His Daddy's best boy.

'Our first walk. This is going to go by really fast isn't it?',
February 2019.
Reproduced by kind permission of Gemma Thornley.

And Molly
(17 March 2015–15 February 2025)
My soft-eared baby girl.

'The photo that started it all.'
May 2015.
Reproduced by kind permission of Ceri Byrne.

Research Thesis:
Declaration of Authorship

Print name:	CHRISTOPHER STEPHEN BYRNE

Title of thesis:	'THE JEW HAS BEEN PERSECUTED BECAUSE HE IS A JEW': THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION, DISRUPTION, AND RECONSTRUCTION OF 'THE JEW' IN RACE RELATIONS LEGISLATION AND SITUATION COMEDY, 1965–1976

I declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;

2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;

3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;

4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;

5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;

6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;

7. None of this work has been published before submission.

Signature:		Date:	14 January 2025

Acknowledgements

So few grains of happiness measured against all the dark, and still the scales balance.
The world asks of us only the strength we have and we give it.
Then it asks more and we give it.
— 'The Weighing', Jane Hirshfield

I always found the acknowledgments compelling when reading academic monographs, so these, dear reader, are mine. If you were to ask me honestly, I would tell you this thesis was the most difficult thing I have ever done, and it nearly broke me. But I did not walk alone. Though my name stands at its head, it would not exist without the encouragement and aid of wonderful people who have stood beside me throughout its development. It is testament to their efforts as much as to mine and these few small paragraphs stand now as what seem meagre, but deeply felt, thanks at the end of a long hard road.

First, I thank my supervisors, James Jordan and Eve Colpus. Eve, for highlighting the central issue of this thesis' approach, the balance of History and Cultural Studies and helping to keep me on the right side of that line. James, supported this project from its inception. His guidance, his indefatigable patience, and support in areas beyond it: teaching and outreach in particular, and for his overriding concern for the strain a research degree can impart upon its author were invaluable. I thank Tony Kushner and Charlotte Riley, (both University of Southampton), who assessed this thesis at upgrade and offered a fresh perspective and helped point the way to what it could become. Thanks are also due to Tony in his role as internal examiner, alongside Gavin Schaffer (University of Birmingham) as external examiner, of this thesis at *viva*, for their constructive and incisive criticism and their generosity is supporting and finessing what has always been, from its outset, a methodological challenge.

Thanks are due also to Michelle, my therapist, who greatly assisted me in overcoming significant personal difficulties over the latter portion of this project. Without her help, this project would not have reached its end and her work has inspired me to seek to help others as I look to a future beyond academia.

My parents gave so much to help me achieve this dream (and many others), always encouraging me to go wherever my mind led and fostering a thirst for knowledge and a willingness to try something new in its pursuit. I thank them with all my heart. Their support at every point and at my lowest ebb has been unending and indispensable and without it this thesis may well have remained just a single throwaway scrawl in an undergraduate notebook. Also, to Rufus 'Mr Wufus' the Westie† and Molly 'Moo', the Basset Hound† (my supervisors *emeriti*), for reminding me that work is only one part of a wide and beautiful world—it lives and breathes and it must be sought to be appreciated. We live *now*, not tomorrow, they put things in perspective for me offering wisdom that seems facile but speaks to a wisdom that dogs seem to truly grasp.

Finally, to Gemma, my *fiancée*, my heart, my centre, whom I met part way through this endeavour and who, from that moment, has been its, and my, most vocal and enthusiastic cheerleader. Her love and support have lit the way in the darkest of times. She is the most wonderful person I have ever met. Thank you for the warm words, the earnest talks, the hugs, the laughter, for being my home, for accepting me, thank you for never wavering, even when I did, thank you for believing in me, and for making me whole.

— C. S. B. (9 December 2024)

Introduction
Locating the 'Otherness' of Anglo-Jewry

This thesis maps the Jewish discursive third space in the United Kingdom across two 1965–1976 source bases—parliamentary debates from the passage of the Race Relations Acts (hereafter RRA[s] or RRB[s] pre-promulgation) 1965, 1968, and 1976, and two sitcoms, *Till Death Us Do Part* (1965–1975; hereafter *TDUDP*), and *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width* (1967–1971; hereafter *NMTQ*). Both sets of sources demonstrate aspects of hybridism in the positionality of Jews, they demonstrate respectively both the oppressive and resistive potential of that position. Consequently, it will demonstrate the value of examining these resources in concert, and show that, when understood as part of a cohesive discursive third space, sitcoms function as a key site of resistance.

'Jewishness'—the quality of being Jewish (purposefully broad)—was a protean term in this context. Frank Soskice, during the Second Reading of the RRB 1965, exemplifies this.[1] He first posits 'faith' as the root of Jewishness, followed by successive references to 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'nation'. More significant is the Government's intention that Jews '*should* be covered' by the Act (my emphasis). This indicates an assumption that Jews are a distinct racialised identity group; this rests on a discursive construction of Jews—'the Jew'—following scholars such as Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus who argue: 'the Jewish other is both at the heart of Western metropolitan culture and is also that which is excluded in order for ascendant racial and sexual identities to be formed and maintained'.[2] This thesis explores these questions in the aforementioned historical context. While not universal in Parliament, Soskice's surety that Jews *should* be included and his lack of argumentation are broadly representative of parliamentarians' pronouncements. Jewishness was not only constructed in Parliament at this time, nor can these other semiotic sites be characterised by this same mix of surety without argumentation.

---

1 'It is certainly the intention of the Government that people of the Jewish faith should be covered […] a person of Jewish faith, if not caught by the word "racial", would undoubtedly be caught by the word "ethnic", but if not caught by the word "ethnic" would certainly be caught by the word "national", he would certainly have an origin which many people would describe as an ethnic if not a racial one' (Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932–33).

2 See Bryan Cheyette & Laura Marcus, 'Introduction: Some Methodological Anxieties', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Bryan Cheyette & Laura Marcus (Stanford: Stanford U. P., 1998), 1–20 (p. 3).

This Introduction details the thesis' theoretical background, covering Foucauldian discourse, power-knowledge, Hallsian 'encoding'/'decoding' (and why this thesis largely keeps 'reception' at arm's length), and Bakhtinian ideas on popular culture—which, while important theoretically, do not determine this thesis' methodology. Instead, a postcolonial theoretical framework drives the analysis herein, with some Saidian elements but mainly Bhabhaian-derived. Following this is a brief history of 'difference' in twentieth century Britain, showing its developing discursive construction and that popular culture, specifically television, relates dynamically with State-derived discourses. It will then justify its inquiry, place this thesis in its historiographical context, and close by detailing its structure and methodology.

Michel Foucault's work on discourse, mostly in *L'archéologie du savoir* (1969), is fundamental. For Foucault discourse is 'a strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known'.[3] Foucault goes further, defining discourse as 'practice': 'not a consciousness that embodies its project in the external form of language [*langage*]; it is not a language [*longue*], plus a subject to speak it'.[4] Discourse is actively practised and exercised by those who use it. But, if discourse is unconscious, it is inflected by pre-existing power relations within its 'host' society. Thus, discourse is a knowledge-production process about a given set of epistemic 'objects', not a division of human knowledge; nor a set of statements and ideas, but an active *producer* of knowledge and therefore liable to politics. Consequently, here, 'race relations' is conceptualised not only as a policy area or discipline, but as a Foucauldian discourse in which knowledge and power are bound.

Foucault developed this concept as an active, non-neutral, phenomenon of human interaction, arguing that discourses are a means of establishing how the world is to be known.[5] Related, but not requiring a full delineation here is Foucault's understanding of

3 See the entry for 'Discourse' in Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths & Helen Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* (London/New York, Routledge, 2002), 70–73 (p. 70).

4 Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London/New York: Routledge, 2004 [1st French ed. *L'archéologie du savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969)]), 187.

5 Foucault did not delineate this concept in a single work, for a selection of texts that touch upon key aspects of this concept see Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Vintage Books, 2015 [1st ed. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980]). Important aspects of this argument can be found in his *History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley, 4 vols (New York: Pantheon, 1978–2021 [1st French ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1976–2018)]), esp. I, *An Introduction* (1978 [1st French ed. *La Volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976)]); *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Richard Howard (London/New York: Routledge, 2008 [1st French ed. *Folie et Déraison: Histoire*

power, summarisable as power not necessarily being a negative/restrictive force but positive/productive, nor rooted in the individual as a social unit but relational—rendering social networks critical to its operation and understanding. Foucault applied this to discourse historically, positing that in the transition to modernity there developed the 'Will to truth'—the desire to know what is true—consequently power and 'knowing' coalesce.[6] Foucault theorises a symbiotic relationship with the Nietzschean 'Will to power'.[7] Thus he argues that power and knowledge are fused: those with power can define truth and those who can define truth have power. Power produces knowledge—for Foucault, knowledge of sex/sexuality, criminality, or insanity, and, here, knowledge of 'difference'. Discourses are fundamental to power relations, power in modernity is not simply the power to compel action but the power to *know* and structure others' knowing: the Foucauldian *pouvoir-savoir* (power-knowledge). From this I reframe the RRAs as examples of power-knowledge producing the concept of the 'Other' and highlight 'the Jew' within this.

Hallsian understandings of television and discourse, particularly 'encoding' are also implicated here. Stuart Hall argues that texts (especially televisual) are encoded with variegated meanings by their producer(s), some more intentional than others. The act of reading decodes certain of these meanings.[8] This revised earlier theorisations of audience as a (passive) *tabula rasa* and informs John Corner's view of multiple possible readings, some more likely than others and more intentional than others.[9] In combination with Foucauldian discourse and power-knowledge, this thesis assesses television as a site in which power-knowledge of 'difference' may be produced or contested.

---

de la folie à l'âge classique (Paris: Gallimard, 1961)]); *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, trans. A. M. Sheridan (London/New York: Routledge, 2003 [1st French ed. *Naissance de la clinique: une archéologie du regard medical* (Paris: Gallimard, 1963)]); *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (London: Penguin, 2020 [1st French ed. *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975)]).

6 Michel Foucault, 'The Order of Discourse', in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. R. Young (London: Routledge 1981), 48–79. This topic is well summarised in Sara Mills, *Michel Foucault* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003), 73–76.

7 Michel Foucault, *Lectures on the Will to Know: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1970–1971 and Oedipal Knowledge*, ed. Daniel Defert, trans. Graham Burchell (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013 [1st French ed. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2011]), esp. ch. 2 '16 December 1970' (pp. 22–30).

8 Stuart Hall, 'Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse', Paper for the Council of Europe Colloquy on 'Training in the Critical Reading of Television Language' organized by the Council & The Centre for Mass Communication Research, University of Leicester, September 1975; available online at <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/1to8and11to24and38to48/SOP07.pdf> (accessed 21 March 2018).

9 John Corner, *Critical Ideas in Television Studies* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2007), 51.

'Encoding' necessarily implicates 'decoding' and reception of meaning, yet these are not broached here, requiring justification as many studies of television incorporate reception. Studies of, *per* Andrew Ross' phrase, 'television-as-it-is-used' highlight reception and might critique a study that instead discusses direct analysis of television texts.[10] Yet, reception is epistemically and methodologically limited. Ien Ang presents a compelling justification for studying 'from the box out'.[11] Ang argues that individuals comprising 'the audience' are variegated, heterogenous in background, perspective, desire, and motivation; there can be no single 'audience'. While social groupings may demonstrate some coherence, these are cross-cut by further differentiations that atomise viewers. Using 'audience' implies a mythical phenomenological coherence. 'Audience research' does not study the audience, but 'viewers', from which a fictive 'audience' is projected, limiting audience studies' academic credence.

Hall acknowledged the methodological inadequacies of the 'decoding moment'.[12] Corner further argues that television's domesticity, and genres emphasising 'pleasures of comedy' over 'pleasures of knowledge' promote passive, not active, viewing; audiences are not reliable in their 'readings', nor are they necessarily aware of them, restricting the utility of reception studies. Equally, this thesis seeks, not the social effects of television discourse, but their implication within a third space. Consequently, reception plays no methodological role here, only illustrative; so little 'audience' coherence renders reception largely meaningless. Encoded meanings however, are relatively coherent and examinable, especially with a consistent method.

The nature of comedy (generally and generically), which conditions this thesis' method and scope, requires discussion. Key here is comedy's ambiguity in relation to structures of power—disruptive or oppressive—through the rubrics of superiority/oppression, relief-release, and incongruity. Platonic and Hobbesian interpretations understand laughter as oppressive, a boundary-strengthening tool enforcing particular social behaviours/structures.[13] Others, including Sigmund Freud and Mikhail Bakhtin, have regarded comedy as a disruptive form of power resistance, formulating identity and social value; jokes relieve pressure and

---

10 Andrew Ross, 'All in the Family: On David Morley's *Family Television: Cultural Power and Domestic Leisure* (London: Comedia, 1986); and Philip Simpson's (editor) *Parents Talking Television* (London: Comedia, 1987)', *Camera Obscura*, 6:1 (1988), 169–77, quoted in David Morley, *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies* (London/New York: Routledge, 1992), 6.

11 Ien Ang, *Desperately Seeking the Audience* (London: Routledge, 1991), 126–28.

12 Stuart Hall, quoted in Corner, *Critical Ideas in Television Studies*, 84.

13 Plato, *Philebus*, trans. Jeffrey Rusten, in *Reader in Comedy: An Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, ed. Magda Romanska & Alan Ackerman (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2017), 33–35; and Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan; Or, The Matter, Forme, & Power of A Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civill*, ed., with an intro. by W. G. Pogson Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965 [1st ed. 1651), 45.

allow both for aggression and its disavowal.[14] Synthesising these, Henri Bergson identified the essential ambiguity of the comic through his theories of incongruity.[15] Humour/comedy studies must take no approach in isolation but highlight humour's (and its objects') precarity, as a double-edged sword, able to cut both ways. The nature of comedy arises not from any essence but from its specific historical context of production. Two further thinkers informing this thesis' approach to comedy as culture and its mediating function are Edward Said and Homi Bhabha. Said's idea of 'contrapuntal reading' emphasises, as in studies of music and the concept of 'counterpoint', layers—even networks—of meaning within texts.[16] This coincides with Hall and Corner to allow for both dominant and disruptive ideas that 'intertwine and overlap' to exist within the same text, unpicked by different audiences.

Discussions of comedy and power (and the *status quo*) are salient in discussions of the specific genre examined here—the sitcom. Michael Billig argues that comedy reinforces pre-existing social modes.[17] Many sitcoms are based on ideas of the family or the hierarchical workplace, bastions of conservative social value, and change to these structures becomes socially harmful, their resolution back into familial or workplace harmony becomes a form of catharsis. With each episode seemingly 'out of time', sitcoms stand to reinforce the idea of the family or hierarchy as a timeless social good.[18] However, Bakhtin's disruptive ideas of the

---

14 Sigmund Freud, *Penguin Freud Library*, trans. James Strachey, rev. Angela Richards, 15 vols (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972–1991), VI (1976 [1st German ed., *Die Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten* (F. Deuticke, 1905); 1st English ed. *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious*, trans., with an intro. by A. A. Brill (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916)]), *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*, esp. chs 3 (pp. 132–62) & 5 (pp. 191–211); and Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana U. P., 1984). (F. Deuticke, 1905)] [1st English ed. *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious* trans., with an intro. by A. A. Brill (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916)

15 Highlighting the ambiguous role of wordplay, Bergson argued that the comic lies in something belonging 'simultaneously to two altogether independent series of events and is capable of being interpreted in two entirely different meanings at the same time' (Henri Bergson, *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*, trans. Cloudesley Brereton & Fred Rothwell ([London: Wildside Press, 2008 (1st French ed. *Le Rire. Essai sur la signification du comique* [Paris: Éditions Alcan, 1900])]), 48.

16 Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Random House, 1994), *passim*, but see p. 66 for its clearest enunciation.

17 'The prospect of ridicule […] protects [the] codes of daily behaviour [and] conformity with social order' (Michael Billig, *Laughter and Ridicule: Towards a Social Critique of Laughter* [London: Sage, 2005], 199).

18 This is demonstrated in a well-known anecdote of Warren Mitchell's wherein he was often confronted on the street by fans who addressed him as 'Alf' and congratulated him for having the *chutzpah* to 'stand up and have a go at the immigrants', to which Mitchell always felt compelled to reply that it was not the immigrants Alf was having a go at, but the racism of the general public (Geoffrey Buchler, 'Warren Mitchell', *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 December 2015), n.p..

carnivalesque allow for a reappraisal of sitcom.[19] Adopting Bakhtin's ideas of the carnival as formalised socio-political inversion, sitcom becomes a conservative cultural form within which social roles, relationships, and attitudes can be disrupted while maintaining a critical distance allowing for decommitment. The comedy can create subject positions that allow performers and audiences to decommit from, and engage with, the discourses they present, they are a democratic and at times anarchic site of representation/negotiation.[20] They allow, as Gavin Schaffer remarks, a 'working through' of social issues precisely because they are able to express the inexpressible.[21] Sitcom can be oppressive or resistive, reinforcing or disrupting power structures. How then to tie these to more traditional historical sources in a coherent method?

Foundational here is the postcolonial framework of Homi Bhabha, who revises Saidian binarism to develop new ideas of the third space, hybridity, mimicry, and important work on the idea of the stereotype.[22] Third space, where contact between oppressor and oppressed is made possible in the absence of oppression, may be applied to comedy by regarding comedy as this site of contact, or, 'a space of enunciation' where cultural statements are inherently ambivalent but operate within a power structure as a site of meaning making and meaning negotiation.[23] In this contact, comedy can support either, both, or neither, oppressor or oppressed. This thesis demonstrates the significant interplay of history and politics within two comedies and with the comedic; this hybridisation is multi-levelled, jokes are often predicated on dual meanings and the over-layering of meaning within them, comedy in more general terms is predicated on the existence and transgression of boundaries.

---

19 See Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Iswolsky, *passim*.

20 The concept of decommitment can be pithily summed up in the phrase 'it was only a joke' or 'I was only joking'. Thomas R. Kane, Jerry Suls and James T. Tedeschi have shown that decommitment processes are utilised in order to avert 'social disaster' ('Humour as a Tool of Social Interaction', in *It's a Funny Thing Humour. Proceedings of the International Conference on Humour and Laughter, Cardiff, Wales, 1976*, ed. Anthony J. Chapman & Hugh C. Foot [Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1977], 13–17 [pp. 14–15]). Joan P. Emerson (in her 'Negotiating the serious import of humor', *Sociometry*, 32:2 [1969], 169–81) argued that humour is a necessary mechanism by which 'risky' or taboo subjects may be addressed with minimal social risk. While Emerson applies this model to interpersonal joking, its arguments may be usefully applied to the relationship between television writers/actors and television viewers which, in effect allows all parties to engage in decommitment when faced with humour around taboo topics.

21 Gavin Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation: Making Multiculturalism on British Television, 1960–80* (Houndmills/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 181.

22 Sumit Chakrabarti, 'Moving beyond Edward Said: Homi Bhabha and the problem of postcolonial representation', *International Studies: Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal*, 14:1 (2012), 5–21 (p. 15).

23 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London/New York: Routledge, 1994), 36–39 (p. 37).

Also key is 'hybridity', a goal of, and a challenge to, colonial power structures; a process that demonstrates the simultaneous desire of oppressors for the oppressed to adopt their culture and the fear of disrupting the process of oppression if successful. Hybridity and the essential ambiguity of slippage between discourses can be applied to the positionality of Jews within discussions of difference both in Parliament and comedy: it allows for both the adoption and disruption of particular discourses about difference by and about Jews.

Hybridity's outcome is mimicry, wherein the colonised adopts the culture of the colonisers, habits, patterns of living, even institutional structures.[24] This idea of mimicry is exemplified extensively throughout this thesis and related to theories of humour, as Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin argue, 'mimicry is never far from mockery'.[25] Bhabha indicates this ambivalence, arguing that it is 'almost the same but not quite'.[26] He argues that the 'slippage or excess', which occurs procedurally, lead to mimicry becoming both 'resemblance and menace'.[27] What Bhabha refers to as a 'metonymy of presence', forms part of this mimicry wherein the colonised are able to subvert their location 'from one of disadvantage to one of advantage' and thereby 'revalue', as Sumit Chakrabarti suggests, 'the normative principles of race'.[28] This sense of disjuncture, of almost but not quite, and of mockery, must bring to mind the structures and ambivalence of comedy (above).

Finally, Bhabha's work on stereotype, predominantly through his essay 'The Other Question', theorises an understanding of stereotype as, not a function of colonial power but of colonial anxiety.[29] Stereotypes are conceptualised via Foucauldian knowledge production, they must maintain an openness in order to maintain their authority (to paraphrase David Huddart).[30] Yet, Bhabha then argues that stereotype is a product of (Freudian) phantasy in that it relies upon the unreal as we desire it and that colonial discourse utilises stereotype as a process, co-opting hybridity and concretising 'positionalities and oppositionality of racist discourse', utilised to justify the oppressive colonial power by producing the colonised as 'a social reality that is at once an "other" and yet entirely knowable and visible'.[31] One must return however to Bhabha's understanding of stereotype as open, i.e. accessible (particularly when one takes into account processes of hybridity and mimicry) to those whose

---

24 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85–92.

25 See 'Mimicry', in Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies*, 139–42 (p. 139).

26 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

27 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

28 Chakrabarti, 'Moving beyond Edward Said', 15.

29 Homi Bhabha, 'The Other Question', in *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Mongia, 37–54.

30 David Huddart, *Homi K. Bhabha*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2006), 54.

31 Bhabha, 'The Other Question', ed. Mongia, 51 & 41.

positionalities it is designed to produce. This leads to a correlation of the Bakhtinian *carnivalesque* with Bhabha's work in which power structures can be inverted and disrupted within the third space.

How then to apply this framework to both parliamentary records and sitcoms? Parliamentary records are easily assimilated as productions of a colonial state, but sitcom is the rub. However, adopting a Hallsian understanding of television-as-text clarifies the way forward. Sitcoms are elaborate, ambiguity-suffused, texts, thus the core of this thesis' analysis is textual. Problematically, the context of this thesis is not colonial, it takes place within the geographical and discursive bounds of Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, not in colonised territories, nor does it deal, for the most part, with colonised people. I would argue that the commonality exists in positionality. British Jews at this time occupied a liminal position in relation to power structures (more ambivalent than that of a colonised people) presenting an apt area of analysis for Bhabha's ideas. Additionally, Huddart's analysis of Bhabha discusses the 'reified forms of realism and stereotype', from this Huddart argues that, because Bhabha understands colonial discourse as essentially a form of narrative, his ideas have a complex relationship with the idea of realism, specifically in Bhabha's own work, the nineteenth-century realist novel.[32] Even if all realist narratives do not connect to colonialist discourse, colonialist discourse always purports to represent a reality. Bhabha argues that colonialist discourse employs a 'regime of truth that is structurally similar to realism'.[33] What this implies is both obstacle and opportunity. As the sitcom is predicated upon a 'situation' in which comedy is enacted there must be a recognisable realism to it, to facilitate operations of comedy. *TDUDP* has been described as a social realist sitcom, and *NMTQ* also adopts a reality-based situation as its context but they both rely upon the ambivalence and ambiguity of comedy to fill these worlds.[34] This intersection is key for why these sitcoms are such ripe ground for Bhabhaian-derived analysis, they embody this ambiguous connection to reality, and to colonialist discourses. Having demonstrated this framework as a consistent method I shall discuss the politico-historical context of this thesis, the history of difference in Britain and latterly, on television.

* * * * *

32 Huddart, *Homi K. Bhabha*, 39.

33 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 71.

34 Brett Bebber, '*Till Death Us Do Part*: political satire and social realism in the 1960s and 1970s', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 34:2 (2014), 253–74.

Linda Colley has argued, following Jacques Lacan, that in Britain, national identity has been developed not only against the 'Other' but in terms of the 'Other'.[35] From the 1880s on, political efforts were made to reify British identity, consequently, the political sphere became a key site for discussions of difference and the 'Other'. The Aliens Act 1905, emerging from ideas of 'alienism', exemplifies these discussions about the positionality of Jews.[36] David Glover has attributed it to anti-Jewish political and social agitation by radical-right 'counterpublics' across class boundaries that discursively synthesised 'the Jew' with 'the alien'.[37] Officially, 'alien' was a national (in a political sense) and socio-economic (not racial) category but Glover has shown the synthesis of 'the Jew' and 'the alien' being culturally constructed in racial/antisemitic terms showing a disconnection between culture and politics.[38]

Television was only theorised in 1905, yet thirty-one years later, the first night's programming (2 November 1936) in the UK demonstrates that the representation of 'difference', even the 'alien', was a possibility and advantage for it. Television is a key site of twentieth-century discourse/knowledge production and numerous studies have been produced demonstrating its productive/reflective processes around discourse, of difference (generally and in specific forms), as well as the histories of group representations in the industry.[39] Most

---

35 Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation* (London: Yale U. P., 1992), 5. For Lacan's ideas of 'the Other', specifically the *grande-autre* as applied to historical processes, see 'Other/other', in Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies*, 169–71.

36 Distinct from the psychiatric term 'alienism', the use of this term is intended to denote a particular set of ideas about difference: as primarily determined by the discursive and legal concept of 'the alien', meaning 'foreign' or 'out of place' rather than by ideas of 'colour', 'race', 'nation', or 'ethnicity', that structured such legislation as *The Aliens Act 1905* and came to prominence at the *fin de siècle*.

37 David Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-Siècle England: A Cultural History of the 1905 Aliens Act* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 2012), 12. The Conservative candidate for Whitechapel in 1906, David Hope Kyd, argued that 'this was not a movement against Jews, but a movement in defence of Englishmen' tacitly suggesting that to be a Jew and to be an Englishman were mutually exclusive (Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-Siècle England*, 118–21 [p. 118]). Glover also details the role of popular culture in spreading these ideas.

38 Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-Siècle England*, 87–101.

39 For historical accounts of the role of specific racialised identity groups in twentieth-century television see *Black and White in Colour: Black People in British Television Since 1936*, ed. with an intro. by Jim Pines (London: BFI, 1992); Stephen Bourne, *Black in the British Frame: Black People in British Film and Television 1896–1996* (London: Cassell, 1998); Darrel M. Newton, *Paving the Empire Road: BBC Television and Black Britons* (Manchester: Manchester U. P., 2011); Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation*; and James Jordan, 'Assimilated, Integrated, Other: An Introduction to Jews and British Television, 1946–55', in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts. Section II: Culture: Self-Representations*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 251–66. For studies of discourses of difference on television

of these have taken BAME representation as their focus however James Jordan, Gavin Schaffer, Ruth Gilbert and others have explored the Jewish experience. The 2 November broadcast saw performances from Ford Lee 'Buck' Washington and John 'Bubbles' Sublett, a popular African-American duo; the Lai Founs, a Chinese plate-spinning act; and an orchestral performance conducted by Hyam Greenbaum and led by Boris Pecker.[40] The *Radio Times* descriptions of these figures emphasised their being 'coloured' in the case of Buck and Bubbles, and 'oriental' in the Lai Founs' case. Such language indicates a Saidian 'orientalist' discourse more akin to 'alienism' than to 'race relations'.[41]

Post-1945, two events demonstrate a changing formulation of difference in Britain. The Polish Resettlement Act 1947 granted British citizenship in recognition of their war service to two hundred thousand Polish citizens. This demonstrates the arbitrariness of national identity in the face of the law post-1945: 'alien' identity was no longer immutable as in 1905, by State *fiat*, alienness was overwritten, hybridised. Consequently, this lays the foundation for acknowledging the subjectivity of difference, i.e. the role of one's subject position in its determination. Members of Parliament encouraged this hybridisation, leaflets entitled *What the Poles Have Done For You* appeared, inconceivable in earlier decades when such individuals were the objects of the counter-publics' vitriol.[42] Second, *Empire Windrush* docked at Tilbury in 1948, bringing Caribbean migrants—British citizens permitted entry under the Aliens Act—home to Britain. This led to the 'colonialisation' of ideas of 'difference' in Britain: 'race' joining 'nation' as a legal basis for social exclusion.[43]

---

see Sarita Malik, *Representing Black Britain: Black and Asian Images on Television* (London: Sage, 2002); *The Colour Black: Black Images in British Television* ed. Therese Daniels & Jane Gerson, with an intro. by Kobena Mercer (London: BFI, 1989); *The Black and White Media Book*, ed. with an intro. by John Twitchin (London: Trentham Books, 1992); Vincent Brook, *Something Ain't Kosher Here: The Rise of the 'Jewish Sitcom'* (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. P., 2003); Gavin Schaffer, ' "You Don't Cure a Problem by Sweeping It under the Carpet": Jews, Sitcoms and Race Relations in 1960s Britain', in *Hidden in Plain Sight: Jews and Jewishness in British Film, Television and Popular Culture*, ed. Nathan Abrams (Evanston: Northwestern U. P., 2016), 115–36; and Ruth Gilbert, 'My big fat Jewish TV dinner: reflections on British Jewishness in *Friday Night Dinner* and *Grandma's House*', *Jewish Film and New Media: An International Journal*, 2:2 (2014), 181–200.

40 'Television Programmes', *The Radio Times: The Journal of the British Broadcasting Corporation 1 November 1936–7 November 1936*, 30 October 1936, 53:683, p. 88; available online at <https://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk/page/68aba19c259d4c37ae285afae2798390> (accessed 2 March 2018).

41 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004 [1st ed. Pantheon, 1978]), 3–4.

42 Richard Weight, *Patriots: National Identity in Britain, 1940–2000* (London: Pan Macmillan, 2002), 138.

43 While the *Empire Windrush* has undergone some historical reassessment regarding its significance as an event (see Peter Fryer, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* [London: Pluto, 1984], 372) and Matthew Mead has argued that it was not the starting point it might have been later thought to be ('Empire Windrush: the cultural memory of an imaginary arrival', *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 45:2 [2009], 147); John Solomos has shown the shift in public and governmental opinion with regard to non-'White' migration following

These individuals embodied colonial forms of difference with long histories of negative representations in British culture. Discourses, including 'race' or even 'racialism' had emerged in preceding centuries that identified and 'explained' these forms of difference, excluded those who were identified as possessing them and justified their colonial oppression. Now the objects of these discourses were not a distant colonised Other, but neighbours and colleagues. This context and its implications interacted with a British State that, largely, framed difference through the lens of 'alienism' developed to address forms of difference that were less than 'skin deep', emphasising the universality of assimilation. While, as the rhetoric of Enoch Powell, Cyril Osborne and Norman Pannell attests, this was not hegemonic; it took the Nottingham and Notting Hill riots in 1958 to cause a widespread recognition of the historical specificity of the moment. Consequently, from the late 1950s domestic legislation began to incorporate ideas of 'race' to limit migration and structure social relations.

On television, 'race' was regularly screened; Darrel Newton, has shown the changing patterns of 'Black' representation on British television.[44] He demonstrates the orientalist discursive foundation of how 'Black' performers were described internally with such words as 'loud', 'savage', 'excitement', and 'virility' applied to them. This reinscribes discourses of 'Black' Africans and West Indians as unreserved, uncivilised, and sexually aggressive or promiscuous. It is unsurprising that, in the context of the transition from empire to post-empire, such a colonialist discourse of 'Black' difference maintained its knowledge-producing power at the time. Also indicative of this colonialist 'hangover' was *Race and Colour* (10 November 1952). Newton demonstrates the conflict between its stated goal, offering 'the man in the street' an objective assessment of 'race' as a scientific concept and a social issue and archival evidence showing a reinforcement of racial discourse rather than

---

this event, non-'White' migration in the 1950s received a good deal of attention from the British Government unlike in the late nineteenth century in response to Jewish migration, see his *Race and Racism in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 52. What can be argued is that non-'White' migration, including the passengers of *Windrush*, led to a series of laws that increasingly curtailed that right of entry.

44 Newton, *Paving the Empire Road*, 4. In his analysis of the Trinidadian performer Boscoe Holder's 1951 appearance on *Caribbean Cabaret*, Newton details a memo from then Controller of Television Cecil McGivern, to producer Bill Ward requesting that the performance of Holder's group, the West African Rhythm Brothers, be 'as loud and savage' as possible for the audience. A further note from McGivern, to the Head of Television, noted the group's 'excitement and virility' (54).

disruption.[45] Following disappointing feedback, BBC programmes transitioned to assessments of the social impact of 'race' in Britain, not 'race' as an idea.[46]

This focus on 'race' as issue rather than concept was redoubled following the 1958 riots. A *Special Enquiry* episode (14 November 1958), 'A Question of Colour', was based on an investigation in Birmingham of a large 'coloured' population and the effects of migration on the resident population, highlighting the importance of racial difference in everyday life.[47] The assumption that migration into an area requires investigation into its effects implies that immigration (especially non-'White') brings problems. The episode ends ostensibly hopeful: the area was relatively peaceful; but it explained this quiescence via the willingness of non-'White' migrants to adapt to (hybridise) British culture, not 'White' Britons allowing non-'Whites' to develop, enjoy, and share their cultures.

Schaffer has shown a focus on assimilation in television, through the work of the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council.[48] The CIAC developed educational programming designed to aid migrant assimilation. Notably, they emphasised making migrants 'the same' as 'White' Britons: showing acceptance that hybridity, mimicry or full assimilation is possible/desirable. This thesis will show a conflict between a continued emphasis on hybridity in television and a legislative reification of racial difference in Parliament. The RRAs, while offering protection from prejudice, legalised racial 'difference'. Television was different, offering complex and reflexive assessments of racial difference as an idea not simply as an issue.

Historiography of the post-war period was first characterised by 'declinism'.[49] Following Arthur Marwick, scholars recognised the UK's cultural richness within a declining geo-

45 Newton, *Paving the Empire Road*, 59–61. Guests on the programme aired ideas of 'Black' individuals having lower intelligence levels than 'White' people, without anyone offering evidence demonstrating the falsity of such claims. A production memo detailing the topics the programme should cover included a discussion of whether 'negroes [are] black because they are so near the sun' (59).

46 Newton, *Paving the Empire Road*, 61.

47 Newton, *Paving the Empire Road*, 61–5.

48 Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation*, 18.

49 See, for instance, Corelli Barnett *et al.*, 'Britain's postwar industrial decline', *Contemporary Record*, 1:2 (1987), 11−18; Corelli Barnett, *The Audit of War: The Illusion and Reality of Britain as a Great Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1986); Paul Barker & John Hanvey, 'Facing two ways: between the 60s and the 70s', *New Society* (27 November 1969), 847–50; Victor George & Irving Howards, *Poverty Amidst Affluence: Britain and the United States* (London: Edward Elgar Press, 1991); and Ken Coates & Richard Silburn, *Poverty: The Forgotten Englishman*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970).

political and macroeconomic context.[50] Key to this thesis is the concept of 'the Sixties' or, in some works 'the Long Sixties' as a period of cultural abundance and social progress including, for some, the RRAs.[51] This thesis counters this view of the RRAs, following Robert Miles, Annie Phizacklea, Errol Lawrence, and Paul Gilroy, who see the RRAs as regressive.[52] This thesis draws these conclusions through exploring the question of 'the Jew' in the RRAs, arguing that the RRAs were founded on tenuous, artificial, colonialist concepts and that the RRAs role as operations of power-knowledge is brought into stark relief when assessed via the lens of 'the Jew'. This is part of a recent theme, the study of race relations has increasingly highlighted non-West Indian or South Asian identities.[53] This thesis follows Kathleen Paul (who disregards the RRAs) arguing that the legislation of 'race' in this period exemplifies elite-led racism.[54] This thesis goes further however, utilising Bhabha, and argues that the RRAs legalised colonialist forms of difference and demonstrate elite-led 'Otherising'

---

50 Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c.1958–c.1974* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1998); Jonathan Green, *All Dressed Up: The Sixties and the Counterculture* (London: Pimlico, 1999); and *Windows on the Sixties: Exploring Key Texts of Media and Culture*, ed. Anthony Aldgate, James Chapman & Arthur Marwick (London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2000) among others.

51 See for 'progressive' characterisations of the RRAs: Fryer, *Staying Power*, 383; Kathleen Paul, *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Censorship in the Postwar Era* (Ithaca/London: Cornell U. P., 1997); the essays in *From Legislation to Integration? Race Relations in Britain*, ed. Muhammad Anwar, Patrick Roach & Ranjit Sondhi (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 3; and Dilip Hiro, *Black British, White British: A History of Race Relations in Britain* (London: Paladin, 1992). These works tend to characterise Race Relations legislation as generally a good idea to counter popular racism that was ineffectually put together for this purpose.

52 See Robert Miles, *Racism After 'Race Relations'* (London/New York: Routledge, 1993); Robert Miles & Annie Phizacklea, *White Man's Country: Racism in British Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 1984); Erroll Lawrence, 'In the Abundance of Water the Fool is Thirsty: Sociology and Black "pathology" ', and Paul Gilroy, 'Steppin' out of Babylon—Race, Class and Autonomy', both in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain* (London/New York: Routledge [assoc. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies], 1994 [1st ed. 1982]), 95–143 & 276–314 respectively.

53 See for instance Dominic Sandbrook, *White Heat: A History of Britain in the Swinging Sixties* (London: Abacus, 2008), 676–8; Alwyn W. Turner, *Crisis? What Crisis? Britain in the 1970s* (London: Aurum, 2008), 205–225; Andy Beckett, *When the Lights Go Out: What Really Happened to Britain in the Seventies* (London: Faber & Faber, 2009), 442–53; Marwick, *British Society Since 1945*, 132–34, 189–90 & 389–90; Hiro, *Black British White British*; David Mason, *Race & Ethnicity in Modern Britain* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1995); and Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back*. The emphasis on West Indian and South Asian groupings is being redressed in works such as Tony Kushner, *Anglo-Jewry Since 1066* (Manchester: Manchester U. P., 2009), 238–57; Geoffrey Alderman, *Modern British Jewry* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1998); Todd M. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000* (London: Univ. of California Press, 2002); and Didi Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence: Jews, Jewishness and English Law* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2011).

54 Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*, 175–76.

which affected contemporary Jews because of their liminality within these colonialist discourses.

Historiography has tended to investigate sitcom and parliamentary sources in isolation. This applies a deeper level of analysis to sitcoms than in previous historical work and using Bhabha, opens up a dialogue between the sources to explicate holistically their discourse handling. This contributes to understandings of historical representations of Jews but also shows the utility of sitcom as a third space. Why then take these sources in concert and not isolation; it allows the demonstration of the variegation and nuance of the debate and demonstrates the significance of power-knowledge in the production of parliamentary sources. It also allows for colonialist discourses like 'colour', 'race', 'nationality'/'national origin', and 'ethnicity'/'ethnic origin' to be revealed as Freudian phantasy and not universally held. Given the taboo nature of certain discourses ('colour', 'race' *etc*.) in this period, there is value in utilising a resource that did not eschew such topics.[55] A further justification is their interaction. The two comedies explicitly interrogate contemporary politics and politicians make reference to them, particularly to *TDUDP*'s Alf Garnett's racism and demonstrating that parliamentarians read Garnett as an uncritical glorification of racism.[56]

This thesis combines these sources in a novel way, to investigate the representation of Jews within this theoretical framework, method, and aims. Research on the RRAs has overwhelmingly focused on West Indian and South Asian migrants and their descendants, Sarita Malik's work *Representing Black Britain* being a key example wherein she engages with discourses of 'blackness' and 'Black' identity in sitcoms, extracting these discourses through language use in a method informed by Hallsian encoding, but she does so in isolation, with limited recognition of the cultural and political *milieux*. This thesis reassesses the RRAs as regressive operations of power-knowledge that reinforce and legalise colonial forms of

55 As Alenka Zupančič argues: '[…] things that really concern us, things that concern the very kernel of our being can be watched and performed only as comedy' (Alenka Zupančič, *The Odd One In: On Comedy* [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008], 182). As unhelpful as the absolutism of this particular statement may be, it is a foundational plank of this thesis' theoretical outlook that comedy offers an invaluable resource to address the taboo, especially in concert with traditional sources.

56 See Hansard, HC, 27 February 1967, vol. 742, c. 106; 27 February 1968, vol. 759, c. 1342; 28 February 1968, vol. 759, c. 1558; 7 March 1968, vol. 760, c. 649; 1 April 1968, vol. 762, c. 61; 23 April 1968, vol. 763, c. 108; 5 July 1968, vol. 767, c. 1947; 19 November 1968, vol. 773, c. 1206; 6 May 1969, vol. 783, c. 365; 30 October 1969, vol. 790, c. 394; 19 October 1972, vol. 843, c. 554; 20 October 1972, vol. 843, c. 677; 3 July 1973, vol. 859, c. 304; 10 May 1974, vol. 873, c. 764; 10 July 1974, vol. 876, c. 1480; and HL, 28 January 1976, vol. 367, c. 1034. See also the report from the Committee chaired by Lord Annan, *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting*, Cmnd. 6753 (March 1977), 261.

othering. Utilising and applying the concepts of power-knowledge and 'new racism' within a Bhabhaian framework enables a reassessment of the idea that there is a progressive way to legislate 'race', when 'race' itself is phantasy, an historically-contingent and politically-suffused concept developed to justify oppression.[57] Using sitcom and State sources in tandem demonstrates this.

Historiographically, this thesis is closest to Schaffer's ' "You Don't Solve a Problem by Sweeping it Under the Carpet": Jews, Sitcoms, and Race Relations in 1960s Britain'.[58] Schaffer's chapter examines how the representation of Jewish/non-Jewish relations opened up wider questions of race relations onscreen, influencing Johnny Speight, Vince Powell and Harry Driver in representing 'White'/non-'White' relations. Schaffer argues that changing migration patterns and the increasing visibility of non-'White' people in Britain led to concern around the language of race relations in political circles while sitcom had no reason for such caution. He argues that the representation of Jews was utilised as a means of 'working through' the implications of race relations; a gateway to wider questions that were more fully handled later. The differences between Schaffer's chapter and this thesis are broadly those of method and aim.

This thesis places Bhabhaian theory, language use and the analysis of discourse more centrally in its method than Schaffer, whose chapter analyses the subject matter of jokes and explores the process of joking around Jewish/non-Jewish relations to demonstrate that *TDUDP*'s and *NMTQ* 'did openly [what] politics did quietly'.[59] This thesis takes more of a

---

57 As Robert Miles argues (in paraphrase): 'race relations is not the problem, the idea of race is' (Miles, *Racism After 'Race Relations*', 2–9 & 27–35 *passim*).

58 Schaffer, ' "You Don't Solve a Problem by Sweeping it Under the Carpet" ' .

59 Schaffer, ' "You Don't Solve a Problem by Sweeping it Under the Carpet" ', 131. It should be mentioned at this point that these two programmes are investigated to the exclusion of others (save for brief illustrative elaborations) as these were among the very few that satisfied a number of criteria for selection: to be a sitcom; to have a main character who was identified as Jewish in the programme; to be produced between 1964 and 1976 and to contain extended discussions of Jewish identity, Otherness, and relations between identity groups. Only two other programmes, *Alexander the Greatest* (2 series, 1971–1972) and *My Son Reuben* (1 series, 1975) fit these criteria according to the exhaustive *Radio Times Guide to TV Comedy*, ed. Mark Lewisohn & Dick Fiddy (London: BBC Worldwide, 2003). Given the relative longevity of *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* and the extent to which they highlight politics and inter-group relations, combined with the relative difficulty in viewing *Alexander the Greatest* and *My Son Reuben* (the latter of which is seemingly not extant and the former of which is held in a private collection) and the thematic focus of *Alexander the Greatest* being more concerned with family dynamics than wider political and cultural currents (though of course families exist within a social context), it was judged that to maintain a cohesive structure and avoid this thesis becoming overblown and overly expansive that *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* should be the predominant programmes under analysis here. It would, of course, behove future research to explore a wider selection of comedies but to do so is beyond the practical limitations of a doctoral thesis.

semantic/semiotic approach: exploring the contents of jokes, ideas/contexts behind them, dissecting specific quotations to extract discourses from them. While humour plays a role, it is not a central site of analysis. Schaffer focuses on the 1960s while this thesis also takes in the 1970s, demonstrating connections between the RRAs and Martin Barker's 'new racism' and Étienne Balibar's 'neo-racism', earlier than previously understood.[60] Barker locates 'new racism' in the mid-1970s, this thesis demonstrates examples from the mid-1960s. Balibarian 'neo-racism' is similar to Barker's formulation but relies on the idea of cultural incompatibility *versus* Barker's naturalising of discrete groupings. Both of these formulations are implicated in parliamentary sources.

Rather than a test case or precursor, representations of Jews and the disruption of 'the Jew' was part of a negotiated reformulation of difference around the RRAs. Parliamentary discussions of Jews, rather than being an easier way to talk about the uncomfortable idea of 'race' without talking about non-'White' people, was a consequence of a poorly thought out formulation of difference that emphasised 'colour', 'race', 'nation' and 'national origin', and 'ethnicity' and 'ethnic origin', Jews, in this formulation, were incongruous, and much of the discussion around Jews in these sources is geared towards attempting to comprehend the 'differentness' of Jews in terms that were not easily or convincingly applied to them. By that same token, while Schaffer sees the representation of Jews in sitcom as a 'working through' of race relations in a safe space, as a precursor to representations of non-'White' characters, I argue that these representations worked through of the idea of Jewish difference in the context of a cultural landscape that increasingly understood the difference in 'colour', 'race', national or ethnic terms which left Jews occupying an 'unknowable' conceptual space. Sitcom's role is as a third space where Jews and non-Jews engage with ideas of Jewish difference and disrupt prevailing political currents. *TDUDP* can be interpreted as a satirical mimetic attack on these colonialist discourses and *NMTQ* posits a new (or, perhaps more accurately, older) representation of Jewish identity as religious through a demonstration of a new hybridity.

The RRA 1965 stated that it was intended to prevent the discrimination of persons 'on the grounds of colour, race, or ethnic or national origin'.[61] The RRA 1968 went further and established that, in law, a racial group 'means a group of persons defined by reference to

60 Martin Barker, *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of The Tribe* (Frederick: Aletheia Books, 1981); Étienne Balibar, 'Is There a "Neo-Racism" ', in Étienne Balibar & Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London/New York: Verso, 1991 [1st French ed. *Race, nation, classe* (Paris: La Découverte, 1988)]), 17–28.

61 *The Race Relations Act 1965*, ch. 73, §1 (1).

colour, race, or ethnic or national origin'.[62] It is from this formulation (also detailed in the RRA 1965's Second Reading) that this thesis takes its structure.[63] For a group to be protected, it must be understood as different via at least one of these criteria. Following a framing chapter (below) four chapters follow, exploring discourses of 'colour', 'race', 'nation' or 'national origin', and 'ethnicity' or 'ethnic origin'. Each chapter utilises its central concept as an analytical lens to assess how the discursive 'Jew' was constructed and located in both parliamentary and sitcoms through the extent to which each concept was utilised to define/explain/determine the 'difference' of Jews. Each chapter investigates the concept as-it-was-used in parliamentary circles; intersections with each other and their application to 'the Jew'; then the ways in which *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* exhibit Bhabhaian forms of disruption in relation to Jewish positionality. Consequently, the lack of theorisation and assessment of the applicability of these discourses to Jews in parliamentary circles alongside a surety of the essentialism of Jewish difference is demonstrable *versus* the nuanced messier handling of the sitcom third space.

Chapter 1 is a framing chapter to locate the proceeding discussions in their context and assess the interaction between contemporary Jews and the British State on this question. Demonstrating through the efforts of the Board of Deputies of British Jews (hereafter BoDs) to influence the content of the RRBs, the content of contemporary Jews' concerns around antisemitism and the representation of Jews and Jewishness on television. Chapter 2, examines 'colour', and demonstrates the establishing of a ' "Black"/Protected/ "Other" ' *vs* ' "White"/Constrained/"Same" ' binary in Parliament. 'Colour' was largely discarded as a source of Jewish difference in parliamentary sources, yet this was not universal, not even within Parliament. Within the 'Black' *vs* 'White' binary, 'the Jew's' positionality was both liminal and precarious. Sitcoms will show a systematic deconstruction of 'colour' difference through Garnett and his utilisation of 'colour' discourse. Chapter 3 assesses 'race', the overarching legislative determinant of protected groups; despite this importance it had little conceptual clarity. Parliamentary sources demonstrate multivalent understandings of 'race', showing significant overlap with other discourses while being spoken of as distinct. Within this 'the Jew's' positionality is hybridised and a matter of significant debate. While parliamentarians condemned racism, they uncritically engaged with the language of 'race' underpinning it. *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* critique the discourse of 'race' as it applies to Jews, exploring ideas of 'blood', physiognomy, and 'the Jewish nose' as racial markers. Chapter 4 explores 'nationality'/'national origin' as a single discourse of 'nation'. The former was a revision following a civil case of 1971, but there is little indication of how these diverge,

62 *The Race Relations Act 1968*, ch. 71, Part I, §8 (4).

63 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932–33.

particularly when applied to 'the Jew'. Key here is the positionality of 'the Jew in relation to Israel and to British 'nationality'. This chapter shows the dynamic positionality of Jews in parliamentary sources is largely due to confusion between 'nation' and 'national origin' which is not problematised in the debates. Yet, *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* both explore issues of nation: Israel is prominent in both and both explore masculinity as a metonym for 'nation'. Chapter 5 explores 'ethnicity' and 'ethnic origin'. Parliamentary sources lack any coherent definition of these terms and this proteanity is the root of its utility. It is the primary discourse by which parliamentarians identity Jewish difference. In the absence of a workable definition, this chapter takes a *de*ductive, rather than *in*ductive approach and asks instead 'in what ways are Jews defined as different in parliamentary sources'? This leads to discussion of religious and cultural difference. Religion is explicitly and repeatedly rejected by successive Governments for inclusion in the RRAs, while culture as way-of-life/behaviour is preferred. Consequently, representations of 'Jewish behaviour' form the basis of this chapter's assessment of sitcoms. The 'Jewish gesture' is explored, joining discussions of insularity, 'the Jew' as victim, ideas of dirt, and of sexual rapacity. What emerges is 'the Jew' in Parliament as largely the product of phantastic stereotype. While religious difference was rejected for legislation, sitcoms utilise it extensively.

What becomes apparent across the latter four chapters of this thesis is a degree of 'bleeding' between them as discussions of examples in one chapter butt up against and intersect with others. This is not a fault of the methodology and is, in fact, discussed and incorporated into the thesis' Conclusion. 'Colour', 'race', 'nation', and 'ethnicity', are intimately connected and intertwined—in a very Saidian sense, they are overlain. These points of intersection are valuable not because they highlight a weakness in Bhabhaian theory or deficiencies of the sources, but because they demonstrate the phantastic roots of the discourses. They are, to varying degrees, artificial, the product of history rather than nature. This thesis takes this and demonstrates the issues of formulating law on the basis of these concepts, arguing that doing so demonstrates that the RRAs are best understood within the rubric of postcolonial studies as a method of reinforcing and concretising Otherness.

1

British Jews, the Board of Deputies and the Race Relations Acts, 1965–1976

This chapter historically surveys interfaces between the British Jewish community and the RRAs. It has two functions: demonstrating Jewish self-positioning within the RRAs (*versus* how Jews are positioned by Parliament in later chapters); and demonstrating how contemporary Jews understood the RRAs affecting their lives as a socio-political power structure, framing relations with other groups.

Georgia Brown's Whitechapel

On 17 August 1968, the BBC aired an episode of *One Pair of Eyes*, 'Who are the Cockneys now?' [hereafter *WATCN*], focusing on Whitechapel.[64] This episode, presented by Jewish actress Georgia Brown, explored Jewish reactions to non-'White' migration and how they perceived both racial difference and attempts to structure interpersonal relations along those lines. It also demonstrates the continuing role of colonialist discourse in framing perspectives on difference. Brown, joined by Lionel Bart, returned to her old neighbourhood of Whitechapel: previously an area of Jewish settlement and, by 1968, largely an area of Pakistani settlement. The episode acknowledges social change alongside concern over concomitant cultural change. Brown poses a series of questions around identity, from the eponymous question of the episode's title, to the more conceptual ('what will it mean to be a cockney in the future?'), and even the existential ('will there be any cockneys if the East End has no more Jews?').

A recurrent motif of this episode is faces. John Corner has written on televisual images, their links to ideology, and the process of 'figuration': the ability of an image to connote understandings beyond the visual.[65] 'Faces' thereby figurate change in Whitechapel in *WATCN*. In the 'Museum of the East End' Brown highlights some china dolls, asking 'who gave all these cockney dolls the same face'? This introduces a montage of twelve (apparently

64 'Who are the Cockneys now?', *One Pair of Eyes*, BBC 1, 17 August 1968, BBC iPlayer, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/p00t3mkz/one-pair-of-eyes-georgia-brown-who-are-the-cockneys-now> (accessed 15 August 2015).

65 John Corner, *Critical Ideas in Television Studies*, 32.

representative) faces on location, intended to demonstrate the heterogeny of cockney faces all but four broadly 'elderly' and all but one 'White': indicating, perhaps, an awareness of intragroup difference in the context of a legalised 'Black' *vs* 'White' binary (Chapter 2). In voiceover Brown calls Whitechapel a 'melting pot'. Consequently, this recognises the demographic change in the area, yet diminishes both its extent and its importance for cultural change in the area. While interviewees refer to 'race' and skin 'colour' as indicators of widespread and deep cultural change in the area, the lack of 'Black' people in the montage presumably designed to show Whitechapel's diversity is striking. The lone woman of 'colour' being placed in the middle of the montage (not the more impactful start or end) might well indicate an intentional lack of focus on 'colour' 'difference'. While eleven of the faces are, broadly, 'White', this, combined with Brown's description, might imply an intentionally ironic juxtaposition. Yet, Brown refers in the episode to groups including Italians, Greeks, Cypriots, and Irish who share a history of contested racial and 'colour' status. The 'colour' of these groups has been subject to processes like those set out in Chapter 2, exemplifying Hall's 'sliding signifier' idea.[66]

In Black Lion Yard, off Whitechapel Road, Brown remarks 'there's a tension in this street that wasn't there before', accompanied by shots of non-'White' faces, implying a causal connection. Brown interviews a 'White' woman who argues similarly, that little has changed in the East End apart from 'the colour', she then explicitly connects 'colour' to immigration, arguing that migrants should not receive National Assistance, that this should be reserved for 'Whites', concluding that she feels, 'we're in the wrong country'. Other 'White' interviewees concede the change but are optimistic, demonstrating a degree of pluralism in responses to migration in an historically Jewish community in Whitechapel, also borne out in archival evidence below. Rather than representing Jews as a 'Millet model'[67] minority in the manner of Brown and many others, this interviewee sees Jews as assimilated into British society, with

66 See, for a brief overview of the 'whitening' of Greek, Italian and Cypriot peoples, Fotis Kapetopoulos, 'When did I become "White"? ', *Neos Kosmos*, 31 October 2016, n.p., <https://neoskosmos.com/en/2016/10/31/dialogue/opinion/when-did-greeks-become-white/> (accessed 3 January 2024). See also Stuart Hall, 'Race—The Sliding Signifier', in his *The Fateful Triangle: Race, Ethnicity, Nation*, ed. with an intro. by Kobena Mercer, with a foreword by Henry Louis Gates Jr. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 2017), 31–79.

67 This model argues that humans are cultural beings embedded in specific communities. Everything that matters to people is derived from their cultures and thus society is more of a union of communities than a cohesive whole. Contrastingly, assimilationism advocates that the State has a responsibility to maintain a cohesive national culture in order to maintain the survival of the nation. The State is seen as the custodian of a society's way of life with a duty to protect it. Minorities should accept the majority culture within which they live. See Bhikhu Parekh, 'Integrating Minorities', in *Race Relations in Britain: A Developing Agenda*, ed. Tessa Blackstone, Bhikhu Parekh & Peter Sanders (London: Routledge, 2005 [1st ed. New York, 1998]), 1–21.

a stake in resisting non-'White' immigration. Even if she is not Jewish, she speaks directly to Brown, establishing a confidential connection between them, discursively hybridizing Brown (at least) as belonging to a correlative grouping demonstrating a heterogenous and dynamic subjectivity of Jews within a race relations framework and a diversity of opinion among Jews engaged with racial difference. Writing in response to Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech (20 April 1968), Rabbi Hugo Gryn argued that Jews have a unique historical position from which to—and a unique historic responsibility to—speak on the importance of race relations.[68] For Gryn, this responsibility has its roots in the deepest Jewish religious tenets, making it essentially Jewish, a point also made by Anthony Lester.[69] Lester does not appeal to scripture but to the hybrid identity of British Jews and their history.[70]

Identity formation is tied to the discourse of race relations in *WATCN*, especially when utilising Jewishness as a lens. Brown's pieces to camera demonstrate an historical synonymisation of Jewish and cockney but also that this admixture is itself a source of debate within Whitechapel's Jewish organisations. Brown first advances a spatial/geographic/affective criteria of 'cockney' identity: 'I was born within the sound of Bow bells and that makes me a cockney', emphasising place over 'person' leads to an optimistic view of migration: 'cockney' becomes a spatial inheritance. However, David Dryer, head of Whitechapel's Brady Club (of which Brown was a member), takes an alternative view. Brown asks Dryer about restricting non-Jewish Whitechapel residents' Brady membership in favour of Jewish children from outside Whitechapel. He posits that it

---

68 'The Holocaust took place because a sick prejudice was allowed to spread like a contagious plague, because it was fanned by a set of vicious laws which legalised this process, and because decent nations and individuals were not sufficiently concerned to do anything about stopping it before it was too late. For this reason alone Jews have an historic right and a moral duty to speak, to warn and to plead' (Rabbi Hugo Gryn, 'Prejudice is like a contagious plague', *Jewish Chronicle*, 3 May 1968, p. 7). This idea of the importance of a Jewish voice in the race relations debate was echoed in the leading articles of the *Chronicle* a fortnight later. See 'Towards racial harmony', *Jewish Chronicle*, 17 May 1968, p. 6.

69 ' "When a stranger resides with you in your land, you shall not wrong him. The stranger who resides with you shall be to you as one of your citizens; you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God" […] "Know the heart of the stranger" ' (Gryn, 'Prejudice is like a contagious plague', p. 7).

70 'We should begin by educating ourselves (for one does not have to be non-Jewish to be prejudiced!) […] We have particular cause to understand the horrors of racialism and the terrible consequences of appeasement […] We owe it to ourselves, both as British citizens and as Jews' (Antony Lester, 'The New Scapegoats: An analysis of the Race Relations Bill', *Jewish Chronicle*, 19 July 1968, p. 7). Lester also published a similar analysis in the run up to the passage of the 1976 Act ('How the new Race Bill affects Britain's Jews', *Jewish Chronicle*, 26 March 1976, p. 11).

maintains a specifically Jewish way of life in Whitechapel, implying an essentially Jewish 'cockney' identity. Brown connects this to race relations, arguing for a new 'cockney' identity that integrates non-'White'/non-Jewish residents to maintain the community sentiment from her childhood. Brown claims little distinction between the 'faces' of her childhood and those of 1968, yet Dryer recognises and emphasises an essential difference. Jewish positionality is in flux within the discourse of race relations here. Brown argues for a mediating positionality between British and non-British, Dryer argues for a specifically British Jewish positionality. This negotiated hybridity is exemplified by Brown and Bart discussing their name changes to something less 'Jewish-sounding' than Lilian Klot and Leibele Begleiter yet they acknowledge Whitechapel's important influences on their lives and their work.

Brown links her return to Whitechapel, and the area itself, to contemporary public debates on immigration and race relations as a single issue: 'it's about the whole immigrant situation, what they're going to let in, what they're not going to let in, and what opportunities there are [for young people] now'. Her linkage between the two mirrors successive British Governments: that immigration causes change in pre-existing, harmonious, and static communities.

This programme was not unremarked upon in the Jewish press. The 23 August issue of the *Jewish Chronicle* offered a critique from Hyam Corney in 'Georgia goes back East'.[71] He argues that Brown's 'philosophising [comes] unstuck', was misplaced, and that 'turning clubs like Brady into multi-racial centres' would not aid immigrants. Mrs Celia Kennard, in a letter the next week, opposed Corney, arguing instead that while Brown 'deplored the tight exclusiveness of the Jewish clubs and the narrow attitude of the Jewish population' her belief in the 'brotherhood of man' was still admirable.[72] Kennard admonished Corney suggesting that he 'started philosophising and came unstuck'. Clearly, contemporary Jews actively discussed race relations, debating the role that Jews could/should play in it; it is clear also that a sense of Jewish specificity inflected this positionality due to British Jews' own experience of migration and prejudice.

The Aliens Act 1905 – An Historical Preamble

It is important to contextualise British Jewish responses to racialised legislation, being no strangers to its implications. The Aliens Act 1905 was an attempt to limit the migration of Russian and Eastern European Jews to Britain since the 1880s. It rested on the legalised idea

71 'As a sociologist, Georgia Brown makes an accomplished cabaret star. As a thinker on religion, she also leaves much to be desired […] But as a television reporter […] she was excellent' (Hyam Corney, 'Georgia goes back East', *Jewish Chronicle*, 23 August 1968, p. 23).

72 Letter from Mrs Celia Kennard, 'Georgia Goes Home', *Jewish Chronicle*, 30 August 1968, p. 8.

of 'the alien'. The Act does not define 'alien' yet it to defines 'immigrant' as 'an *alien* steerage passenger'.[73] An 'alien' is ill-defined but there is a distinction between immigrant and alien: not all immigrants are aliens but all aliens are necessarily immigrants. Later Acts clarify 'alien' as a person not born within the UK, its Empire, or protected territories.[74] There is then, a link established between foreign-ness and 'alien'. Also notable is the use of 'steerage', an indication of the socio-economic targets of the legislation—only the poorest were in steerage—persons in more expensive classes were 'passengers'. Entry was also predicated on demonstrating a waiting job negating the procedures established by British Jews that found new arrivals work *after* disembarkation. It also linked British identity to parental provenance. Jews were, therefore the target of the first attempt to limit migration to the UK and thus it was against Jews that early twentieth-century British legal discourses of difference concretised.

While other laws restricting alien entry were passed in 1914 and 1918, these were focused less on Jews than 'foreigners' more generally.[75] A 1919 Amendment Act, however, set out severe restrictions that would have tragic implications as the interwar period progressed.[76] It specifically limited entry for enemy and former enemy aliens (i.e. from Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary). These would be the countries from which Jews would flee in the 1930s seeking refuge from fascist and Nazi persecutions. The 1919 Act made it difficult for these people to find safety in Britain. Additionally, this Act assumes that aliens within a nation cause disruption; thus, difference is legalised as a reason for suspicion and bigotry among the population towards 'aliens'. The Act places the onus on the 'alien' to make themselves inconspicuous, unobtrusive, and invisible to lessen their exposure to British people (or *vice versa*). Alien difference becomes reified, a fact of existence, insurmountable even over time: to be a German in Britain at this time was to *always* be a German in Britain, never an Anglo-German, making hybridity inconceivable.

Georgia Brown's engagement with the reality of race relations in Whitechapel in 1968 is one indication of the interest that British Jews took in race relations as a lived reality and the plurality of opinions they held. While Brown argues for a Jewish amelioration to facilitate integration for others to find a new hybridity together, Dryer and others see it as a dilution of specifically Jewish spaces and institutions. This raises the question: was there such a thing as

---

73 *The Aliens Act 1905*, 5 Edw. 7, ch. 13, §8 (1); my emphasis.

74 *The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914*, 4 & 5 Geo. 5, ch. 17, §27 (1).

75 See *The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914*, 4 & 5 Geo. 5, ch. 17; and *The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1918*, 8 & 9 Geo. 5, ch. 38.

76 *The Aliens Restriction (Amendment) Act 1919*, 9 & 10 Geo. 5, ch. 92.

a Jewish community response to race relations and the RRAs? This chapter frames the main analysis of the thesis by providing an historical overview of a variegated and heterogenous picture. While individuals, like Brown, Bart, and Dryer demonstrate a concern with lived race relations, how far did those currents of thought cut across British Jewry and was any engagement based purely on the Jewish position within the framework or did it engage more widely with lived race relations or even the theory of it?

In the absence of a comprehensive survey of all British Jews on the topic of race relations this chapter examines one major organisation's engagement with the topic. The principal evidence base will be provided by the archives of the BoDs, London Metropolitan Archives, supplemented by the National Archives (hereafter TNA), and the *Jewish Chronicle*. A number of caveats must be borne in mind. While the BoDs considered itself a representative institution and was for a significant enough number of British Jews to warrant its examination here, not all British Jews of this period necessarily understood the BoDs as representative of their outlook.[77] Thus, while its archive demonstrates a broadly consistent response to the RRAs this must not be considered an *essentially* British Jewish response. However, the BoDs was among the most significant Jewish institutions. It was able to secure meetings with cabinet-level ministers, maintained contacts with MPs and peers and was a principal point of contact for those British Jews who saw it as representative to air their views on race relations and antisemitism. Despite this significance, the Board's lobbying point around the RRAs—the inclusion of religion as a protected category—was disregarded.

The Board and the RRAs, 1965–1976

The BoDs archive indicates that it was very active in lobbying the State to legislate around incitement to racial hatred. Countering this, Government officials argued for the utility of pre-existing legislative frameworks—the Public Order Act 1936 (hereafter POA) and seditious libel—both of which the BoDs argued were inadequate. The BoDs was concerned at the inability (though suspecting unwillingness) of police and the courts to curtail the British National Socialist movement led by Colin Jordan. On 10 May 1962 Adolf. G. Brotman,

77 Raphael Langham in his institutional history (*250 Years of Convention and Contention: A History of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–2020* [London/Portland, OR: Vallentine Mitchell, 2010]) has argued that until 1964 the BoDs was largely a Zionist-led institution (176–224). From 1964 he suggests that the Board became a 'battleground' (225) between progressive and orthodox Jews, ultimately causing several orthodox members to leave in 1971. He argues that this meant that ten percent of British Jews were unrepresented by the Board in this period. He also argues that thirty-seven percent of British Jews had no affiliation to any synagogue in 1967 (226) but that they were represented through their 'membership of Jewish institutions' (226) but this claim is not supported and the institutions not identified. I would suggest that there is a chance that over the many years of 'the Zionists [taking] control' (176), non-religious Jews may not have thought of the BoDs as representative.

Reuben Lieberman, and Martin Savitt met Assistant Commissioner of Police, R. R. M. Bacon, discussing Jordan and National Socialist Movement activities, including a meeting in Trafalgar Square.[78] Police argued that, while provocative, even speaker John Tyndall's use of antisemitic rhetoric, (specifically 'Jewish maggots') did not constitute a breach of the POA. Police in fact halted the meeting several times to re-establish order, then allowed it to proceed. BoDs representatives at a meeting on 16 June 1962, expressed frustration that Bacon acknowledged some of what was said was justification for shutting the meeting down yet no such action was taken.[79] The text of a speech by R. N. Carvalho (President of the Anglo-Jewish Association) of mid to late June 1962 is held in the BoD's archive; he argued against additional legislation due to an inevitable lack of clarity. No annotations indicate (dis)agreement with Carvalho but it demonstrates that the BoDs were aware of a plurality of views on such topics among British Jews and that the difficulty of defining a group such as Jews was not unconsidered.[80]

The BoDs supported the 1960 Racial and Religious Insults Bill, introduced by Leslie Plummer, Creech Jones, Tom Driberg, Charles Royle, Bob Mellish, John Stonehouse, and Kenneth Robinson.[81] Barnett Janner spoke in support and describes its intent to: 'make it an offence to insult publicly or conspire to insult publicly any person or persons because of their race or religion'.[82] He continues: 'I have long been engaged in work of a kind which aimed at giving protection not only to my own co-religionists but to all minorities, distinguishable by race, creed or colour, and have in the present state of law no method or means of defending themselves'.[83] The BoDs gave evidence to the Porter Committee on the laws of libel and slander and sought for the law to be amended.[84] The file concludes that while the intention of the proposed Bill was admirable, it 'does not go as far as our original intention'.[85]

A key meeting on 2 August 1962 saw a BoDs deputation meet then Home Secretary Henry Brooke: Barnett Janner, Israel Brodie (Chief Rabbi), Solomon Teff, H. Landy, John

78 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

79 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

80 'This meeting and the question of prejudicial literature have caused the General Purposes Committee to consider the whole question of legal safeguards against group libel. We are sufficiently infused with legal minds to realise the danger of such legislation, *the difficulty of defining a group* or libel […] some of us wonder if it is beyond our minds to make such definitions and it should not be beyond the power of the parliamentarians somehow to enact the necessary safeguards' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403; my emphasis). This speech is also quoted extensively in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 22 June 1962, p. 9.

81 LMA ACC/3121/B/06/002/038.

82 LMA ACC/3121/B/06/002/038.

83 LMA ACC/3121/B/06/002/038.

84 LMA ACC/3121/B/06/002/038.

85 LMA ACC/3121/B/06/002/038.

Dight, and others.[86] Barnett Janner suggested that given the content of the meetings in Trafalgar Square and the inability of the police to prevent such meetings from taking place: 'If it should be found after full consideration that the present law was not sufficient to deal with such meetings and provocations, then [Janner] urged that the law should be amended to make racial provocation and incitement an offence'. Brooke pointed out that he had been '[o]nly in office for 17 days […] There was no question of legislation in the present session of Parliament. With regard to the Public Order Act some thought it should be amended, others that it was adequate'.[87] This line of argumentation was replicated in BoDs discussions; Hayim Pinner argued in a 16 July 1962 letter that the current law was satisfactory but required amendment rather than the creation of a new offence.[88] Discussions ramped up in late 1962 prior to Jordan's trial at Bow Street Magistrates. Brooke received a letter from Dight on 13 August 1962 warning that the BoDs could not placate local organisations from arranging meetings (and breaching the peace) in the light of Jordan's arrest and trial.[89]

A memorandum by Dight summing up the BoDs position was sent to the Home Office on 2 May 1963. It argued both that racial- or 'colour'-based attacks were not analogous to political ones and the cumulative effects of this rhetoric led to violence, not necessarily a breach of the POA at the time.[90] He also discusses a Home Office inquiry into the use of

86 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

87 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403

88 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

89 This was reiterated in a letter of 6 January 1965: 'In practice the Act operates against the speaker only when there are signs of such restiveness in the audience that they appear to be on the verge of violence [police stoppages] are entirely dependent on the judgement of the police on the spot. // The Board has repeatedly asked members of our community to keep away from meetings where antisemitic propaganda is likely to be disseminated [consequently] the speaker has a clear field for his vituperation […] increasing the chance of spreading his doctrines' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

90 'The Lord Chief Justice's ruling in the High Court of 19 March 1963 makes it clear that when words of an insulting, threatening or abusive nature are used at public meetings they constitute a breach of section 5 of the Public Order Act. In particular his lordship referred to Colin Jordan's words used on 1 July 1962 which were deliberately intended to be insulting to the audience […] // The matter of the enforcement of this law is difficult as it requires a police officer to be present and to give an airtight account that places the words in the mouth of the speaker and not the audience. It also requires a police officer to determine whether a breach of the peace is occasioned which is hard to prove to a jury. […] It is additionally felt that the events of the post war years show that there has rarely been a charge brought by the authorities of insulting behaviour. // It is palpably unfair to ask law-abiding citizens who may be Jews to absent themselves from such places […] Jews have the same rights as other citizens and should not run the risk of hearing themselves vilified under the guise of free speech. […] Quite apart from the examination of this matter from the point of view of public order is the aspect of the Government's duty to protect all its citizens, whatever their race creed or colour from attack. No individual should, on the ground of his religious or ethnic origin be subject to attack. […] // This is not comparable to political propaganda as "the

seditious libel. Brooke, in November 1962, argued for the possibility of utilising seditious libel to counter Jordan. Dight pointed out that the burden of proof is so significant that this approach is of 'little assistance, if not almost a dead letter', it is in this letter that religion is first mentioned in a missive to the Government.[91]

The BoDs consulted Gerald Gardiner QC on 7 January 1963 in search of a legal formulation to circumvent the intent provision and reported his suggestions in a letter to the Government.[92] They conceded that these only covered public meetings; for widespread dissemination of speeches and writing they suggested using wording provided by Fenner Brockway in one of his failed Bills.[93] They argue that this would forego the important issue of proving *mens rea*. They quote Sherres *v.* De Rutzen (1891) 1 Q.B. 918, per R. S. Wright J. and also Reynolds *v.* G. H. Austin & Sons Ltd. (1951) 2 K.B. 135 & 148, per Devlin J. to justify this dispensing with the requirements of *mens rea*.[94]

In a May 1963 meeting with Brooke, deputies clarified their position for specific incitement of racial and religious hatred legislation, arguing that no case of seditious libel had been to trial since 1947 as the need to prove intent was too complex. This was further reiterated in a letter of 6 January 1965.[95] Brooke rejected the BoDs proposals and argued for

---

target of political propaganda can change his views but the target of racial or religious propaganda, is in no way in position to alter the characteristics deriving from his origin" ' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

91 'It is hoped that the Government will see its way to introduce new legislation or amend existing legislation […] to make it easier for the responsible authorities to limit spoken and written propaganda of a provocative nature which incites to racial and religious hatred while not diminishing the right to freedom of expression' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

92 '[Gardner suggests] as a law to stop anti-Jewish propaganda at public meetings […] "To provide that any person who at any public meeting exhibits any poster or placard or uses any words calculated to arouse hatred of any racial or religious group of her majesties subjects in Great Britain shall be guilty of an offence by a fine not exceeding £100, and on a second or other conviction for such and offence by imprisonment not exceeding three months" ' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

93 ' "Any person who incites publicly by speech or writing or by illustration contempt or hatred of any person or persons (of any racial or religious group of HM subjects in Great Britain) (because of their colour, race or religion) shall be guilt of an offence". Ditto for "any person who prints publishes or distributes or circulates any written matter or illustration inciting [same]" ' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

94 'We think that such a Bill should contain a clause expressly prohibiting any defence that the words were true or were believed to be true or that it was for the public interest that they should be published. […] We submit that it is to-day axiomatic that freedom of speech, in any modern society, in order to protect the foundations of its freedom must be subject to limitations lest the free society itself and its freedom of speech themselves destroyed' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

95 [Seditious libel and the Public Order Acts], are both in our view inadequate […] // This has been underlined as recently as 9 December 1963 in a letter from the then Attorney General to a Member of Parliament who sent him a copy of the then current *National Socialist* […] "there was insufficient evidence of an intention to provoke violence …" // The Public Order Act 1936 as amended by the Public Order Act 1963 has no more than a limited usefulness

increased seditious libel penalties in the Public Order Act 1963 as preferable, but this was not well received by the BoDs.[96] Seven months after the 1963 Act passed, Home Office minister J. C. H. Holden wrote to Brotman on 20 March 1964 attempting to close the matter.[97] Clearly the BoDs continued to lobby for further reform.

The BoDs arranged two Home Office meetings in January and March 1965: Teff (by then President), Lieberman (Vice President), Hyman Diamond (Chair of the Law, Parliamentary and General Purposes Committee [hereafter LPGPC]), Frank Renton (Vice Chairman of the Jewish Defence Committee [hereafter JDC]), Neville Laski (QC and former President of the BoDs), George Webber (barrister), Savitt (Chair of the Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen [hereafter AJEX]), Brotman (Secretary of the Board), David Carrington (Press and Public Relations Officer), and A. D. Massel (Secretary of JDC) attended.[98] In advance of this meeting a memorandum was sent to Soskice excoriating current legislation: 'The Public Order Act 1963 merely increases penalties under the Public Order Act 1936 and the Public Meeting Act [1908]'.[99] The memorandum quotes and comments on Lord Parker C. J. in the Jordan case regarding the Trafalgar Square meeting on 18 March 1965 and the significance of cumulative, non-violent speech and writing.[100]

In the Queen's Speech 1964, the Wilsonian Government committed to outlawing racial discrimination. A Bill against Racial Discrimination (without mentioning incitement), is listed as number eleven on the Government's legislative programme (17 November 1964).[101]

---

in dealing with public meetings, and this was clearly demonstrated by the protracted hearings in the Colin Jordan case (1962–1963). // The High Court ruling in this case made it clear that the true test was the effect of the speaker's words on the audience actually present and whether they were likely to be provoked to violent reaction. […] this still fails to deal with a situation in which the speaker's entire audience is in sympathy with him, or even if hostile to him, its members are not likely to react violently' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

96 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

97 '[B]y increasing the penalties, [it strengthens] the deterrent powers of the law for dealing with racial attacks. Nothing that has happened since the passing of that Act has convinced the Home Secretary that further powers are necessary. […] To go further and make racial or religious hatred or its incitement a punishable offence would be to introduce a political censorship—even if one which many people would support' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

98 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

99 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

100 ' "A man was entitled to express his views as strongly as he likes, to criticise and to say disagreeable things about his opponents. But he must not threaten, abuse or insult by threatening with words". // To anyone other than a lawyer it is respectfully submitted these words might be construed as words of encouragement. It does not protect the Jewish Community against the inciting of racial hatred by the printing and dissemination of writings scurrilous and insidious, or by speeches which do not involve a breach of the peace. Widespread dissemination has cumulative effects of which we have strong evidence' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

101 TNA CAB 129/119/16.

Soskice also discussed the idea of legislation against incitement to racial hatred in a memorandum to the cabinet (17 February 1965).[102] While they maintained an emphasis on a strengthened section 5 of the POA; they recognised the utility of including written material and creating a new offense to disseminate written matter or use threatening and abusive speech in a public place with the intent to stir up racial hatred.[103]

On 6 January 1965 the BoDs sent a lengthy letter to Soskice seeking to comprehensively set out their views on incitement to racial hatred as a specific offence and the inadequacy of the current law to cover that offence, specifically in relation to antisemitism and divorced from public meetings.[104] This letter ends:

> We would request that the proposed legislation be framed so as to cover both the written and the spoken words, as well as pictorial representations, likely to incite hatred or contempt against any group of citizens by reason of, or by reference to, their origins whether racial, ethnic or religious.[105]

If one takes this point in concert with Soskice's proviso of 'finding the right definitions', one raises the key issue of religion's role in contemporary British Jewish identity. The BoDs archives indicate a coherent narrative that ties Jewish identity to a religion, rather than a 'colour', 'race', ethnic, or national minority identity. The BoDs' *Annual Report* for 1964 contained a statement responding to the Queen's Speech that year: 'The Board expresses the hope that when Government legislation is announced it will include provisions to cover, so far

---

102 TNA CAB/129/120/23

103 TNA CAB/129/120/23

104 'The Jewish Community has long held the view, [on] basic principles of humanitarianism and decency, that the inciting of hatred […] is a detestable activity which should be outlawed. […] // The Board, as the representative body of the Jewish community in this country, [approves] of the intention of the Government to introduce legislation against racial discrimination and incitement [particularly in] the Labour Party Manifesto that "… a Labour Government will legislate against racial discrimination and incitement in public places …" and the Prime Minister's speech at the Guildhall Banquet on 16th November 1964 when he said "… we have a duty at home to show our deep loathing and to condemn by our words and to outlaw by our deeds racial intolerance, colour prejudice, antisemitism …" // We also [quote] the Home Secretary [on] 17 November that "if we can find the necessary definitions—they are extremely difficult— we would [legislate] against incitement". // […] One cannot ignore the possible long-term effects of such speeches, whether or not they are violence, if they are likely to excite contempt, ridicule or hatred. // […] whipping up hatred of Jews is bound to have the result that Jews will do everything in their power to prevent such speeches, and will attend such meetings even at the risk of being prosecuted under the same statute which is intended by the Act to deter the speaker. This results in the anomaly that the speaker is unrestricted by the Act unless the audience is prepared to break the law. […]' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

105 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403.

as is possible, incitement to contempt and hatred of persons on the ground of their colour, race and religion'.[106]

It is indicative of the importance with which the Board viewed this legislation that they established an *ad hoc* committee specifically to assess legislation on racial incitement and to advise the Board on its approach to the Government regarding any legislation around racial incitement, its remit was also expanded to include the RRAs.[107] The establishment and first meeting of the *ad hoc* committee took place on 7 December 1964, its members were Teff, Diamond, Dight, Janner, Laski, Lieberman, Savitt, G. Bean, QC, F. Brassloff, and G. J. Webber.[108] The first point raised in the agenda for that first meeting, was the absence of religion in the proposed Bill.[109] A *précis* of the committee's minutes from 27 April 1965 contains important information regarding Soskice's statements during the Second Reading debate, indicating a level of concern around the surety with which Soskice included Jews in the provision in the absence of religion and that antisemitism was specifically racial; it also demonstrates that the BoDs were aware of different views on the relationship of Jewish identity to religion in the wider community, and an unease with appearing too enthusiastic in pursuing religion lest it invite reaction.[110] This last idea of the BoDs keeping one eye on the

106 LMA ACC/3121/G/01/001/43.

107 While, unfortunately the reports, papers and full minutes of this *ad hoc* committee are not available in the BoDs archives (even after repeated and deep searches of the holdings) some understanding of its work can be pieced together from disparate documents found in reports from and files on more senior committees within the BoDs' structure, these contain useful information about the discussions that took place in this committee, its membership and the conclusions it drew on important issues within its remit. Sadly, however, what would surely have been a fascinating repository, the full argumentation within this committee's discussion, is, it seems, not in the archive's holdings (LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/017). The *Jewish Chronicle* reported on the work of this *ad hoc* committee throughout this period. See 21 May 1965, p. 16; 19 April 1968, p. 21; and 2 April 1976, p. 9.

108 LMA ACC/3121/G/01/001/43.

109 Copies included as loose-leaf attachments within files covering the BoDs minutes for 1963–1968 and the LPGPC January 1963–February 1967. See LMA ACC/3121/A/041; and LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/017 respectively.

110 'The Home Secretary had contended that in his view the words ethnic *etc.* would be held to include Jews. The members of the deputation had elaborated on the doubts in this respect and especially the view of some Jews themselves that racially they were not distinct from the community in which they lived. The Home Secretary made it quite clear that nothing whatever would induce him to introduce into the wording of the Bill any reference to religion. He felt that the courts would uphold a contention that in the normal context of anti-Jewish propaganda there was an undeniable attack on Jews as a race and in this case such attacks would be open to prosecution. If the Jewish religion were attacked he felt that if he were found wrong and a prosecution for anti-Jewish propaganda failed then the Act would be looked at again. […] Urging amendments too vigorously may invite reaction from those who were completely opposed to the Bill. […] There was another point of view that not too much satisfaction should be expressed in the terms of the Bill as set out. There was also a danger that some Jews may not

reactions of other groups towards the legislation is borne out by the 13 April 1965 JDC minutes, which pointed to a 'mixed reception in the press' for the RRB.[111]

The *Jewish Chronicle*'s first report on the reception of the Bill quotes Savitt: 'We have always maintained that legislation is necessary as part of a determined policy to combat racial and religious prejudice. We are however concerned that in this Bill there is no provision for religious groups'.[112] The *Chronicle* was key for BoDs' representatives to contribute to public RRB debates; though it was no mouthpiece. The leading articles of 16 April 1965 do not specifically mention religion, making reference only to the 'defects and deficiencies' of the Bill.[113] Louis Blom-Cooper in his critique, in the same issue, argues that the law 'is to be equated with sedition, obscene libel or blasphemy—the speaker is to be punished for the language he uses and not for its immediate effect'.[114] While he is correct to focus on language, this largely misrepresents the law, disregarding the need to prove 'intention to stir up'; hard to prove (as case law demonstrated), resultingly, this was recognised in the RRA 1976 which had no 'intent' provision.[115] Blom-Cooper minimises the 'omission of religion [as] of little consequence' as 'antisemitism is widely regarded as racialism'.[116] Compare this to the *Chronicle*'s General Editor, William Frankel, who, in his 7 May leading article, following the Second Reading of the Bill, argued that:

> In its present form [the Bill] appears to exclude anti-semitism from its provisions […] The question of what is a Jew has baffled a Jewish Government and it is understandable that it should occasion some difficulty to Sir Frank, but, to put it briefly, it has very little to do with being part of a racial, ethnic or national group and a great deal with religion.[117]

---

like to see any reference to religion in the Bill (LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/017). Concern over non-Jewish reactions against the Bill is also set out in 'Press voices Opposition', *Jewish Chronicle*, 16 April 1965, pp. 18–19.

111 LMA ACC/3121/A/041. This plurality was borne out even in the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle*, from headlines and leading articles expressing uncertainty ('Cool Reception for Race Bill' & 'Race Bill', 16 April 1965, pp. 1 & 6–7 respectively; 'Tories oppose Race Bill', 30 April 1965, p. 1; 'Race, Religion and Law', 7 May 1965, pp. 6–7) to extended critiques by Louis Blom-Cooper ('Race Relations Bill: Ineffective Measure', 16 April 1965, pp. 18–19), to more positive assessments from Anthony Lester (14 May, pp. 8–9). The leading article of 7 May 1965 even going so far as to state plainly '[the Bill] appears to exclude antisemitism from its provisions' (pp. 6–7).

112 'Cool reception for Race Bill'.

113 'Race Bill', p. 7.

114 Blom-Cooper, 'Race Relations Bill', p. 18.

115 Blom-Cooper, 'Race Relations Bill', p. 18.

116 Blom-Cooper, 'Race Relations Bill', both p. 18. In spite of his use of 'widely', this is one of a small number of examples from contemporary Jewish sources that do not emphasise a specificity for antisemitism and instead condense it within a wider discourse of racial violence.

117 'Race, Religion and Law', p. 6.

He continues in a most prescient manner: '[…] no matter how categorical Sir Frank's statement [that Jews are included under the existing terms of the Bill] *the courts are guided by the words of the statute and not by Hansard*'.[118] A JDC report of 10 May 1965 indicates discussion around a 3 May 1965 Commons exchange between Soskice and Bernard Braine (see also Chapter 5 below p. 160) in which Soskice argued that Jews were protected in racial, ethnic or national terms.[119] The JDC report from June 1965 gives the Home Secretary's argument, originally given in select committee, against religion's inclusion which argues simply that it is a non-issue and states the Government's unwillingness to act but rests on ideas of origins as a backstop.[120]

Still, in 1968 the BoDs continued to argue for the inclusion of religion. The campaign resumed in a memorandum sent to new Home Secretary James Callaghan on 22 February 1968 making reference to Jordan's use of religion as an attempt to circumvent conviction and that this was not tested in the trial but that this clearly indicated a shift in antisemitic rhetoric.[121] Victor Mishcon (then Vice-President of the BoDs) led a deputation to the Home Office on 5 March 1968, and reported: 'There remained doubt as to whether Jews were really covered […] there was a strong case to make this more clear by inserting religion into the categories covered …', a note at the end of the report details that there was no reply from Callaghan on this point.[122] This unease and uncertainty of being protected even after two years of the Act's operation shows a significant lack of intersection between the current

118 'Race, Religion and Law', p. 6; my emphasis. Didi Herman has demonstrated the difficulty the courts had with applying the statute to Jews in the manner outlined by Soskice. See below pp. 54–55.

119 LMA ACC/3121/A/041.

120 'If there were evidence of interference with people in the practice of religion, and people tried to stir up hatred against the Catholics or the nonconformists or people who profess the Jewish religion, Parliament or the Government would have to reconcile the matter and if there were an evil would have to come to the house and ask for the powers necessary to deal with that evil […] Where there is clear evidence—however the propaganda is dressed up, whatever the specious arguments are—that (a person) has it in mind not to criticise a particular religion but, to use it as pretence to disguise his intention to stir up hatred against a particular section because of origin, I do not believe that any jury will have such difficulty in coming to a conclusion where the prosecution have established that intent beyond reasonable doubt. If they come to that conclusion conviction will follow' (LMA ACC/3121/A/041).

121 '[I]t is of some relevance to note that during his trial at London assizes, Colin Jordan made a brief attempt to maintain that as Jews were a religious group, criticisms of them in his publication was not an offence. He did not elaborate on this point, nor [did the judge] The possibility remains however, that at some future stage such a defence will receive rather more attention and we would therefore wish to reserve our position on this matter for the moment in regard of section 6. // Insofar as section 1 is concerned we feel there is a strong case for the word religion to be added to the categories of persons as now stated for as already mentioned there is some evidence of religious groups being discriminated against on those grounds' (LMA ACC/3121/A/042).

122 LMA ACC/3121/C/06/001/001.

Government's understanding of Jewish identity and Jewish identity as understood by members of the BoDs.

LPGPC minutes from 22 March 1968 discussed the potential amendments to the RRA 1965 that the Board might opt to push for with the Government: 'from HS. "there was no intention to give in to pressure to rescind section 6 which made it an offence to incite against race or colour" ', but also indicated that there did not seem much hope for having religion included in the terms of the new Act.[123] In standing committee on 9 May 1968, Maurice Orbach pointed out the issues with the words 'ethnic' and 'ethnic origin' especially when applied to the Jews, appealing to dictionary research and thereby demonstrating the intense subjectivity of the term.[124] A 19 May 1968 memorandum from Brotman corroborates Orbach's statement that he represented the BoDs in Committee, likely as a result of his membership of the *ad hoc* committee.[125] Callaghan's counter to Orbach's points rejects the inclusion of religion; yet, instead of arguing for a lack of evidence as Soskice had in 1965, he bases his rejection on twin arguments of matching the United Nations wording (as enacted in 1965), and that the current wording has been effective in helping the Jewish community. Discursively he utilises 'ethnicity' and 'nation' as a stopgap for those not covered by 'colour' or 'race', effectively ignoring Orbach's demonstration of the points of intersection among

123 LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/018.

124 '[T]he words "ethnic origin" are used by the Home Secretary […] on the basis of including religion. This is exactly what the Home Secretary has told the leaders of the Jewish community on repeated occasions. I feel that those two words have not been looked at by the parliamentary draftsmen. […] I have always been worried about the word "ethnic". Under "ethnic" the *Shorter Oxford Dictionary* says "the non-Israelitish nations". It also says "Gentiles" and then "pertaining to nations no Christian or Jewish" and the last definition is "heathens" […]. I then went to the *Oxford Dictionary* and I found these definitions were repeated with a further one: "Pertaining to race or races, their origin or characteristics". I should have thought that the word "race" already in the Clause covered the whole subject and that the words "ethnic origins" were tautologous. I must make it clear to the committee and the HS in this matter I speak on behalf of the Jewish community. The Board of Deputies of British Jews has asked me to say that if the Jewish Community is to be protected from discrimination—and economic discrimination in particular, which still exists in Britain—the word "religion" must be spelt out in the Bill' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403; underlining in original).

125 'Our *ad hoc* committee met earlier this month when it had before it the text of the bill and of the various amendments which had been tabled […] prominent among these were amendments tabled by members of both parties who sought to introduce the word "religion" […] in the Commons Standing Committee discussion the introduction of the word religion had been ruled out of order. Nevertheless, during the debate on the clause as a whole Maurice Orbach […] also a member of our *ad hoc* committee expressed his doubts as to whether the present wording would cover the Jewish community' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403).

these terms yet he pointedly marks out the Jewish experience as worthy of attention moving forward.[126] Likely in reply, a letter to Callaghan from Teff of 24 May 1968 reads:

> Even though you have apparently decided not to add 'religion' to the categories of persons covered by the Bill, and we are therefore still somewhat uncertain (as mentioned by Mr Maurice Orbach) about the Jewish position, we were considerably reassured by your much appreciated special reference to Jews in Committee on 9 May.

A trend emerges from these documented ministerial interactions: the BoDs, invariably, was the proactive party. What is demonstrable is that the BoDs, and no other Jewish institution, is included in the two files of 'Consultations with Organisations' which cover the period 1967–1969. Copies of the memoranda and letters above are not appended to these files in spite of their propriety as being from 'interested parties', while other bodies (the Board of Trade, the Oxford Committee for Racial Integration, Letchworth Urban District Council, and the Gypsy Council Liaison Committee) *are* included.[127]

In a box covering the LPGPC, 1972–1974, some undated Chairman's minutes cover discussions held at a meeting of the *ad hoc* committee at which the potential for a shortly-to-be introduced RRB by Lord Brockway in the House of Lords was discussed.[128] They mention

---

126 'My hon. Friend the Member for Stockport (M.O.) raised with me the position of the Jews and I would only say one words: during my lifetime the position of Jews has improved dramatically, certainly since I was a very young man, and I think that is a mark of the growing civilisation of the world and also a mark of the fact that every community is capable of absorbing and assimilating people when they have sufficient history and sufficient time to do so. […] The question of where the Jews are covered was widely discussed. In 1965 Sir Frank Soskice justified the inclusion of ethnic origins on the grounds that it was hoped that this would cover any minority group who would not come under race or national origins. He argued that the object of including the words "ethnic or national origins" was to sweep in, as it were, anybody who cannot be said to come within the previous words "race or colour" […]. However ,what we have done of course is to adopt the words that are used in the draft of the U.N. Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination. They have amended it since to add another phrase but we are using exactly those words. Although I would not argue that if it is good enough for the United Nations it is good enough for us, nevertheless […] it seems to me that it is sensible to stick to the definition that we had in the 1965 Act and which has had, on the evidence of the Jewish community, a healthy influence. When I saw the leaders of the Jewish community, they accepted, and indeed, put to me, examples where the operation of the 1965 Act had been of benefit to them. I was very glad indeed to see that it was so. //
<u>But I want to say now and on behalf of the Government and, I should think, on behalf of all parts of the Committee, that we will continue to watch the position of the Jew in this country with very great care, to ensure that as far as possible discrimination is not practised against him as against anyone else</u>' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0403; underlining in original). This speech was reported on in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 17 May 1968, p. 21.

127 TNA HO 376/20 and HO 376/28.

128 LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/019. For the records of the debate on this Bill see Hansard, HL, 4 April 1974, vol. 350 cc. 1039–78.

a meeting of 29 March with lawyers including Geoffrey Bindman, 'legal advisor to the Race Relations Board', at which they discussed the practical difficulties of pushing for religion, particularly for Jewish clubs and ultimately they declare themselves satisfied that Jews are included under the Act as is.[129]

Yet, the question was evidently not settled. On 9 May 1974 in a meeting of the LPGPC, Savitt (then JDC Chair) discussed a letter from the Race Relations Board regarding a complaint about a travel brochure and the inability of the authorities to act on the basis of references to the religion of Jews rather than their 'race', the precise concern raised in the letter to Callaghan of February 1968.[130] In 1976 the question arose again, on 3 March, in a discussion about the forthcoming RRB an LPGPC meeting attended by Savitt and Dr Jacob 'Jack' Gerwirtz discussed the persistence of the legal loophole.[131] The minutes reiterate the Government's commitment to reassess should the courts rule it necessary (though there was no indication that the travel brochure issue of two years prior had prompted such a consideration—perhaps as it referred to discrimination, not incitement. In spite of this they demonstrated that there had still been some success but that this stood to be an isolated

129 'Overwhelming majority was that although it is recognised that this would be a desirable achievement the practical difficulties both from the general point of view and also from the specifically Jewish angle make it preferable not to press for any amendment. The position of Jewish schools and clubs was a particular factor to take into consideration. There was even one comment that if the word "religion" were to be introduced it could well lead to complications within the Jewish community itself. The *ad hoc* committee was satisfied with the assurances that Jews were covered under the existing words of the Bill and therefore recommend both to this committee and the Defence Committee that no further action be taken' (LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/019).

130 '[This brochure] stated that members of the Jewish faith would not be permitted to enter Lybia [*sic*]. The Race Relations Board was unable to take action as the word "religion" was not dealt with under the Act. Mr Savitt said that there had been several instances of alleged inability of the authorities to act under either the incitement clause of the 1965 Act or the discrimination clause of the 1968 Act. The Jewish Defence and Group Relations Committee thus felt that the Government should be asked to clarify the situation. The Committee agreed that [note: this is later hand-amended to add "to consider"] that representations to clarify the position of "Jews" should be made in due course' (LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/019).

131 '[T]he general definition of groups protected by the Bills as persons of "colour, race, nationality or ethnic or national origins" might not be advantageous in that "religion" was omitted. [F. M. Landau, Chairman] referred to a paragraph in the most comprehensive review of Race Relations legislation—*Race and Law*—in which it was stated: "By excluding religion from the legislation, Parliament has left members of the Jewish community without legal protection against religious as distinct from racial persecution—ironically because the Jewish community has been the most persistent advocates of such legislation. // The Chairman said that it would be wrong to rely on the existing definition as a clever speaker could circumvent the measure by saying that he was attacking Jews as a religion' (LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/020).

example unless recognition of the Jewish understanding of Jewish identity was recognised in law.[132]

Ultimately, it appears that the issue was abandoned. A 6 April 1976 *ad hoc* committee report to the LPGPC states:

> A recommendation to the Board had been agreed that the Jewish community's interests would best be served by not pressing for the addition of the word 'religion' in the appropriate definition clauses of the Bill.
>
> The recommendation had been given on the basis of assurances by successive Home Secretaries that Jewish people were covered in the phrase '[…] ethnic or national origins', and that should the courts rule otherwise the Government would consider the matter afresh.[133]

A report in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 14 May 1976 detailed the Standing Committee debate following the Second Reading of the RRB 1976. It demonstrates a reversal of political position from 1965: Conservative MPs including William Whitelaw, Michael Alison, and David Lane argue in favour of the inclusion of religion. In reply the Government changed tack again, arguing that racial discrimination had nothing to do with religious discrimination. This further ties the legalised understanding of Jewish identity into racial discourses and dispenses with any notion that there may be a degree of intersection between the two in cases such as Jews.[134] A 17 June 1976 LPGPC report covers an Opposition amendment to include the word 'religion' in the Bill at committee stage in the House of Lords that was

---

132 'Mr Martin Savitt said that during the 1960s efforts had been made to try to get the word "religion" included and the Board had dealt at length on this point in particular when a memorandum was presented to the Home Secretary in 1965. Both the then Home Secretary, Sir Frank Soskice and his successor, Mr James Callaghan, had made it clear that it was the intention of the Government that Jews would be covered in one of the existing definitions. There had been a firm undertaking that if the courts should rule otherwise, the whole matter would be looked at sympathetically by the Government. The failure of representations on section 6 had been because of the difficulty of proving intent and in fact there had been a conviction in respect of insulting material about Michael Fidler as a "Jewish M.P.". // The Chairman said that Jews were legally neither a race nor of common ethnic origin but they were a religious sect. He felt that there should at least be private representations to the Home Office' (LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/020). Records of these 'private representations' (if any were made prior to 6 April 1976) are not extant in the BoDs' archive.

133 LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/020.

134 Reg Robinson, 'MPs clash on exclusion of religion from Bill', *Jewish Chronicle*, 14 May 1976, p. 8. Brynmor John argued that: 'the Bill was trying to combat racial discrimination and not religious discrimination as such […] "If religion is so central to our life it does not do us any good as a Parliament to deal with it by appendage to a Bill on another subject" '.

withdrawn.[135] On 23 September 1976 Baroness Vickers was named as the relevant peer: 'Lord Harris of Greenwich had expressed the Government's sympathy with the sentiment behind the amendment but had said that the proposed statute was not the place for it' reinscribing the 'right time and place' argument reported on 14 May.[136]

Why, then, was religion not included, and from whence did Governments' adamantine resistance stem? A number of potential answers present themselves from the archival evidence. A statement by Teff to the Council of Jewish Organisations in July 1966 highlights the significance of Northern Ireland.[137] This significance is reiterated in the BoDs' *Annual Report*, January 1970–April 1971. It discusses an Act, applicable to Ulster, that includes 'religious belief' in its protected categories: '[which] while obviously designed to deal with the Catholic/Protestant controversy, could also be applicable to Jews'; this attempt to open up a discursive space that Jews could utilise as a hybridising space in pursuit of this religious recognition—though with precedent, was unsuccessful.[138]

Home Affairs Select Committee minutes cover discussions that took place around the RRAs' formulation. The role of religion in the RRAs was discussed there, where practical, not philosophical, considerations, were given precedence. On 12 February 1965, the last item, 'Racial Discrimination and Incitement to Racial Hatred', was based on Soskice's memorandum (circulated to the Cabinet as C. 65 [23]).[139] Some advocated for the inclusion of

---

135 LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/020.

136 LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/020. This was also reported on in the *Jewish Chronicle* (' "All shapes, sizes and colours" ', *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 October 1976, p. 5).

137 '[W]e endeavoured to have the phrase "religious origins" introduced. Government spokesmen, probably because of the rather particular situation in Northern Ireland (that is the continued tension between Protestants and Catholics) declined to make such an insertion. […] I think it worthwhile mentioning that much of this literature is directed against the coloured people but the groups who peddle such material are in the main anti-semitic' (LMA ACC/3121/C/06/001/001).

138 LMA ACC/3121/G/01/001/47.

139 'In discussion it was pointed out that the Home Secretary's proposals did not appear to penalise discrimination or incitement to hatred on the grounds of religious belief. It might be argued in reply to a charge or racial discrimination that the person in question was refused services, not on the grounds of race, but because he was, for example, a Muslim; and in view of the attitude which the Labour Party had adopted in the past it would be expected that the provisions against incitement would protect religious as well as racial minorities. On the other hand, to include in the new offence incitement on grounds of religion would go wider than was necessary to deal with the existing evils of colour prejudice and anti-semitism, and might inhibit normal religious or political controversy to which the country was accustomed. Moreover, section 5 of the Public Order Act already prohibited the use of offensive language in a public place, irrespective of the persons attacked, if the result was intended or likely to be a breach of the peace and this should sufficiently protect religious minorities. If there was any question of extending the provision set out in Annex C of the Home Secretary's paper in this sense the Secretary of State of

religion, it might would be expected from a Labour Government, but numerous several counter arguments were made. From these, two points emerge. First, the Protestant/Catholic situation in Scotland (not Northern Ireland) was raised as a reason against the inclusion of religion, showing that the effects on Christian sub-groups was, consistently, made a reason not to include religion.[140] Quite why 'continued hostility' between two sects would be reason *not* to include religion is not explained. Possibly, the Catholic civil rights movement and Protestant reaction against it, mirrored to an extent in Scotland, offered a context into which the creation of new criminal (incitement) and civil (discrimination) procedures, would be thought to add fuel to an already smouldering fire. Second, these documents show the insistence, early on and as assured then as it would remain, that antisemitism was covered without including religion. The Cabinet memorandum only mentions 'race' and 'colour' as protected categories of persons, implying that from the start, even after significant lobbying from the BoDs over years, it had already been decided that Jews were racially, not religiously defined, shutting down any sense of hybridity that might be opened up by Jews in this discursive space.[141] The Cabinet memorandum (17 February 1965) leaves Northern Ireland and Scotland unmentioned when discussing religious discrimination, remarking only that Soskice 'doubt[s], whether in practice there is a need for legislation to deal with discrimination on religious grounds […] the Public Order Act already prohibits the use of offensive language in a public place, irrespective of the persons attacked, if the result is intended or likely to be a breach of the peace', the same line of argument used against the racial incitement legislation in years past, that had already been discredited.[142]

Frank Soskice wrote to Donald Chapman MP on 28 June 1965, and discusses including religion. He cites the recent case of *In Re Lysaght: Hill v. The Royal College of Surgeons* around the College's refusal of an endowment in Trust as the testatrix sought to fund students who were '[…] a British-born subject and not of the Jewish or Roman Catholic Faith'.[143] It was decided that while this religious discrimination was 'unamiable' that it was not against

---

Scotland would wish to be consulted in view of the continued existence of hostility between Protestants and Roman Catholics in some areas of that country. [The Home Secretary] should refer to the difference of opinion in the Committee on the question of whether the proposed measures should be applied to discrimination or to incitement to hatred on religious grounds' (TNA CAB 134/1997); the memorandum as disseminated for Cabinet discussions may also be seen at TNA CAB 129/120/23.

140 TNA CAB 134/1997.

141 TNA CAB 129/120/23.

142 TNA CAB 129/120/23.

143 See P. S. A. Lamek, '*In Re Lysaght: Hill v. The Royal College of Surgeons*, [1965] 3 W.L.R. 391', *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 4–1 (1966), 113–21 (p. 113).

public policy.[144] But, as the College was unwilling to act as the trustee on the basis of this provision, the courts struck out the provision to enable the trust to operate.[145] This opened questions of objectionable/unobjectionable discrimination and the relationship between private property and public policy. Soskice refers to the first in his letter, arguing that 'public policy will not avoid a provision based on religious discrimination, in other words, that religious discrimination is already being actively argued out of public life by the processes of common law'.[146] This argument also ignores a legal opinion from 'F.A.R.B.' in a letter to Attorney General Elwyn Jones and Soskice (16 June 1965) which argues that if religion were not included 'it would then be possible to say that such withholding of consent [on the basis of religion] cannot have been unreasonable before'.[147] This notion of the role of common law is utilised in the opposing direction in a note justifying the Government's resistance to an amendment to include religion by Reginald Freeson and Paul Rose.[148] A more comprehensive rationale is given to a corresponding amendment to clause 3 also from the pair.[149] There are

144 Lamek, '*In Re Lysaght*', 114.

145 Lamek, '*In Re Lysaght*', 114–15.

146 TNA HO 376/6.

147 TNA HO 376/6.

148 'There is no evidence that persons are being discriminated against on religious grounds in places of public resort and the amendment is therefore unnecessary. […] Any argument about alleged religious discrimination in Northern Ireland is irrelevant since the Bill does not apply to Northern Ireland […]. It has been suggested that there is a loophole [that discrimination was on the grounds of religion and not of 'race' or 'colour'] But whatever force this argument may have had […] does not survive the change of approach to conciliation […] The true motives of discrimination would be certain to be revealed in a course of conduct probed first by the conciliation committees and later, if need be, by the courts' (TNA HO 376/6).

149 'During the Second Reading debate Mr Thorpe, Mr St John Stevas and Sir Barnett Janner expressed concern that clause 3 did not include religion as one of the grounds of incitement to racial hatred. Their argument was that by omitting any reference to religion the Bill wrongly labels the Jewish community as a racial minority; that there would be a practical difficulty in identifying a person (whose family had lived here for six generations) as a Jew within the meaning of the Bill; and that a way of escape may be left open to a scurrilous abuser of the Jews who alleges that he did not mean to attack the Jews as a race but was criticising practices or tenets of the Jewish religion. // There are two elements in the clause 3 offence which are relevant to the amendment. The first is that to make out a case the prosecution must show that the accused intended to stir up hatred against a section of the public distinguished on one or more grounds set out in the clause; the second is that the matter or words used were likely to stir up hatred on one or more of those grounds. It does not follow that if it could be shown that as a matter of fact the distinction made by the inciter was wrong, or that the reactions of the persons incited were based on an erroneous distinction, the prosecution would fail. Thus, if persons are labelled as Jews because of their cast of countenance and are made the object of incitement to hatred on this basis, it does not matter that it can be shown positively that they have no Jewish connection of any sort, and the fact that their families had lived here for six generations or longer and descended from Christian converts to Judaism would also be irrelevant. Indeed, it has been claimed that any scientific examination of suggestions that the Jews (or the Germans) can be identified as

then, three pillars to the Government's professed objections. First that religious controversy is an essential aspect of contemporary life. This ignores the fact that one might very reasonably draw a legally enforceable distinction between 'religious controversy' and intentionally stirring up hatred against a religious group.

Secondly, that it is immaterial whether Jews are a 'race' or not, as it is: a) not the truth of the matter that is relevant to the issue of incitement, only what the defendant is known to have said or written and the effects thereof: that antisemitism is at its heart racial and that it conceptualises the Jewish religion as an outgrowth of Jewish 'inherent wickedness', there is no recognition of this reasoning's contradictory implication that if prejudice against the Jews is racial that Jews are made a racial group; and b) not the case that any discrimination against Jews in Britain is based on religion rather than 'race'. However, Herman shows that courts

---

separate races leads to the conclusion that they cannot be regarded as more than members of the same Indo-European ethnological group. The Bill, however, is not concerned with the true facts, but with what is said or written by the propagandist, and if he is shown to have intended to stir up hatred against a section of the public which he, however erroneously, distinguished by race, and to have used threatening, abusive or insulting words likely to stir up hatred against that section of the public on the grounds of race, he will be guilty of an offence under the clause. // The essence of anti-Semitism moreover is that it is based on racial and ethnic grounds and is not based on nationality or religion. Although Jewish beliefs and practices, like those of other creeds, such as Mormonism, are attacked violently by some people on moral or religious grounds, these are easily distinguishable from anti-Semitic allegations, which are essentially based on allegations of racial or hereditary defects, in support of which the Jewish religion (and in extreme cases baseless accusations of shocking religious practices) may be dragged in not as the cause of Jewish wickedness, but as an example or demonstration of what is said to be the inherent wickedness of the Jewish race. It does not seem possible that a prosecution would fail merely because anti-Semitic propaganda was alleged to have been no more than legitimate religious controversy. // Religious controversy is an important aspect of contemporary life, and controversy about Jewish religious doctrine and practice is as legitimate as it is about those of Mohamedanism or various Christian sects, and Sir Barnett Janner accepted that this should be so. Religion was not included in the list of prohibited grounds because it does not give rise to the same problems as racial attacks (which would include anti-Semitism) and anti-colour attacks, and it is desirable, if the Bill is to have the maximum impact, to limit the scope of the offence to the problem that actually arises. // These points were dealt with by the Solicitor General, who, in winding up on Second Reading, said that in his submission incitement or abusive language concerned with religion fell into a wholly different category from racial incitement. Both the tenets and practices of various religious denominations were the subject of violent differences and perfectly legitimate controversy. But attacks upon the Jews were directed against Jews as a race and not against those who observe the Mosaic law, and it was undesirable and unnecessary to include references to religion in clause 3' (TNA HO 376/6). Both Rose and Freeson were Jewish MPs. Freeson was quoted by the *Jewish Chronicle* in April 1965 as speaking at a meeting commemorating the 22nd anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising that 'Jews should stand up and fight also when any other minority was under attacks because of its race, colour, or religion'. For Freeson, at least, then, the inclusion of religion may not have been sought purely for the interests of British Jews. See 'London's Homage to Ghetto Heroes', *Jewish Chronicle*, 30 April 1965, p. 12.

did consider the nature of Jewish identity in their judgements.[150] Several cases include discussions of how Jewish identity fitted into the categories of the RRAs. She also shows the significant role of religion in these, indicating that no case she explores was won by its Jewish claimant, that judges invariably declared the Jews were a 'race', and that these decisions were never rationalised, simply asserted—what she calls 'judicial "common sense" '.[151]

Finally, the Government argues that antisemitism is not religious but 'essentially based on allegations of racial or hereditary defects'. First, this does not align with the previous assertion that it does not matter whether Jews are a 'race' or not as it clearly establishes the essence of hating Jews as racial, implying the essence of that hatred is racial as well. This reasoning ignores the significance in antisemitic propaganda of supposed underhand powers and influence held of Jews and conspiratorial accusations of internationalist control, not 'racial or hereditary defect'. It also ignores the significant religious history/component of antisemitism yet, Herman shows, the judiciary had great difficulty disentangling racial and religious conceptions of Jewish identity, this was highlighted in the RRB 1965 Second Reading debate by Soskice.[152] Soskice demonstrates the arbitrariness of this separation, by failing to allow for the significant role of religion in shaping Jewish forms of identity. Kenneth Lasson writes that: 'a person should not suffer because of that which he cannot change, such as his race. His political and religious beliefs on the other hand, may be fair game for criticism'.[153] This line of argument is also discussed by Anthony Lester and Geoffrey Bindman in their *Race and Law*.[154] Lester and Bindman express the irony that Jews are left without protection from religious, as distinct from racial incitement, given the significant role that British Jews played in lobbying for laws of this type. They also identify the importance of Northern Ireland in swaying the Government's rationale.[155]

In Cabinet, on 22 February 1965 Soskice commented: 'On incitement, admittedly difficult to prove breach of peace likely to be caused. But worth effort for the sake of bad

---

150 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 138–54.

151 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 142.

152 See above, *fn.* 1 (Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932–33).

153 Kenneth Lasson, 'Racism in Great Britain: Drawing the line on free speech', *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, 7:2 (1987), 161–81 (p. 167).

154 'There is an obvious distinction between the two. Membership of a religious group involves personal choice, and religious beliefs and practices are as much the subject of public controversy as political opinions […] membership of a racial group involves inherited and immutable characteristics and is not directly relevant to controversial beliefs, ideas or behaviour. A racial attack is therefore a more fundamental attack on a person's humanity than an attack upon his religion' (Anthony Lester & Geoffrey Bindman, *Race and Law* [Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972], 363).

155 Lester & Bindman, *Race and Law*, 363.

case: and has advantage of covering religion'.[156] Jones added: 'On [section] 1 we shall be pressed to add "religion". Must resist: opens too wide a field'.[157] Whether this was in reference to philosophical, practical or political terms is uncertain. Soskice's comment is also curious, given that the Bill in no way 'covers' religion. What Soskice may have meant is that including intention to breach the peace would be good even if it would lead to a bad case through which the Act was tested as it would demonstrate the inutility of adding religion to its terms, thereby 'covering' the issue of religion's inclusion. We must understand this comment in its context, religion had already been discounted in spite of lobbying from interested parties, in what sense then would legislators seek to 'cover' religion? I would suggest that by 'cover' is meant the legal basis for an argument against including religion in the law.

There is no coherent argumentative thread against the inclusion of religion in these documents: even Jones' contribution is not in itself a persuasive argument, rather a statement of priority, that the Bill should not become 'too wide'. Jones' comment contrasts with his speech at the Warsaw Ghetto uprising commemoration (presumably with a large Jewish attendance): 'We attach importance also to the declaration and proposed convention on religious intolerance which are now in the process of negotiation [at the United Nations]'.[158] There was then, no objection in principle against the State legislating against religious intolerance, the objection appears to be both practical and specific to the British context.

As Herman has demonstrated the inability of Jews to bring cases of discrimination under the RRAs, so other scholars have shown comparable results from investigations into the Attorney General's ability to bring incitement cases. Schaffer has shown that despite Soskice's argument that the incitement clauses had 'roots in "the thirties" ',[159] (clearly referencing British fascist antisemitism), that antisemitism and racist rhetoric *was* able to escape prosecution in certain cases.[160] The Race Preservation Society's publications show that 'hostility to the Jews simmered at the margins'.[161] This rhetoric did not call for violence directly but instead contained 'facts' in the guise of 'concerned citizens'. This allowed the Society's *British Independent* publication to 'leave it to the reader to draw his own

156 TNA CAB 195/25/5.

157 TNA CAB 195/25/5.

158 'Attorney-General: "We must not remain silent" ', *Jewish Chronicle*, 30 April 1965, p. 12. It is likely this was the same event attended by Reginald Freeson (see above *fn.* 149).

159 Gavin Schaffer, 'Legislating against hatred: meaning and motive in section six of the Race Relations Act of 1965', *Twentieth Century British History*, 25:2 (2014), 251–75 (p. 254).

160 See Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred', 263–68.

161 Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred', 265.

conclusions'.[162] Lasson undertook to survey incitement cases and demonstrated that only twenty ever received Attorney General consent to be brought and more than a third led to acquittal, though how many concerned antisemitism is not mentioned.[163] The Government's White Paper on Racial Discrimination of 11 September 1975 acknowledged that, 'relatively few prosecutions have been brought under the 1965 Act'.[164] While recognising developments in 'racialist' propaganda it argues for a move from legislation to public education (from the politico-legal to the cultural) to match this, transforming the issue into a 'debate' to be 'won', legitimising antisemites and racists into an opposition rather than antithetical to 'British values' as before.[165] There was, importantly, no discussion of the inclusion of religion as with the White Paper of 1965. By 1976 religion is excised from both governmental discussion and within the BoDs. A rare exception to this, and rare too as it amounts to a Jewish voice speaking against the inclusion of religion in the Bill, is Anthony Lester's analysis of the 1976 Bill.[166]

The debate around the removal of the need to prove intent in the 1976 Bill is however, also featured in the BoDs archives on the Bill.[167] The BoDs archive does not distinguish between complaints relating to incitement and complaints relating to discrimination but it would be useful for this thesis' contextualisation to discuss the complaints that were received by the BoDs, and how these relate to the preceding information.

---

162 Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred', 265–66, *fn.* 69.

163 Lasson, 'Racism in Great Britain', 170.

164 '[T]here has been a decided change in the style of racialist propaganda. It tends to be less blatantly bigoted, to disclaim any intention of stirring up racial hatred, and to purport to make a contribution to public education and debate. […] it is not an unmixed benefit. The more apparently rational and moderate is the message, the greater is its probable impact on public opinion. […] In the Government's view [the provisions of the 1965 and 1968 Acts regarding incitement] are too narrow an approach. […] It therefore proposes to ensure that it will no longer be necessary to prove a subjective intention to stir up racial hatred' (TNA CAB 129/184/18).

165 '[T]he present law does not, however, penalise the dissemination of ideas, based on an assumption of racial superiority or inferiority or facts (whether true or false) which may encourage racial prejudice or discrimination. It is arguable that false and evil publications of this kind may well be more effectively defeated by public education and debate than by prosecution' (TNA CAB 129/184/18).

166 'The explanation is a practical one. There is little evidence that religious discrimination is a serious social problem in Britain (as distinct from Northern Ireland, where the legislation applies to religious but not to racial discrimination). Moreover, the provisions of an already lengthy Bill would be greatly complicated and its passage would be made more difficult by including religion. // There would have to be a multitude of complex exceptions to take account of the special position of the Church of England, religious schools, Jewish welfare services, charities and so on' (Lester, 'How the new Race Bill affects Britain's Jews', p. 11).

167 See especially the documents (including minutes of the LPGPC meeting of 5 November 1974) held in LMA ACC/3121/C/13/001/019.

Correspondence to the Board and Jewish 'Difference' in Complaints of Antisemitism

The BoDs' was a key point of contact for Jews to voice complaints of antisemitism. Through these epistolary exchanges, one can investigate the way Jewish identity was lived for the correspondents, why Jews were mistreated, or the reasons they attributed to mistreatment, and the BoDs reasons for supporting or ameliorating the situations.

A letter of 5 February 1958 covers a comics issue of *Oliver Twist* and its use of the word 'Jew' around Fagin, 'J. Menasche', the correspondent, expresses worry that Jewish and non-Jewish children will misidentify all Jews as 'Fagins'.[168] A. D. Massel (then JDC Secretary) replies arguing that, as a classic, the issues around Fagin character have been well picked over, that people are generally aware that the stereotype is not representative.[169] He therefore offers sympathy but no action. An 8 July 1959 letter from a Jewish tourist to Stoke Poges church details comments by a tour guide that the vicarage was 'let to Jews who won't allow visitors'.[170] Upon being challenged, this changed to 'Jews or Catholics'; Massel praises her challenging flippant antisemitism.[171] It is notable that the tour guide's amendment includes a Christian religious minority, rhizomatically connecting this discourse to Jews while revealing an inability to distinguish between them. This identificatory inability (or attempt to distance) is pertinent to Chapters 2 and 3; as is the evident assumption that unwillingness to allow visitors is dogmatic or from persons opposed to or antipathetic towards the Church of England.

A 16 August 1961 letter from Massel to the London Transport Executive discusses political insignia on employee uniforms.[172] A second missive (29 August) specifies a conductor wearing a British National Party badge: 'This party engages in very better [*sic*] anti-Jewish and anti-coloured propaganda'.[173] Massel highlights that the cross in the circle symbol is graffitied with antisemitic words. Massel writes that his concern is one of Jewish safety not infringing upon free speech. His letter does not lodge a complaint but asks for the LTE's policy: 'We do not for one minute wish to interfere with the private views of your employees'.[174] An important thread thereby emerges: a concern with appearing too sensitive and of an awareness of the boundary between private proclivities and public spaces.

168 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

169 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

170 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

171 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

172 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

173 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

174 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

On 6 December 1961, 'V. S. Besso' corresponded about a comedy sketch, 'The Battle of Basher Green' from the 'The Lord Chamberlain Regrets' music hall review at the Saville Theatre, which Besso saw as 'anti-"The Jew" '.[175] Massel's 15 December reply mentions that he attended, that he and 'many thousands of our co-religionists must have seen it by now', that he found it very funny, and Besso's was the only complaint. Massel argued that the League of Empire Loyalists had complained that it misrepresented their views as violent and 'anti-colour or anti-Jewish'.[176] He implies that the sketch cannot be antisemitic if antisemitic groups are complaining (though it does also show the essential ambiguity of comedy pointed out in the Introduction here [see above pp. 18–20]). His using 'co-religionists' is also important as this is his mechanism for identifying Jews.

'Mrs D. Bourne' wrote in 1961 about her daughter Beverly being sacked for taking Yom Kippur off work after she was told she could not unless she had holiday saved, further indicating the importance of religion for lived Jewish identity.[177] Bourne argues that her daughter's mistreatment is religiously motivated rather than racial; Massel is sympathetic but reminds her that the UK has an established non-Jewish religion and a holiday on Yom Kippur is not a State obligation. He argues that having to use personal holiday time is not egregiously antisemitic and her daughter's firing is largely due to ignoring company policies.

An exchange (12–13 November 1962) between Massel and 'Mr Siddick' is prompted by the latter's son Barry's 'persecution on racial grounds' at Hoxton and Shoreditch School, leading to his father's attempt to get him into the Jewish Free School at Camden Town for which he seeks the BoDs' support.[178] No details are given about this persecution but its description as 'racial' is significant, though it is uncertain what leads to this description. Even though Massel elsewhere argues for Jews as a religious minority, he sends an internal letter enquiring about the possibility of moving Barry in the absence of any detail, clearly the idea of a child being racially persecuted prompts a degree of action, albeit seemingly only investigative as no other letters are appended.

A letter from Grafton Clarke (7 December 1963) 'implores' the Board to persuade members 'to accept negroes as tenants' if they own, or manage, London rental properties, as Clarke claims significant discrimination from Jews.[179] This desperate *cri de coeur* is

175 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

176 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

177 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

178 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

179 'It has been the unfortunate and humiliating experience of most negroes in this country and in London in particular to be denied decent living places because we were born into an ethnic group in which dark pigmentation is a dominant characteristic. […] Instead to force us to live in conditions where they can always point at us have

distinguished by Clarke positioning British Jews as part of an oppressive group rather than as also oppressed or even with liminal positionality within this framework which he sees as focused on the oppression and exclusion of an 'ethnic group in which dark pigmentation is dominant characteristic'. Clarke also intersects 'ethnicity' with 'colour' and heritability which, as this thesis consistently demonstrates is unavoidable in handling these concepts due to their minimal internal coherence. Clarke ends: 'I know you are kept busy by the problems of your own people', simultaneously reinforcing his separation of Jews and non-'White' people and acknowledging a shared history of prejudice and discrimination (or reminding the BoDs of this). David Carrington of the Public Relations Office replies with a standard holding letter.[180]

Eve Webber (6 July 1964) also writes about complaints from 'tenants, mostly of colour, of exploitation by Jewish landlords […] this would appear to be true'.[181] While there is no reply appended, it does speak to a sense of Jewish moral responsibility to utilise their liminal position to assist non-'White' people due to their own history, a sense of shame in the face of accusations of 'Rachmanism' with its concomitant discursive links to antisemitic ideas of avarice. Webber also shows the importance of religious structures and their links to a sense of Jewish self-policing by mentioning her appeal to her local rabbinate. Her phrase 'brought to heel' is also worth comment; such a phrase usually refers to dogs and the restraining of their natural instincts. Whether, Webber understands the mistreatment of 'coloured' tenants as a natural instinct of landlords, of Jews, or of humanity generally is unclear but the phraseology is provocative.

A complaint of 15 August 1964 concerns a café in Brighton; a group of six (three Jewish) patrons complained about the service and were called 'bighead' and a waitress muttered 'Jews, Jews' under her breath.[182] While there is no recognisable antisemitic discursive antecedent for the 'bighead' remark, 'Jews, Jews' directed at this group of people draws a connection between irksome behaviour (as the waitress in question defines it) and being Jewish identity. Her identification of the whole group as Jewish, whether she was unable to determine who was Jewish (if any) or if this was her shorthand annoying customers, is

---

created within many of us hatred and distrust of such magnitude that the prevailing attitudes tend to create disharmony among ourselves' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079).

180 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

181 She continues: 'In view of the growing antisemitism, I feel that there should be a meeting of the responsible Jewry in this district. I have contacted some of the Rabbinate but have not been able to call a group together. The Jewish people have a right to demand that those responsible should be brought to heel' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079).

182 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

uncertain. Both could indicate the pitfalls of conceptualising Jewish identity under frameworks that depend upon physical, behavioural or social identifying markers.

An exchange (10 December 1965 to 5 January 1966) with 'Mrs N. Bell' covers classified adverts for German and Japanese military music which Bell regards as in very poor taste given the atrocities of the Second World War.[183] A follow-up from her runs: '[…] numerous fanatical Hassidic sects in this district, by their distinct dress and demeanour fan the flames of antisemitism […] I have often thought that many of the so-called ultra-religious should emigrate to Israel'.[184] Not only does this blame Hassidic Jews for antisemitism, it also speaks to the role of Israel in the lives and identities of British Jews and alludes to the antisemitic trope of Jewish 'dual loyalty'. However, more noteworthy is Bell's connecting religious orthodoxy to Israel. This connection between religious purity and Zionism reinforces the idea of Jewish identity as fundamentally religious but still allows for ambiguity: that Jewish identity is not monolithic, with forms for Jews to live as part of British society (as Bell implies for herself) and intransigent forms. Alternatively, Bell's words might be read as seeing orthodox religion as incompatible with a majority non-Jewish Western society.

Raymond Fischer (7 April 1966) writes, objecting to the term 'Jew's [*sic*] Cemetery' in the *Geographers' Atlas of Greater London*, arguing 'it never shows the name of any other religion on its cemetery'.[185] He specifies that it is the use of 'Jew' as a noun he objects to, and publishers should be lobbied to amend it to an adjective 'Jewish Cemetery'. Carrington replies, likening it to 'Jews' College'.[186] This idea also appears in a project undertaken by Reverend William Simpson and Joan Lawrence of the Council of Christians and Jews, investigating dictionary definitions of 'Jew' and its derivations between 1969 and 1972. This appears to have been provoked by the campaign of Marcus Shloimovitz to launch a libel suit against Clarendon Press.[187] Letters to various dictionary publishers and editors including Professor G. N. Garmonsway (*Penguin English Dictionary*) on 6 April 1967; J. Liddell

183 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

184 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

185 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

186 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079. Fischer may have been prescient however, as Jews' College changed its name in 1999 to the London School of Jewish Studies; the LSJS's own site explains this as a rebranding: '[…] to secure a vibrant future as a hub of academic study and lifelong learning, catering to a wide spectrum of the community' ('About Us – A Brief History', *LSJS.ac.uk*, n.d., n.p., <https://www.lsjs.ac.uk/about-lsjs.php> [accessed 18 November 2023]). See also Raymond Apple, 'Foreword', in Derek Taylor, *Defenders of the Faith: The History of Jews' College and the London School of Jewish Studies* (London: Vallentine Michell, 2017), xiii–xvi wherein he remarks, 'the ministerial department closed down, though other adult education programs remained' (p. xvi).

187 LMA ACC/3121/04/0395.

Geddie (*Chambers' Dictionary*) of 16 February 1968; G&C Merriam on 24 March 1970; and D. M. Davin *(Oxford English Dictionary*) on 25 March 1970. Invariably the replies focus on the historical veracity of the words' meaning(s) which may have been seen as offensive.[188] Two important themes do emerge: a lack of reference to Jewish religion throughout the dictionaries as surveyed by Lawrence in her report of March 1970; and the comparisons drawn between the use of the word 'Jew' as a verb and definitions of 'Welsh' including the idea of 'running away without paying'.[189] Further to this is a letter from a Bruce Gillet (secretary of a local club) in 1970 wherein he compares the word 'Jew' to the word 'nigger' as a racial slur, which correlates with Fischer's distaste for the use of 'Jew' as a noun. Gillet goes on to write: 'I have Jews, Roman Catholics, a Sikh and several other religions represented as well as Indians and those from all quarters'.[190] This reinforces a religious foundation to Jewish identity and contrasts directly with 'Indians and those from all quarters'.

A 1967 letter from 'H. Leibovitch' complains about a nurse treating their mother saying that she could not have a kosher meal: 'Why should you Jews get to be different?'.[191] Leibovitch had secured an apology from the nurse but the hospital claimed no wrongdoing or discrimination. Massel agreed with the hospital, citing that the RRA 1965 did not cover religious discrimination, he does not detail the BoDs lobbying.[192] This speaks to several ideas: distinction as privilege, the 'Other' as having an obligation to conform to a 'host' society, that attempts to assert dietary strictures make Jews 'other' themselves.

Throughout 1967 'Schiller', corresponded about 'bullet holes', 'bomb threats', and 'murdered cats in garden' among other incidents.[193] Despite the extreme and threatening nature of these incidents (not to mention the implied presence of firearms), Massel's reply simply references 'some trouble you are having with your neighbours'.[194] Schiller describes his suspected antagonists: 'They are either Cypriots, Lebanese, Asians and, in any case, of

188 Quoted definitions include: 'Member of Hebrew race; believer in Hebrew religion; (coll.) extortionate money-lender; astute trader; miser – jew v/t (coll) defraud; cheat j.down lower (price) by haggling' (Garmonsway); 'a person of the Jewish race or religion, who has not formally embraced a non-Jewish religion, no matter whether he observes his own or does not' (also by Garmonsway); 'Jew: a usurer, an extortionate tradesman, moneylender *etc.* […] to get the better in a bargain, to overreach', 'Jewing: The wattles at the base of the beak in some domestic pigeons (supposed to have some resemblance to a hooked nose)' (*Cassels Dictionary*); 'One of the Hebrew or Jewish people, or one who follows or professes Judaism; (trans., derog., vulg.) usurer, trader who drives hard bargains; jew-baiting, persecution of Jews' (Clarendon Press).

189 LMA ACC/3121/04/0395.

190 LMA ACC/3121/04/0395.

191 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

192 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

193 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

194 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

Middle Eastern origin […]. The police in the area are not interested at all, this being a 90% Jewish area'.[195] Whether Massel and the BoDs knew Schiller as a person liable to fabricate such things (in any case this is the only missive identifiable as from Schiller), the lack of action and the downplaying of the severity of these incidents is curious, given Massel's action for Barry Siddick only a few years before. Schiller is offered no advice (not even to contact the JDC) and no internal letters regarding him are appended.

Mrs F. Wilder-Okladek wrote about an issue at Goldsmith's London University Library on 20 January 1968.[196] During a minor disagreement with another reader over borrowing a book she is met with 'Heil Hitler', when asked what that was supposed to mean, 'I repeat, Heil Hitler', the man refused to identify himself and Wilder-Okladek informed librarians who 'told him in an extremely mild and apologetic manner that he "should not use such expressions" '. She argues that 'an invective amounting to an incitement of race hatred was uttered on the grounds of a University Library and that she wished to pursue legal action under an enactment against race discrimination'. On 30 January the library stated that no action would be taken leading Wilder-Okladek to write to Massel on 25 May, arguing '[c]learly such a person is likely to corrupt young people by his MANIFEST anti-semitism, probably racial intolerance […] neither myself nor any other Jew should be subjected to the danger of such an insult'.[197] Massel replies (7 June) that nothing can be done to which she responds on 10 June asking for guidance in dealing with the Race Relations Board. Mischon (JDC Chairman) then writes 'more harm will be done at this stage in relations with the University authorities and others if this matter, which is now rather "stale" is revived'. Mishcon speaks to a sense of collective responsibility, that it is Wilder-Okladek's responsibility to see the bigger picture. Bernard Sefton wrote in 1968 to complain about his neighbours' children being noisy.[198] When he spoke to his neighbour he was told 'Hitler had been right and all Jews should be put in gas ovens'. Further, on 9 September, a porter had said similar things after Sefton complained about rubbish being swept near to his front door. Massel wrote to the manager, who replied on 18 November apologising but describing Sefton as overly sensitive and as bearing a degree of responsibility for the antagonism at the property.[199] This echoes the Brighton waitress incident with Jewish complaints being regarded

195 Briefly, compare the grouping of Cypriots here alongside 'Lebanese' and 'Asians' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079) with Georgia Brown's grouping with 'Greeks' and 'Italians' in *WATCN* (see above p. 34).

196 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

197 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079; original capitalisation.

198 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079.

199 'He is not the easiest of persons to deal with […] There is a long record of trouble in connection with which Mr Sefton cannot be said to be entirely blameless […] He makes regular complaints at the office usually

as overly fussy, sensitive, and irksome. Massel thanks the manager for putting their official position on the record.

These two last issues taken together demonstrate a peripatetic approach from the Board. 'Heil Hitler' and 'Hitler was right and all Jews should be put in gas ovens' both speak to the same idea, glorifying and justifying violence against Jews, yet, Wilder-Okladek's complaint was diminuted while Sefton's was taken up. Wilder-Okaldek's mention of going to the Race Relations Board is discouraged by Mishcon while Massel refers to it directly when writing to Sefton's property manager. This difference might be explained in a number of ways: the relative power of the alleged discriminator, institutional rather than private discrimination, the actual form of words being used as opposed to the implied meaning of them, and even outright misogyny all being possible. However, Mishcon's rationale that Wilder-Okaldek's taking her complaint further will cause issues with wider university authorities must be commented on. It speaks to a recurrent idea that pursuing justice, even for a distressing and humiliating experience, must be tempered, especially when dealing with a public institution, with some wider goal in view. There is a sense of having a responsibility to 'take it on the chin'.

The Board received from A. Krausz (16 April 1969) a response to a race relations questionnaire sent to synagogues.[200] He describes race relations as 'not our direct concern'. This rests on the idea that Jews do not constitute a 'race' or at least not one that requires policy-defined intervention, Krausz may not regard Jews as the right sort of 'Other' or 'Other' enough for a stake in race relations. He establishes a distinction between a 'race problem' and a 'colour problem' but does not elucidate this. His argument that in being 'frontline fighters' Jews would draw the ire of 'decent white natives' may be an allusion to the idea of Jews

about his neighbours. He invariably seeks immediate action and has a habit of airing his grievances to any other visitors present' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079).

200 'As a matter of principle, I return your questionnaire unanswered and would like you to convey to the committee and to the Board my strong protest in trying to become frontline fighters of a cause which is not our direct concern and can only produce great harm to ourselves. As someone who lived in a country which set up the first fascist government in the world I have unfortunately witnessed the extent Jews themselves share the blame for it. […] // In the first instance, in England there is no race problem. Please do not confuse it with the colour problem. The Black power is not a friend of the Jews and for that matter they have no great sympathy with any democratic institution. […] under no circumstances should we involve ourselves to fight their cause. // I do not have to tell our hot-headed socialist deputies the attitude of these black people towards the Jews in America. […] // We do not need nor shall we make these black people to be our champions but at the same time we are alienating the legitimate decent white natives of this liberty loving country whose future we seem to be generously giving away to the black. […] // Need we be surprised if in time to come we shall be accused of treacherous attitude in trying to turn this country into a bi-national State and reproduce those horrible and ugly scenes which are plaguing the USA?' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0080).

bearing some blame for antisemitic prejudice (seen in several of these letters), Krausz likens this to 'the first fascist government in the world'. Krausz argues that 'Black power is no friend to the Jews'. This monolithic conceptualisation of race relations as Black Power is indicative of an almost Powellite view of race relations as investing non-'Whites' with political and social power over Whites. Krausz further positions Jews as part of the 'decent white natives' he sees as under threat. Yet he acknowledges that Jewish history leads to the potential to occupy a liminal space between these groups, able to assist either against the other (in his view). Finally, Krausz echoes fears of accusations of disloyalty, though he focuses not on 'dual loyalty' but on disruptive, even seditious, disloyalty in general, of being seen as a harmful presence; he implicates the US and may be alluding to antisemitic ideas of Jewish international and international*ist* conspiracy. On 30 December 1969, he wrote again, to Samuel Fisher stating agreement with 'Deepak [*sic*] Nandy' that: ' "It would be preferable for the Jewish contribution to the problem to be in co-operation with existing projects rather than as a specifically Jewish effort'.[201] Perhaps his position was not opposition to race relations, nor to Jewish involvement, but to a leading role for Jews.

Contrasting with this is a sermon given by John D. Rayner on 20 March 1971 in Newton Aycliffe on Racial Harmony.[202] While Rayner, a key voice in liberal Judaism, historicizes 'colour' as a concept he does not subject 'race' to the same analysis though he appears to demonstrate a cultural understanding of 'race' as well arguing that Ancient Israelites recognised different 'races' but that 'the only differences that mattered' were cultural and religious. He also speaks to Jewish responsibility positioning Jews as mediators, utilising their liminality, thereby contrasting with Krausz.

Mirroring Rayner, an undated press clipping from a Glasgow newspaper discusses the first Pakistani JP Bashir Mann [*sic* 'Maan'] in a race relations panel with Reverend John Morrow and Rabbi Jeremy Rosen.[203] Rosen condemned 'anti-Genitilism', he 'spoke of a

---

201 Krausz does not specify from whence he gleaned his understanding of Dipak Nandy's views though, as he misspells Nandy's name, it may well not have been in print (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0080).

202 'If we search the classical literature of Judaism we shall hardly find a single passage which says in so many words that colour prejudice is wrong but that is because it was not seen in those terms. Colour consciousness is a relatively modern disease. The ancient Israelites were colour blind. They knew of course that there were different races and that they differed among other things in the pigmentation of their skins but it never occurred to them to regard that difference as a noteworthy one. There is no hint of embarrassment that the Cushites (from whom Moses wife came) were a negro people […]. The only differences which seemed to [ancient Israelites] to matter at all were cultural, moral and religious ones […]. The resident alien has exactly the same rights as the alien "There shall be one law for the homeborn and for the stranger who lives among you" […] The Temple was conceived as a house of worship for people of all races. […] As Jews we must begin by killing the worm in ourselves before killing it in others' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0080).

203 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0080.

situation within the community where there were many Jews who wanted to preserve Judaism merely for the sake of preserving Jews: in other words, they wanted to keep Jews together'. Rosen speaks against the idea of Jewish exceptionalism and ordination as the chosen people: 'He was critical of those who assumed there was something in Jewish genes which guaranteed a front seat in the next world'. It is interesting note the use of 'Jewish genes' here, implying a criticism of biological Jewishness and connecting this to religious significance (but perhaps also speaking to a prevalence of this idea among Jews). He also speaks to Israel, arguing that Israel is a safety net for Jews should History turn against them in their home countries, not an alternative nation but a stopgap and point of affective reference.[204]

'An Informal Approach': The Television and Radio Committee

Not only were the BoDs' cognisant of the importance not only of the political and social realms in safeguarding British Jews, but also the cultural realm, particularly broadcasting. As a means of representing Jews to Jews and non-Jews the BoDs recognised the need to identify and reduce antisemitic representations without disrupting ideas of British free speech or appearing to be too sensitive (as most replies to complaints attest) and to increase Jewish membership of advisory boards.[205] The former point is evidenced specifically in a memorandum from Diamond noting the well-known hostility of then Director-General Sir Hugh Greene, to 'anything which bears the least resemblance to what he regards as a pressure group'. He goes on to quote Greene directly: ' "nothing is to be achieved by coercion or censorship from inside the Corporation or outside" '; and concludes that: 'The ideal situation […] is one in which every BBC producer who intends presenting a programme containing a Jewish element, consults us before it finally reaches the screen'.[206] The Television and Radio Committee was set up in 1965, chaired by Teff, complaints were mainly handled by Carrington and Dight.

---

204 'On the specialist role of Israel as a refuge from anti-Semitism. […] even if a person in any country claimed they were not anti-semitic but anti-Zionist, the Jewish community in that country was threatened. "We knew in our hearts we needed a home to go to when we were told Jews go home" ' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0080).

205 The committee's remit stated that it should: 'Try to obtain informal Jewish representation on the General Advisory Councils both of the BBC and ITA. To create a unit under the Board which would be able to discuss these issues from time to time; give some thought to the Jewish image and how it is projected; and advise on points that may arise, e.g. a controversial or unsavoury item in a documentary or satirical feature or play, or by way of unbalanced news presentation. To make representations through the Board to one or more of the Authorities if the Defence Committee and the sub-committee were convinced that a particular item was prejudicial to the interests of the community; that it seriously offended against Jewish susceptibilities; or that it was unbalanced' (LMA ACC/3121/C/21/001/001).

206 LMA ACC/3121/C/21/001/001.

A 17 November 1964 letter by Adolph Brotman to Greene (copied to the BoDs) about an episode of *Meeting Point*, 'Meeting Point in Israel', of 1 November synthesises a number of prior complaints received and highlights 'distortion' in the programme and a focus on tension over the community aspects of Israeli life.[207] A representative complaint is appended from a Louise Mosely around the same time.[208] Mosely discusses the religious foundation of Jewish identity, while recognising the plurality of opinion while arguing that the programme was archaic in its representation. In describing agnostics and atheists as 'of Jewish birth', it is uncertain whether she means that they remain Jewish by virtue of their birth or that they were born Jewish but by renouncing their faith have renounced their claim to the identity speaking to the precarity of Jewish identity and its liminal relationship with the discourses being applied to it such as heredity. Several letters from September 1967 complain about the reporting of Israeli/Arab military engagements on BBC and ITV news. A letter from Carrington of 25 September 1967 to the BBC asks if their 'line' is to denigrate Israel.[209] The BBC replies with a transcript a particular phrase Carrington complains about was not in the programme.[210]

Birmingham-based ATV featured Colin Jordan on a current affairs programme (5 July 1962); when asked why he hated Jews, he responded, 'I believe all you Jews, who have a country of your own, should go and live there'.[211] Several archived letters complain about giving Jordan a platform and his implication that all Jews should live in Israel.[212] Janner wrote personally to the ITA's Bernard Sendall about this; Sendall replied that he would notify all companies that Carrington was available.[213] On 7 November 1966, Jordan appeared on Tyne Tees Television. Numerous letters are exchanged between Dight, Carrington, Massel and E.

---

207 'The short description in the *Radio Times* of the object of this broadcast indicates that the intention of Mr Werner Pelz was to look at the tensions in Israel between old and young, religious and secular […] it was a distorted view that was presented. // A prominent feature was made of the views on Judaism given by members of a secular kibbutz; there was hardly any reflection of the vigorous and intense Jewish traditional life which is the religious basis upon which Israel is founded' (LMA ACC/3121/E/02/035).

208 'Ths [*sic*] narrator, a Jew, was unsympathetic to Judaism and the impression created was that the Jewish religion was archaic and no longer represented the feelings of the Israelis or the Jewish people. // This film was certainly anti-Jewish in its tenor, and had non-Jews expressed similar views over religious Jews and Judaism it would have been held to have been Anti-Semitic. […] No-one denies that there are agnostics and atheists of Jewish birth in Israel and elsewhere but they are in a minority' (LMA ACC/3121/E/02/035).

209 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

210 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

211 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

212 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

213 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

G. Fairburn (of Tyne Tees) about the impact of airing these views unchallenged.[214] BoDs representatives argue, for Jordan's views to be censured and rebutted not for his outright banning.

Several letters and a press clipping from on or around 16 June 1974 deal with a *Man Alive* episode, 'Right to be Different'. This featured three 'foreign' students (Sikh, West Indian, and Jewish) discussing their experiences.[215] A clipped letter to an unknown periodical (possibly the *Radio Times*) from Dorothy Kenmore reads 'I've never thought of Jews as foreign before'. The editor of *Man Alive* responds: 'two white students were chosen for *Man Alive: A Right to Be Different* to indicate the sort of pressures that the West Indian, the Jew and the Sikh come up against […]. Prejudice is irrational, often unspoken'.[216]

This England: Getting on a Little (July 1966) contrasting down-and-out non-Jewish pensioners with a highly affluent, Jewish, Mrs Goldstone incurred numerous letters.[217] Carrington's replies assert that the programme was not antisemitic, but the complaints were largely about Goldstone. Renate Cohen (15 July 1966) exhorts the BoDs to: 'educate Jews to realise the infinite harm they are doing to themselves and their fellow-Jews by this kind of thoughtlessness'.[218] Frances Merton (18 July 1966), 'pointed out to [the producer of the programme] that many wealthy Mancunian Jewesses did in fact spend much of their leisure time helping others'.[219] The implication across these letters is that showing wealthy Jews creates resentment, with potential for violence. Goldstone is thought to be *gauche*, lacking a sense of community responsibility (locally and specifically as Jewish).

J. H. Kurer (3 May 1968) complained about the Israel documentary *The State of the Jews* by David Wheeler.[220] He argued that it misrepresents modern Jewish life in Israel, neglecting the communal religious life and focusing too much on the idea of dual loyalty. Jakob Sacks (7 May) says it was 'only done to take us down a peg'. Carrington wrote to Mishcon (8 May), claiming to have advised a Miss Purnell, BBC research assistant, on this programme: 'Miss Purnell's main interest was clearly the "dual loyalty", we thrashed it out interminably but eventually managed to direct the discussion into more constructive channels'.[221] It appears however that this was unsuccessful.

---

214 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

215 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/942.

216 There is no indication that the editor is aware of the irony of his statement being preceded by his drawing a distinction between 'two white students' and 'the Jew'.

217 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

218 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

219 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

220 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

221 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

David Hammond (2 July 1969) wrote to a Mr Lebenstein about journalist Marghanita Laski's appearance on *Reason to Believe*, during which she opined: 'Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were as big a lot of crooks and shysters as ever there were'.[222] Hammond remarks: '[…] she hasn't the decency to respect what all Jewry holds sacred' and that her own Jewish identity makes it worse.[223] This speaks simultaneously to the collective responsibility idea and to a religious foundation of Jewish identity.

In contrast to the relative frequency of BoDs representatives passing on complaints about non-fictional programming; letters about fictional programmes tend to receive replies that admonish them as largely spurious, overly sensitive and violating free speech. Alfred Morris wrote to Massel on 17 December 1962 about an episode of *Playbox*, specifically about a Harold Behrens character: 'most distasteful to Jews though Jews were not mentioned […] Behrens in the box spoke in broken English and waving his hands, as if he was a foreign Jew of the old-fashioned Whitechapel days'.[224] No reply is appended yet the acknowledgment that 'Jews were not mentioned' demonstrates a number of points. Harold Behren's involvement and his gesticulatory gestures were enough for Morris to read the character as Jewish and stereotypical/harmful, the use of behavioural markers to identify Jews is explored further in later chapters. Also, Morris's understanding of 'old-fashioned Whitechapel' contrasts with Georgia Brown's nostalgia (see above pp. 33–36). For Morris, Jews have left these behaviours in the past and they cannot be said to mark contemporary Jews (ironically what he himself does). This distaste for gesticulation and stereotyped performance recurs in a 15 January 1964 letter about *My Son the Doctor*,[225] and on 22 December 1969 Paula Deutsch complained about *Dixon of Dock Green* and Sidney Tafler as Mr Green: 'a most convincing performance of what our enemies call a "typical Jew" '.[226] Deutsch references 'a Jewish stereotype with what is usually accepted to be a cockney-Jewish accent'. Carrington replied that he saw no antisemitic intent in either programme

The term 'Jew boy' elicits many complaints. *Softly Softly*'s use of 'Jew boy' is a case in point.[227] A 9 February 1968 letter describes a detective trying to intimidate a suspect and says: 'You always did everything in your wife's name like a Jew boy preparing for bankruptcy'.

---

222 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

223 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

224 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

225 '[It] promotes bad feelings […] makes a laughing stock of the Jewish people […] what with the continuous use of the hand gestures every time the actors spoke a word which we all know is not really characteristic of our people nowadays' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330).

226 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

227 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

Many included press clippings cover Janner's complaint about this also.[228] Yet there was no outcry about *The Thoughts of Chairman Alf*, written by Johnny Speight in 1973, which reads: 'Nowhere in the world is there a woman Prime Minister. Except in Israel—yer Goldwyn Meyer [*sic*]. And that's only because her husband, being Jewish, put the country in his wife's name'. This book was advertised and reviewed in the *Jewish Chronicle*, yet nothing was made of this similar joke.[229] Carrington wrote to ATV (3 June 1964), complaining about a line in 'The Brick Umbrella' (part of *Drama '64*): 'Jew-boys with long noses, long enough to hang keys on'.[230] Lew Grade's reply encloses an earlier response to a Walter King in which he clearly attempts to implicate dramatic irony and satire to disavow any antisemitic intent in the line.[231] Leon Newmark (11 January 1971) complained about the use of 'Jew boy' in 'Tales of Piccadilly: Behind the Spearmint Sign' part of ITV *Saturday Night Theatre* (9 January): 'The play was not concerned in any way with Jewish, Christian, Moslem or any other religious or racial matters'; indicating perhaps an acceptance that Lew Grade's response might be thought to hold water were the subject matter appropriate.[232] In a 14 January 1971 letter to 'Behind the Spearmint Sign's' producer, Jack Williams, Massel highlights another 'jewboy' usage in the episode, regarding the non-repayment of debt.[233] He too, indicates that were the subject matter different, the complaint might not stand.

Several press clippings concern 'The Nineteenth Hole' an episode of the *Ten Commandments* written by Bill Macilwraith about golf-club antisemitism.[234] Nancy Banks Smith's *Guardian* review (7 April 1971) itself contains problematic assertions about Jewish behaviours.[235] No letters about Banks Smith's separation of Jews from good manners are

228 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

229 *Jewish Chronicle*, 14 September 1973, p. 29. See also Johnny Speight, *The Thoughts of Chairman Alf: Alf Garnett's Little Blue Book; Or, Where England Went Wrong* (London: Robson Books, 1973), 83–84.

230 'The remark was in its stupidity and bigotry, meant only to portray the particular character in a derogatory way. It was not intended to reflect in any way on the Jewish people. The average viewer would have fully understood the author's intention – to express his personal disapproval of a type of insidious mentality that, unfortunately, persists in contemporary society' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330).

231 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

232 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

233 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

234 'Had this phrase occurred in a factual programme it would obviously have been difficult to edit the filming thereof so as to remove such offensive terminology, but here would appear to be little excuse in deliberately introducing such wording when in point of fact none of the characters concerned were Jewish' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330).

235 'Willy and Madge, the Jewish couple, were, I thought, written and played with such impeccable manners and restrained good breeding that it eliminated not only any suggestion of Jewishness but any sense of humanity too' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330).

extant, several however, highlight the Jewish couple only having Jewish friends, as a harmful idea, including Benny Green's (16 April 1971).[236] He connects it to ideas of Jewish isolation as an 'inaccurate portrayal' of Jews adopting a servile 'cap in hand attitude' to non-Jews.

Mrs Reginald Graham (23 November [1973 from cross-referencing with the BBC's historical schedule database]) wrote about *The Triumph of the Will*'s (Leni Riefenstahl, 1934) broadcast on that Friday night.[237] She, 'feels there are dangers from such films giving ideas where none exist […] I saw last week's programme which was I think "Jew-suss" [Veit Harlan, 1940] – I believe you have already been involved in some reports on this with Jack Barnett'. Understandably, concern surrounds the broadcast of Nazi propaganda during the Jewish sabbath (though this latter piece of context is absent in the letter). Phillip Jenkinson's review in the *Radio Times*' section 'This Week's Films', describes the film glowingly and, strangely, in verse: 'Perhaps the young ones looking in will scarce believe the scenes therein; the power, the pomp, the music bold that grabbed the senses and then told of Brave New Worlds of light and Joy'.[238] Adulatory tone aside, there are no extant letters about this description, nor does it seem Mrs Graham's complaint was taken up, there are no follow-up letters appended.

A small number of letters broach the issue of comedy, and speak to its essential ambiguity in relation to an already protean Jewish identity. On 28 June 1971, Malcolm Hulke (prolific screenwriter of *Doctor Who* serials) wrote to Abraham Marks about an episode of *The Comedians* containing 'a veritable deluge' of antisemitism.[239] Carrington took up this

---

236 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

237 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/942.

238 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/942. A scan of this page is available as part of a tweet. See @woodg31 (18 November 2018), <https://twitter.com/woodg31/status/1064200876628369408/photo/3> (accessed 16 August 2023). The meter and rhyme of the words is evident and, given the subject, odd, but I have been unable to find any source from which it may have been taken, opening up the possibility that it was written intentionally by Jenkinson for this film.

239 'God offering the Ten Commandments to the Romans and then to the Pharisees and then finally to the Jews. Moses asked "How much", God said they cost nothing. Moses: ' "Give us ten". // Arab found dead in a Leeds backstreet with 87 stab wounds in the back. The Jewish coroner said it was the worst case of suicide he'd ever seen. // Jew finds a wage packet, looks miserable. Why miserable when he's just picked up £32 in the street? "Look at the tax I'm paying". // One of my best friends is a Jewish salesman. I don't mean he sells Jews, he's not that good. They're clever talkers. He sold a milking machine to an Arab farmer who only had one cow. He took the cow as a deposit. He's a bit mean, turns the gas out when he wants to turn his bacon over. When he's playing dominoes in a pub, he won't knock in case the waiter comes […] I have been supplying funny stories to a top American television comedian. His one rule is no racism unless it improves inter racial harmony. Which somehow proves that racism is never necessary in the joke business' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330).

complaint writing to John Hamp on 22 July 1971.[240] Hamp replies on 10 August: 'I am glad that you are not suggesting the total exclusion of Jewish jokes because as you rightly point out they are enjoyed by most Jewish people'.[241] Aside from misrepresenting Carrington's point, Hamp echoes arguments in defence of comedies like *TDUDP*, that if Jewish people laugh at them then the jokes are not antisemitic. Their exchange is, in microcosm, the essence of the tension within comedy studies as it relates to power and exclusion. While Carrington points to the social role that comedy does (should?) have, Hamp argues that 'punching down' is more a matter of perspective.

Two complaints from Oscar Deutsch (31 March 1963) and Peter Prager (1 April 1961 [likely a typo given its content]) relate to Bernard Levin's phrases, 'Jew who came in early childhood from Russia' and 'the Jew Clore' in a monological reference to businessman Charles Clore on 30 March's *That Was The Week That Was*.[242] Dight expresses surprise to both men's reactions: '[…] what he was trying to say was that he hoped that the time will come when calling a man a Russian Jew would mean no more than saying he was a man'.[243] These were evidently not isolated complaints, a transcript of Levin's response, aired on 6 April 1963, is also appended.[244] He argues that complaints about criticism of Jews is as much a form of racialism as placing moral value on skin 'colour'. He argues that had Clore been

240 '[We] do not want to be over sensitive but these jokes do little to promote racial harmony. […] Jewish people have a wide sense of humour, are able to tell jokes about their own alleged idiosyncrasies and similarly accept jokes told about themselves when told by Gentiles' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330).

241 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

242 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

243 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

244 'Jew. Yes, the emotive content of that word is clear from the slightly embarrassed expression that appeared on a number of the faces in front of me when I used it. […] others have declared it must have been written by a follower of Hitler (It was as a matter of fact, though I don't think that it is relevant, written by a Jewess) […] why in a sketch about Mr Charles Clore, mention that he is a Jew at all. The answer is very simple. We mentioned the fact that he is a Jew because he is one. If he had been an Irish Catholic we would have mentioned that. […] Anti-semitism does not consist of using the word Jew. It does not even consist of using the word Jew irrelevantly. It is an attitude of mind that regards a Jew as being in some way fundamentally different because they are Jews from other people. There are of course many corollaries to this belief. Its most widespread form in the modern world is the belief that people with black skins are in some fundamental way different from those with white ones. Others believe that Catholics or freemasons are responsible for all the evils in the world. […] Should we refrain from criticising any Jew or any negro or Catholic on the grounds that uncivilized persons may be listening? Is this not also a form of racialism? A subconscious argument that whereas an ordinary person is fair game for criticism a member of one of these minorities is somehow not? Or is it seriously contended that a certain particular Jew or negro if he is criticised is tantamount to suggesting that all Jews or negroes are whatever the criticism may be directed at? […] Does thou think that because thou are virtuous there shall be no more Jewish jokes?' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331).

Irish Catholic that would have been mentioned. Levin clearly attempts to normalise—perhaps even reclaim—the word 'Jew' as descriptor yet this necessitates overlaying its historical context, clearly unpalatable to many.

A 'Mr Kirk' complained about 'The Stationary Tenants' episode of *Mickey Dunne* (17 July 1967) having 'highly unnecessary references to the Jewish religion and community'.[245] Kathleen Haacke at the BBC replied on 27 July 1967: 'Mr Frankau […] hopes he is right in imagining you would not like to see all Jews portrayed as paragons of perfection. […] The Jewish actors taking part in the programme found no offense, and neither did Mr Frankau, who is himself Jewish'.[246] Carrington writes on 31 July 1967, quoting, ' "I ain't paying out money for nothing. It's against my religion" '.[247] Carrington argued that the play did not require the landlord to be Jewish.

Two archived letters deal with the specific comedies under examination here containing some valuable points that demonstrate the significance of the works for the purposes of this thesis. A letter from an Isaac Woolf, 28 September 1972,[248] elicits a reply from Massel on 2 October 1972.[249] Minutes from the Committee's meeting of 19 December 1971 detail that: 'An informal approach had been made to the producer of *TDUDP* following snide remarks about his fellow Jews made by a character portraying a Jewish taxi driver'.[250] The minutes give no detail as to how many complaints were received about the programme, only one is

---

245 'Genuine comedy can be taken very well by members of the Jewish community but one would have thought that the writer of the episode should have progressed sufficiently in his profession so that he need not rely on this type of prejudiced comedy that should have died with Hitler' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331).

246 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

247 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331.

248 'I write to enquire whether you are concerned to take action […] regarding last night's episode of *Till Death Us Do Part* in which "Alf Garnett" figured. // You probably had many letters concerning this so I will not go into full details. I will just register my deepest disgust at the effrontery of Harold Behrens' lines as the Jewish (so-called) taxi-driver ("There are more Jews in Bournemouth than there are in Israel") This is harmless compared to his statement that "They go dahn [*sic*] to the Cash and Carry, buy a chicken, stick a seal on it that they buy for tenpence and sell it for kosher". This stinks in the nostrils. Behrens and Mitchell must be renegade indeed to mouth this rubbish to a listening world—and we all know the hostile ears that will make whatever capital they can from the statements. I understand the BBC has a thriving export trade in films; who knows where the damage will end. And this at a time when it is more necessary than ever to preserve our collective image. // The BBC must be made to realise that they have burnt their fingers' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331).

249 'Strangely enough we have had very few complaints about this programme. There were two telephone calls on Thursday and your own letter. // Having said this I was informed by the Chairman of the Radio and Television Committee that he too considered the attitude of the taxi driver to be in bad taste. […] whilst appreciating the normal aim of this programme is to expose bigotry, in this particular instance it seems to have been most inopportune for a Jewish character to denigrate his fellow Jews' (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0331).

250 LMA ACC/3121/C/21/001/001.

present in the archival holdings. The episode itself is notable for the number of jokes about Jews and misrepresentation of their practices, yet it also features the slur 'Ikey', directed at Garnett by the taxi driver when he leaves without tipping.[251] This use of an established slur is not mentioned in the complaint about the episode, perhaps because it is self-evidently offensive (in the manner of 'jew boy').

Finally, Alfred Morris wrote on 15 January 1971, unfortunately this lacks any substantive content, implying that Morris felt his complaint was self-evident:

> Dear Sir, What is the opinion of the Chairman of and Committee of the television programme of Jewish bad taste shown on ITV on Tuesday 12th January 1971 7pm called 'Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width'? What does the committee intend to do about this?[252]

Massel writes the next day informing Morris that Mishcon has been made aware.[253] The episode closest in broadcast date to this letter, 'The Not so Kosher Cantor', features an Irish character taking on the role of Cantor within a synagogue in a farce typical of the sitcom, is among the more innocuous episodes.[254] This leads to the idea that the plot itself was distasteful which is more noteworthy when one recalls that it mirrors the plot of an earlier episode in which a Jewish character dresses as Father Christmas, which no letters in the BoDs archive reference. Yet, Morris' is identified for discussion in the Committee minutes on 18 January 1971.[255] There is an implication of a theme in the complaints to lobby for the cancellation of the programme but that the BoDs disagreed though agreeing it was distasteful. What this may be taken as showing is the foundational relationship between ideas of Jewish identity among contemporary Jews and religion.[256]

Conclusions

251 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.3 'Holiday in Bournemouth' (27 September 1971).

252 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

253 LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0330.

254 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.5 Ep.5 'The Not so Kosher Cantor' (12 January 1971).

255 'Complaints had also been received with regard to the comedy programme [*Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*], but the Chairman felt that whilst it was proper to raise any serious question of "taste" in an unofficial communication to the authority, it would be nonsensical to try to stop the programme as such. The Committee agreed' (LMA ACC/3121/C/21/001/001).

256 The *Jewish Chronicle* around the same date of this transmission and complaint makes no mention of any controversy, John Bluthal is mentioned on 12 January, as part of his being present at the Kingston and District Progressive Jewish Congregation ('TV star meets fans', *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 January 1971, pp. 20–21).

The BoDs exhibited a relatively consistent and coherent position on the RRAs 1965–1976. Through figures like Barnett Janner, A. D. Massell, Adolf Brotman, Solomon Teff, Paul B. Rose, Maurice Orbach, John Dight, and Victor Mishcon it engaged with State processes and lobbied for a Bill prior to 1965 and attempted to have religion included in its terms until 1976 when this was considered only briefly internally. The BoDs understanding of Jewish identity was clearly rooted in religion, there was scepticism that Jews would be considered protected by the Bill were it not included. This view was rejected by repeated Governments, Jews were understood to be a racial minority, due to the implication of such inclusion on the Acts and their enforcement. Outside of the BoDs, in the press and in correspondence to the BoDs, the understanding of Jews as a religious minority was less universal but still widespread.

This chapter has also covered correspondence to the BoDs from British Jews. What this has shown is the consistency of antisemitic activity and the—relative—inaction of the BoDs in many cases, even discouraging correspondents from appealing to the Race Relations Board. Discursively this correspondence has demonstrated the patchiness, among Jews and non-Jews, of the religious foundation of Jewish identity, there is far greater variegation in the correspondence *to* the Board than *from* the Board regarding the extent to which Jews are a religious group. A number of other threads presented themselves: the sense of community self-policing, fear of being seen as over sensitive, a consistent debate over how Jews should position themselves in relation to ideas of 'White'/British and 'Black'/non-British within the race relations framework, a desire for representation of Jewish life as it is liked now and not based on 'old fashioned' stereotyping and a concern around balancing British ideas of free speech with avoiding a 'slippery slope' of normalising harmful speech. In its work on broadcasting, the BoDs was evidently more willing to pursue non-fictional programmes for comment while, fictional and entertainment programmes largely were interpreted as non-antisemitic, if distasteful.

Utilising Bhabha here ties this historical evidence together. What is apparent from the BoDs archives that the BoDs attempted to open up a third space for contact between Jews and the British State through their letters. They attempted to establish a discursive space into which Jewish identity as religiously founded could be incorporated into British law. Ultimately this was unsuccessful. As the foregoing chapters will demonstrate, parliamentary debates were also a site for this attempt to inject religious identity into the law and also open and frame a discursive third space. The BoDs were keen to avoid the racialisation of Jews and attempted to force open a discursive space for a more nuanced form of identity that nevertheless required protection from incitement and discrimination, State documents have shown however that the overriding concern of the State only served to shut these down. Perhaps what the correspondence to the BoDs shows is the workings of a third space against

this more nuanced understanding of Jewish identity, there is an undercurrent of Jewish understanding themselves as a non-religious form of identity and instead incorporating Jewish identity into discourses of ‘race’, ‘nation’, and ‘ethnicity’. What the foregoing chapters will show is the workings of each of these discourses (along with ‘colour’) and how a more successful third space was found in the genre of television given so little attention by the BoDs.

2

'As far as we are concerned a Jew is a black man'[257]
'Colour' and 'the Jew'

'Colour' was the primary criterion of RRA 'protectees': it is given primacy in the legislation, successive Home Secretaries reiterated this,[258] and Baroness Birk, not then part of the Government but a Labour peer, made this primacy explicit while distinguishing between the protection of immigrants and of 'coloured people'.[259] Her statement acknowledges the driving force of the RRAs and provides a suitable frame for this chapter. It shows the primacy of 'colour', juxtaposes this with 'whiteness', and it separates 'immigrant' from 'colour'. This chapter will show, using Bhabhaian analysis, that this way of understanding/producing difference locates 'the Jew' problematically. First this chapter establishes the RRAs' reinscribing and legalisation of a 'Black' *vs* 'White' binarism within which all forms of 'difference' are subsumed, racialised, and classified. It will then historicise the dynamic position of 'the Jew' in relation to 'blackness' and 'whiteness' in the Anglosphere. Next, it will show the persistence of this precarity in the RRAs' debates. Next, it will place parliamentary sources in a wider context of political discourse, implicating the contemporary far-right. It closes with the ways in which *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* engage with Jewish 'colour'. It argues that relative silence around Jewish 'colour' in Parliament was of no utility in combatting far-right ideas; this contrasts with the sitcoms. Sitcoms are interrogative opening up ambiguous spaces through mechanisms of humour and disavowal within which Jewish hybridity and liminality may be established and utilised to disrupt otherwise harmful ideas of 'colour'. Relative parliamentary silence and lack of argumentation only reify the position of 'the Jew' as liminal and precarious, the lack of argumentation in Parliament opens up a political discursive space which far-right discourses may fill.

---

257 Colin Jordan, quoted in Paul Jackson, *Colin Jordan and Britain's Neo-Nazi Movement: Hitler's Echo* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 87.

258 Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 53–67.

259 '[P]eople who have been talking round or about or against the Bill have carefully used the word "immigrants" and have kept off the word "coloured"; whereas what I think we all know and should accept and face frankly is that this Bill is about coloured people. It is not about immigrants as immigrants; it is about people who are coloured, people who are dark—dark in different shades perhaps, but who are not the same colour as white people' (Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 132).

'Black' *vs* 'White' Binarism

If the RRAs are conceptualised, *à la* Foucault, as exemplifying power-knowledge, the RRAs' establishment of a simplistic, homogenised, and immutable 'Black' *vs* 'White' binarism which explains, encapsulates, reinscribes, and legalises 'difference'—thereby creating an opposition between 'Black' and 'White'—is key. Herman has shown this artificial juxtaposition within the 'race relations narrative'.[260] It is so pervasive that it structures even the majority of academic work on race relations, leaving many racialised encounters unexplored with some key exceptions.[261] This chapter combines these ideas with Paul's work on 'elite-led' racism.[262] The prior chapter demonstrated the importance of antisemitism in prompting the RRAs, yet early race relations scholars, who largely informed the formulation of the RRAs, demonstrate, Herman argues, an overriding focus on 'colour'. John Rex, Michael Banton and others deal only with 'colour' difference and discrimination, marginalising forms of difference outside this or homogenising them within it.[263]

The RRAs were justified in Parliament by levels of racially-motivated violence against non-'White' people and Jews and the need to make this a specific offense.[264] The POA 1936, developed in response to antisemitic violence, was devoid of any racial content, relying only on an intention to breach the peace as determining an offence.[265] Soskice made this 'colourisation' of legislation explicit in introducing the RRB 1965.[266] The primacy of skin 'colour' as a marker of difference in the 'race relations narrative', is evident across political and cameral boundaries.[267] Some parliamentarians, mostly on the Right, speak also to a

---

260 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 126–28.

261 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 4–6 (p. 4 *fn.*15); *cf.*, Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 4 *fn.*16.

262 Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*, 139–40 & 175–76.

263 See Michael Banton, *White and Coloured: The Behaviour of British People Towards Coloured Immigrants* (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. P., 1960); John Rex & Robert Samuel Moore, *Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook* (London: Oxford U. P., 1979 [1st ed. 1966]).

264 See Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1039; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1044; Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 83–84; and Hansard, HL, 15 November 1976, vol. 377, c. 1095.

265 *Public Order Act 1936*, ch. 6 (Edw. 8 & 1 Geo. 6). See also *Race Relations Act* 1965 ch. 73, §6 (1–3); and Hansard, HL, 15 November 1976, vol. 377, c. 1095.

266 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 942.

267 See Hansard, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 928; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 932; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 942; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1013; Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1027; Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1043; Hansard, HC, 16 December 1965, vol. 738, c. 926; Hansard, HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c. 925; Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1857; Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1860; Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1883; Hansard, HL, 7 June 1967,

binarism in arguing that the RRAs created a racially-specific offence that only 'White' British people might commit—without enjoying equal protections.[268] Research has shown that while, in principle, they were wrong, in practice civil were cases were, most often, brought by plaintiffs categorised as 'Black' against defendants categorised as 'White'.[269] Collaborating this are several examples from Hansard wherein discrimination against 'Whites' is dismissed or mocked as demonstrating the RRAs' inutility.[270] Race Relations Board reports also bear this out; reinforcing that one's status under the RRAs was largely framed by one's 'colour'.[271] Consequently, within the framework outlined by the RRAs, 'colour' became a codified, legalised form of 'difference'. 'Colour' becomes synonymised with 'difference' through the formulation and operation of the RRAs which would have particular relevance for the historically contested idea of 'the Jew'.

To discursively encapsulate all forms of difference, the 'Black' *vs* 'White' binary also homogenised its binary categories. There is scant indication that politicians conceptualised

---

vol. 283, cc. 449–50; Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, c. 104; Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 43; Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 51; Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 89; Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 132; Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, cc. 1630–31; and Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, cc. 1670 among others.

268 See Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 954; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1009; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1022; Hansard, HC, 16 December 1966, vol. 738, cc. 915–16; Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1882 for representative examples.

269 See Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 138–42; Sheila Patterson, *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain 1960–1967* (London: Institute of Race Relations [assoc. Oxford U. P.], 1969), 89 & 93–94. See also *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1966–67*, House of Commons Papers no. 437 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1967), 29–31; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1967–68*, House of Commons Papers no. 262 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1968), 35–38; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1968–69*, House of Commons Papers no. 270 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1969), 46–49; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1969–70*, House of Commons Papers no. 309 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1970), 47–50; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1970–71*, House of Commons Papers no. 448 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1971), 43–46; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1971–72*, House of Commons Papers no. 296 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1972), 46–54; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1972*, House of Commons Papers no. 297 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1973), 27–38 (esp. pp. 27–30 for a quantitative analysis of complainants); *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1973*, House of Commons Papers no. 144 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1974), 40–44; *Report of the Race Relations Board for 1974*, House of Commons Papers no. 409 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1975), 34–41; and *Report of the Race Relations Board January 1975–June 1976*, House of Commons Papers no. 3 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1976), 45–56 for qualitative analyses of cases brought to the Race Relations Board in these years.

270 Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, cc. 338–39; Hansard, HL, 25 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 1332; Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, c. 54; Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, c. 67.

271 See above *fn.* 267.

discrimination *within* 'Black' or 'White', groups only between them.[272] On 15 July 1968, Lord Elton explicitly stated this, homogenising the difference of West Indians with South Asians and failing account for their divergent histories and cultures.[273] Elton provided two pairings of groups who share almost no similarities other than not being 'White' (even such a distinction as that is not universal) speaking to a single, monolithic, 'coloured'/'Black' group within which Elton and many others could not distinguish between its constituents. Elton expressed the hope that discrimination between be recognised in the RRA 1968; it would not, the law would simplify (or rather *distort*), the racial makeup of the UK, substituting nuance for utility.[274]

Also indicative of homogenisation is the consistency of terminology in parliamentary debates; the terms 'coloured people', 'the coloured man', 'the Black man', or 'Black people' abound as shorthand for all 'protected' individuals. There is a concomitantly consistent verbiage for 'whiteness': 'Whites', 'White people', and 'White British' (at its most specific) that also glosses over its historical variegation. As with Elton, there are some references to 'West Indian', 'Pakistani', 'Indian', 'Irish', 'Jewish', and 'Gypsy' but skin 'colour' is overwhelming in its use as a sign. Consequently, 'Black' and 'White' are invested with additional discursive meanings of 'Otherness' and 'Sameness', becoming value-laden and tied in to epistemologies of the 'Other'. Consequently, the 'Black' *vs* 'White' binarism, becomes a metonymic Other *vs* Same binarism. Lord Strange, in 1966, perpetuates the separation of 'colour' and British by juxtaposing them, declaring that when one is British one is not 'coloured', there is no discursive space in Strange's statement for hybridity.[275] Yet, another reading is possible, Strange's intervention acknowledges the potential intersection of 'race' with ideas of 'nation', tacitly revealing the potential space within which hybridism might develop but he does not take this further. 'Black' *vs* 'White' binarism manufactured a simplified and distorted understanding of race relations in Britain, shutting down the potential for variegated and hybrid identities that exceed and slip its conceptual bounds. It seeks to tessellate the entirety of difference to allow no gaps within which individuals may mark out

272 For a rare example of a contemporary parliamentarian diverting from this discourse see Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, c. 150.

273 '[I]t would test the wisdom of a Solomon to distinguish between ethnic characteristics and ethnic origins, perhaps particularly when it comes to Indians discriminating against West Indians, or West Indians discriminating against Pakistanis' (Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 108). Elton's use of Solomon might be read as a, likely unintended, poetic use of a Jewish figure as a negotiator of difference.

274 Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 108.

275 '[O]ne thing I think it is important to realise is that in this debate speakers over and over again talk about coloured workers and coloured people, Blacks. These people are British. When they are in this country they are British' (Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, cc. 1888–90).

their own identifies. Thus, it overlays the significant heterogeny between the groups that were colourised as 'Black' constituted the 'protected' 'Black' grouping. This process was particularly salient for the Jews, a group with a lengthy history of liminality within this discourse.

What's 'Black' and 'White' and 'Read' All Over?

The history of how colonial 'colour' discourse has intersected with the historically contingent set of discourses comprising 'the Jew', is well-trodden.[276] These studies have shown a gradual problematizing and 'whitening' of 'the Jew's' 'colour'. Usually utilising the Jewish body as a 'text' to be 'read', this process of 'signifying' engages reciprocally with constructions of 'the Jew'. Yet the idea of Jewish difference has persisted, from which it is surmisable that Jewish difference has become implicated in discourses outside 'colour'.

The Jewish body has historically been read as 'Black' within a predominantly European discourse. Jay Geller, in his studies, particularly of nineteenth/twentieth century Germany has explored 'blackness' in literary representations of Jews. Artur Dinter's, *Die Sünde wider das Blut* (1917) described a 'dark, beautiful, Jewish-looking boy'.[277] Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, described Jews as 'black parasites'.[278] Sander Gilman has explored similar ideas throughout Europe and historicised these ideas, relating them to ideas of 'the Jew' as diseased (specifically syphilitic).[279] Geller goes further, arguing for historical antecedents in Hellenic Egypt.[280]

Few examples, in this literature, however, come from Britain and 'the Jew' as 'Black' idea appears to founder. Early twentieth-century British reactions to large-scale Jewish

---

276 For studies of the relationship of Jews to ideas of 'blackness' and 'whiteness' see, among others, David Gillota, 'The New Jewish Blackface: African American Tropes in Contemporary Jewish Humour', in *Jews and Humor*, ed. Leonard J. Greenspoon (West Lafayette: Purdue U. P., 2011), 225–36; Charles Hersch, ' "Every time I try to play black it comes out sounding Jewish": Jewish jazz musicians and racial identity', *American Jewish History*, 97:3 (2013), 259–82; Richard Howells, ' "Is it because I is black?" Race, humour and the polysemiology of Ali G', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 26:2 (2006), 155–77; Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Colour: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard U. P., 1998); Michael Lerner & Cornell West, *Jews & Blacks: A Dialogue on Race, Religion and Culture in America* (London: Plume [assoc. Penguin], 1996); Pelligrini, Ann, 'Whiteface Performances: "Race", Gender and Jewish Bodies', in *Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish Cultural Studies*, ed. Jonathan Boyarin & Daniel Boyarin (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1997), 108–49.

277 Jay Geller, *The Other Jewish Question: Identifying the Jew and Making Sense of Modernity* (New York: Fordham U. P., 2011), 119; Geller's translation.

278 Geller, *The Other Jewish Question*, 130; Geller's translation.

279 See Sander Gilman, *The Jew's Body* (New York/London: Routledge, 1991), 99–101 & 171–75.

280 Geller, *The Other Jewish Question*, 95.

migration from Eastern Europe leading to the 1905 Aliens Act, invariably locate Jews within a discourse of 'alienism', a but there is little indication of any connotation to 'colour'.[281] Glover's work on reactions to Jewish migration shows while 'alien' became synonymous with 'the Jew', this largely located Jewish difference outside 'colour' discourse.[282] Olive Christian Malvery, in a 1905 report on migrants for *Pearson's Magazine*, referred to 'Russian Jewish' and 'Polish Jewish' migrants.[283] They are described as 'tall and strikingly beautiful', 'attractive', and 'fine'—not words utilised in connection with 'blackness' post-1945.[284] Glover's work on contemporary literature and theatre demonstrates little reference to 'colour', rather morphology, comportment, and hygiene in representing 'the Jew'.[285] Arnold White, among the most vociferous contemporary antisemites, did not refer to 'colour' in his attacks.[286] John Garrard, demonstrated similarities between reactions to Jewish and New Commonwealth (what he termed 'coloured'—itself a notable distinction) immigration, 'colour' was not among them.[287] Only a few decades prior however, the 1806 engraving 'The Jew Beauties' represents two figures with dark skin 'colour'.[288] There is then, some indication that even in Britain there was a development toward viewing 'the Jew' as 'White' and that this took place, perhaps earlier than elsewhere on the continent.

Gilman has argued that the 'whitening' of 'the Jew' was driven by the American assimilatory experience and increasing levels of public hygiene.[289] He has also explored these ideas through Franz Kafka's work and the idea of the Jew as a 'white negro'—as between 'White' and non-'White'. Kafka, in a 1920 letter to Milena Jesenská wrote of the non-Jewish

---

281 Comprehensive studies of the topic by David Glover, John A. Garrard, and Bernard Gainer all lack any reference to the 'colour' of the Jewish migrants of the period in their descriptions of reactions to them.

282 David Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de Siècle England: A Cultural History of the 1905 Aliens Act* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge U. P., 2012), 2–4

283 Olive Christian Malvery, 'The Alien Question II.—The Promised Land', *Pearson's Magazine*, 19 (1905), 525–32.

284 Malvery, 'The Alien Question II.', 526, 527 & 531; *cf.* Peter Fryer, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (London/Boulder: Pluto, 1984), 165–90.

285 Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora*, 80–121. This is even true of the otherwise infamous character of Fagin in Charles Dickens' *Olive Twist* (London: Richard Bentley, 1838); available online at Project Gutenberg <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/730/pg730-images.html> (accessed 5 November 2023).

286 Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora*, 84–86 & 114–15.

287 John A. Garrard, *The English and Immigration 1880–1910* (London: Oxford U. P., 1971), *passim*.

288 Anon., 'The Jew Beauties. A Whimsical Song, Sung by Mr Fawcett at Covent Garden Theatre', reproduced in black-and-white in Michael Ragussis, *Theatrical Nation: Jews and Other Outlandish Englishmen in Georgian Britain* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 5; reproduced in full colour on the dust jacket of this edition.

289 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 172–73.

homogenising of Jew and 'Negro' faces.[290] Jesenská would later write, in 1938, of the Jews as 'the Negroes of Europe'.[291] Ran HaCohen has also, through Bruno Bauer's work demonstrated this liminality, specifically Bauer's 1863 work *Das Judenthum in der Fremde*. He takes a racialist view that invests Jews with a 'Caucasian' brain yet reinforces their status as 'Negro'.[292] These examples speak not yet to a whitening, but to a hybridising 'neither/both' discursive space between 'White' and 'Black'.

Karen Brodkin has explored how the Second World War affected American Jews' lived experience of 'colour', locating the whitening process in the post-war boom as a result of American Jews' increasing socioeconomic power and scientific revision of the efficacy of 'race' for taxonomy.[293] Brodkin incorporates Zygmunt Bauman's ideas of classification as social control[294] (and as a site of resistance) and Toni Morrison's assertion that 'whiteness' requires 'blackness' to invest it with meaning and argued that post-war American Jews eschewed classification as 'Black' by reformulating Jewish identity as 'Anglo-Saxon', developing an 'authentic' 'White' Jewishness in opposition to an externally imposed invented 'blackness'.[295]

I examine the British context and will largely follow Brodkin but divert from her at a critical juncture: British Jews were still experiencing processes of negotiation, attempting to locate themselves and being located within a 'colour' discourse. These hybridising processes are largely absent from political discourse and took place elsewhere including within the third space of sitcom.

Locating the 'Colour' of 'the Jew' within Parliament's 'Black' *vs* 'White' Binarism

290 '[N]aturally for your [non-Jewish] father there's no difference between your husband and myself [both Jewish]; there's no doubt about it, to the European we both have the same Negro face' (quoted in Sander Gilman, *Multiculturalism and The Jews* [London/New York: Routledge, 2006], 62).

291 Sander Gilman, *Freud, Race, and Gender* (Princeton: Princeton U. P., 1993), 20.

292 '[T]he Jew as white Negro, but the robust nature and the capacity for physical work of the Negro are missing and are replaced by a brain which by size and activity bring the Jew close to the Caucasian peoples' (Ran HaCohen, 'The "Jewish blackness" thesis revisited', *Religions*, 9:7 [2018], n.p.; available online at <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9070222> [accessed 25 November 2018]). See also Bruno Bauer, *Das Judenthum in der Fremde* (Berlin: F. Heinicke, 1863).

293 Karen Brodkin, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick/London: Rutgers U. P., 1998).

294 Brodkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, 180.

295 Brodkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, 183. Morrison's ideas may well be correlated with Linda Colley's work on the negative construction of British national identity (*Britons*, *passim*).

When first asked about the relevance of the RRB 1965 to Jews, the sole discourse that Soskice does *not* offer as a justification is 'colour'.[296] Soskice clearly locates 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse, consistent with the trends explored above. However, only twenty years prior, Lord Strabolgi opined: 'Most [Italians] have the same appearance as the dark-skinned Jew'.[297] Strabolgi's location of 'the Jew' within 'colour' discourse is ambiguous: dark skin as a Jewish marker or dark skin being a marker of *some* Jews (whom Italians look like) is uncertain. He further posits that German Jewish refugees might look the same as non-Jewish German refugees. Strabolgi appears then to liminalise 'the Jew' within 'colour' discourse neither 'White' nor 'Black' but simultaneously both/neither. The relative proximity of Strabolgi's comment to Soskice's and the divergence in their approaches to Jewish 'colour' highlights some degree of debate around this in the British State at this time such that ideas of 'colour' became relevant to contemporary Jews.

There is some scant evidence of this debate in Hansard sources from 1965–1976. 'The Jew' is implicated directly in 'colour' discourse three times in that period. Lord Hailsham, in Committee in 1976, highlights that Jewish communities cross numerous 'forms' of 'colour'.[298] He specifies 'black Jews', 'yellow Jews', and 'white Jews', and indeed his statement may be ostensibly progressive—recognising that 'the Jew' transcends 'colour' boundaries—yet a number of counterpoints exist. If we take a postcolonialist lens to this statement what becomes apparent is that Hailsham persists in utilising colonialist 'colour' discourse. There is no indication of awareness of the self-conception of these groups within 'colour' discourse, their 'colour' identity is imposed, not adopted. Within their own contexts he disregards whether they think of their identity as these 'colours', including 'white Jews', nor does he recognise the possibility for variation *within* these groups. While he discursively demonstrates the transgressive relationship of 'the Jew' to 'colour' he hybridises 'the Jew', but, in doing so, he does not allow for this hybridity to be utilised to disrupt the discourse of 'colour' but to separate 'the Jew' from it. He locates 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse and, tacitly, into the discourses of 'race', 'nation', and 'ethnicity'. It is important also, that Hailsham defers to Janner prior to this statement, seeking Jewish allyship in his construction, he seeks, in this moment of third space contact, to establish an authoritative voice, Janner

296 'I would have thought that a person of Jewish faith, if not regarded as caught by the word "race" would undoubtedly be caught by the word "ethnic", but if not caught by the word "ethnic" would certainly be caught by the word "national" as certainly having a national origin' (Hansard, HC, vol. 711, c. 933).

297 Hansard, HL, 10 September 1942, vol. 124, c. 354.

298 'Now Jews, if the noble Lord, Lord Janner will forgive me, come all [*sic*] shapes, sizes and colours. There are Black Jews called *Falashas* in Ethiopia; there are yellow Jews called something else in China; and there are white Jews with fair hair and blue eyes, with the best Aryan characteristics in Europe' (Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, cc. 53–54; original emphasis).

does not challenge it—given the historical context, hardly to be expected—but the oppressive, colonialist, discursive effect remains. Hailsham's statement imposes therefore a 'White' identity on European Jews, separating them from 'colour' discourse, and shutting down any potential for hybridity and disruption of the discourse itself.

Lord Brockway, introducing a Private Members' Bill in April 1974, also implicates 'the Jew' within 'colour' discourse and thereby opens up another ambiguous discursive third space, arguing that 'a Jew could not be excluded [from a private club] because he was brown'.[299] On the surface, he argues that there are no brown Jews against whom exclusion might operate, yet the aim of his legislation makes such a reading unlikely. Alternatively, Brockway is arguing that 'brown Jews' exist in the UK in the 1970s and that his Bill prevents them from being excluded due to them being 'brown'. In the context of the whitening processes (above) and Hailsham's statement, Brockway diverges from uncritical Jewish 'whiteness', revealing a more variegated understanding of Jewish 'colour' and a more disruptive hybridism within this third space. Prior, Brockway alludes to clubs for specific 'ethnic or national origins' including 'Irish, Scottish, Jewish or Commonwealth [people]'.[300] In this context, Brockway locates 'the Jew' as transgressing 'colour' discourse. Having established that 'the Jew' is an 'ethnic or national origin' and by then referring to 'brown' Jews he locates 'the Jew' as intersecting with, but not defined by, 'colour' discourse. This location, within *and* without, allows Brockway to disrupt the very discourse he utilises, disrupting its explanatory power by showing how 'the Jew' hybridises ideas of 'colour' and 'non-colour', thus 'the Jew' becomes 'almost but not quite both 'brown' and not-'brown'. Incidentally, Brockway also appears to counter other statements (discussed in more detail in Chapter 5, pp. 190–95) across the debates in which Jews are constructed as passive objects of prejudice and perennial victims by opening up the possibility that a 'brown' Jew may be the object of exclusionary practice by a non-'brown' Jewish club, which further disrupts oppressive discourses about Jews across the debates.[301] This idea of Jews as oppressors and excluders on the basis of 'colour' is explored in *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* and referred to in letters to the BoDs by Grafton Clarke and Eve Webber.[302]

---

299 'A Jew could not be excluded because he was brown. An Indian could not be excluded because he was white. As I am a white who was born in India, perhaps I have an interest in that aspect' (Hansard, HL, 4 April 1974, vol. 350, c. 1043).

300 Hansard, HL, 4 April 1974, vol. 350, c. 1043.

301 Hansard, HL, 10 September 1942, vol. 124, c. 344; Hansard, HC, 25 March 1965, vol. 709, c. 728; and Hansard, HC, 16 July 1965, vol. 716, cc. 1062–63 for representative examples.

302 See letters from Eve Webber and Grafton Clarke (LMA ACC/3121/E/04/0079; and above pp. 60 & 59–60 respectively).

The Marquess of Hertford, in a 1969 debate, recounted that 'the scion of the noble house of Seymour [his ancestor] was half-Jew and half-black, and a bastard to boot'.[303] This is an instructive comment in three respects: first it demonstrates the immutability with which both Jewish and 'Black' identity is regarded. Hertford, like Hailsham, imposes modern forms of identity on his medieval ancestor. Second, he proceeds to utilise these as a means to legitimise his own pronouncements on race relations. This latter point is replicated across a number of parliamentarians, who also seek to show 'credentials of difference' as a form of socio-cultural capital to speak on race relations; he does not explicitly claim these identities for himself however allowing him to locate himself outside 'colour' discourse.[304] Finally, he juxtaposes 'half-Jew' with 'half-black' suggesting a locating of 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse, yet, as with Hailsham, this 'example' of hybridity in action only reinforces the discourse as it removes from its rubric a form of identity that disrupts its internal logics. This is perhaps an apt example of what Bhabha would term a colonial 'phantasy', in which myth is utilised for oppressive political effect.

One further example, while not explicitly connecting 'the Jew' to 'colour' discourse, is still instructive. Lord Stonham's intervention into the RRB 1965 Second Reading is one such: '[…] we in the Home Office […] receive continuing complaints of anti-Semitic or anti-colour articles in Fascist news-sheets and flyposting of the 'nigger-neighbour' variety'.[305] Stonham here separates 'anti-colour' from 'anti-Semitic' and thus anti-colour prejudice from antisemitic prejudice. This implicates the history of the relationship between antisemitism and racism which, as demonstrated by several parliamentary contributions, is broadly understood as specifically anti-'Black'/anti-'colour'.[306] Some have argued for antisemitism's specificity that it constitutes a unique form of prejudice outside racism,[307] others, through a comparative approach have explored the discursive and affective similarities of the Jewish and 'Black' experience, conceptualising antisemitism as a variant, or an essential part, of racism.[308] William Nicholls' *Christian Antisemitism*, argues that antisemitism is in essence a separate

303 Hansard, HC, 16 December 1965, vol. 306, c. 1029. This appears to be apocryphal as there is no indication of any Jewish lineage for Wido de St Maur, to whom Hertford appears to refer here.

304 See Hansard, HC, 16 December 1966, vol. 738, cc. 912–13; Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 110–11; Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 88; Hansard, HL, 16 December 1969, vol. 306, c. 1021; and Hansard, HL, 16 December 1969, vol. 306, c. 1059 among others.

305 Hansard, HC, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1010.

306 See for instance, Hansard, HC, 16 December 1966, vol. 738, c. 903; and Hansard, HL, 20 July 1976, vol. 373, c. 751.

307 See Robert Wistrich, *Anti-Semitism: The Longest Hatred* (London: Thames Mandarin, 1992).

308 See William Nicholls, *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate* (Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1995); and Robert Miles, *Racism* (London: Routledge, 2003); and Lerner & West, *Jews & Blacks*.

form of hatred but that from the nineteenth century it has been, in part, racialised. Stonham would appear to regard antisemitism as a specific form of prejudice; yet, 'or' is ambiguous, as it can 'connect two words denoting the same thing'.[309] This does open a discursive space within which antisemitism can be construed as a form of, or alternative to, anti-colour prejudice. Stonham does not clarify his position. It is not certain whether Stonham is referring to 'anti-colour' as an alternative category of prejudice or an alternative name of 'anti-Semitic' prejudice. Regardless, of their relationship, this shows that antisemitism and anti-colour prejudice were treated in the same breath, and advanced by the same groups yet, within Parliament there has been shown to be a separation of 'the Jew' from 'colour'.

What emerges from the available parliamentary evidence then is a relatively undertheorized and unproblematised construction of the Jewish location in relation to 'colour' discourse that largely locates 'the Jew' outside the discourse. For parliamentarians of this period, 'colour' was not the discourse through which Jews were implicated in the RRAs. The preponderance of this lack of discursive negotiation, within a wider history that is passingly implicated in the debates, of 'the Jew' being 'Black', leaves a discursive space that the far-right actively sought to fill. A third space exists in this site of negotiation, there is the potential for contact between 'the Jew' and the oppressive colonial discourse of 'colour' within which a hybridity might be established but it has been shown that this opportunity was largely eschewed in favour of an imposed discursive separation

'The Jew' in Far-Right 'Colour' Discourse

Contemporary evidence from the British far-right shows a coherent locating of 'the Jew' as within the bounds of 'colour' discourse. In 1956, 'White' nationalist and neo-Nazi Colin Jordan sought to limit membership of the League of Empire Loyalists to 'White Gentiles'. To be Jewish then, for Jordan, was not necessarily to be 'White', even contrary to being 'White'.[310] Jordan's April 1956 interview in the *West London Observer* stated that, for his new 'White Defence League': 'as far as we are concerned a Jew is a black man'.[311] Taken alongside Lord Strabolgi's remark less than a decade prior, these indicate the persistence of a discursive space in which 'the Jew' was understood as occupying a space definitively within 'colour' discourse as a 'coloured' Other. In this space, a Jewish person's 'blackness' was immutable and undeniable; while this was evidently not broached in Parliament, within the

309 See 'Or', OED Online, <https://www.oed.com/dictionary/or_conj1?tab=meaning_and_use> (accessed 24 March 2024)

310 Jackson, *Colin Jordan and Britain's Neo-Nazi Movement*, 81.

311 Quoted in Jackson, *Colin Jordan and Britain's Neo-Nazi Movement*, 87.

third space of sitcom these discursive constructions would be tested and disrupted (see below).

Five years after the RRA 1976 was passed, the persistence of a far-right connection between 'the Jew' and 'colour' is evident in the *Stormer* 'comic book' (1981) illustrated by Robert Edwards for the National Front. Its strips 'The Real Menachem Begin Story' and 'Billy the Yid' both represent Jews as having dark complexions.[312] In a report by antifascist magazine *Searchlight* (May 1981) *The Stormer*'s tagline was reported as 'This publication contravenes the Race Relations Act'.[313] The conflation of Jews and skin 'colour' within the publication may therefore be taken as part of this contravention and evidence that, outside the political mainstream, 'the Jew' was actively being located within 'colour' discourse.

It is noted in Parliament that there is a current of discriminatory feeling in the general population directed at Jews and non-'White' people.[314] Parliamentarians explicitly correlated this with Nazi ideology and Adolf Hitler's rhetoric.[315] References to far-right rhetoric do demonstrate that antisemitism was an essential part of a more general racism, discursively, they were part and parcel.[316] Yet, largely, the significance of this rhetoric is diminished. It is spoken of as contrary to an essentially British sense of fair play and inuredness to extremist thought. Henry Brooke's 1965 statement, in reply to Barnett Janner, is representative:

> We all understand the feelings of coloured people when filthy, poisonous little leaflets are dropped into letter boxes or left along the pavement. We all understand the feelings of the Jewish population, which [Lord Janner] described to us, in the face of this neo-Fascist provocation, although I am bound to say to him that if he thinks that what was brought about thirty or more years ago in Germany could be repeated in this country […] then he does not understand the British people today or the British character.[317]

Two key points may be taken here; an acknowledgement of the importance of antisemitism to far-right dogma, and the almost *blasé* lack of consideration given to its potential cumulative

---

312 See Victor S. Navasky, *The Art of Controversy: Political Cartoons and Their Enduring Power* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013), eBook, ch. 26 'Robert Edwards', n.p. for a reproduction of 'The Real Menachem Begin Story'. See also 'The Stormer', UK Comics Wiki, n.p., <https://ukcomics.fandom.com/wiki/The_Stormer> (accessed 24 February 2024) for a reproduction of 'Billy the Yid'.

313 Photographs of the *Searchlight* report are reproduced on *Stormer* illustrator Robert Edward's blog 'European Action'. See Robert Edwards, 'The Stormer Comic Trial in September 1981', *European Action*, n.d., n.p.; available online at <http://www.europeanaction.com/id112.html> (accessed 1 September 2019).

314 Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 127.

315 Hansard, HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c. 939; Hansard, HL, 7 July 1966, vol. 275, cc. 1246; and Hansard, HC 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1789.

316 See, for instance, Hansard, HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c. 947.

317 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 964–65

effect as indicated by BoDs' lobbying (see Chapter 1 above) in the context of parliamentary discussions that largely located 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse and, therefore placed the 'protected' status of Jews in jeopardy by also refusing to incorporate religion. Thus, parliamentarians failed to understand that by causing this slippage they open a discursive space that can be filled by far-right discourses that 'explain' Jewish difference as correlative to 'colour'.

Returning to Stonham's statement on the 'nigger neighbour' leaflets (above p. 87), he follows this by also diminishing the importance of the far-right in British social politics, ' [they] have almost no support from the public'.[318] His leaflet remark directly implicates the election literature of the 1964 General Election, specifically in the Smethwick constituency. Contrary to Stonham, this shows how effective far-right anti-colour discourses were. Peter Griffiths, the successful candidate, discusses 'the Jew' in his book *A Question of Colour?* (this inclusion itself an instructive point).[319] He argues, following Jordan, that antisemitism is a 'particular form of racism', not separate to but *part of*, this acknowledges a degree of specificity but firmly locates 'the Jew' within 'colour' discourse while tacitly demonstrating an acknowledgement of the 'almost but not quite' aspects of Jewish identities intersecting between and across 'colour' identity; of bringing it closer to ideas of anti-colour prejudice while maintaining a degree of specificity, the nature of which he does not discuss.[320] He conflates 'the Jew' with non-'White' people in his positing the impossibility of their 'absorption' into British life.[321] In Parliament he opposed the RRAs, claiming the sufficiency of the POAs to deal with 'leaflets against Jews'.[322] Yet, he goes on to criticise the operation of the RRAs: '[…] people who are sensitive to the fact that they are coloured in a population that is largely White frequently imagine they have been discriminated against'.[323] I would reason, from these statements that for Griffiths, the distinction between 'coloured' and 'Jews' is very thin, to the point of its practical irrelevance. There is a degree of conflation between his understanding of the RRAs as motivated by Jews and the use of the RRAs by 'coloured' people. From 1968 onwards, Powellism became a potent force on the far-right with its eponymous figurehead a voice in Parliament. Maurice Orbach historicised and explicitly

318 Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1010.

319 Peter Griffiths, *A Question of Colour?* (London: Leslie Frewin [assoc. Anchor Press], 1966), 26–29.

320 Griffiths, *A Question of Colour?*, 13.

321 Griffiths, *A Question of Colour?*, 28–29 (p. 29).

322 Griffiths, *A Question of Colour?*, 189–95 (p. 194).

323 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1009.

linked Powellist rhetoric to antisemitism in April 1968.[324] Antisemitism is innately part of far-right discourse in 1960s and 1970s Britain, while this was recognised by some in Parliament, the significance of this connection was not acted upon, in locating 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse 'the Jew' is separated from the counter-racist efforts in parliamentary debates, this opens a discursive slip that the far-right can occupy. Some years after the period in question, the Tower Hamlets Arts Project produced *Auschwitz and East London* (1983) which also showed discursive similarities between contemporary anti-colour propaganda and antisemitism.[325] It reproduces Issue 10 of the Young National Front's *Bulldog* (1978), in tandem with extracts from Isaac Levy and Lord Elwyn Jones.[326]

By disregarding the far-right as a 'lunatic fringe', contemporary mainstream political discourse did more harm than good.[327] Repeatedly in this chapter I have demonstrated the numerous points at which by locating 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse, parliamentarians enabled far-right discourses to gain explanatory potential, particularly when one bears in mind the context of what Gavin Schaffer has identified as the shift in that rhetoric (see above pp. 56–58). Outside Parliament there was a serious debate around Jewish 'colour' and it would be in third spaces of contact wherein 'the Jew' would adopt a more hybridic nature within that discourse as a means of contesting it.

Jewish 'Colour' in Sitcoms

There is only limited inferential evidence to hint at a discussion of 'the Jew' and 'colour' in *NMTQ*, it can be briefly covered here. In 'Without Prejudice', Manny Cohen (John Bluthal) sets up a blind date with 'Samantha', who is West Indian. He runs away and she later confronts him. He says simply: 'Why didn't you say in your letter that you were coloured? Oh, why should you? What, you've got to apologise because you're coloured?'[328] Manny, separates himself (and tacitly the actor who plays him) from 'Samantha' using 'colour', it is something Samantha 'is' but Manny 'is not'. For Manny, Samantha's 'colour' becomes an immutable sign of irreconcilable difference. He offers examples of everyday or casual racism that he abhors, but he does not correlate this with antisemitism, his reaction is sympathetic not empathetic. One might offer a metaphorical reading of the Jewish man 'running away' from

324 Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 98–99; the full quote is reproduced below on page 194 of this thesis. See also Orbach's statements, Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 83–84; and Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 122.

325 Tower Hamlets Arts Project, *Auschwitz and East London* (London: Tower Hamlets Arts Project, 1983).

326 Tower Hamlets Arts Project, *Auschwitz and East London*, 13 & 16.

327 Hansard, HC, 16 July 1965, vol. 716, c. 1007–08.

328 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.2 'Without Prejudice' (2 July 1970).

'colour' as a microcosm of Jewish 'whitening' but, given that Vince Powell and Harry Driver, have explicitly stated that the programme was developed from the idea of religious conflict (and therefore of a religious understanding of Jewish identity), this reading would stand to be presumptive.[329]

TDUDP makes greater use of 'the Jew' to disrupt 'colour' discourse in its episodes. Though there are scant references to Jews as 'coloured', the few references there are are instructive. *TDUDP*'s Else Garnett (Dandy Nicholls), Alf's wife discusses the 'blackness' of American entertainer Al Jolson:

ELSE Your Dad never said [his 'Black' doctor] wasn't human. I mean look at *[indistinct]*, he's human; and Paul Robeson, he was alright; Al Jolson...

ALF *[incredulous]* Who?

ELSE Al Jolson

ALF What are you talking about Al Jolson? Al Jolson wasn't a blackie he was White.

ELSE He was Black in 'Sonny Boy'[330]

In this exchange, Jolson is located within 'colour' discourse to humorous effect. Known in part for his 'blackface' performances, Else construes Al Jolson's 'colour' identity from his role as 'Al Stone' in his performance of 'Sonny Boy'.[331] Alf is shocked and directly counters and ridicules Else for her contention, thereby opening a 'negotiative' space around Jolson and his character. Jolson was a well-known Jewish performer and well known *as* a Jewish performer: his Jewish identity not being rejected or diminished throughout his life.[332] While Jolson's blackface performance is confined to the finale of the film, this is how Else justifies her describing Jolson as 'Black'. Jolson may 'be Black' in one performance of 'Sonny Boy' but for *The Singing Fool's* two other performances of the number he is not. Thus, Else's location of Jolson within a 'colour' discourse as 'Black', combined with Alf's counter to this and extratextual knowledge about the film, combine to provoke a Bergsonian sense of incongruence and, thereby, humour. From this incongruence one may discern a discursive excess/slippage indicating the potential use of Jolson/Stone as a hybridic or even mimetic figure within the programme. Jolson/Stone is, at once 'Black', 'White' and Jewish, and in

329 Vince Powell, *From Rags to Gags: The Memoirs of a Comedy Writer* (Clacton-on-Sea: Apex, 2008), 128.

330 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966). All transcriptions from situation comedies are mine.

331 Actually the final song from *The Singing Fool* (dir. Lloyd Bacon, 1928) and not the 1929 film (dir. Archie Mayo) which did not star Jolson.

332 See Michael Alexander, *Jazz Age Jews* (Princeton: Princeton U. P., 2001), 131–79.

exceeding and not quite assuming all of these identities at once, the figure disrupts the categories themselves. Else casually replies to Alf, 'he was Black in "Sonny Boy" ', in a manner suggesting little conflict for her in Jolson being alternatively and simultaneously 'White' and 'Black', moving fluidly between the two, yet this disjuncture produces a comedic tension by its incongruence with what is expected (to be one *or the other*). It is key that there is no cathartic or resolutive end to this disruption, Else's final comment above is the last comment on it, allowing the discursive tension to persist. Johnny Speight here utilises the well-studied history of Jewish blackface performance in America, though comparatively little has been done to explore British blackface histories.[333] Both historiographies have shown the frequency with which Jews performed in blackface and the complex relationship such performances had with cultural and social politics; operating simultaneously as forms of oppression and resistance. A parallel might well be drawn with Brodkin's paradigm of Jewish whitening by conceptualising these performances as a key means by which Jews sought to stake out a hybridic discursive space for themselves across ideas of 'blackness' and 'whiteness' and consequently reinforcing and disrupting them.

The Singing Fool was almost four decades old by this point, produced in America when, Brodkin has argued, the 'colour' of Jews was still precarious.[334] Blackface performances were still popular in Britain in 1966: *The Black and White Minstrel Show* was produced until the late 1970s and a letter to the BBC (28 March 1967) from Reverend Derek H. Buckley compares *TDUDP* unfavourably with 'such wonderful programmes' as the *Minstrel Show*.[335] In producing this hybridic third space using a reference to an older film, Speight is able to utilise 'the Jew' to disrupt the discourse of 'blackness' by revealing its inherent artificiality and disrupt the mainstream political locating of 'the Jew' outside 'colour' discourse through utilising an old, popular film in which that 'whiteness' is problematised.

---

333 See, among others, Michael Rogin, 'Blackface, white noise: the Jewish jazz singer finds his voice', *Critical Inquiry*, 18:3 (1992), 417–53; Alexander, *Jazz Age Jews*, esp. Part III, pp. 131–79; Brian Roberts, 'Blackface minstrelsy and Jewish identity: fleshing out ragtime as the central metaphor in E. L. Doctorow's Ragtime', *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 45:3 (2004), 247–60; Vincent Brook, 'The four *Jazz Singers*: mapping the Jewish assimilation narrative', *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, 10:3 (2011), 401–20; and Gillota, 'The new Jewish blackface', 225–36. For Jewish performances of 'Black' music see Hersch, ' "Every time I try to play black it comes out sounding Jewish" '. Studies of British 'blackface' have focused overwhelmingly on 'minstrelsy' entertainment and the Sacha Baron Cohen character of 'Ali G': see Michael Pickering 'Race, gender and broadcast comedy: the case of the BBC's *Kentucky Minstrels*', *European Journal of Communication*, 9:3 (1994), 311–33; Newton, *Paving the Empire Road*, 145–46; Howells, ' "Is it because I is black?" '; and Tara Atluri, 'Lighten up?! Humour, race and da off colour joke of Ali G', *Media, Culture & Society*, 31:2 (2009), 197–214.

334 Brodkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, 2.

335 BBC WAC, T16/727.

The Garnetts' daughter Rita (Una Stubbs), also plays with the idea of Jewish 'colour' to mock her father when discussing God's role in creating the peoples of the world:

> RITA He made the blackies didn't he?
>
> ALF *[thumbing through the Bible]* There's nothing in here that says that God made blackies. There's nothing in here that says he come down to speak to 'em, lead 'em anywhere, advise 'em, chastise 'em —
>
> RITA — Circumcise them?[336]

As with Else above, Speight here utilises Rita to produce a discursive slippage between 'the Jew' and 'blackness'. In positing God 'circumcising' the 'blackies' Rita imbricates 'blackness' with a (among others) Jewish ritual. By creating this overlap she manufactures a discursive space for negotiation. Within the series' internal logic this has particular relevance to Alf as throughout the programme Alf is identified as Jewish by other characters, an identity he rejects. Prior to the above exchange, it is implied (though not stated) through Warren Mitchell's performance, that Alf has been circumcised. Thus Rita's manufacturing a discursive space directly implicates Alf into ideas of 'blackness'—anathema to his racist worldview. While allowing for disavowal—humour being produced by a daughter referring to a taboo subject with her father—a deeper analysis is possible. While Rita produces the discursive space within which Alf is personally implicated, so too is Warren Mitchell as a Jewish actor (presumably circumcised himself). By investing this discursive space with ideas of 'blackness', Alf's precarious 'whiteness', his imposed and resisted Jewishness, and Mitchell's own Jewishness as well as the resultant tendentious relationship of Rita to Jewishness and Stubb's own non-Jewishness, Speight, in collaboration with Mitchell's performance is able to demonstrate the incongruence of 'the Jew' with 'blackness' and 'whiteness', occupying a location across both ideas, in Bhabahian terms slipping and exceeding them. The comedic tension is key in this moment of hybridisation as it is in that tension that the ambiguity of the situation lies.

Some more minor examples also rely on the extratextual tension between Mitchell's proudly-held Jewish identity and Alf's aggressive disavowal of it. In the 1972 Christmas special, 'Jesus Christ Superstar', during a discussion of the Nativity with his friend Bert (Bill Maynard):

> BERT So Alf, tell me: why [was Jesus born in] Bethlehem and not London?

336 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.7 'Paki-Paddy' (28 February 1974).

ALF *[taps his nose]* Oil. God ain't daft, he knew the wogs was useless.[337]

Alf intends the slur 'wog' to stand for both a person constructed as 'coloured' (this, along with 'coon' is his typical word to refer to non-'White' people) and the people living in the Roman province of Palestine during that period of occupation, including Jews. In another episode, Alf does the same in relation to contemporary geopolitics:

ALF Now the wogs have put the price of petrol up.

ELSE No, it was the Jews who done that.

RITA It was the Arabs

ELSE But it was the Jews what caused it.

ALF 'Course you can't talk to 'em, can't tell them nothing. Your Whitechapel mob started the bloody war. *If them Jews want a war they should wait until they can bloody well afford it.*

[…]

MIKE Your only pure-blooded race is your Arabs, your Jews, your negroes, your Chinese—

ALF —We might be mongrels but we're pure bloody mongrels! English mongrels. *Not like your wogs, they start wars they can't afford and expect us to pay for it*.[338]

Notable here is the similar descriptions of Jews and later 'wogs' starting 'wars they can't afford'. This intersects 'the Jew' with 'wog' (i.e. with 'colour' discourse). Yet, Else's brief interjection problematises this intersection by forcing a discursive slippage between the two ideas—'wogs' did not increase petrol prices but Jews. Earlier in 'Jesus Christ Superstar', Alf, Rita and her husband Mike (Tony Booth) discuss Jewishness and the role of 'colour' therein:

ALF You have Jews on your BBC an'all. I mean, Robin Day, don't tell me he ain't one.

RITA What about Eamonn Andrews?

ALF Another one

RITA He's Irish

337 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1972).

338 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.1 'TV Licence' (2 January 1974); my emphasis both.

ALF Irish Jew. You have Scots-Jews. I mean, they're the worst bloody kind. You can have any kind of Jew—you can even have Egyptian Jews.

MIKE Cobblers

ALF I've seen 'em. Palestine Jews…[339]

Alf separates Jewishness from such criteria as 'nation' and 'colour' by offering examples of Jews from areas of the world (Ireland, Scotland, Egypt and Palestine) with noted 'colour' differences in their average phenotypical makeup (at least to the reductionist, essentialist mind-set within which Alf operates). These three examples all rest on the discursive slippage produced between Mitchell and Garnett, in all three Mitchell's performance as Garnett implicates Garnett and himself in the discourse of 'colour', producing comedic tension and opening up a hybridic space; in so doing he demonstrates the intersection of Jewishness across other discourses of identity, with 'colour' predominantly, but secondarily, with 'race' and 'nation'. The latter example explicitly demonstrates the discursive excess of 'the Jew' in relation to 'colour', with examples from Ireland, Scotland, Egypt and Palestine, all occupying divergent discursive locations within 'colour' discourse yet all contained within the discourse of 'the Jew'.

The idea of interlacing Jewish and 'Black' identities in order to disrupt them is evident in another of Speight's works, his teleplay, *If There Weren't Any Blacks You'd Have to Invent Them*.[340] Though not a sitcom *per se*, it contains similar elements of satire to *TDUDP* and deals with similar issues, while allowing Speight free reign to utilise archetypal characters as representative of his perspective of certain groups (conservative, socialist, Jewish, the military, the medical professions, and the clergy among others) in the manner of a morality play. This programme (aired in black-and-white 4 August 1968; re-made in colour 3 March 1974) offers an extreme example of discursive hybridity and mimicry in order to explore questions around Jewish 'colour'. Within the play, 'the young man', 'the blind man', and 'the backwards man' explore issues of identity. The blind man unequivocally identifies 'the young man' as 'Black'. 'The backwards man' refuses to aid the young man's cause, refusing to open his eyes to confirm his skin 'colour', claiming that he doesn't 'like to get involved in politics'. The play climaxes with the young man being literally 'blackened' by other characters who say that because he is 'Black' (in spite of his protests) then his skin 'colour' must match. The 'young man's' mother then enters and admonishes him for rejecting Jewish identity in favour of becoming 'Black'. The 'young man' is then shot as a martyr for his 'colour'.

339 *Till Death Us Do Part,* S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1972).

340 *If There Weren't Any Blacks You'd Have to Invent Them* (4 August 1968), DVD, Granada Ventures.

Throughout the play the imposition of 'colour' on the 'young man' is treated as absurd by Speight, indeed laughter is the 'young man's' initial reaction in the first instance. 'Black' then, is initially located as outside subjectivity, something ontological. Yet, it is clear to the audience that this is an identity being imposed upon the 'young man' by the blind man. The young man is literally 'blacked' by other characters and as a means of his 'blackness' being given expression. The relationship of 'blackness' to skin 'colour' is thereby called into question, 'blackness' becomes something innate, problematising the very notion of 'colour' and its significance as a marker of difference. 'Blackness' then, is revealed by Speight as something imposed from without by the blind and the wilfully blind. Into this complex interrogation that embodies Speights critiques of the RRAs in his biographies as relying on specious concepts, Speight injects the idea of Jewishness.[341]

The 'young man' rejects the other characters' identification of him as 'Black', insisting that he is White, saying initially 'I'm White, completely white, all over […] even underneath'. He never declares that he is Jewish to refute this blackening. In conversation with his mother, he states to her 'I'm Black: they've made me Black'. His mother admonishes him saying 'you won't be a Jew like us, but you'll be a "Black", yes, you don't mind being a Black […] I'm not having any Blacks in my house'. Jewishness is thereby framed as contrary to 'blackness'; it cannot be reconciled. Following his 'blacking' and his mother's revocation of his Jewishness, the 'young man' is divested of his Jewish identity, accepting that he is 'Black' now. When the 'young man' is first identified as Jewish, the 'blind man' immediately feels his nose, and states 'you used to be a Jew did you?' alluding to a mutability of Jewishness and that the 'young man's' 'blackness' has overlaid his Jewishness. Another character argues that the young man 'doesn't look a bit Jewish' to which the 'blind man' replies, 'don't let his looks fool you'. This both mirrors the idea of the 'young man' being blacked so that his skin 'matches' his identity, and speaks now to an immutability of Jewishness. Finally, the 'blind man' posits that Jewishness and 'blackness' are both signifiers of sin and the 'young man' is told that he must be executed for the 'good of [his] race'.

Speight implicates such a degree of internal incoherence, twisted logics, symbolism, and discursive intersection/disruption in this teleplay as to render its full explication impossible here. Yet, utilising a Bhabhaian framework, some coherence emerges. Speight's play relies on its ambiguity, and on its use of archetypal characters to weave a powerful discursive hybridity within which he is able not only to problematise the location of 'the Jew' within 'colour' discourse, but to disrupt the discourse itself. The 'young man' is the initial, hybridic body that

341 Johnny Speight, *For Richer, For Poorer: A Kind of Autobiography* (London: BBC Books, 1991), 143–45. See also Mark Ward, *A Family at War: The Unofficial and Unauthorised Guide to Till Death Us Do Part* (Tolworth: Telos Publishing, 2008), 74–77.

Speight utilises, for much of the play characters invest him with discourses of 'blackness', while the audience may read him as 'White' as he protests that he is. This in itself manifests a discursive hybridity that is both imposed and clearly artificial which by its own merits offers a valid critique of 'colour' discourse. Into this, Speight suddenly brings the idea of Jewishness, with a history of liminality to further invest the 'young man' with additional intersecting and transgressive discourses within the wider frame of 'colour'. By playing on the transgressive and dynamic history of Jewish 'colour', by then making the 'young man' 'Black' and by finally correlating 'blackness' and Jewishness together and martyring him, Speight offers a postcolonial vision of 'colour' discourse as oppressive, inherently violent and arbitrary in its objects. If we utilise the 'blacked' young man as a Bhabhaian mimic of 'Black'/Jew/'White', Speight's deconstruction of 'colour' becomes clear, that 'colour' is not a fact but a process, a relationship, a history, and a lie. Speight also demonstrates the precarity of mimicry, the 'young man' ultimately dies and he dies 'Black' and Jewish, as the other characters have made him.

Concluding Remarks: Comedic Negotiation and Parliamentary Antisemi(o)tism

TDUDP offers a complex—if diffuse—reflection on the role that 'colour' can and does play in discussions of Jewish identity without presenting any unified perspective. This is characteristic of Johnny Speight's anarchic approach to satire in his sitcom: every perspective is equally open to interrogation and ridicule with no resolution or alternative guaranteed, a very *carnivalesque* approach without any resolution, just questioning and disrupting of established discourses. Through Speight's *TDUDP* the role of 'colour' in complicating issues of Jewish identity can clearly be seen. Alf offers, alternately, arguments for and against its role in creating a coherent Jewish identity and therefore being a valuable means of defining 'the Jew' yet none of his arguments are permitted go unchallenged or unmocked. This diverges from both mainstream and fringe political discourse of the time that saw 'colour' as either irrelevant to, or instrumental for, defining 'the Jew'. While these political sites of discursive power-knowledge certainly demonstrate constructions of 'the Jew' in relation to the discourses of 'colour' they do not exhibit the same degree of semiotic problematisation that *TDUDP* (and to a lesser extent *NMTQ*) do, indeed their discourses are more a matter of reinforcement, of shutting down semiotic proliferation and problematisation, that ultimately produces more harm as it opens the space for fringe discourses that actively seek to other 'the Jew'. Thus, parliamentary uncritical whitening of Jews may well be regarded as an example of what we might—with tongue somewhat in cheek—call antisemi(o)tism. *TDUDP*'s move away from the homogenous (albeit opposing) views explored above in the political sphere towards a more deliberative, self-reflexive, approach to discourses of 'colour' difference is an

operation of sitcom as a genre, permitting the writer and the actors considerable leeway in discussions of social and political issues. Unlike contemporary MPs, they were uninhibited in their ability to air, and interrogate, taboo discourses that, for MPs to do so, might have led all too quickly to accusations of lending credence to such discourses. This was not, however, the case for parliamentary discussions of 'race' which, as the next chapter will demonstrate, legitimised a harmful othering concept even as its use in other situations was attacked. Within this discourse 'the Jew' was firmly located in the 'Other' camp.

Yet, if we take up Bhabha's view that the notion of Self/Other is too binarist and seek to apply his theories to the foregoing evidence, a more nuanced picture emerges. The conversation around the 'colour' of 'the Jew' can be broadly understood in terms of Bhabhaian third space. What emerges between the rejection of Jewish 'colour' difference in parliamentary contributions and its attempted reinforcement among far-right spoken and written sources is the establishment of an enforced hybridism that contemporary Jews themselves rejected, which consequently led to little resistive potential within that hybridism which subsequently stood to be determined largely by those who sought to utilise it as a form of explanatory power-knowledge around Jewish 'difference'. An important counter may be found in sitcom. *TDUDP*'s treatment of Jewish 'colour' must be understood as inflected through the fact that a Jewish actor is playing the role of Alf Garnett. In his continual 'toe-dipping' into far-right discourses that reinforce the idea of Jewish 'colour', the audience is continually reminded of the irony that Warren Mitchell (the man) is advocating for overlaying his own 'colour identity' as a Jewish man while simultaneously demonstrating the inutility of 'colour' by playing a character whose personal identity at times is predicated on his *not* possessing any 'colour' identity: 'whiteness' being to Alf Garnett an absence or a purity. This highly self-reflexive and ironic formulation, explored through a Bhabhaian lens allows one to demonstrate that *TDUDP* is an apt demonstration of Bhabha's ideas of mimicry and stereotype wherein the stereotypical discourse of 'the Jew' as swarthy-faced and as a form of 'blackness' is inverted through the casting of Warren Mitchell and exegetically utilised as a form of resistance or, in Bhabhaian terms, 'menace' to attempts to reinforce the idea of 'the Jew' as a form of 'colour' identity. This develops into a form of Bhabhaian mimicry in which a Jewish actor, playing a Jewish character, who denies his Jewishness, attempts to distance himself from that identity by arguing for the 'colour' of Jews which only serves to extratextually operate as a form of farce. This complex overlaying of forms of identity is also played out in more explicitly terms in Speight's *If There Weren't Any Blacks*. Both of these forms of mimicry (Jewish man playing non-Jewish—but actually Jewish—man and 'White' man playing 'White' man having 'blackness' imposed on him) demonstrate keenly both Speight's sceptical view of 'colour' as a taxonomy of human existence/identity and also the

value in understanding television texts generally, and *TDUDP* specifically, through the Bhabhaian lens. Speight's utilisation of Mitchell as Garnett enacts a complex hybridity and mimicry which disrupts the colonialist discourse of 'colour'.

3

'That's a right kosher conk you've got there'.[342]
'Race' and 'the Jew'

This chapter explores 'race', or racial discourse, as a criterion of difference utilised in the RRAs and how 'the Jew' was located within that discourse to justify Jews' inclusion as a protected minority. Soskice argued that 'race' was a valid reason (the first one he gives) by which Jews might be protected.[343] 'Race' was also, along with 'colour', one of the primary concepts utilised in the formulation of the RRB 1965 (based on the Cabinet memorandum).[344] It is therefore of critical importance that its role in structuring understandings of 'the Jew' be determined. This chapter first explores the shape and bounds of racial discourse within parliamentary debates, 1965–1976—demonstrating intersections with 'colour', 'nation', and 'ethnicity' in the context of a widespread debunking of 'race' as a scientifically and politically tenable concept. Parliamentarians continued to utilise 'race' as an epistemological lens to conceptualise human identities and relations, thereby framing the legislation with it in spite of their repeated professions of, at best, its obsolescence, and, at worst, its artificiality. The significant theme of blood/heredity in parliamentary conceptualisations will be covered as part of this. While 'race' was acknowledged as untenable, its utilisation was largely driven by political expediency, allowing groups such as Jews to be included in the 'protected' category in spite of the discursive issues outlined and the effect such racialisation processes had. Following this, the location of 'the Jew' within these debates is key; attempts to apply racial discourse to 'the Jew' lead to inevitable discursive slippage as it 'almost but not quite' fitted, and this slip was unacknowledged by parliamentarians, demonstrating the shortcomings of such categorisation. It will then compare this ineffective third space to *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*, how they utilised this discourse to play on the ambiguity of 'the Jew' within racial discourse.

This chapter will then explore the role racial stereotyping played in representations of 'the Jew' in Parliament and sitcom. Parliamentarians largely eschewed explicit racial stereotyping

342 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

343 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932–33.

344 Cabinet Memorandum on Racial Discrimination and Incitement to Racial Hatred, C. (65) 23, 17 February 1965.

in locating 'the Jew' and instead condemned and mocked (not deconstructed or disrupted) such discourses in far-right literature; though concurrently perpetuating stereotyped discourses of 'Jewish' behaviour—in cultural, rather than biological, terms. This did little to divest such far-right stereotypes of their symbolic or explanatory power so the importance of stereotype on British Jews' lives will be explored. *TDUDP* explored the intricacies of Jewish racialisation, investigation of 'the Jewish nose' will show aspects of this within their historical context and how Speight utilised them as disruptive forces. *NMTQ*, while it made use of stereotypes, did not utilise them in this manner. While *NMTQ* operates a hybridity within this discourse, it is more ambiguous and less openly resistive than *TDUDP*.

'Inherently absurd and improper for the purposes of a statute'[345]: Defining 'Race' in Parliament, 1965–1976

The strongest evidence for the boundaries of racial discourse in Parliament at this time is the RRA 1968: which defines 'racial group' as, 'a group of persons defined by reference to colour, race, or ethnic or national origins'.[346] By 1976, this was amended to include 'nationality' as well.[347] Such definitions prompted more questions, for instance: what legal force would a tautology like 'racial group […] a group […] defined by reference to race' have; what did 'origin' mean and did its significance degrade; and, if a 'colour'/'nation'/'ethnicity' group was a racial group, why include those categories at all? No schedule for any RRA defines the terms they use to conceptualise difference; the rationale is opaque. Therefore, in the absence of a statement against which to 'test' parliamentary statements, one must look to the statements themselves, how parliamentarians talk about 'race', and how they locate 'the Jew'.

As the RRA 1968 definition shows, there was a close, unproblematised intersection between 'colour' and 'race' leading consequently to discursive tension. Soskice demonstrates the Government's view on human 'difference' wherein 'racial' precedes 'ethnicity' and 'ethnicity' precedes 'nation'; he does not acknowledge that 'ethnicity' and 'nation' might cross or exceed racial boundaries or that 'race' might cross or exceed them in turn.[348] Some parliamentarians acknowledged 'colour's intersection with 'race' but no argumentation fleshed this out (or clarified why 'colour' was included on its own).[349] The complex but

345 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1913.

346 *Race Relations Act 1968*, ch. 71, §8 (4). The RRA 1965 does not contain any such definition.

347 *Race Relations Act 1976*, ch. 74, §3 (1).

348 See Soskice's remarks, Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932 & 933.

349 See for instance contributions from Peter Thorneycroft and C. M. Woodhouse in 1965; Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 952 & 1021–22.

untheorised intersections are particularly evident when Soskice discusses the relevance of the RRA 1965 to Jews wherein he first applies 'race', then 'nation', and then 'ethnicity'. There is, evidently, significant discursive confusion over the points at which one concept ends and another begins. This totalising approach to difference, which Soskice admits in the case of Jews is intended in a 'catch-all manner', will be problematised more as this thesis develops.[350] these points of intersection are important as they show the hybridic construction of difference in Parliament yet, in attempting to tessellate over the 'Other' in their definitions they exceed and slip that Other, revealing their artifice.

Ironically, Enoch Powell, speaking in 1976, critiqued 'race' as a concept but without applying this to 'the Jew' (reproduced below pp. 163–64).[351] It is arguable that Powell intended not discursive clarity, but filibuster, as his comments occur during a Third Reading debate of well over twenty hours' duration, not at any point when the content of the Bill could be affected. Just such criticism was levelled at him, along with Ronald Bell and Norman Tebbit at the time.[352] A further indication of the arbitrariness of ideas of race may be inferred from the RRA 1968 which contained a subsection (§8 [4]) that allowed the law in specific situations to redefine as a 'single racial group' 'persons wholly or mainly educated in Great Britain' in the defence of hiring practices that might at first be thought to be discriminatory but which could be demonstrated to be in pursuit of a 'reasonable balance' of races in a given work place. Though a small and highly specific context in which it was applied, this does demonstrate that there was at least a small extent to which 'race' was understood as malleable and at the behest of the law.

Blood is a consistent theme in these debates that is tied in to racial difference.[353] Herman argues in these debates the discussion of 'race' is characterised by the desire *not* to discuss it lest the concept be lent credence.[354] Soskice speaks of origins 'loosely *referred to* as racial origin[s]' when opening the RRA 1965's Second Reading.[355] He then argues 'he must have some blood origin' which highlights the primacy of biological and hereditary discourses in framing the Government's perception of the differences to be covered under the RRA(s).[356] Allusions to blood are clearly attached to ideas of (specifically) 'race' by interventions the likes of Lord Russell of Liverpool who quotes from a far-right pamphlet:

---

350 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932–33.

351 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, cc. 1630–31.

352 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1896.

353 For notable uses of 'blood', see Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 933, 971 & 983; and Hansard, HL, 15 December 1971, vol. 326 c. 1234

354 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 131.

355 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 932; my emphasis.

356 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 933.

> It starts off with the old nonsense about the Aryan race […] 'Only those of British or *kindred Aryan blood* should be members of the nation'. It then goes on to say: 'Citizenship of the State, and hence participation in the life of the nation, should be denied to all those of alien race, including the large coloured and influential Jewish communities, who should be eventually repatriated to their countries of origin'.[357]

For the far-right, the nation is an expression of 'race', so it may be reasonable to suggest that the use of 'blood' may be taken as speaking to racial identity. Lord Russell also refers to 'the old nonsense' this is a brief allusion to a lengthy history of the use of blood as a racial marker over preceding centuries, thus there is an established discursive framework within which blood is metonymic of 'race'. For parliamentarians, a significant driver of the RRAs the desire to curb groups whose central concern was the 'sanctity' of British blood.[358] However, to avoid accusations of sympathy, parliamentarians largely eschewed the use of 'blood' as a signifier of 'race' and sought an alternative signifier with which to mark and embody a specifically racial difference.

Some contextual evidence points to the use of morphological phenotype as that marker. Returning to Lord Hailsham's contribution of 27 September 1976, alongside 'colour' he mentions that Jews 'come all [*sic*] *shapes and sizes*'[359] Fenner Brockway, sitting in the Lords, characterised 'race' as '[difference] in the pigment of the skin or in the features of the face'.[360] The role of morphology in structuring understandings of 'race' is notable yet the connection of 'colour' to 'race' in spite of their legal separation is readily apparent, and it is in terms such as these that a number of politicians discuss ideas of 'the Jew'. Thus, there is no consistent general framing of 'race' in the parliamentary debates, yet it is readily invoked, especially in relation to 'the Jew'.

Locating 'The Jew' in 'Racial Discourse'

> Last week's programme did more to root out false, unscientific ideas about blood, race, and heredity than any number of earnest bilogy [*sic*] programmes.[361]

---

357 Hansard, HL, 7 July 1966, vol. 275, c. 1246; my emphasis.

358 See, by way of example, Hansard, HC, 15 November 1962, vol. 667, c. 548; Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1010; and Hansard, HC, 16 December 1966, vol. 738, c. 931.

359 Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, cc. 53–54; my emphasis.

360 Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1043.

361 Letter from Enid Hutchinson to BBC Director General, 15 January 1968 (BBC WAC, R78/2811/1). This episode was also the subject of a complaint by the National Viewers and Listeners Association to the Attorney General. Dated 13 January 1968, their telegram argues that the episode 'contained gross disrespect to Her Majesty the Queen and also subject matter liable to excite racial prejudice' (TNA LO2/460). The complaint was not given

So states Enid Hutchinson regarding 12 January 1968's *TDUDP* episode, 'The Blood Donor'. This episode offers a keen disruption of racial discourse. The role of 'the Jew' in what Hutchinson lauds is significant yet ignored in Hutchinson's letter. The racialisation of Jews—locating them within a 'racial discourse' as 'the Jew'—was more common in parliamentary discussions than, for instance, the 'colouring' of the Jews. Parliamentarians readily invoked 'race' to justify the RRAs' coverage of Jews. While they acknowledge the paltry scientific evidence for racialism[362] and the bastardisation of the scientific method by the far-right, they concurrently utilise the very discourse they shun—one is tempted to characterise it as almost Orwellian 'doublethink'.[363] In 1942, the Earl of Listowel argued, without drawing any counter-argument that 'the Jew' as 'race' had no basis in science.[364] In 1966, Maurice Orbach, in introducing an Amendment Bill for the RRA 1965 echoed this:

> [It] is surely quite wrong that evilly disposed person[s] should be permitted to [circumvent the RRA 1965] *by resort to pseudo-genetic polemics, by the selection and distortion of facts*.[365]

Yet, many parliamentarians made casualised references to 'race': John Binns refers to Nazi plans to 'exterminate a whole race of people'.[366] Binns here condemns the use of 'race' but co-opts its foundational idea, the existence of 'races' and the locating of 'the Jew' as one. This seeming contradiction, when historicised, is ameliorated. While twenty-first-century critiques of 'race' problematise the concept itself—to paraphrase Miles, 'the problem is not race relations, it is race'[367]—it is plain from the parliamentary debates around the RRAs that 'race' was considered a natural, not historical, phenomenon. Critiques focus on the use of 'race' and its development into racism, it becomes almost paternalistic, an uncomfortable

---

Attorney General consent for prosecution under the Race Relations Act 1968 as broadcast media was not included under the terms of the Act.

362 Here understood as the idea of the natural existence of 'races' as opposed to racism—the prejudice towards one or more 'races'. See the work of Tzvetan Todorov, including his ' "Race", writing, and culture', trans. Loulou Mack, *Critical Inquiry*, 13:1 (1986), 171–81; and his *On Diversity: Nationalism, Racism, and Exoticism in French Thought*, trans. Catherine Porter [Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard U. P., 1993], 90–96).

363 '[T]o hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them' (George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, intro. by Alex Massie [London: Polygon, 2021 (1st ed. London: Secker & Warburg, 1949)], 18).

364 'Nazi doctrine that the Jews of the present day are a separate racial type [has] no scientific foundation whatever, and that they are—one of the most pernicious and anti-social inventions of anthropological mythology' (Hansard, HC, 10 September 1942, vol. 124, cc. 350–52).

365 Hansard, HC, 16 December 1966, vol. 738, c. 903; my emphasis.

366 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1003.

367 See Miles, *Racism after 'Race Relations'*, 27–52.

truth that should be recognised and used to distinguish people and condition social relations but should not affect a person's moral worth. This of course, only entrenches 'race' as an unspoken corollary to any given human interaction and fosters a postcolonial form of oppression that fundamentally demarcates those that are located within the racial discourse from those that are not, for, as has been shown elsewhere, the idea of a 'White' 'race', is discursively negative, defined by what it is not: to be part of a 'White' 'race' is *not* to 'have' 'race' at all.[368]

References to a 'Jewish race' are commonplace in the debates.[369] Lord Brockway for instance, addresses Lord Stonham thus in 1966: '[…] does not the fact that the present law does not allow prosecution for this incitement against the Jewish race indicate there is a need to amend the law?'.[370] Brockway engages several discourses around 'the Jew': he first racialises Jews, however, his contention that the RRA insufficiently protects them *as* a 'race' speaks to a racial discourse that locates the Jews both within and without. Brockway's understanding of 'the Jew' as a 'race' goes beyond physiognomy, blood or heredity, otherwise his point would be moot. Unfortunately he does not expand on, nor is he challenged on how he sees Jews transgressing 'race' to the extent they are unprotected. It is possible to conjecture, given that his statement concerns a lack of prosecutions following synagogue attacks, that he sees religion as intersecting with 'race' (which would not be covered by the RRAs). If this is the case, Brockway's connection of religion to 'race' is unique within these sources, as other figures with sympathy for the idea of 'the Jew' as religion, position this as a discourse outside 'race'.

Rarely, parliamentarians would locate 'the Jew' outside racial discourse, Lord Hailsham stated: '[Jews] are not a race and it is folly to believe they are'.[371] This follows Hailsham's discussion on the 'colour' of Jews (Chapter 1) and may be understood within this as 'colour' being the principal determinant of a 'race'. Hailsham, apart from figures advocating for the inclusion of religion, is a lone voice of dissent from the casual racialising of 'the Jew', indicating a level of disinterest in why 'the Jew' was a 'race'. For the majority, 'the Jew' was protected under the RRAs, therefore, 'the Jew' must be a 'race', this forces 'the Jew' into racial discourse and *vice versa* via inverse logics that are only comprehensible within a postcolonialist lens that conceptualises difference as something imposed.

---

368 See Brodkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, *passim*.

369 See, for instance, Hansard, HC, 15 November 1962, vol. 667, c. 548. See also Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, cc. 308 & 340 for two such examples in relatively quick succession within a single debate, neither received any interrogation as to the veracity of such a characterisation.

370 Hansard, HC, 14 June 1966, vol. 275, c. 2.

371 Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, c. 54.

TDUDP and *NMTQ* also engage with how 'the Jew' relates to racial discourse. However, unlike the rather ineffective third space of Parliament that (aside from perhaps one notable example) invariably located 'the Jew' firmly within racial discourse, in sitcom, the location of 'the Jew' is far more variegated and transgressive. Utilising some of the same linguistic markers as above of 'race', heredity, biology, blood, and morphology enables *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* to be explored in the same manner.

Blood is the central issue in 'The Blood Donor', the topic of Hutchinson's letter and the NVLA's complaint.[372] Faced with becoming a donor, Alf opines on the nature of blood, its essence and implicates blood within his racial worldview, highlighting 'incompatibility' between 'Black blood' and 'White blood'. Alf and Else both construct blood as determinative of personality and 'quality'. Alf sees a 'Black' man waiting to donate and complains that Black blood' should be for 'Black' people only. He claims that using 'Black blood' for 'White' people would turn them 'Black'. Mike then mocks him, saying if that were true, doctors could use 'White blood' to 'solve the colour problem'. This episode utilises humour to disrupt the racialisation. First, Alf's construction of blood as determining personality is rendered absurd by virtue of Alf—unlikeable, irredeemably nasty—has rare, 'higher quality' blood. Alf's inscription of 'race' through blood is represented as in stark contrast to medical practice; he ignores the evidence that blood is no indicator of quality and simply insists that it 'should' be. Alf, well inscribed at this point as a resistive Jewish person, in being shown to have higher quality blood and claiming that it is good 'British' blood, in fact hybridises the idea of 'the Jew' within the racial discourse. He opens a third space into which the audience knows that he has Jewish blood which is the blood being sought after. That Alf attempts to overlay this with the idea of 'British blood, allows for a discursive excess in which the idea of Jewish blood and British blood meld and, in so doing, allows for the notion of blood as determinative to be disrupted. Alf's hybrid status as Jewish is absolutely key to this comedic operation, without it, the humour would lie only in Alf's utilisation of 'race' (*à la* examples above). Alf expands from blood to the body, specifically, 'the Jewish body', saying that Louis Washkansky's heart transplant in South Africa failed because Washkansky was Jewish and was given an 'incompatible' Gentile heart—'it wouldn't be what they call kosher, would it?'. This suggestion is treated as laughable by other characters and the audience who at the time of recording, certainly at the time of broadcast, would likely be aware that Washkansky passed due to pneumonia. While the discursive mechanics of this remark *vis à vis* racial discourse are broadly correlative to those above, Alf's invocation of kosher intersects this with more religious and cultural ideas of the Jewish body (Chapter 5).

372 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.3 Ep.2 'The Blood Donor' (12 January 1968).

Phenotype/morphology are broached in 'Party Night', in which British Jewish actress Adrienne Posta (Rita in the 1972 *TDUDP* film, also starring in *Bar Mitzvah Boy* and *Alexander the Greatest*) plays Millie, an escort.[373] She comments to Alf:

MILLIE 'Course, you're Jewish in't you?

ALF I am not bloody Jewish.

MILLIE Funny, you look it.

Later Millie talks to her mother about her parentage:

RUBY Your Dad wasn't Jewish.

MILLIE I know, but the milkman was wasn't he?

Both exchanges locate 'the Jew' within a racial discourse by positing the heritability of Jewish 'looks'. This is not simplistic however, both Millie and Alf (in the episode 'Intolerance') explicitly have their Jewish 'look' connected to their paternity. Culturally, however, Jewish identity is matrilineal, making any identification of these two individuals as Jewish inherently funny to a well-versed, astute audience. This reveals the imposition of racial discourses on the idea of 'the Jew', as racial discourse considers the identity of both parents in determining the identity of offspring, yet this demonstrates the 'almost but not quite' fit of Jewish identity within this discourse.

As with 'colour', locating 'the Jew' within or in relation to racial discourse is relatively rare in *NMTQ*. This may again be due to the emphasis Powell and Driver placed on religion. This in itself is suggestive when taken within the context of the duo's other significant work based around inter-group relations—*Love Thy Neighbour*. *Love Thy Neighbour* has been characterised as a 'racial sitcom', one in which 'race' is accepted as a legitimate means of conceptualising inter-group relations and utilised for humour instead of seriously critiqued as in *TDUDP*.[374] The fact that Powell and Driver rarely, if ever, invoke discourses of 'race', blood, heritability, morphology or physiognomy within *NMTQ*, when they proved themselves perfectly capable of doing so in their later work, may be interpreted as locating 'the Jew' definitively outside racial discourse. 'And Ecumenicals to you' briefly implicates racial discourse (though not specifically in relation to Jews).[375] Following Jewish/Irish football match, the referee threatens to report both teams to the Race Relations Board. The referee is alternately represented as Muslim, Sikh and Hindu through his dialogue and is played by the Jamaican actor Charles Hyatt. While the hybridising of these identities as ethnic or religious

373 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.6 'Party Night a.k.a. The Demon Drink' (12 February 1974).

374 For an exploration of 'the racial sitcom', see Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation*, 178–231 (pp. 196–201).

375 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.5 Ep.1 'And Ecumenicals to You' (15 December 1970).

identities will be briefly covered in Chapter 5, the character can also be analysed as racially hybridic as well. Charles Hyatt was born in Jamaica, emigrating to the UK in 1960 through a British Council bursary.[376] The character he plays is not from the West Indies, but from South Asia, Hyatt's accent when performing incorporates stereotyped inflections and affectations. This character might be interpreted as embodying, through the lens of 'authenticity', a form of 'asianface' performance akin to 'blackface' in which the character is interpreted as mocking the groups 'represented'.[377] Consequently, the character could be interpreted as fundamentally racist, intermixing South Asian migrant stereotypes with an actor who does not hold these forms of identity. This homogenisation of such diverse discourses into a single body may be said to reflect the homogenisation processes shown in Chapter 2's section on 'Black' *vs* 'White' binarism.

Yet, there is a critical ambiguity to the character arising from the hyperbolic performance of Hyatt, he exaggerates the already exaggerated affectations and dialogue of the character thus, the character may be read not as an 'asianface' character but as a hybridised mimic of racial difference that utilises and disrupts stereotype. Undoubtedly the character utilises stereotype, in doing so it becomes a *collage* of colonialist discourse's construction of colonised Otherness and in this analysis, Hyatt's West Indian background is key, his personal background, over which is inscribed discourses and stereotypes of Sikh, Hindu Paksitani, and Indian difference operates within racial discourse to exceed that colonialist vison of racial difference. In exceeding it, it slips and the stereotypes are revealed in their excess, thereby creating humorous incongruence and disjuncture that locates the character precariously both inside and outside racial discourse.[378] Colonialised, stereotyped South Asian 'behaviours' invested in a West Indian, colonialised body create discursive slippage, by revealing the phantasy of the stereotype and even the phantasy of the racialised body, thereby resisting them.[379]

'A Right Kosher conk': Constructing and Disrupting the 'Jewish Nose'

---

376 See Clayton Goodwin, 'Charles Hyatt', *The Guardian*, 24 February 2007, n.p.; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2007/feb/24/guardianobituaries.television> (accessed 3 June 2017).

377 For studies of the British series *The Black and White Minstrel Show* and its antecedents see Newton, *Paving the Empire* Road, 145–46; and Pickering, 'Race, gender and broadcast comedy'.

378 The idea of 'disjuncture' and distance between what is and what should be as the basis of comedy and humour has its roots in the work of Mikhail Bakhtin among others. See Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Iswolsky; Freud, *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*, trans. Strachey rev. Richards, 89–96. See also, for a particular example of discontinuity and incongruence as a source of humour, Atluri, 'Lighten up?!'.

379 For an exploration of a particular '–face' performance as a form of resistance see Atluri, 'Lighten up?!', 203–04; and Howells, ' "Is it because I is black?" '.

This section explores a thematic thread across the sources in relation to 'the Jew' as 'race'—the 'Jewish nose'. This discourse will be placed within its historical context and similarities drawn between the idea of the 'Jewish nose' and the idea of the 'Black nose' and how these operate ambiguously to alternately disrupt or reinforce the location of 'the Jew' within racial discourse.

Lord Hailsham offers the only parliamentary example of this: 'If you want to discriminate against Jews, it is no use discriminating against people with long noses'.[380] Hailsham clearly aims to discredit the idea of the Jewish nose in this statement by creating conceptual distance between 'the Jew' and 'the nose' as a site of racial difference. Compare this to an 1896 statement by Augustine Birrell MP in response to amendments to the Church of England's ability to sell advowsons in which he references and mocks money lenders having to pay 'through the Jewish nose'.[381] Or Richard Brooman-White's contribution to a 1956 debate on the Middle East which refers to 'banging' Israelis 'on the nose'.[382] Hailsham's statement appears to run counter to these, critiquing, not co-opting, the idea. His use of the stereotype both shows his awareness of its long history and demonstrates the discursive use to which it has been put as well as its intersecting across group boundaries—long noses are not a Jewish preserve. His failure, is, once again, in the lack of argumentation, even historicization, as to why it is of no use when the RRAs identify Jews as a racial group. Hailsham's is the sole reference across all of these debates to this idea, the overwhelming silence over what was (and is) a touchstone for antisemitism is not indicative of a decline in its use.[383] It is entirely possible that this is part of the general parliamentary attitude towards 'race' as scientifically untenable and unworthy of comment; or, alternatively, an outgrowth of their sense of themselves as British and the discursive investiture of that identity with ideas of 'fair play' and civility in these debates, leading to seeing references to 'the nose' as *gauche*. It is a

380 Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, c. 53.

381 'Reference had been made to the moneychangers who had been turned out of the Temple. [Mr Birrell] believed there were hon. Gentlemen opposite who would have given those moneychangers compensation—*[laughter]*—for he had little doubt that if an inquiry had been held before the Sanhedrim, it would have been found that all these persons had paid through the nose—through the Jewish nose—*[laughter]*—for the privilege of having stalls in the Temple' (Hansard, HC, 10 June 1896, vol. 41, c. 798).

382 'The implication of [Mr Bevan]'s remarks was that we had gone to the Israelis and said "If you take action against Jordan this will be an unfriendly act" […] It is not unusual to say in diplomatic language, "If you go into Egypt we will bang you on the nose" ' (Hansard, HC, 5 December 1956, vol. 561, c. 1285).

383 For the preponderance of 'the nose' as a touchstone of contemporary antisemitism see among other examples, the reproduction of *The Phoenix* (February 1982), in Tower Hamlets Arts Project, *Auschwitz and East London*, 10; and the reproduction of 'Billy the Yid' referred to above in Chapter 2 p. 88, *fn.* 312.

common theme that 'race' 'cannot be helped'[384] that it is immutable but, supposedly, value neutral. This is a harmful approach as it serves to lend validity the idea of the nose as a site or indication of Jewishness, it transfers the idea of 'the Jewish nose' from a site of negotiation and resistance to a site of silence, of *politesse*. Politely benign silence does not discredit an idea, it opens a discursive space into which oppressive discourses and rhetoric may flow to 'explain' it, to lay claim to truth and thus, to power. The RRAs' opponents argued that they stifled freedom of speech, in Bhabhaian terms, shutting down the third space in which earnest if ill-informed discussion was silenced for fear of prosecution. Polite silence, was, however, far from prevalent in the third space of sitcom.

Speight makes several uses of the 'Jewish nose' as a racial marker and as a means of problematising the location of 'the Jew' within racial discourse in *TDUDP*. In the episode, 'Intolerance', Mike engages in a lengthy argument with Alf over whether Alf is, as Mike contends, Jewish. One of the principal means by which Mike imposes/reveals Alf as Jewish is Alf's nose. He highlights its size and shape, connecting this explicitly racialised discourses of 'the Jew' by calling it a 'kosher conk'. Other occasions mirror this, for instance when, meeting a cameoing Kenny Lynch in 'Till Closing Time Us Do Part'.[385] Alf is in the pub trying to remember a fellow customer's (Jimmy Tarbuck) name, he says 'It's on the tip of my—' and Lynch offers '—Jew conk?' to diegetic and exegetic laughter. Unlike in Parliament, Speight makes use of these moments of discursive opening and utilises them as a third space of contact between 'the Jew' and colonialist racial discourse, utilising this stereotype as disruptive. Alf contends his nose is 'Roman'.[386] Mike also suggests that Alf will get on well with Mike's father, as both have 'large noses'.[387] Mike's father is Irish, thus establishing that 'large noses' is neither especially Jewish nor especially racial, it transgresses and slips these discursive bonds. In his conversation with Lynch, as an attempted rebuttal, Alf then invokes other, well-inscribed discourses of the 'Black' nose, saying to Lynch that his is 'so flat I thought you was [*sic*] a boxer'. Speight again, utilises extratextual knowledge to open up new readings of a seemingly straightforward insult; Lynch, during his time in the army, was a featherweight boxing champion.[388] Speight thereby plays with racial discourse of the 'flattened "Black" nose' in close proximity to references to the 'Jewish nose' along with

---

384 See, for instance comments by Shirley Williams (Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1018); Fenner Brockway (Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1846); and Lord Stonham (Hansard, HL, 26 July 1967, vol. 285, c. 970)

385 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.11 'Till Closing Time Us Do Part' (27 March 1967).

386 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

387 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.6 'From Liverpool With Love' (18 July 1966).

388 See David Laing, 'Kenny Lynch obituary', *The Guardian*, 18 December 2019, n.p.; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2019/dec/18/kenny-lynch-obituary> (accessed 19 December 2019).

the extratextual context of Lynch to disrupt the idea itself. This forces an ambiguity in which Lynch's nose becomes potentially relocated outside the realm of racial discourse. Speight's knowledge of Lynch's army career is uncertain, but both men were in the army at the same time and worked together following their service. It is perfectly plausible that the boxing reference was intentional.

Worth unpicking in more detail is a conversation between Alf in the 1972 Christmas special with a cockney 'Black' British hawker played by Derek Griffiths.[389] Following their argument Alf turns to Bert and says 'bloody Jew-nosed coon'. Ostensibly this echoes an earlier insult from Alf:

HAWKER […] I tell you, that really gets up my nose.

ALF Well there's plenty of room—

Ostensibly, this is simply a reinscribed insult directed at the 'Black nose' that concretises it as a marker of racial difference. However, Speight incorporates the 'Jewish nose' as well and in doing so opens up new readings that rest on ambiguity, precarity and offer resistive potential to both the 'Black nose' and the 'Jewish nose'. Chapter 2 showed the mainstream 'whitening' of 'the Jew' in Britain at this time. The hawker character expresses his wish to spend Christmas with his family, representing him as a non-Jewish 'Black' cockney who is possibly (but not necessarily) Christian. Alf's attachment of 'Jewish' to this character introduces humorous tension through an incongruence. Speight grafts the 'Jewish nose' onto this non-Jewish character and stands to disrupt physiognomic discourses of the nose as a marker of racial identity. By forcing the investiture of this character with Christian, 'Black', and Jewish discursive formulation, Speight compels the ideas of the Jewish nose and the 'Black' nose to slip, they can no longer be contained by racial discourse, no longer 'explained' and thus the incongruence must be acknowledged. This slippage of the stereotypical 'Jewish nose' into the stereotypical 'Black nose' and back again is dynamic and yet remains ambiguous, though its resistive potential is reinforced by the irony of Michell's performance of the antisemitic Garnett, the humour remains tendentious and thereby the tension remains in the situation. Speight ends to conversation, allowing the tension to remain unresolved.

Other, less successful examples of third space contact over the nose include, 'To Garnett, a Grandson', Nan (Joan Sims) remarks that Rita's baby has a big nose but he will 'grow into it like your [Rita's] Dad'.[390] Rita attempts to re-locate her child's nose outside racial discourse. The notion of 'growing into' a large nose suggests that Jewishness is inherent within the nose. The nose 'marks' the child just as it marked Alf. In 'Marital Bliss', Bert and

389 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1972).

390 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.1 'To Garnett a Grandson' (13 September 1972).

his wife Min are arguing and Alf is told to 'keep your long nose out of it', Alf then discusses his experience of bigotry in childhood. There is a clear discursive continuity this and Lord Hailsham's statement in Parliament (above). The 'Jewish nose' becomes specifically lengthy, not simply 'big'. This specificity about the 'Jewish nose' must be historicised to locate it within the context of 1960s and 1970s Britain.

The 'Jewish nose's' modern history has been presented by Sander Gilman via nineteenth-century scientific literature, directly relating this to changing ideas of Jewish skin 'colour'.[391] Some studies marked it as distinctive while others located it within a wider 'Mediterranean nose' rubric.[392] However, 'the nose' as a signifier of 'the Jew' is older. William Rowley, in *A Search for Money* (1609) refers to: 'A visage (or vizard) like the artificiall Iewe of *Maltaes* nose'.[393] This refers to Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (1590) and the use of a prosthetic nose. Sara Lipton has shown the emergence of the depiction of the 'Jewish nose' earlier (around the twelfth century) in religious iconography, and shows, prior to that, 'the Jew' had been visually signified outside the body, first by a Phrygian cap and even earlier by only contextual iconographic elements seen in, for instance, the depiction of Jews in 'Initial to Psalm 68' (1166) of Peter the Lombard's *Commentary on the Psalms*[394] and compared to that in the Moutiers-Grandval Bible (*c.*840).[395] The idea of 'the Jewish nose' then, may be medieval but it became racialised in the nineteenth century as a biological phenomenon.

NMTQ, for its part, mirrors Parliament's silence about 'the Jewish nose'. How far this is also attributable to the 'polite silence' idea is uncertain; Powell and Driver did not express concern as to the political correctness of their comedy writing, stated outright by Powell but it is attested by the explicitly anti-political correctness of their later work, *Love Thy Neighbour*.[396] *NMTQ*'s silence around 'the Jewish nose' may have been an attempt to 'de-racialise', to counter harmful stereotypes. Yet, this holds little water in the context of other stereotypes around physiognomy and behaviour included in the programme and the role that

---

391 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 169–80.

392 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 169–93.

393 See William Rowley, *A Search for Money. Or the Lamentable Complaint for the losse of the Wandring Knight, Monsieur l'Argent Or Come Along With Me, I Know Thou Louest Money. Dedicated To All Those That Lack Money* (London: Ioseph Hunt, 1609), 12; available online at <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A11154.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext> (accessed 3 October 2015); original emphasis.

394 Ms a.244, fol. 113^{v}, Brememn Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek; n.p., available online at <http://saralipton.com/chapter3.html> (accessed 2 October 2015).

395 Add. Ms. 10546, fol. 25^{v}, British Library; n.p., available online at <http://saralipton.com/introduction.html> (accessed 2 October 2015).

396 Powell, *From Rags to Gags*, 303–04. For *Love Thy Neighbour*, see Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation*, 196–201.

such stereotypes played in *Love Thy Neighbour*. It is more likely that this silence arises from Powell and Driver's understanding of 'the Jew' as a religious identity.

Conclusions: Jewish Racial Stereotyping in State and Sitcom; or, 'I doubt if anyone takes stereotypes seriously anyway'[397]

This chapter has drawn out a number of themes about how 'the Jew' was implicated in racial discourse 1965–1976 and how, while both Parliament and sitcom function as third spaces, the latter demonstrates far more resistive potential through its ambiguity than the former. While 'racism' is invariably castigated as a regressive, even evil, doctrine within parliamentary debates, 'racialism' (see *fn.* 362), is readily utilised as a discursive framework, a totalising one in fact, as it is 'racial group' that is used to describe all groups defined by their 'colour, race, or ethnic or national origin'. 'Race' is the fundamental determinant of difference in the RRAs as it encompasses all other forms of difference, it comes legally to encompass them. In spite of the legal force being given, no argumentation is offered, no discursive boundaries are set out, and, with the scientific use of 'race' by the far-right being roundly abhorred, racial discourse becomes simultaneously discursively empty *and* totalising. In attempting to handle 'race' in an 'enlightened' manner, parliamentarians demonstrated its impossibility.

TDUDP by contrast, demonstrates that critical handling of racial discourse opens up a more successful third space in which the resistive potential of hybridism is given greater potentiality. It has been shown that Speight and the cast manufacture a series of discursive hybridities that offer the potential to disrupt racial discourse, especially as it locates 'the Jew'. Within the programme, 'the Jew' has its location blurred within racial discourse, demonstrating intersections across other forms of identity and establishing locations simultaneously inside and outside racial discourse itself, demonstrating transgression and slippage. While the nature of the *TDUDP* as anarchic means that the ambiguity inherent in comedy is further compounded here by the ambiguity of the discursive content, the use of stenotype (particularly with regard to 'the nose') was shown to have more resistive potential than the discursive picture painted by parliamentary records.

To tie this chapter together, let the foregoing evidence now be assessed through a postcolonialist Bhabhaian lens. As Bhabha has argued, 'race' is, fundamentally a colonialist discourse. Constructed in order to justify colonial forms of oppression. I, together with authors the likes of Kathleen Paul, Richard Dyer, Stuart Hall, and Paul Gilroy (along with other figures from Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies) would support the contention that this colonialist discourse existed not simply in the colonial context but in

397 Letter from Stephen Murphy to Jim Rose, 19 May 1967 (IBA Archive 3049/9).

the postcolonial domestic context of Britain as well, and I would suggest that its harm and oppressive function extended beyond the bounds of indigenous oppressed peoples both as migrants to Britain and their descendants and to groups who occupied a hydridic positionality within that racial discourse, such as the Jews and that this precarity of position is both produced and reinforced by the colonialist discourse of 'race' that reinscribes Jews as both different and yet knowable within the Western discourse of 'race'. As Bhabha would term it, they become the colonialist 'Other'. Yet, Jews are able to utilise hybridity of identity in order to disrupt racial discourse's othering tendencies. This takes place in Parliament as well as outside. It has been shown that figures such as Maurice Orbach critiqued the idea of 'race' as applied to the Jews as a form of 'pseudo-genetics'. In spite of this, 'race' is hardly ever addressed in the parliamentary debates as a concept, it is, for the most part, assumed, which is a reliable indicator that, as a form of power-knowledge, it was effective. In spite of efforts on the part of Orbach and others, there was little debate about whether Jews constituted a 'race' in these debates—that was assumed, also thereby implicating Jews within this harmful colonialist discourse that was constructed to legitimise colonial forms of power and oppression. Yet, the few examples that do problematise the idea of Jews as a 'race' demonstrate that even at the highest levels of the British State one may find evidence to support the idea of Jews occupying a Bhabhaian position of hybridity that allows for interventions like Orbach's that disrupt the discourse of 'race' in its application to Jews, this also contributes to a rhizomatic understanding of this form of colonialist discourse, the process of Jewish racialisation in Parliament is not simply a matter of top-down power-knowledge but is disrupted, intermittent, and irregular.

This ambivalent, ambiguous, and precarious relationship of contemporary Jews to the discourse of 'race' is further demonstrated through the representation of Jews in *TDUDP*. If the evidence from these sources collected together in this chapter is analysed through a Bhabhaian, postcolonial lens it demonstrates that the validity of the perspective that this thesis advances of these sitcoms as a valuable site of third space analysis. They demonstrate a key point of intersection at which Jews and non-Jews take hold of the idea of 'the Jew' as 'race' and play with it, offering the potential disruption of it and, ultimately, through processes of mimicry and stereotype (in a Bhabhaian sense), mimicry becomes mockery and stereotype becomes critique. As I have demonstrated through discussions of how these comedies intersect with the histories of representation of the Jewish nose as a racial marker, these comedies carve out a new space of representation that at once utilises and inverts these ideas. While *TDUDP* fundamentally relies on the internal tension between actor and character, *NMTQ* opts for a relative silence on these topics. *TDUDP* offers an example of Bhabhaian mimicry in action as Alf Garnett is character who is identified as racially Jewish (due to his

heredity) yet he continually attempts to overlay this identity with a non-Jewish racial identity. A large amount of humour results from these attempts at mimicry Alf manifests the various trappings of what he considers to be his racial identity (or his preferred racial identity) and in doing so, becomes a stereotype. By investing him with a glut of stereotypical representational discourses, Speight is able to utilise, to those who are aware of Mitchell's Jewish identity, the character of Alf Garnett as an incisive critical intervention into the discourse of 'race' to disrupt its hegemony and demonstrate its inutility both generally and in its application to Jews specifically.

4

'They are unremarkable people'[398]
'The Jew' as 'Nationality' and 'National Origin'

As well as 'colour' and 'race', the RRAs also utilised 'ethnic or national origin' to identify protected groups. Soskice demonstrated that 'ethnicity' and 'nation' were regarded as complementary (see also Chapter 5).[399] He explicitly states that these terms were included to 'catch' groups who escaped definition by 'colour' or 'race'.[400] One such group was Jews. In spite of what might be assumed to be greater clarity in its definition and discursive boundaries, 'nation' as a discourse, was just as liable 'colour' and 'race' to ambiguity, and thereby to resistance and disruption both in Parliament and in sitcom, especially when attempts were made to locate 'the Jew' within its strictures. Parliamentary debates on 'nationhood' are characterised more by complacency than consideration.[401] While parliamentarians utilised 'nation' to describe specific groups, no coherent sense of this is evident.

TDUDP and *NMTQ* locate 'the Jew' within a more carefully handled 'nation' discourse that recognises the ambiguity and nuance of the discourse itself and of the location of 'the Jew' within that discourse. Within that ambiguity, the consequent third space that opens up offers more resistive potential for 'the Jew' to slip the discourse of 'nationhood' thereby demonstrating its artificiality. There writers were able to interrogate the ways in which the idea of 'national origin' greatly limited the individual agency in matters of identity and how 'nationality' was transient, historically-contingent phenomenon. This chapter will include two thematic sections on 'nation' discourse through the character of Manny and Alf: on Israel and on masculinity.

'Nationhood' and 'the Jew' in Parliament, 1965–1976

398 Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, c. 128.

399 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 932–33.

400 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 933.

401 Throughout this chapter I refer to 'nationality' and 'national origin(s)' to indicate cohesive (yet intersecting) elements of a wider discourse that I term 'nation discourse' or 'nationhood'.

While the RRAs 1965 and 1968 legislated around 'national origin', *Ealing London Borough Council v Race Relations Board (1971)* demonstrated its legal and discursive inadequacies.[402] It found that ELBC's reserving housing for British nationals was *not* discriminatory against Polish nationals as 'national origin' did not encompass nationality.[403] Parliament then recognised this discursive slippage.[404] Consequently the RRA 1976 explicitly included *both* 'nationality' and 'national origin'.[405] Parliament's lack of problematising of the concepts used in the RRAs directly led to this decision; thus, judicial intervention meant 'national origin' was the only discourse of difference to undergo any degree of refining across this period in Parliament. Parliament's failure to recognise this discursive gap highlights the artificiality of the discourse itself. As Benedict Anderson has convincingly argued, the 'nation' is an 'imagined community'—an historically-contingent psychosocial phenomenon and this was outside the bounds of contemporary parliamentarians' Western colonialist thinking.[406]

Primordialist discourses of 'nation' as natural and outside History, and, consequently, of 'national origin' as impermeable, fixed, and independent of citizenship, abound in parliamentary debate. 'Nation' is spoken of as a cohesive—familial or even corporeal—whole, with a life and character of its own. Statements by Paul B. Rose that 'the nation has derived a great deal [from immigration]';[407] Michael Foot regarding Enoch Powell's fear for 'the future of the nation';[408] and John Stokes' bemoaning that 'we are not the nation we were'[409] attest to this organic understanding of 'nation' as an essential, natural community finding political expression through the nation-state but which exists outside the political.

This emphasis on the primordial causes 'national origin' to intersect significantly with 'ethnic origin'. The ways in which these are discussed are often congruous, though they are never explicitly compared or synthesised in Parliament. Lord Drumalbyn, in 1968, demonstrated this intersection:

---

402 See *The Race Relations Act 1965*, ch. 73, §1 (1); and *The Race Relations Act 1968*, ch. 71, Part I, §1 (1) and §8 (4).

403 See Philip Rawlings, 'Judges, politics and property: the interpretation of legislation on race relations and immigration', *Cambrian Law Review*, 16 (1985), 98–115 (p. 102).

404 See Lord Janner's introductory remarks for his failed 1974 RRB (Hansard, HC, 4 April 1974, vol. 350, cc. 1039–78 [esp. c. 1042]). See also Cabinet Paper C(75) 93, 9 September 1975, published as Cd. 6234, 11 September 1975 §13; and the House of Commons' Second Reading of what would become the RRA 1976 (Hansard, HC, 4 March 1976, vol. 906, c. 1550).

405 *Race Relations Act 1976*, ch. 74, §1 (1) b (ii).

406 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London/New York: Verso, 2006 [1st ed. 1986]).

407 Hansard, HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c. 930.

408 Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, c. 466.

409 Hansard, HC, 4 March 1976, vol. 906, c. 1645.

> There must be cases where the particular qualifications are related to ethnic or national origins, and what one wants to advertise for is a person with that particular qualification. It is the ethnic or national origin which gives them the fullest possible knowledge of the culture and language of that nation.[410]

Drumalbyn moves between 'nation' and 'ethnicity' discourses as though they were one. He refers to 'culture and language' with regard to both without offering any rationale as to how they condition an individual's location within either/both. In reply, Lord Saltoun demonstrates, but does not take up, the discursive excess engendered by this overlap:

> […] it is not unlawful to advertise for a Scots nurse or a German cook or a French governess but it is unlawful to advertise for a Pakistani cook. […] This will be a Public General Act applying to everybody of all ethnic groups …[411]

The implication that there is no indication of the conceptual difference between what is an 'ethnic group' and what is a 'national group' is left untheorised. It might be argued that Scottish, German, or French people constituted multiple ethnicities or a single 'ethnicity', indeed parliamentarians advanced both lines during the 'Scot's porridge case' but at no point was it interrogated why such debates arose or their implication for the RRAs.[412] Similarly, W. R. Rees-Davies, characterised Germans as an ethnic group thus:

> […] there are people throughout the country, and in the party opposite, who would under no circumstances have an ex-member of the Nazi Party in their homes if he was a German and who would be objecting, therefore, on ethnic grounds.[413]

Rees-Davies demonstrates here also the implications that such intersectional and primordialist ideas when taken together and unproblematised and differentiated have for individual agency. For Rees-Davis, to be a German is to be indelibly marked with a connection to the Nazi Party in spite of one's own political leanings or national or ethnic identity.

Exploring the locating of 'the Jew' within 'nation' discourse acutely demonstrates the confusion around the concept within Parliament. Rarely did parliamentarians of the period refer to ideas of 'the Jew' as 'nation' or as a 'national origin' independent of others. Only once were these ideas ever explicitly connected throughout the entire period, by Eric Heffer during the Third Reading of the RRA 1968:

---

410 Hansard, HL, 25 July 1968, vol. 295, cc. 1329–30.

411 Hansard, HL, 25 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 1332.

412 This case involved the debate around the legality of an Eastbourne doctor's advertisement for a 'Scottish daily for [a] Scottish family able to do some plain cooking'. This generated a good deal of debate and derision in Parliament. See Hansard, HC, 6 February 1970, vol. 795 cc. 769–851 (esp. 770–72, 783, 788–89, 805 & 833).

413 Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, c. 338.

> Suppose an individual has a violent objection to the Jewish race, wishes to express it in the privacy of his own home but, perforce, has had thrust on him someone upstairs of the Jewish nationality. That will obviously cause trouble and will end up before the Board. It is not right that we should intrude.[414]

Heffer successively refers to 'the Jew' as a 'race' and then as a nationality. Their proximity in this speech is indicative of a congruence across the two for Heffer. He is able to move between one and the other discourse without prompting explain or interrogation by others. This apparent interchangeability between 'the Jew as race' and 'the Jew as nation' speaks to a precarity around 'the Jew's' relationship to these terms and their relationship to each other. 'The Jew' for Heffer simultaneously fulfils both discourses but not enough to merit a consistency of terminology. As with references to 'the Jew' as 'race' explored above, what is marked is the casualness of Heffer's reference, and its unproblematic reception.

The experience of former actor turned MP Andrew Faulds also offers evidence as to the location of 'the Jew' within the discourse of 'nation' and how far 'the Jew' might have been regarded as a distinct 'national origin' at this time.[415] Elected as MP for Smethwick in 1966, replacing Peter Griffiths, Faulds' attitude towards Jews became so well known that it was referenced casually and explicitly in 1976 by Norman Tebbitt:

> I hope that no one will accuse me of being prejudiced against [the Jews]. I fancy that the hon. Member for Smethwick would probably chastise me for not being sufficiently prejudiced against them.[416]

For Tebbitt to remark so flippantly, even with parliamentary privilege, about a colleague's prejudice without calls from the Speaker withdraw his remarks is telling. Faulds was removed from a Labour Party post as Arts spokesman following his accusing British Jews of having 'dual loyalties'.[417] In a parliamentary debate of 1972 he argued that 'it is time some of our colleagues […] forgot their dual loyalty to another country and another Parliament. They are representatives here and not in the Knesset', a clear reference to Israel.[418] There is, within such characterisations, an indication that 'the Jew' constitutes a 'national origin' or

---

414 Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, c. 396.

415 For a study of Faulds' opinions on British Jews and Israel, along with those of other Labour members of similar perspective, see James R. Vaughan, ' "Mayhew's outcasts": anti-Zionism and the Arab lobby in Harold Wilson's Labour Party', *Israel Affairs*, 21:1 (2015), 27–47.

416 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1849

417 Oliver Kamm, 'The Fight's Gone Out of Me', *The JC*, 17 March 2016, n.p.; available online at <https://www.thejc.com/comment/columnists/the-%EF%AC%81ght-s-gone-out-of-me-1.61851> (accessed 20 March 2016).

418 Hansard, HC, 14 December 1972, vol. 848, c. 726.

'nationality' distinct from others even though Jews have not, for a large amount of time, had a specifically Jewish State from which they might possibly claim citizenship. Consequently, there appears to be here a locating of 'the Jew' within a 'nation' discourse that positions Jewish 'nationhood' as something outside of History, that defies its ebbs and flows, and outside politics that eschews the transience of the rise and fall of States and Governments. Faulds' comments on this topic were not commonly expressed in Parliament. Faulds remained an MP for the Labour Party until 1997 and, as far as can be discerned, faced few calls to resign his seat for his pronouncements. Indeed, his antisemitic remarks are now largely forgotten by all but the Jewish press. *The Guardian*, in his obituary, trivialised his attitudes towards Jews as 'blimpish'.[419] From the absence of discussion engendered by Faulds, one might readily surmise that the locating of Jewish 'nationhood' as exceeding other discourses such as 'race', the notion of Jews as having 'dual loyalties', and 'Jewish' being constructed as a distinct 'nationality' and 'national origin' might not have lacked for sympathisers, if not outspoken advocates.

More common in Parliament is the locating of 'the Jew' as an identity subordinate to 'nation'—a sectional, cultural identity (Chapter 5). This was not novel, in 1942, Viscount Cranbourne had noted with regard to German Jews being interned in Jamaica that:

> [Lord Wedgwood] said that they were interned because they were Jews. Again, with all respect, that is not true. They were interned originally because they were German Jews. If they had been English Jews, Scottish Jews, Irish Jews, or Australian Jews they would not have been interned.[420]

This statement is ambiguous and opens two competing interpretations. Does Cranbourne conceptualise 'the Jew' as a 'nation across nations', as a 'nation *within* nations', or as a constituent part of a nation with different discursive foundations? This tension between 'the Jew' as a nation across 'nations' and 'the Jew' as form of identity outside of 'nation' discourse is echoed in the judgment handed down by Lord Justice Denning in 1983 following the Court of Appeal's hearing of *Mandla v Dowell-Lee*: 'Jews are not to be distinguished by their national origins. The wandering Jew has no nation'.[421]

The implication from reading these two comments from before and after the period of the RRAs is a discursive shift away from locating 'the Jew' as both part of, across and separate

---

419 Michael White, 'Andrew Faulds: Passionate Labour MP of the Pre-Pager Era', *The Guardian*, 1 June 2000, n.p.; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2000/jun/01/guardianobituaries.obituaries> (accessed 20 March 2016); c*f.* Kamm, 'The Fight's Gone Out of Me', n.p.

420 Hansard, HL, 10 September 1942, vol. 124, c. 359.

421 Quoted in Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 143.

from ‘nation’ discourse, to a judicial discourse of ‘the Jew’ located outside ‘nation’ discourse. In 1942 the State of Israel did not yet exist, yet by 1983 it had existed for almost four decades. In this sense Cranbourne’s apparent argument that Jewishness operates at a level either within or across ‘nationality’ is readily contextualised. The geopolitical context of 1983 by contrast presents a complex problematic within which to interpret Denning’s statement. Were Israel not to exist at this point then the phrase ‘the wandering Jew has no nation’ might be easily dismissed as an antisemitic reference to Ahasuerus (see below pp. 140–41) however, given the existence of Israel, a polity constructed on the basis of being a specifically Jewish nation-state, a more nuanced interpretation is required.[422]

Denning’s statement weakens Jewish national identity not only as Britons, but as Jews, weakening their discursive connection not simply to Britain and Israel as sites of identity, but to any ‘nation’. While this could simply be dismissed as an uncritical re-inscription of the legend of Ahasuerus and stereotypes of Jewish ‘unfittedness’, for Denning, there is a clear difference between ‘nationality’ and ‘national origin’. He argues that ‘Jews are not to be distinguished by their national origins’[423] this appears to point to an unambiguous construction of ‘the Jew’ as not being a ‘national origin’ in its own right. Israel, for Denning, apparently has no bearing upon the idea of Jewish national identity. This interpretation of the RRA 1976 fundamentally disrupts the notion that ‘the Jew’ is included in the remit of the Act under the rubric of ‘nation’ or ‘national origins’ in spite of a clear, expressed intention that it should.[424] There is a clear divergence in interpretation between these two statements forty years apart on the same subject: while Cranbourne regards the presence of Jews among many nations to show that ‘the Jew’ has a hybridic fluid relationship with ‘nation’, Denning argues, and legalises, that it is not and as such the Jews do not occupy a distinct position within ‘nation’ discourse. There is a tension at the heart of the idea of ‘nationhood’ across this period that the case of ‘the Jew’ exposes: disrupting the solidity of the concept by being simultaneously of all ‘nations’, none, and their own, this is Bhabhaian hybridism in action and this ambiguity that results from constant discursive investiture and divestiture offers the potential to disrupt ‘nation’ discourse.

---

422 The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel (14 May 1948) describes Israel as a ‘Jewish State’, and connects its establishment to ‘independent nationhood’, ‘national rebirth’, and a means by which the Jews may join the ‘comity of nations’ demonstrating the ‘nationalised’ perspective of Jewish identity invoked in Israel’s establishment. See a translation of the document from the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, n.p.; available online at <https://www.gov.il/en/pages/declaration-of-establishment-state-of-israel> (accessed 28 November 2024).

423 Quoted in Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 143.

424 See Cabinet Paper C(75) 93, 9 September 1975 (published as Cd. 6234 11 September 1975), ‘White Paper on Racial Discrimination’, §13.

A rare instance in which Jewish 'nationality' is discussed also serves to separate Jews from the idea of 'national origin', in 1965, the following exchange took place between Jeremy Thorpe and Sir Dingle-Foot (then Solicitor General):

> THORPE — What is the Solicitor-General's interpretation in the question of attacks against persons of Jewish religion or Jewish extraction? What if they are merely of Jewish extraction and are attacked for that reason? Is it his view that this would be covered by racial or ethnic or national considerations in the Bill or not at all?
>
> DINGLE-FOOT — They would certainly be in one or other of those categories. I do not think that the word 'national' would be appropriate, but I think that the words 'racial' or 'ethnic' would be appropriate.[425]

This is a rare explicit statement on the relationship of 'the Jew' to 'nation' from the highest legal representative in the Government and it makes it clear that in 1965 the Government's view, was that, legally, Jews did not constitute a 'nation', but were a 'race' or an 'ethnicity'.

The intersection of racial discourse and 'nation' discourse around 'the Jew' is also shown in the rare discussions of the salience of Israel. Barnett Janner characterises the Arab-Israeli war as a racial conflict in a race relations debate in 1967.[426] This conflates ideas of 'race' and 'nation' in relation to the State of Israel though Janner does not extend this discursive overlap to British Jews. Janner, I would argue, draws a clear connection between the modern State of Israel and the ancient Kingdom of Israel, and alludes to an essential inadequacy in other parliamentarians' understandings of 'national origin', when applied to 'the Jew'. By describing the post-1948 Israeli State as essentially racial, Janner demonstrates the complex location of 'the Jew' within 'nation' and 'race', how it transgresses them and slips their bonds. Returning briefly to Faulds, James R. Vaughan has argued that he had sympathy with the idea that Jewish nationalism was an essentially racist set of ideas.[427] Faulds, for instance, did not rebut these ideas in his reply to a letter from a constituent who argued that: 'Judaism (Zionism) is as racially exclusive as the "master race" "chosen people" [*sic*] and just as ruthless'.[428] This too speaks to the extent to which 'the Jewish nation' and 'the Jewish race' were liable to be confused in political discourse of the time. For other politicians, Israel has

425 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1044.

426 Hansard, HL, 7 June 1967, vol. 283, c. 451.

427 Vaughan, ' "Mayhew's Outcasts" ', 37–38.

428 Vaughan, ' "Mayhew's Outcasts" ', 38.

almost no bearing on the idea of Jewish 'nationality' or 'national origin'.[429] It is noteworthy that nowhere in the debates are the terms 'Israeli', 'Israelite' or 'Hebrew', utilised to describe British Jews. All this, perhaps, indicates a recognition of the complex role Israel plays in in British Jewish identity. This untheorised intersection between 'race' and 'nation' discourses when addressing 'the Jew' demonstrates the potential disruption of these discourses through this lens, by necessarily occupying a hybridic location, compelling the recognition of its connections to both discourses and across (and outside) them, 'the Jew' takes on a mimetic countenance, exceeding both discursive structures and fulfilling neither. Israel is key to this, by being almost but not quite both 'nation' and 'race' as a result, 'the Jew' has the potential to reveal the epistemic inadequacies of these discourses.

What is notable across any pronouncements on the 'nationality' or 'national origins' of Jews is the lack of argumentation to justify such views. Further demonstrating an ongoing theme within this thesis, parliamentary discussion is characterised not by debate, but by assumption and unsubstantiated statement. The significance of Israel was one of the principal channels through which 'the Jew' as 'national origin', was interrogated within the two sitcoms under examination. Within these comedies, the role of 'nation' in structuring the difference of 'the Jew' is roundly addressed.

'The Jew' and 'Nationhood' in Sitcom, 1965–1976

Archival evidence demonstrates the presence of discourses that located 'the Jew' within 'nation' discourse in connection with *TDUDP*. In promotional material for the first series episode 'Intolerance', producer Dennis Main Wilson wrote: 'We do have half a dozen letters from various types of foreigners—i.e. Scots and Jewish, who protested that the programme was in bad taste—because it was racially prejudiced'.[430] This promotional material was used domestically and internationally to advertise *TDUDP*, including as part of a press package for the 1967 Rose d'Or Awards in Montreux. By explicitly locating 'Jewish' as a 'foreigner', this promotional piece offers a clear discursive statement about the nature of Jewish identity in ways that not found in parliamentary discussions. However, this does not reflect the subtleties of the programme itself.[431]

---

429 See Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 932–33 (specifically Bernard Braine's contribution) & 1013; HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 98–99 & 128; HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, cc. 80 & 134; and HL, 16 December 1969, vol. 306, c. 960 among others.

430 BBC WAC, T12/1254/1.

431 It is unfortunate to note that none of the alleged letters from Jewish viewers protesting the 'racially prejudiced' nature of the programme are extant in the BBC Written Archives Centre.

In *TDUDP*, Alf is an English/British nationalist, glorifying them, and counting himself an essential and archetypal part of them. His extreme, almost cartoonish, nationalist sentiment is expressed both through reverence for the land, the people, and the political party he connects most closely with land ownership—the Conservatives. Alf's attachment to the idea of land as a form of nationalism is explicitly stated in 'State Visit', wherein he claims that his neighbour's fence has encroached an inch onto his land and has severely limited the value of his property as 'land is a very valuable commodity'.[432] This attachment is not solely economic, 'Two Toilets? That's Posh' shows Alf's perspective on land's moral and social value.[433] He argues that by owning his home he is part of the land-owning classes which he correlates with British virtues.

Alf's fervour for royalty and the national anthem also point to extreme nationalism. His deference to royalty and his reflex-like reaction to the anthem eschew any pretence to 'realistic' representations of patriotism/nationalism. He always stands for the national anthem (the only character to do so) and is aggressive towards those that do not.[434] He is also an avid viewer of the Queen's Christmas address, insisting in 'Peace and Goodwill' that everyone watch it.[435] He sees the royals as the first family of the nation and a manifestation of the nation's character, he use their first names familiarly, and invests them with his own opinions on issues and other public figures as well as supposedly 'British' characteristics.[436] He also displays significant religious fervour, but is not shown attending church, he sees the Church of England as the one true religion[437] and argues that the British have a special relationship with God as 'we were chosen to celebrate Christmas'.[438]

Alf also glorifies British military power. He extensively praises the armed forces referring to 'our boys' or 'our lads', once again constructing the nation as familial. Connected to this is Alf's nostalgia for the British Empire which he regards as divinely sanctioned, an indicator of status as a world power and an inheritance for the future that, he argues, successive Labour Governments have given away.

---

432 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.9 'State Visit' (20 February 1967).

433 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.3 'Two Toilets? That's Posh' (4 July 1966).

434 See, for instance *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.1 'Peace and Goodwill' (26 December 1966).

435 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.1 'Peace and Goodwill' (26 December 1966). See also *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1966).

436 See for instance *Till Death Us Do Part* S.2 Ep.7 'A Wapping Mythology a.k.a. The Workers' King' (6 February 1967); it should be noted that Alf refuses to refer to Elizabeth II by her regnal name, opting for the reverential pseudo-religious 'Her'.

437 See *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.2 'Sex Before Marriage' (2 January 1967); and *Till Death Us Do Part* S.5 Ep.2 'Royal Wedding' (9 January 1974) offer two notable examples.

438 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.1 'Peace and Goodwill' (26 December 1966).

TDUDP offers some exploration of the location of 'the Jew' in relation to 'nation' discourse. The episode 'Paki-Paddy' has Alf describe a Soviet conspiracy to create racial discord in America through the Civil Rights Movement.[439] He speaks of Soviet manufacturing of solidarity between 'your American Jews and your Israeli Jews', speaking further to antisemitic ideas of Jewish internationalism and influence.[440] Alf clearly locates Jewishness as something intersecting with but also transgressing 'nation', for Alf 'the Jew' is not necessarily tied to a place of birth and thus not defined by citizenship. Alf tacitly acknowledges non-Jewish Israelis here further distinguishing Israeli citizenship from 'the Jew'.

Prior, Alf argues that Arabs do not like Jews, 'because they are only Black Jews themselves aren't they. […] Did you know that the Arabs are the lost ten tribes of Israel?'.[441] Again, Israel allows Speight to problematise the relationship between 'the Jew' and 'nationhood'. In 'revealing' the true nature of 'the Arabs' as part of a Jewish 'nation', Alf synthesises 'Arab' identity—seemingly a form of 'colour'—with Jewish 'nationhood'. Utilising the category of what Lord Brown in Parliament referred to as 'Semites' to interrogate 'nation' and problematise ideas of Jewish 'nationhood' is frequent in *TDUDP*.[442] During the 1972 Christmas special, Alf, Bert and Rita discuss Israel:

ALF I've seen 'em, Palestine Jews.

RITA Palestine's in Israel.

ALF But Israel's part of Egypt isn't it.[443]

Alf hereby posits Israel not as an independent nation-state but as a constituent part of a larger 'Arab' area. This plays with the history of the region in the late 1960s whereby the Gaza strip was administered by Egypt, and other areas by Jordan and Syria, until the Six Day War, after which Israel gained control over the regions. Alf seems to post that political administration of an area is transient and unrelated to true 'ownership'. Alf here represents Israel as an area that Jews have moved into and claimed. This undermines ideas of Israel as a specifically Jewish national identity, arguing that Israelis are really Egyptian. Bert then complicates this further:

> They never got on, even then…The Jews went down into Egypt with…him with the coat…Jacob…I don't know where they come from but that's definitely where they went to. They never got on with the 'Gyptians, according to the Bible they never really got on

439 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.7 'Paki-Paddy' (28 February 1974).

440 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.7 'Paki-Paddy' (28 February 1974).

441 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.7 'Paki-Paddy' (28 February 1974).

442 Hansard, HL, 31 October 1973, vol. 346, c. 73.

443 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1966).

> with anybody. That's why God was always sending them somewhere else. He even parted the Red Sea for 'em…'cos of the locusts. That's why Jews eat *matzos* y'know. Jews have been wandering this world ever since the world began.[444]

Aside from this quotation's humorous conflation and juxtaposition of Biblical stories and tropes about Jews, Speight here utilises Bert to overlayer an already complex discursive picture. Bert mysticises the Jewish origin, seemingly connecting them, not to a defined area of land, but to a person, Jacob, progenitor of the twelve tribes of Israel. This proposed national foundation runs counter to a central tenet of Jewish nationalism: that the Jews have a special relationship with *Eretz Israel*. By separating Jews from the land, Speight, through Bert, undermines a long-established notion of Jewish 'nationhood', intersecting 'nation' with ideas of family, heredity, and blood thereby intersecting with racial discourse (Chapter 3).

A final element worth delineating is Alf's consistent identification by other characters as Jewish. Alf rejects any notion of being Jewish. For Alf, Jewish identity is not compatible with his self-identity as English/British. For Alf, accepting Jewishness is to be marked as 'different', hybridity is anathema to his worldview, yet it is hybridity he embodies. We see his attitude to hybridity in his reactions to Kevin O'Grady (Spike Milligan) in 'Paki-Paddy'.[445] Alf is incredulous at O'Grady's embrace of both Irish and Pakistani identities. O'Grady was born in Dublin and his father in Pakistan thus he is a living embodiment of central point of the ELBC case (p. 118), his 'nationality' is not his 'national origin'. Alf, unable to accept two conflicting forms of identity, is thereby dialogued with a character who can. He mocks O'Grady's hybridity yet Speight utilises O'Grady as a means to reveal the paucity and irony of Alf's own hybrid identity

What opens up through this thesis' use of Bhabha is the analysis of Alf Garnett as mimic, offering a site of potential mockery, menace, and disruption of the discourses he embodies. Garnett is so extreme in his nationalism, his royalism, his hostility to the foreign, and this extremism must be contextualised alongside the understanding of the character as a self-denying Jew. Within this context, taking place diegetically within an extratextual context of Warren Mitchell being a proud Jewish man, the shape of Garnett as national colonialist mimic takes form. There is an inherent tension created by the characters simultaneous glorifying of the immutability of 'English' identity and its superiority to other forms of 'nationhood' in the context of his accusing Jews of being unfitted (being precariously Jewish himself). This of its own accord produces discursive ambiguity, which is only heightened within the context of Mitchell as a performer. Mitchell demonstrated in the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle* his ideas

444 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1966).

445 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.7 'Paki-Paddy' (28 February 1974).

around modern British Jewish identity and his considered, mature relationship to Israel as an idea, showing that, in his view one could combine the ideas of being English and being Jewish within the context of measured support for Israel.[446] He also declared himself 'suspicious of nationalism', so his performance must be analysed with this in mind.[447] Consequently, Alf Garnett must be viewed as a nationalist mimic that is invested with the trappings and discourses of English/British nationalism while embodying an identity he regards as incompatible with these. His nationalism is so excessive in this context that his Jewishness causes it to slip and reveal its incongruence which produces humour. This humour might be directed oppressively in a Hobbesian manner at the character trying to embody something he can never be, or in a Bakhtinian *carnivalesque* manner at the very idea of 'nation' itself. Both are possible and in this possibility the mimic becomes menace, not openly hostile to the discourse it embodies but possibly disruptive. Speight does not close this loop in the series, there is no cathartic moment, the dynamic remains precarious.

Manny, in *NMTQ* offers a complex examination of the relationship between 'the Jew' and 'nationhood', primarily through an exploration of the significance of Israel. The entirety of 'Old Soldiers Never Die' is structured around this issue.[448] Manny proudly displays his photograph of Moshe Dayan, the Israeli military leader and politician whom Manny praises. This might be usefully compared to Alf's photographs of displays of Churchill, the royal family and his painting of Jesus. Manny displays a non-British figure in his workplace, implying both pride and inspiration. Manny sees his work as a tailor as parallel to Dayan's in Israeli military affairs, providing an important discursive point when considering Powell and Driver's locating of 'the Jew' in relation to 'nationhood'.

Manny's colleague Patrick (Joe Lynch) asks him why he did not fight in the Six Day War echoing Alf's statement about American and Israeli Jews yet without the antisemitic undertones. Manny replies: 'I would have joined up, but I wanted to finish making a jacket and by the time I'd got around to it the war was over'. Ostensibly this statement presents Manny as owing loyalty to another country yet his British patriotism is reclaimed by the comic nature of his facetious reply to Patrick. Patrick test Manny's resolve and consequently, his identity, by forging a personal letter from Dayan calling for Manny's enlistment. To

446 In two interviews with the *Jewish Chronicle*, Mitchell alternately declares that he had intended to move to Israel as it was 'the only genuine Socialist country in the world' ('Mitchell Surprises', *Jewish Chronicle*, 14 February 1969, p. 4) and, two years later that he had experienced a great deal of surprise from fellow Jews that he 'didn't attend every Zionist function and side with Israel come what may […] I don't believe in my country right or wrong as far as England is concerned and I don't believe that Israel is right just because I'm Jewish' ('My country right not wrong', *Jewish Chronicle*, 10 September 1971, p. 15).

447 'My country right not wrong', p. 15.

448 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.3 Ep.1 'Old Soldiers Never Die' (21 August 1969).

Patrick's surprise Manny resolves to acquiesce to 'Dayan's' exhortation that 'your country needs you' and 'we need the help of every able-bodied Jew'. Manny establishes his loyalty to Israel and leaves. Patrick's understanding of Jewish 'nationality' and 'national origin' clearly plays on but does not express sympathy with the antisemitic undertones of ideas of dual loyalty as expressed by, for instance, Faulds. Manny following the letter's instructions would seem to lend credence to this idea, however, the revelation that Manny has rumbled Patrick's joke and has decided to turn the tables on him, complicates the situation. Manny does in fact go to 'Israel'—his friend Israel Bloom's delicatessen—where he stays and corresponds with Patrick about life in the Israeli army.[449] Bloom asks Manny what tipped him off Manny offers the following:

> After I got over the initial shock I read the letter again. Now whilst I accept the fact that Moshe Dayan could write 'critical' with a 'k', I don't believe that he would write 'Israel' with a 'z'.[450]

It is noteworthy that he refers to typography, not the idea that a country in which he was not born and has never been resident could legitimately enlist him, let alone have his address, along with every 'able-bodied Jew'. This statement, to those viewers either ignorant of, or uncertain of the status of British Jews with regard to Israel, might be interpreted as legitimating the harmful 'dual loyalties idea' and perpetuating the idea that Israel was a form of Jewish 'nationhood' that could supersede any sense of loyalty to Britain. While Manny not actually going may well be taken as 'reclaiming' his Britishness, along with his statement that he needs to look after England as that is also 'in *schtuck*', the fact that these negative ideas about Jews are not fully rebutted in the programme opens an ambiguous space in which 'the Jew' is located within discourses of 'nation' but also superior to them, transgressing 'nation' into other discourses such as 'race' or 'ethnicity'.

While Manny does not possess the intrinsic, *carnivalesque* disruptive potential of Garnett's mimic character, how Powell and Driver locate 'the Jew' within 'nation' discourse as part of his character does still exhibit some elements of a Bhabhaian hybridity. There is no seeming tension in his simultaneous support for Israel, to the extent that he has a poster of Dayan on the wall of the workshop, and his British patriotism expressed through his military service (for instance). What this does, discursively, is demonstrate the compatibility for Powell and Driver, of British 'nationality' with Jewish identity (even if it is presented as a

---

449 The wordplay in Manny's seeking refuge from 'Israel' is not explicitly drawn out and would not likely be picked up by casual audience members. There is no indication that such a joke was intended specifically for his episode as Israel Bloom has been introduced as a character in the previous series.

450 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.3 Ep.1 'Old Soldiers Never Die' (21 August 1969).

'national origin'). For Powell and Driver, Jewish identity clearly occupies a position that does not put it in conflict with British nationality. Yet, there is still an ambiguity at play here. While it is possible to read Manny as a hybridic character, this hybridism locates Jewishness as existing across or within British nationality, potentialising the unfittedness of parliamentary ideas of 'the Jew as nation', particular as expressed by Soskice. There is then a tension with discourses outside the *NMTQ* text in a wider context. Manny's ability to embody both Jewish identity manifested as support for Israel's military actions and British patriotism mirror that of the actor John Bluthal. Bluthal, throughout 1971, appeared in advertisements in the *Jewish Chronicle* for an Israel-focused travel agency, the adverts describe him as a 'frequent traveller to Israel' and suggest that holiday makers might see him on their journey.[451] He also gave an interview during a 'March for Israel' for the 23 November 1973 issue of the paper.[452] In taking on the character Bluthal was conscious of the hybridic potential of the role and the inherent tension of that hybridity, remarking in a 1967 interview: 'To play a character like this, you must get rid of the phoney cliches. If someone who wasn't as conscientious a Jew as I am was playing the part, I'd be worried about it'.[453] There is a clear awareness of the potential for harm or disruption in the character, though he does not connect this to any particular idea of difference but to the requirement for an authentic and conscientious Jew to play the part, implying perhaps that only someone like him who has successfully hybridised British and Jewish identity could play the role effectively. There does not appear to be the disruptive intention either in Powell and Driver's writing or in Bluthal's performance that is discernible from Speight and Mitchell.

A further significant element of the sitcoms' treatment of 'the Jew' in relation to 'nationality' is the consideration given to ideas of masculinity, predominantly through the two Jewish protagonists. These comedies variously utilise and disrupt stereotypical discourses of Jewish masculinity and in so doing construct two alternative visions of Jewish masculinity and its relationship to ideas of 'British masculinity', 'Black masculinity', and 'White non-British masculinity'. These discussions of masculinity will be contextualised within ideas of 'nation' and the importance of these discussions as a means of conceptualising 'the Jew' in relation to ideas of ' "White"/Same' and ' "Black"/Other', and even ' "White"/Other', within the context of silence on the topic within Hansard sources, will be demonstrated as a key means of locating 'the Jew' within ideas of race relations.

---

451 See *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 March 1971, p. 29; 19 March 1971, p. 31; and 2 April 1971, p. 25, for instance.

452 Mollie Brandel Bowen, 'My feet are killing me but it was worth it', *Jewish Chronicle*, 23 November 1973, p. 30.

453 Hyam Corney, 'Bluthal has no need to be worried', *Jewish Chronicle*, 24 November 1967, p. 37.

The Jewish Man and the Crisis of British Masculinity

Jewish masculinity and its relationship to ideas of 'nation' is rarely explicitly discussed in Parliament. However, anxieties around, aspersions regarding, and vindications of, Jewish masculinity, are significant in discourse of 'the Jew' in Britain and the wider world.[454] *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* also cover this topic in some detail speaking to a discursive focus on the status, content, and expression of Jewish masculinity, particularly in relation, or contrast, to non-Jewish forms of masculinity. Parliamentary silence is not surprising given the foregoing exploration of ideas of fair play and propriety (see above Chapter 3).[455] However, when discussing postcolonial ideas of oppressive discourses such as 'nation', gender is a fundamental part of this: the manner in which a given identity group is identified as 'masculine', in what terms and to what degree, as well as the ways in which a group may be

454 For discussions of Jewish masculinity as part of wider constructions of 'the Jew' by both Jews and non-Jews, there is a large historiography, important examples include Harry Brod, 'Of Mice and Supermen: Images of Jewish Masculinity', in *Gender & Judaism: The Transformation of Identity*, ed. T. M. Rudavsky (New York/London: New York U. P., 1995), 279–93; Maurice Berger, 'The Mouse that Never Roars: Jewish Masculinity on American Television', in *Too Jewish? Challenging Traditional Identities*, ed. Norman L. Kleeblatt (New Brunswick: New York Jewish Museum [assoc. Rutgers U. P.], 1996), 93–107; Sander Gilman, 'The Jew's Body: Thoughts on Jewish Physical Difference', in *Too Jewish?*, ed. Kleeblatt, 60–73 as well as his *The Jew's Body*, 83–4 & 208–09; Daniel Boyarin, '*Goyim Naches*, or, Modernity and the Manliness of the *Mentsch*', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 63–87; *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History*, ed. Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman & Paul Lerner (Bloomington: Indiana U. P., 2012); Gavin Schaffer, 'Unmasking the "muscle Jew": the Jewish soldier in British war service, 1899–1945', in *Racializing the Soldier*, ed. Gavin Schaffer, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 46:3–4 (2012), 375–96; and Dana Rabin, 'The Jew Bill of 1753: Masculinity, Virility, and the Nation', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39:2 (2006), 157–71 among many others.

455 A notable exception is a brief reference to the construction of the 'Black' male as sexually rapacious. See Lord Clifford of Chudleigh's recounting of a letter sent to him in 1966 (Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, cc. 1884 & 1886); or Peter Thorneycroft's reference in 1965 to 'acute social problems' that 'arise from the absence of wives', specifically of the wives of non-'White' migrants (Hansard, HC, 23 March 1965, vol. 709, c. 339) linking non-'White' immigration to increased rates of sexual crimes against White-British women, yet one is tempted to offer a conjecture that such crimes are constructed not only as crimes against the female individual, but as an affront to British masculinity, see for instance repeated references in racist literature of the time to 'our women' and the manner in which such sentiments are connected to ideas of Social Darwinism and 'race survival' which in many places is given a distinct 'national' flavour as 'the British race'. See for instance Jackson, *Colin Jordan and Britain's Neo-Nazi Movement*, 68 & 231; for references to the 'British race' in Parliament, see Lord Barnby (Hansard, HL, 4 April 1974, vol. 1350, c. 1063); and Ronald Bell (HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1676). These are, indeed, only veiled references to the presence of 'Black' masculinity in Britain, references to other forms of masculinity under examination in this study (British, Jewish and Irish) are entirely absent from the parliamentary records explored here.

identified as 'unmasculine', 'effeminate' or 'feminine' are crucial to processes of othering within postcolonial discourses.[456] Constructing gender-based differences between same-sex individuals (or gender-based similarities between different-sex individuals) across identity group boundaries is a powerful means by which group identity is reinforced and processes of oppression are justified, enacted and, potentially, disrupted.

Parliamentary silence is not a basis from which to conclude that there was no concern around masculinity. Evidence suggests an awareness of a crisis of British masculinity in this period.[457] This is best brought to light through postcolonial theory: longstanding colonialist

456 Postcolonial theory has regularly broached ideas of gender as a means of critiquing and disrupting colonialist discourses and structures. See 'Gender', in Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies*, 101–04. Key to this is Frantz Fanon (*Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann [London: Pluto Press, 1986 (1st French ed. Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1952)], esp. ch. 5; and *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington, with a Preface by Jean-Paul Sartre [New York: Grove Press, 1963 (1st French ed. Paris: François Maspero, 1961]). This important work was also utilised by Homi Bhabha (*The Location of Culture*, 74–75 for instance) through his concept of fetishism. Also important in establishing studies of colonialist masculinities are the chapters by R. W. Connell ('Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities') and Robert Morrell & Sandra Stewart ('Men in the Third World: Postcolonial Perspectives on Masculinity'), both in *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, ed. Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn & R. W. Connell (London: Sage, 2005), 71–89 & 90–113 respectively.

457 The disruption of a previously monolithic and complacent conception of British masculinity is largely to be inferred from the foregoing examples (e.g. p. 131 *fn.* 455, p. 132 *fn*. 457 & p. 133 *fn*. 458) demonstrating concern about the supposed sexual rapacity of 'Black' males. See also Paul B. Rose's explication of the ways in which right-wing literature played upon such sexual anxieties of British men to foment racial angst (Hansard, HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c. 925). Theoretical and historical work on the idea of masculinity and crises it has faced is a burgeoning field, notable theoretical works include Stefan Horlacher, 'Charting the Field of Masculinity Studies; or, Toward a Literary History of Masculinities', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Stefan Horlacher (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 3–18; and also his 'Towards Comparative Masculinity Studies: On the interdependence of National identity and the Construction of Masculinity', in *Post-World War II Masculinities in British and American Literature and Culture: Towards Comparative Masculinity Studies*, ed. Stefan Horlacher & Kevin Floyd (London/New York: Routledge, 2016), 1–14; Harry Brod, 'The Construction of the Construction of Masculinities', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 19–32; and Thomas Winter, 'Crisis of Masculinity', in *American Masculinities: A Historical Encyclopedia*, ed. Bret E. Carroll (New York: The Moschovitz Group, 2003), 117–19 among others. For historical studies of British masculinity in crisis see Michael Kimmel, 'The "Crisis" of Masculinity in Seventeenth-Century England', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 89–108; Silvia Mergenthal, 'A Man Could Stand Up: Masculinities and the Great War', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher,189–208; and Anoop Nayak, ' "Pale Warriors": Skinhead Culture and the Embodiment of White Masculinities', in *Thinking Identities: Ethnicity, Racism and Culture*, ed. Avtar Brah, Mary J. Hickman & Máirtín Mac an Ghaill (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 71–99. For the role of 'race', migration, and gender/sexual equality in disrupting constructions of masculinities see Elahe Haschemi Yekani, *The Privilege of*

discourses of 'Black' and 'White' masculinities and of 'civilization', combined with the representation of New Commonwealth immigration as substantial, male, and unchecked. Also occurring in this context were social trends like the decriminalisation and socio-political emancipation of homosexuality in Britain; increasing moves towards social, economic, political, and cultural parity between the sexes and the disruption of traditional gender roles; and, finally, Britain's declining geopolitical importance, particularly through the process of decolonisation. Several parliamentarians aired concern over the potential physical, social, and political dominance of 'Black' men over 'White' as well as sexual concerns both for the 'safety' of 'White' women and the potential for miscegenation.[458] I would argue that through

---

Crisis: Narratives of Masculinities in Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, Photography and Film (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2011); several of the chapters in *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain*, ed. Louise Ryan & Wendy Webster (New York/Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), including the editors' 'Introduction', 1–18; Nobil Ahmad Ali, 'Gender and Generation in Pakistani Migration: A Critical Study of Masculinity', 155–70; Richard Smith, ' "The Black Peril": Race, Masculinity and Migration During the First World War', 19–34; Joanna Herbert, Masculinity and Migration: Life Stories of East African Asian Men', 189–204; Meinhard Winkgens, 'Cultural Hybridity and Fluid Masculinities in the Postcolonial Metropolis: Individualized Gender Identities in Hanif Kureishi's *The Buddha of Suburbia* and *The Black Album*', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 229–246; Martin Francis, 'The domestication of the male? Recent research on nineteenth- and twentieth-century British masculinity', *The Historical Journal*, 45:3 (2002), 637–52; Berthold Schoener, 'Baffled Hopes and Bad Habits: Men, Marriage, and Queer Conformity in Queer Theory and Gay Representation', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 209–28; and Peter E. Jordan, 'Repressing the male gaze? Sidney J. Furie's *The Leather Boys* and the growing pains of post-war British masculinity', *Film Criticism*, 43:1 (2019); n.p., available online at <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/f/fc/13761232.0043.101/--repressing-the-male-gaze-sidney-j-furies-the-leather-boys?rgn=main;view=fulltext> (accessed 10 June 2019). Finally for work on Jewish masculinity see several of the chapters in *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender and History*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, especially those by Baader, Gillerman & Lerner ('Introduction: German Jews, Gender and History', 1–22); Baader's own 'Jewish Difference and the Feminine Spirit of Judaism in Mid-Nineteenth Century Germany', 50–71; Lisa Fethergill Zwicker ('Performing Masculinities: Jewish Students and the Honor Code at German Universities', 114–37); Sander Gilman ('Whose Body is it Anyway? Hermaphrodites, Gays, and Jews in N. O. Body's Germany', 138–51); and Judith Gerson ('Family Matters: German Jewish Masculinities among Nazi Era Refugees', 210–32). See also Berger, 'The Mouse that Never Roars', in *Too Jewish?*, ed. Kleeblatt, 93–107; Brod, 'Of Mice and Supermen', in *Gender and Judaism,* ed. Rudavsky, 279–93; and Wendy Webster, 'Britain and the Refugees of Europe 1939–50', in *Gendering Migration*, ed. Ryan and Webster, 35–52; and Rabin, 'The Jew Bill of 1753'.

458 Hansard, HC, 17 November 1964, vol. 702, c. 370 (Michael Foot quoting Councillor Donald Finney of Smethwick); HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1029; HL, 10 March 1965, vol. 264, c. 164, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1886; HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 110–11; HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, cc. 1665 & 1667; and HL, 20 July 1976, vol. 373, cc. 801–03. See also Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech, particular the content of his conversation with a working-class man, delivered to a Conservative Association meeting in Birmingham, 20 April

a postcolonial lens, these colonial anxieties are of long standing and this is a matter more of these ideas coming home to roost. I would also suggest that there is a clear intersection between masculinity and 'nationhood' here, particularly of British 'nationhood', that masculinity, in the context of fading empire and social change, came to stand metonymically for the 'nation'. This is evident of a more general anxiety around British masculinity that finds expression in some of the widespread discourses of anti-'Black' prejudice.

Within this, the liminal location of 'the Jew' becomes crucial to exploring these ideas. Sitcoms, with their ability to interrogate the taboo, functioned as an anarchic, democratic site for the negotiation of meaning around masculinity. *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* took particular interest in exploring Jewish masculinity, which functions as a lens through which discourses of masculinity are reappraised, reconstructed, and redefined in contrast. Two distinct conceptualisations of Jewish masculinity emerge. *TDUDP* demonstrates the development of a particularised construction of Jewish masculinity that sharply differentiates it from other forms of masculinity: 'British', 'Black', and 'non-British White'. *NMTQ* established degrees of similarity between Jewish masculinity and 'British', 'Black', and 'non-British White' forms of masculinity while still maintaining a sense of particularity.

Jewish Masculinity, Hybridity, Mimicry, and Stereotype in Sitcom

Western discourses of masculinity have emphasised action; assertiveness and dominance (primarily physical, sexual, and patriarchal—both politically and socially); and virility.[459] Within these discourses, Jewish masculinity has functioned as an antithesis or negative.[460]

1968; n.p., available online here <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3643823/Enoch-Powells-Rivers-of-Blood-speech.html> (accessed 20 April 2018). For remarks regarding miscegenation and 'mixed' marriages, see HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1029; HL, 7 June 1967, vol. 283, c. 472; HL, 16 December 1969, vol. 306, c. 1043; HL, 7 July 1966, vol. 275, c. 1246 (wherein Lord Russell of Liverpool quotes from a pamphlet produced by the Greater Britain Movement); HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, c. 118 (wherein, in a rare moment of nuance in Parliament, Dr M. P. Winstanley argues that objections to 'mixed' marriages are culturally, rather than biologically, based); HL, 4 April 1974, vol. 3560, c. 1063; and HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1863.

459 Daniel Boyarin, 'Masada or Yavneh: Gender and the Arts of Jewish Resistance', in *Jews and other Differences*, ed. Boyarin & Boyarin, 306–07.

460 See Eva Johanna Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination,* 72 & 83 wherein she argues that the early modern English constructed Jewish religious rituals as uncivilised and, in the context of a growing emphasis on civility as an expression of manliness, unmasculine; Matthew Biberman links antisemitism to anti-feminism in the same period as Holmberg and constructs this as a means of establishing a dominant construction of post-medieval masculinity, see his *Masculinity, Anti-Semitism and Early Modern English Literature: From the Satanic to the Effeminate Jew* (London/New York: Ashgate, 2004); Daniel Boyarin, in contrast, places significance on the shift to modernity and the role that the development of heterosexuality played in necessitating the construction of Jewish masculinity as 'other' to that of gentile masculinity see his '*Goyim Naches*, or, Modernity

Consequently, there are many discourses locating Jewish masculinity as weak, impotent, and subservient, even as a variety of femininity. Sander Gilman and Jay Geller have both investigated how the circumcision ritual became constructed as a form of castration, allowing for the representation of Jewish masculinity within a discourse of femininity, extending to what Geller describes as the 'traditional Christian calumny' of Jewish male menstruation.[461] Geller connects this to the supposed Jewish man's propensity for nosebleeds in this discourse, noting its prevalence in Sigmund Freud's letters to his friend Fliess.[462] Geller has also explored Jews represented as feminised animals, particularly the feminine *judensau* image and its juxtaposition against the masculinised dog or hound.[463] Anthony Julius has explored 'un-manly' Jewish characters in Anthony Trollope's novels, positioned as 'the antitype to the [English] gentleman'.[464] Nazi propagandic representations of 'the Jew' as diminutive, underhand, and servile also evoke these discourses in juxtaposition with the strong, active, and dominant 'Aryan' man.[465] For *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*, there was a substantial discursive lineage to draw from.

The representation of the Jewish male with regard to ideas of physicality and violence—in terms of war, physical assertion, and dominance—is a principal thread. Both Alf and Manny have the potential to commit physical violence. Garnett is often quick to threaten physical violence. On numerous occasions he makes such threats, though he does not follow through.[466] He is usually the person in any given exchange to attempt to physically intimidate the other, like his 'squaring up' to Mike during their regular disagreements. He is also, most

---

and the Manliness of the *Mentsch*' and also his *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (Berkeley/London: Univ. of California Press, 1997). Fundamentally then, Jewish masculinity undergoes processes of othering and feminising in relation to (and moreover through the lens of) non-Jewish masculinity in a manner similar to that characterised by Zygmunt Bauman as 'allosemitic' ('Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 143–56).

461 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, and his ' "We're Not Jews": Imagining Jewish Histories and Jewish Bodies in Contemporary Multicultural Literature', in his *Jewish Frontiers: Essays on Bodies, Histories and Identities* (New York/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan Seacaucus, 2003), 169–206 (p. 182); and Jay Geller, '(G)noseology: The Cultural Construction of the Other', in *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*, ed. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992), 243–82 (p. 254–55)

462 See Jay Geller, '(G)noseology: The Cultural Construction of the Other', ed. Eilberg-Schwartz, 254.

463 Jay Geller, *Bestiarium Judaicum: Unnatural Histories of the Jews* (New York: Fordham U. P., 2018), 33–40 (pp. 39–40).

464 Anthony Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2010), 383–87 (p. 384).

465 See Tower Hamlets Arts Project, *Auschwitz and East London*, 5.

466 See, among others *Till Death Us Do Part* S.1 Ep.1 'Arguments, Arguments' (6 June 1966); S.1 Ep. 2 'Hair Raising' (13 June 1966); S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966); S.2 Ep.4 'The Bulldog Breed' (16 January 1967); S. 7 Ep. 2 'Min the Housekeeper' (12 November 1975).

often, the person who retreats from actual physical violence, intimidated by his interlocutors.[467] The sole exception is during a phone argument with another man. His physically violent actions are knocking a football fan's hat off his head from behind and kicking Mike in the backside while Mike is bending over.[468] Alf tends to avoid physical conflict and is largely successful, save for his receiving a black eye in an altercation with a German football fan in 'Intolerance'.[469] Alf is rarely represented as engaging in physical activity in the programme. He suffers greatly when the family goes on holiday to Cornwall and struggles to carry his and Else's luggage when holidaying in Bournemouth. His engagement in sport consists of commenting on various teams' performances and, in one episode, taking on a coaching position for the local boys' team.[470]

Alf's relationship with violence contains two co-synchronous threads: aggression and cowardice. Aggression in general terms is not an oft-represented discourse within stereotypical representations of Jewish masculinity;[471] yet, Alf's particular forms of aggression may be characterised as vicious, hysterical, and, in his tendency to attack people from behind, sneaky. Antisemitic propaganda of the time and of earlier times constructed 'the Jew' in these terms, representing Jews as underhand and possessed of a recriminating nature.[472] These discourses juxtapose the Jewish male with the stereotyped virtues of 'White' masculinity: uprightness, frankness, and a willingness to face adversity head on. Alf is represented as encompassing none of these 'virtues'. Indeed, in his willingness to bully those he thinks he can, and his unwillingness to defend himself when he is being intimidated, Alf's

---

467 See specially his exchange with the 'spiv' character (*Till Death Us Do Part* S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' [26 December 1972]); with a 'Black' police officer (S.7 Ep.3 'Drunk in Charge of a Bicycle' [19 November 1975]); and, to some extent Spike Milligan's 'Paki Paddy' character (S.4 Ep.3 'Holiday in Bournemouth' [27 September 1972]; and S.5 Ep.7 'Paki-Paddy' [28 February 1974]).

468 See *Till Death Us Do Part* S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966) and S.1 Ep. 2 'Hair Raising' (13 June 1966) respectively.

469 *Till Death Us Do Part* S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

470 *Till Death Us Do Part* S.3 Ep.5 'Football' (2 February 1968).

471 Instead, Jewish masculinity is constructed as meek, passive and unassertive. See above, p. 134 *fn*. 460, see also, for instance the thinly veiled use of mice as representatives of Eastern European Jews travelling to America in the Steven Spielberg-directed animated films *An American Tail* (1986) and its sequel *An American Tail: Fievel Goes West* (1991) and the identical zoomorphism of Art Spiegelman's *Maus* comics series. It is a point of note that both of these popular cultural representations of Jews as mice were developed by Jews themselves.

472 Tower Hamlets Arts Project, *Auschwitz and East London*. See specifically the caption appended to the image on p. 5; see also, Anon. [Arnold S. Leese], *Our Seditious Cartoon Book* (Hollywood: Sons of Liberty, 1938), 3 & 9; available online at <https://archive.org/details/ourseditiouscartoonbookleese/page/n1/mode/2up> (accessed 22 September 2017).

status within the discourse of 'White' masculinity is severely disrupted. The importance of Alf's hysterical protestations and threats is also not to be overlooked. Often, when becoming angry and making threats of physical violence or 'squaring up' to potential physical opponents, Alf's voice becomes high-pitched, his words repetitive and his movements erratic. These behaviours were regarded in the late nineteenth century as indicative of the 'hysterical' condition.[473]

Manny offers a contrasting reading. Manny is never physically violent in *NMTQ*, but he successfully warns Patrick instead of physical confrontation.[474] Manny never attempts to physically intimidate other characters however, such warnings are exclusively verbal. He is represented as playing football. Lewtas too contrasts with Alf, having been a boxing champion in his youth. Within *NMTQ*, the Jewish man is a more effective physical entity. A construction of Jewish masculinity emerges wherein Manny is *capable* of physical assertion but *chooses* to avoid it, demonstrating clemency and stoicism rather than Alf's hysteria.

Physical masculinity is also explored through military prowess. Both Alf and Manny are utilised to explore the significance of military service and support for Jewish masculinity. Alf is jingoistic, he regularly asserts the superiority of the British Army, to the extent that he regards military engagements in Ireland as 'sport'.[475] Alf, sees the army as a site of national identification and indicative of a corporeal conception of the 'nation', his support for the army is thus complete and unquestioning. He aggressively shouts down any of Mike's attempts to enter into debate with him regarding the army. He explicitly connects military superiority to the national superiority of 'White' Britons over non-'White' Africans of the nineteenth century and the 'Arabs, micks [and] Jew-boys' of the twentieth century.[476] For Alf, British masculinity is at the root of British military power, he continually constructs the Army as male, not simply calling them 'our soldiers' but 'our lads' and 'our boys'.[477] There is then, for Alf, an intrinsically masculine character to military service, one he is keen to embrace himself as a foundation of and signifier for his own masculinity, the relationship between militarism and what might be termed 'masculinism', particularly as a discourse within various nationalisms has been well established by historians and cultural studies scholars.

---

473 On the construction of the 'hysterical' Jewish man, see in particular Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 60–63.

474 See *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width* S.1 Ep.4 'Man Shall Not Live by Bread Alone' (16 December 1967); S.5 Ep.1 'And Ecumenicals To You' (26 January 1971) among others.

475 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.2 'Pigeon Fancier' (20 September 1972).

476 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.1 'TV Licence' (2 January 1974).

477 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.6 'From Liverpool with Love' (18 July 1966); and S.3 Ep.2 'The Blood Donor' (12 January 1968).

Alf makes regular references to his own military service during the Second World War. He discusses the 'favours' that nurses would bestow upon 'the boys' at the NAAFI with a young female nurse during 'The Blood Donor' and he claims in 'Hair Raising' that his baldness is a result of military service in hot countries that has caused his hair to dry up.[478] This nostalgia for his military days continues in 'The Bulldog Breed' wherein he recounts his time in the desert fighting against Rommel's forces.[479] Alf's military service is maintained throughout the original run of the television series, the final episode, 'Unemployment', however, provides a final ironic *dénouement* to Alf's aggressive militarism.[480] He admits, in the closing scenes of the episode, that he did not serve in the army. He claims that he was not permitted to fight as he was part of a 'reserved occupation'. Thus, Alf's masculinity is predicated upon an admiration for military life and service in which he took no part. The 1968 feature film of the series, further disrupts Alf's military credentials.[481] He is shown to have manufactured the excuse of 'flat feet' to prevent him being called into the army. Thus, in later iterations of the character, Speight moves from constructing Alf's lack of military service as something borne of virtuous impotence to cowardice. Speight unambiguously constructs a lack of military service as indicative of cowardice and hence, un-masculine. Alf, when discussing Mike's giving up smoking, refers to the importance of tobacco taxes to the British economy and says to Mike that he should be given a white feather for being 'too cowardly' to serve his country.[482] Alf's use of a well-known symbol from the Second World War used to shame non-combatants, indicates a construction of masculinity that emphasises service to one's country, something that Alf is revealed to lack.

Alf rejects his Jewish identity throughout the series in favour of an excessive British nationalism based largely on selectively constructed British military history and ability. In separating cowardice from Jewishness via stories of Alf's father's military service, Speight offers the audience a construction of British masculinity through Alf that runs counter to received understandings of British militarily based masculinity. Alf is a coward, but he is a coward who seeks to enjoy domination over others, specifically, 'Black' and Irish others as a result of other British mens' fighting. Speight, who fought in the Second World War himself

478 See, for instance, Catherine E. Anderson, 'Red coats and black shields: race and masculinity in British representations of the Anglo-Zulu war', in *Victorian Masculinities*, ed. Graeme Smart & Amelia Yeates, *Critical Survey*, 20:3 (2008), 6–28; and for a specifically Jewish manifestation of this theme see Schaffer, 'Unmasking the "muscle Jew" '. This is also evident in several of Alf's comments in *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.4 'The Bulldog Breed' (16 January 1967).

479 *Till Death Us Do Part* S.2 Ep.4 'The Bulldog Breed' (16 January 1967).

480 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.6 Ep.6 'Unemployment' (17 December 1975).

481 *Till Death Us Do Part* (dir. Norman Cohen, 1968).

482 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.3 'I Can Give It Up Any Time I Like' (9 January 1967).

wrote of his distaste for military life, writing that he should have sent the Government's letter back to them marked 'not known at this address'.[483] He demonstrated a disregard for military service as a masculine virtue and does not utilise his own as a means of signifying his own masculinity. That he utilises Alf's lack of service as an indication of cowardice then, renders *TDUDP*'s treatment of military service and its relationship to British masculine identities, ever more complex. Speight's construction of Alf as a cowardly man basking in other peoples' efforts without contributing himself provides an ironic *pathos* for Alf's jingoism. In constructing Alf as an uncompromising nationalist who was unwilling to fight for the country he professes to love, Speight strikes at the heart of post-war British masculinity. Alf wishes to feel superior to the 'others' against whom he constructs himself but he is unable to provide a sound basis for doing so.

Alf's cowardice in failing to serve is not explicitly connected to Jewishness. A single story from 'Monopoly' may be interpreted as a demonstration by Speight that Jewish masculinity is not synonymous with cowardice.[484] During a discussion, Alf's father is mentioned, Else recounts that he had bad teeth and bad feet caused by contracting 'trench foot'. It is implied here that Alf's father served in the First World War. This knowledge offers a new interpretation of Alf's masculinity with regard to his military service. Alf's cowardice becomes personal rather than a result of his Jewishness. His father is constructed as Jewish throughout the series and yet is also said to have served his country in a manner that Alf did not. Alf's lack of military service then, is not to be taken as Speight constructing the Jewish male as inherently cowardly. Speight offers no cohesive construction of Jewish or British martial masculinity within the series, there is no resolution—only disruption and tension. Alf's problematic status between British and Jewish identities complicates any attempt to interpret Speight's intention in constructing the character.

Manny is also represented as claiming a military background. As with Alf, this apparent martial virtue is rendered more complex by Powell and Driver, yet unlike Alf, Cohen's complicated relationship with ideas of martial valour is not obfuscated by uncertainty around his status as Jewish. Manny Cohen is a known ex-soldier. His experiences in the British army form the context of much of 'Old Soldiers Never Die'.[485] When recounting his experiences, as detailed above, Manny affects a stoicism that speaks to stereotyped ideas of British masculinity and the 'stiff upper lip'. As a Jewish man it is important to note that Manny's mannerism is a put-on affectation and not the manner in which he actually talks about his

---

483 Johnny Speight, *It Stands To Reason: A Kind of Autobiography* (Walton-on-Thames: M. & J. Hobbes, 1973), 52.

484 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.3 Ep.3 'Monopoly' (19 January 1968).

485 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width* S.3 Ep.1 'Old Soldiers Never Die' (21 August 1969).

experiences. He immediately returns to his usual manner of speaking, divesting himself of stereotypical British 'masculine' traits and admits that he was shot in the foot during training. It later transpires that it was he who accidentally fired the shot. He is revealed to be militarily ineffective and inept in combat. This is evidently not constructed as a Jewish trait in the programme as the foregrounding of Moshe Dayan discussed above demonstrates, disrupting any attempt at constructing 'the Jew' as lacking in military ability. However, this representation of the Jewish man as militarily impotent is reinforced by the revelation that Manny's friends Lewtas and Israel bloom did not fight for various medical reasons. Lewtas, like Alf Garnett, refers to his 'flat feet', speaking to another crucial discourse in the construction of 'the Jew' throughout history and its implications for construction of Jewish masculinity.

The 'flat-footed Jew' has been shown by both Sander Gilman and Edna Nahshon to be a long-established stereotyped discourse of Jewishness and connected to the status of 'the Jew' as 'nation'.[486] Gilman has demonstrated the prevalence of the 'flat-footed' stereotype in German works of the nineteenth century and has argued that flat feet were constructed as a specifically Jewish deformation.[487] He has argued that the flat-footedness of 'the Jew' was utilised by German antisemites as an indicator of the Jews' 'unfittedness' for participation in the life of national institutions. Principal among these representations is the apparent uselessness of 'the Jew' in military situations. For nineteenth-century German writers and artists, the army was the heart of the 'nation', the Prussian military machine having undergone a nationalisation (or more accurately 'Germanification') process following the Austro-Prussian and the Franco-Prussian Wars. Thus to a nation which understood citizenship as conditional upon as military service, 'the Jew' becomes useless and, placing this within the context of discussions of masculine virtue, unmanly. Nahshon, goes further and offers an alternative lineage for the 'flat-footed Jew' discourse. Nahshon takes Gilman's argument and posits that flat-footedness might be usefully contextualised within the ancient discourse of Ahasuerus, the 'wandering Jew'.[488]

This age-old discourse constructs 'the Jew' as rootless and as unconnected to the nation amidst which 'the Jew' resides. This stereotype prevents the hybridity of identity tested above between such identities as 'British' and 'Jewish' as it assumes that the essence of the Jewish experience is migration, transience, and impermanence, that 'the Jew' can never be 'the same' because 'the Jew' can never put down roots. While this relies on a wholly negative conception of the idea of migration itself that marginalises the benefits and universalism of

486 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 38–59; Edna Nahshon, *Jews and Shoes* (Oxford: Berg, 2008).

487 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 38–59.

488 Nahshon, *Jews and Shoes*, 137.

the experience, it is a persistent discourse throughout references to Jewish feet. Nahshon explicitly connects the 'flat-footedness' discourse to 'the wandering Jew' by demonstrating the existence of medical discourses that constructed flat feet as a result of living in the ghetto, thus as a peculiarly Jewish affliction. This connection offers another logical implication for discussions of Jewish masculinity. In positing that flat footedness should be taken as a signifier of the rootlessness of 'the Jew', such discourses serve to separate 'the Jew' from 'the land'.[489] In being unable to root themselves, 'the Jew' becomes unable to develop an attachment to any land other than Israel. Not only does this have implications for the 'nationality' of 'the Jew' but also for perspectives on Jewish masculinity. In creating a separation between 'the Jew' and the land, the 'wandering Jew' discourse prevents 'the Jew' from becoming invested with ideas of pastoralism and agrarian work. These ideas structured a significant number of representations of the virtuous 'Aryan' man during the Nazi period in Germany and variations upon this theme may even be found in the parliamentary debates around the RRAs.

Many politicians speak of the British people as rooted to the land they occupy, not only through sentiment but through farming, constructed as honest, virtuous, manly work. In constructing 'the Jew' as a wanderer and incapable of developing a connection with 'the soil', the 'wandering Jew' discourse, in tandem with the 'flat-footedness' discourse fundamentally undermines the potential for 'the Jew' to be constructed as 'Same'. It may even be argued that *TDUDP*'s episode 'Claustrophobia' speaks to this discourse.[490] The Garnetts travel to the Cornish countryside for a holiday and all except Alf enjoy themselves. Alf continually refers to the lack of amenities, the air's lack of 'taste' compared to the London smog and it is Alf who encounters many countryside mishaps (such as being chased by cows and slipping down muddy banks) and belittles the local Cornish farmers who speak of their own rootedness to the area. Alf's relationship with the English countryside is not explicitly constructed as a Jewish experience but the contested nature of his Jewish identity opens up a discursive space around the veracity and nature of Jewish 'rootlessness'. No other member of the family has such issues with the area, including Rita, who, as has been detailed elsewhere, may be understood as Jewish if subjected to the same patrilineal criteria as are used to establish Alf's Jewishness but who is never constructed as Jewish throughout the programme. Speight deftly opens up such questions but does not provide a cohesive answer to them, while Alf's poor relationship with the British countryside may be interpreted as indicative of a Jewish 'rootlessness' and by extension 'unmanliness' through lack of mastery over nature, it may

489 Nahshon, *Jews and Shoes*, 137.

490 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.7 'Claustrophobia' (1 August 1966).

also be interpreted in class or generational terms—a lifelong city-dweller displaced and unable to make the necessary adjustments to country life.

A further dimension of masculinity utilised by both politicians and sitcom writers in constructing the masculinity of 'the Jew' concerns stoicism and sensitivity. As already discussed above, mastery over oneself emerged in the early modern period as an indicator not only of civility but of masculinity.[491] In nineteenth century Britain, this ability to master oneself found new expression in ideas of comportment, manners, and a stoic attitude towards emotional expression. The ability to disengage from personal animosity and not 'take offense' became constructed as a quintessentially masculine and 'British' characteristic. By the 1960s and 1970s this perception remained in evidence as many politicians applauded the supposed British ability to simply 'get on' with life and not become too unnecessarily animated by interpersonal relations.[492] Numerous references are made to the virtue of what might be termed 'good natured mockery' or 'workplace banter' as a means of ameliorating ideas of difference, as the following statement from Lord Clifford of Chuddleigh, speaking in 1966, typifies:

> Another thing I cannot understand is why everybody seems to be so touchy nowadays. When I am in Australia—and I am sure the noble Lord, Lord Carrington, would bear me out if he were here—I am introduced regularly as a 'Pommie bastard' and my American relatives refer to me as their 'God-dammed Limey liability'. When I am in South Africa it is something about an unmentionable Rue Kneck, and in China it is unprintable in both senses of the word. This particular Ghanaian friend of mine had the name of Martin Ohemeng and he was one of the nicest chaps I have ever met—and I mean that in the Christian sense of the word—but when he telephoned me on one occasion and I did not recognise his voice he said, 'Oh, this is the Black Irishman', because he thought his name sounded somewhat Irish. What I am getting at is that there is a lot of super-touchiness going around and the sooner we forget it and get on with overcoming the problem by education and example, the better.[493]

This sentiment is echoed in 1968 by Quintin Hogg:

---

491 Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination*, 72.

492 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 946; HC, 4 March 1976, vol. 906, c. 1633; and HL, 20 July 1976, vol. 373, c. 805 among other references to the British as 'sensible', 'honest', 'patient', and 'tactful'.

493 Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1885.

> In this world we have got to be ready to take knocks. We have got to be prepared to be called 'limeys' and 'pommies'. Rude remarks are constantly being levelled at us. We must learn to bear them, even if they are offensive.[494]

And also in 1974 by Lord Barnby:

> I am always puzzled as to why there is objection to the word 'Negro', or 'nigger' for that matter. Surely it is no more offensive than to use the word 'Jap' against a Japanese; or, in the States, the use of the word 'Wop' against an Italian, or 'Polack' against a Pole, or 'Greaser' against an American. Why all this sensitiveness? After all, do we not read in the financial Press every day of the Kaffir Market? Is 'Kaffir' not more derogatory than the word 'Bantu' or 'coloured' in South Africa? I am puzzled about the sensitiveness that exists.[495]

Both of these statements present similar arguments to that put forward in *NMTQ*'s fourth series episode 'Without Prejudice', wherein Patrick makes a similar point to Manny, regarding their, and a 'Black' member of Patrick's congregation's, identities, summed up in the phrase 'he's a sambo, I'm a mick, and you're a yid'.[496] Patrick argues to Manny that everybody, to some degree is prejudiced and that in order to promote good race relations, everybody should internalise the essential fact and nature of their forms of 'difference'. Doing so, according to Patrick, provides a level playing field for all forms of difference. Manny argues vehemently against this, protesting that prejudice in any form is bad and cannot be utilised for good. Powell and Driver would return to this debate many times in their later work *Love Thy Neighbour*.[497] This line of argument also finds echoes in Parliament as demonstrated by the following exchange between Peter Thorneycroft and Dr David Kerr:

PETER THORNEYCROFT	One day [Dr David Kerr] may learn that it is no more an insult to a man to say that he is coloured than to say he is a Jew or has got a red head. When the hon. Member learns that lesson he will know more about tolerance.
DAVID KERR	The hon. Member must not try to teach me tolerance. I can teach him about being called a Jew. I have been subjected to this and this is why I have been so passionate about the coloured

494 Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 75–76.

495 Hansard, HL, 4 April 1974, vol. 350, c. 1063.

496 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.2 'Without Prejudice' (2 July 1970).

497 *Love Thy Neighbour*, written by Vince Powell & Harry Driver, ITV (Thames Television, tx. 13 April 1972–22 January 1976).

> immigration problem. The word 'Jew' in a certain context is meant as an insult and I have been subjected to it. Let the hon. Member not try to teach me lessons about this. I learnt them at a very early age. The same is true about the coloured immigrant.[498]

What emerges from these exchanges is a perspective on prejudiced language that acknowledges the historical context of such language and that by embracing the use of epithets such as 'sambo', 'mick', 'yid', or 'Jew' is not to limit their power as Patrick argues, but to embrace and internalise the connotations they carry with them. The arguments produced by Patrick, along with Lord Clifford and Quintin Hogg, ignore the significant role of power in the articulation of prejudice and in so doing mark those that protest against the use of prejudiced language as 'too sensitive'.

The idea of sensitivity as a pejorative trait and one discursively attached to the idea of 'the Jew' and 'the Black' in the post-war era is well evidenced in these sources. Peter Griffiths, speaking in 1965 made precisely this point:

> People who are sensitive to the fact that they are coloured in a community which is largely white frequently imagine that they have been discriminated against in circumstances in which no discrimination whatever has existed.[499]

As did Lord Somers later that year:

> Unfortunately, some of these coloured immigrants from abroad suffer from that painful disease known as a chip on the shoulder, and they are only too anxious to take offence on grounds of their colour where none is meant.[500]

Evidence from the BBC written archives demonstrates that this discourse was explicitly tied to a representative from the BoDs, John Dight. A letter from Dight, dated 8 January 1964 is housed in the BBC Written Archive Centre complaining about the presentation of Jewishness in an episode of *Meeting Point*, entitled 'Jonah'. Dight argues that the episode was 'so contrived as inadvertently to give an erroneous impression to many young people'.[501] Dight comments that his particular role at the JDC was to monitor representations of Jews and Jewishness in the media. He mentions David Carrington, then Secretary of the BoDs and S. C. Hood, Controller of Programmes to whom the letter is addressed, agrees to meet with both Dight and Carrington to discuss the potential for television to foster negative perspectives on

498 Hansard, HC, 23 November 1965, vol. 721, c. 429.

499 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1009.

500 Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1054.

501 BBC WAC, T16/707.

Jewish and Jewishness.[502] Prior to this meeting on 4 March, Hood received an internal letter from Oliver Hunkin, Head of Religious Programmes, who commented to Hood that:

> John Dight, as Chairman of the Dissents [*sic*] Committee of the Board of Deputies, deals specially with alleged cases of antisemitism, *and is known to be hyper-sensitive* […] we have no evidence of any adverse impact on the non-Jewish mind of this particular programme.[503]

Some days after Hood's meeting with Dight and Carrington, archival records show that a letter was sent by Hood to then Director of Television Kenneth Adam recounting the discussions of the meeting. As part of this letter Hood remarks that both Dight and Carrington argued that they should be included more often in discussions around Jewish programming at the BBC as the JDC 'receives many complaints about BBC television which they do not pass on as they are largely *groundless and over-sensitive*'.[504] It is uncertain whether Hood is quoting directly from Dight and Carrington in his use of the term 'over-sensitive' or whether this is his own assessment.

There is evidently, from the foregoing examples, a thematic representation of both 'the Jew' and 'the coloured migrant/citizen' as quick to take offense where none is meant and hyper-sensitive to any and all potential sources of offensive speech and discriminatory practice. The tendency to describe Jews in these terms is also evident in Didi Herman's work on judicial decisions regarding attempts by Jews to utilise the RRAs for protection against discriminatory practices.[505] Herman refers specifically to evidence given in *Seide v. Gillette Industries Ltd* (1980) that described the actions of Mr Seide, a Jewish worker at Gillette as 'making too much of the situation and tending to assume that people were saying things about him when they really were not'.[506] Discourses of Jewish 'hyper-sensitivity' are exclusively attached to Jewish males in these sources rather than to Jewish people in general and in so doing, these representations of the hyper-sensitive Jewish male construct Jewish masculinity in terms that locate it outside non-Jewish Western masculinity. It is arguable that the prevalence of emotion in the construction of the Jewish male is a logical consequence of the construction of Jewish religious practice and behaviour as hyper-emotional (see above p. 134, *fn.* 460 & below pp. 188–89).[507] Sander Gilman, by contrast, has posited a connection between the 'sensitivity' of Jews and the notion of Jewish male hysteria resulting from the

502 BBC WAC, T16/707.

503 BBC WAC, T16/707; my emphasis.

504 BBC WAC, T16/707; my emphasis.

505 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 138–42.

506 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 42.

507 See Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination*.

'syphilitic Jewish male' stereotype.[508] Within the specific British context however, the construction of the Jewish male as hyper-sensitive had particular consequences for the construction of Jewish male masculinity as both 'effeminate' or 'feminised' and un-British establishing 'the Jew' as nationally 'different' to the British. The utilisation of this same discourse in the construction of 'the Black migrant/citizen' further speaks to the construction of a Jewish masculinity that is more sharply divided from 'British masculinity' and more closely connected to ideas of 'Black masculinity'. It may be taken as a further indication of constructions of 'the Jew' as part of a discourse of non-'White'/British Otherness.

Sexuality also forms a core aspect of constructions of masculinity and specifically Jewish masculinity in *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*. Once again, discussion of this idea in relation to Jewish men is absent from parliamentary Hansard records and this is arguably a consequence of the lack of significance this issue was thought to have for the location of 'the Jew' in relation to the RRAs' provisions. Yet, the sitcoms offer a plethora of evidence around discussions of Jewish male sexuality in several respects: the ability to 'access' sexual intercourse, the intensity with which sex is pursued, and sexual virility. Both comedies under examination here offer examples on these three topics and both demonstrate a separation between 'the Jew' and contemporary constructions of both 'Black' and 'White/British' masculinity in these respects.

The ability of the Jewish male to access sexual intercourse is subjected to interrogation in the comedies *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*. Alf Garnett has clearly had a sexual relationship with his wife Else: Rita's paternity is never questioned in the programme. However, a number of factors explicitly discussed, or alluded to in the programme problematise the idea of Alf's sexuality and, within some readings, Jewish masculinity. Alf and Else's sexual relationship throughout the series is entirely absent. Alf never attempts to have sex with Else in any episode, indeed they are only shown to share two kisses throughout the series.[509] Else regularly makes references to the lack of sex in their relationship but makes it clear that this is not due to her unwillingness to have sex, but her unwillingness to have sex with Alf. Alf is unambiguously represented as sexually unsuccessful and largely sexless within his marriage.

Outside of his marriage, Alf does demonstrate a degree of interest in sexual contact. His encounter with the escort Millie in 'Party Night', is characterised by his continually leering at her, in spite of his regular interjections that she is a 'whore'.[510] If we examine the scene through the lens of the Sartrean concept of *le regard* refracted through Laura Mulvey's

508 Gilman, *The Jew's Body*, 56, 63 & 99

509 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.3 'A House With Love In It' (20 June 1966); and S.6 Ep.1 'Outback Bound' (31 December 1974).

510 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.6 'Party Night' (12 February 1974).

feminist formulation a compelling reading presents itself for interpretations of the Jewish man.[511] In contrast to Sartre's conceptualisation of *le regard*, this particular representation of the gaze does not result, as suggested in Mulvey's work, in the objectification of Millie but of Alf. She acknowledges Alf's gaze and sassily remarks that he would need to pay her for her time. Rather than resisting the male gaze, Millie inverts the process and subjects Alf to her own gaze, objectifying him by remarking that he would need to pay for her time and implying that she knows he would never be able to afford her. This inverts the subjectivity inherent in the Sartrean *regard* and contrarily operates as an inverse of Mulvey's male gaze by emasculating Alf, both as a sexual being and as an economic unit as he can neither woo Millie nor afford her in spite of his clear desire to have sex with her. Additionally, he makes a number of references to sex when talking to a nurse in 'The Blood Donor', he discusses with her the 'favours' that nurses would do for 'the boys' in the NAAFI during his apparent time in the army.[512] He attempts to utilises his professed martial background to engage the nurse in sexual acts but is unsuccessful and relents relatively quickly. Once again, Alf becomes objectified, in this particular instance by what might be termed the 'medical gaze' of the nurse wherein he is not a sexual being but a medical case study, a body devoid of sexuality.[513]

The lone woman with whom Alf might successfully have a sexual relationship is his best friend's wife Min (played by Patricia Hayes). She makes regular sexual advances towards Alf, notably in 'Moving in with Min' wherein Alf becomes Min and Bert's short-term lodger.[514] What is notable in these exchanges is Alf's inability, or unwillingness to engage in Min's clearly signposted suggestions of sexual contact. Alf does not reject Min's advances but flees from them, he finds himself fidgeting and unable to speak in her presence. He becomes diminutive and embarrassed either by the intensity with which Min pursues him or his own inability to fully engage in such a pursuit. Within this context, Alf becomes the object of Min's sexualised gaze, a role that speaks to his feminisation within the programme. Not only is he unable to take mastery of the situation, he is unable to explicitly reject Min's sexual gaze. Min becomes the active or, in Mulvey's conceptualisation 'male', gazer in this episode while Alf becomes the feminised and passive 'gazed at' object.

Manny too, is utilised as a means of interrogating the ability of the Jewish male to 'access' sexual contact in *NMTQ*. For most of the series, Manny is shown to be a bachelor

---

511 Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Onotology*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003 [1st French Edition, *L'Être et le néant* (Paris: Gallimard, 1943)]), 276–326; Laura Mulvey, 'Visual pleasure and narrative cinema', *Screen*, 16:3 (1975), 6–18.

512 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.3 Ep.2 'The Blood Donor' (12 January 1968).

513 Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic*, trans. Sheridan, *passim*.

514 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.7 Ep.1 'Moving in with Min' (5 November 1975).

living with his mother.[515] Two episodes however, demonstrate, if not Manny's ability to engage in a sexual relationship, certainly his desire to do so. 'Without Prejudice' has already been discussed elsewhere for its representation of 'colour' prejudice, yet, the episode also demonstrates the representation of the Jewish male as a sexual being. Manny actively seeks a sexual relationship with his pen pal Samantha.[516] When Patrick comments that he hopes his blind date is 'a nice Jewish girl', it is the assumed requirement that she be Jewish that Manny argues with him about, not the nature of the relationship he is seeking to pursue. Offering a more detailed example of Manny's role as a sexual being is the fourth series episode 'Only Four can Play' in which Manny and Patrick go to a bar and attract two female friends.[517] The purpose of their visit to the bar is revealed early in the programme: Manny reveals himself to be a virgin and Patrick intends this to be the night that Manny has sex for the first time, he takes him to the bar intending to mentor him to attract women. Within *NMTQ*, the Jewish male is therefore largely represented, not as sexless but sexually inept, unable to attract a person to have sexual intercourse with and lacking in the qualities necessary to do so to such an extent that they must be taught. This is replicated across numerous Jewish characters in the programme including Lewtas, also a bachelor.

In discussing Manny's virginity, Powell and Driver open up a number of interesting questions around the feminisation of the Jewish male. Initially Manny rejects the label of 'virgin', noting that he 'cannot be a virgin, I'm a man', he later accepts the categorisation of himself as a virgin. By tying virginity and the signifier 'virgin' to ideas of femininity and later representing a Jewish male as virginal, Powell and Driver simultaneously demonstrate the historicisation of virginity as a feminine virtue/trait and speak to a construction of the virginal male as feminised and of the Jewish male as feminised.[518] Manny's virginity is tied to his religious beliefs as he argues that he is 'saving himself' for when he is married. This elicits a significant laugh from the audience. This laughter may be interpreted as the audience conceptualising the notion of virginity as a feminine virtue and not one traditionally associated with masculinity. The discourse of the virtuous virginal bride is not matched in British culture by a discourse of the virtuous virginal groom. Within traditional constructions of masculinity, male virginity is not therefore a virtue but an indication of inadequacy. By representing Manny as part of a discourse of the virginal man, Powell and Driver problematise Manny's masculinity within constructions of traditional 'British' masculinity.

---

515 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.3 'New Worlds For Old' (9 July 1970); and S.5 Ep.7 'You Will Go To The Ball Manny Cohen' (26 January 1971).

516 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.2 'Without Prejudice' (2 July 1970).

517 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.6 'Only Four Can Play' (30 July 1970).

518 See particularly Sander Gilman's work on this idea in his *The Jewish Body*, 83–4.

The audience's laughter however, demonstrates the complexity of this problematisation as it may be read as the audience identifying Manny as unambiguously masculine and therefore at odds with the discourse he speaks to, the humour rising from this apparent disjuncture.

Manny, in explaining to Patrick that he is a virgin, is at pains to demonstrate the several 'opportunities' he had to have sex as well as the circumstances that led to his 'failure'. He discusses a date with a girl at his mother's house during which both he and his date fell asleep as a result of too much wine and a warm fire. He also tells of a relationship he had with a girl in Bournemouth whom he arranged to meet under the pier and they were prevented from having sex by the tide coming in. Both of these examples speak to ideas of Jewish masculinity that place it at odds with British Western ideals of masculinity. Manny's inability to either stop himself from drinking too much wine or to sublimate its intoxicating effects run counter to both British ideals of masculine self-control and ideas of masculinity that emphasise the ability to drink and to either embrace intoxication or resist it by imbibing a great deal of alcohol rather than resisting intoxication through abstention. This latter point is particularly relevant later in the episode wherein Manny and Patrick go to an Irish pub and Manny refuses a whiskey from the barman saying he neither likes the effect it has on him and he is not capable of drinking much alcohol—both Patrick and the Irish barman comment on this in a manner that impugns Manny's masculinity. The latter Bournemouth story may be interpreted as constructing Manny as a Jewish *schlemiel* character: sexually inept and eternally subject to the vagaries of fate.[519] Manny's ability to have sex in this story is not a matter of his own, nor of his prospective partner's, agency. This speaks to ideas of Jewish fatalism particularly those found in certain forms of Jewish humour as discussed by Sarah Blacher Cohen and Joseph Telushkin.[520]

Manny does pursue sex with Dot (played by Stella Tanner) but his attempts at flirtation are characterised by second-guessing, uncertainty, and poorly implemented efforts at replicating Patrick's example. Dot and her friend Rita (played by Julie Martin) toss a coin to

---

519 For a delineation of this stereotype see Sig Altman, *The Comic Image of The Jew: Explorations of A Pop Culture Phenomenon* (Cranbury: Farleigh Dickinson U. P., 1971), 59–62; and David Gillota, 'Negotiating Jewishness: *Curb Your Enthusiasm* and the schlemiel tradition', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 38:4 (2010), 173–97.

520 Several of the essays brought together by Sarah Blacher Cohen in her edited collection *Jewish Wry: Essays on Jewish Humor* (Detroit: Wayne State U. P., 1990) incorporate discussions of the *schlemiel* as a fatalistic figure, including Blacher Cohen's 'Introduction: The Varieties of Jewish Humour', (1–15); Irving Howe's 'The Nature of Jewish Laughter', (16–24); and Robert Alter's 'Jewish Humor and the Domestication of Myth', (25–36). See also Rabbi Joseph Telushkin, *Jewish Humor: What the Best Jewish Jokes Say About the Jews* (New York: Perennial, 2002) for several discussions of the Jews as a fatally-defined, if not necessarily *fatalistic* group (77–107).

determine which of them will 'go back with' (this is clearly constructed as a euphemism for sexual intercourse) which of the main characters with the loser 'going back' with Manny. When in their respective rooms, Manny becomes shy and attempts to delay revealing his body to Dot, going so far as to break a button off his own shirt which he decides to fix immediately, the delay causing Dot to go to sleep. These developments echo the reversal of the male gaze demonstrated in *TDUDP*, it is Dot and Rita who decide to have sex with Manny and Patrick, not due to any masculine flirtation but because they 'want to have some fun' that night. Manny and Patrick thereby become objectified as sexual objects, devoid of any agency in the matter. This objectification and passivity is further reinforced by the method used by Rita and Dot to determine which of them will have sex with which of the main characters: their coin toss is entirely random and there is no sense of personal attraction to either man. Resultingly, Manny and Patrick become merely functional sexual objects with no sense of individuality, their sole value lies in their penises and the sexual gratification, however slight, that Rita and Dot acknowledge they might give. Thus, while the Jewish male body and the Irish male body, in this episode, are invested with sexual ability, they are stripped of any sense of sexual *desir*ability.

Both *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* offer a comparison between their representations of Jewish masculinity and representations of other forms of masculinity. Both feature representations of Irish masculinity as a counterpoint to Jewish masculinity. Within *TDUDP*, Mike functions as an alternative representation of masculine discourses and he is regularly identified as Irish by Alf and demonstrates an acceptance and celebration of this identity through his own dialogue.[521] Mike's masculinity is largely based on his being juxtaposed with Alf, he is more physically imposing, has an active sexual relationship, utilises the prospect of violence (though he does not follow through as Alf invariably backs down) and, in contrast to Alf, is represented as quite hairy. This contrasts with Alf's baldness, his diminutive stature, his cowardice, and his lack of a sexual relationship. *NMTQ*, offers a more in-depth interrogation of the similarities and differences between Irish and Jewish masculinities. Patrick Kelly is represented as being more sexually successful than Manny, he attempts to attract Rita and Dot through displaying his body and performing physical feats such as sit ups (which ultimately causes an injury and mean that he is not able to have sex with Rita at the episode's close). Both Patrick and the Irish barman are shown to be heavy drinkers. In other respects however, Patrick's masculinity is constructed in a similar fashion to Manny's, he largely avoids physical confrontation, preferring to rely on his 'gift of the gab' to avoid trouble. Both men are represented as willing to participate in physical sports but neither show any proficiency.

521 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966); and S.1 Ep.6 'From Liverpool With Love' (18 July 1966).

What emerges from the analysis of Alf and Manny's masculinities is exemplary of Bhabhaian processes of hybridity and mimicry as (potentially) menace. Both characters as Jewish men embody historicised discourses of Jewish masculinity, these are then hybridised with nationalised discourses of British masculinity. Through several coherent discursive strands: aggression (individual and military), stoicism, and virility/rapacity these characters directly implicate British discourses of sexual nationalism within the Jewish body. As shown throughout the preceding section, there are numerous points at which these intersections lead to discursive slippage, and comedic incongruence and thereby laughter. But is this the laughter of Plato and Hobbes, reinforcing social boundaries of British masculinity to exclude 'the Jew', demonstrating Jewish men's 'almost but not quite' fittedness into ideas of British masculinity? Or is this Freudian laughter, the *carnivalesque* disruption wherein the very fixity of British masculinity as a discourse is revealed in its patent absurdity? Neither *TDUDP* or *NMTQ* close this question, they both leave the tension hanging in a manner unsuited to sitcoms generic conventions of resolution and stasis. As discussed above, Alf Garnett must be interpreted as a mimetic representation of British masculinity in the Jewish body and Manny as a less explicitly disruptive hybridisation of the two sets of discourses establishing a less satirical vision of Jewish masculinity within 'nation' discourse.

Alf as a character is written and performed as a stereotyped expression of British masculinity, he is rapacious but, he is aggressive and makes much of his stiff upper lip attitude. His character combines these with stereotypes around Jewish masculinity: lecherous but unsuccessful with women, cowardly, domesticated, prone to emotional outbursts and hysterical rants. We must regard these stereotypes with a Bhabhaian lens, as indicative of an anxiety as much as it is oppressive. In doing so we can locate this anxiety around the Jewish body within the crisis of British masculinity explored above. Speight and Mitchell utilise anxieties around Jewish masculinity within a British national discourse to demonstrate the variegation of masculinity and its intersection across other discourses. This slippage engendered by these stereotypes necessarily cause humour but within the context of his being a self-denying Jewish man they take on a mimetic quality. Speight and Mitchell may be said to utilise Garnett to more than 'send up' masculinity but to disrupt its very tenets utilising Jewish identity as the key. Yet there is precarity in this approach as the laughter the slippage engenders is tendentious, operating either/both as oppressive or resistive.

Manny, by contrast, is a far less discursively combative character, he is an exemplary hybrid, demonstrating the congruence between Jewish and British masculinities, that these are not, as with Alf, necessarily at odds. He is not aggressive, but is able to intimidate; he served in the Army, but was not very good at it; he is stoic, but anxious; he is not sexually

successful, but from moral choice. Manny, as with Alf, embodies stereotypes of the Jewish male but, unlike Alf, these are not placed in conflict with nationalised masculinity discourses, instead these are melded into a more nuanced picture, less explicitly disruptive, quieter, and yet just as capable of causing disruption and less prone to oppressive laughter to shut down any disruption. Manny's stereotyped characterisations exist in concert with and in synthesis with discourse of nationalised masculinity, by demonstrating hybrid identity and writing recognisable, situational humour with this character, Powell, Driver, and Bluthal demonstrate a third way within British masculinity discourses that leaves room for a less (to borrow a neologism) 'toxic' form of masculinity, that locates 'the Jew' within this as a natural carrier of a masculinity that transgresses British nationalised masculinity but has a recognisable relationship to it.

What emerges from these two forms of representation are two competing discourses of Jewish masculinity. Both serve to interrogate the Otherness of 'the Jew' in different ways. *TDUDP* constructs the (potentially) Jewish male as inherently 'other' when compared to a character whose form of masculinity oscillates between a representation of Irishness as a representation of Britishness and is constructed in terms that align it more closely with traditional interpretations of British ('Same') masculinity. Neither Alf not Mike possesses an unambiguously 'British identity': Alf is represented as Jewish (though he rejects this) while Mike is often represented as a signifier of Irish identity. Both characters therefore offer complex representations of Jewish, Irish, and British identities that serve only to disrupt received discourses of all three of these identities. The ways in which Speight constructs Alf's masculinity speak just as much to constructions of Britishness as to Jewishness. Alf's masculinity is replete with stereotypes of Jewish masculinity that place it in opposition to traditional British masculinity, yet these stereotypes are disrupted by Alf's continual insistence that he is not Jewish. Manny Cohen's masculinity is interrogated in an entirely different manner. Within *NMTQ*, Jewish masculinity is unambiguously represented, there is no uncertainty over Manny's identity as a Jewish man, nor of Patrick's as an Irishman. While the programme constructs a nuanced difference between Irish and Jewish masculinities with regard to the avidity with which sex is pursued and the construction of sex as a goal in itself rather than sex as part of a relationship, what is notable about the programme is the overwhelming similarity in constructions of Irish and Jewish masculinities. Manny and Patrick exhibit many of the same traits that run counter to received notions of British masculinity. This reinforces the notion of 'the Jew' as part of a wider Otherness discourse of which the Irish are also a constituent group. In reinforcing the similarities between discourses of Jewish and Irish masculinities *NMTQ* weakens connections between these forms of 'different' masculinity and British masculinity.

Both of these programmes are at pains however, to demonstrate the nature of or lack of a relationship between Jewish masculinity and what might be termed 'Black masculinity'. *TDUDP* features several exchanges between Alf and 'Black' male characters. All of these exchanges are characterised by Alf's cowardice (save for when he is arrested for drunk and disorderly conduct by a 'Black' police officer). He physically shrinks in the presence of the 'Black' male and insults the characters after they have exited the scene, both avoiding conflict and acting in an underhanded 'unmanly' manner. Alf makes several references to the 'primitivism' of the 'Black' male yet in so doing he emphasises qualities incorporated into received discourses of masculinity: these include physical gifts such as strength and bodily control in dancing, sexual performance, and hairiness. This latter element is explicitly drawn out in Alf's conversation with Kenny Lynch in 'Till Closing Time Us Do Part' wherein Alf mock's Kenny's afro and Kenny's sole retort is to call Alf 'baldy', a remark that causes laughter among the other characters and the audience and functions as a means of ending the exchange favourably for Kenny.[522] Once again, Speight utilises discourses of alternative forms of masculinity as both corollary and counterpoint to Jewish masculinity. Speight's construction of Jewish masculinity places it in opposition to both British and 'Black' masculinity, further reinforcing the notion of 'the Jew' as 'Other'. Powell and Driver make fewer explicit comparisons between Jewish and 'Black' masculinity, the most notable being the football referee.[523] The referee's masculinity is constructed as different to Manny's. He is diminutive, servile prior to the game, and nearly hysterical afterwards. This character, it has already been shown, amalgamates many discourses of non-'White/British' Otherness. Powell and Driver's treatment of masculinity through this character presents a complex representation wherein the 'Black' male becomes imbued with discourses of masculinity more akin to those utilised by Speight in his representation of Jewish masculinity and, to an extent, Powell and Driver's representation of Jewish masculinity through the character of Lewtas. It is important to note that the referee, though he is played by the West Indian actor Charles Hyatt, is not played as a West Indian character but as a South Asian character. It is therefore arguable that the character's representation is structured not by discourses of 'Black masculinity' but by orientalist discourses. Edward Said has demonstrated that a significant element in orientalist representation in the West are the discourses of servility and of the emotive nature of life in the Orient which has also been drawn out above in direct relation to the Jews of early modern Britain.[524] In constructing the referee as devout, dressed exotically, servile to Manny and Patrick, and sensitive to offensive language, Powell and Driver

522 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.11 'Till Closing Time Us Do Part' (27 March 1967).

523 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.5 Ep.1 'And Ecumenicals To You' (15 December 1970).

524 See Said, *Orientalism*; and Holmberg, *A Scattered Nation*.

manufacture a representation of South Asian masculinity that aligns it far more with stereotyped discourses of Jewish masculinity than with the discourses of 'Black' West Indian masculinity that the pair would draw on in the character Bill Reynolds in *Love Thy Neighbour*. This reinforces the Otherness of the Jew within a wider umbrella of masculine Otherness alongside Irish and South Asian masculinity that is juxtaposed against received understandings of both Britishness and British masculinity.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has demonstrated the complexity and heterogeneity with which the concept of 'nation' as well as the related ideas of 'nationality' and 'national origins' were handled and conceptualised within parliamentary Hansard debates between 1964 and 1976 when formulating the RRAs. It has also demonstrated the difficulty of applying these conceptualisations to the idea of 'the Jew' in order to justify the unambiguous inclusion of British Jews within the remit of the RRA as a protected 'Other'. It has been shown that there was a substantial tension over whether the Jews did indeed constitute a separate 'nation' from the British and whether this constituted a 'national origin' or a nationality. The significant role of Israel in structuring parliamentary understandings of Jewish 'nationhood' in this period has also been demonstrated. Within Hansard sources of the period, it is evident that Jews are constructed as a national 'Other' but that this Otherness is conceptualised in terms of 'national origin' and not nationality. The views of MPs such as Andrew Faulds notwithstanding, parliamentarians did not, generally, construct the Jews as a 'fifth column' loyal to Israel they did however construct a connection between British Jews and Israel in terms of origin serving to other 'the Jew' within the debates in national terms.

In contrast, sitcoms of the time that featured Jewish protagonists offered a more nuanced assessment of the role of 'nation' in defining 'the Jew'. *TDUDP* utilises Alf Garnett to interrogate both the relationship of Jewishness to Britishness and the significance of Israel in structuring the concept of 'nation' with regard to 'the Jew'. These discussions have shown the ways in which Johnny Speight demonstrated the inadequacies of 'nation' in constructing 'the Jew' and disrupted the idea of Britishness by imbuing a character with a tendentious national identity with jingoistic and nationalist fervour. Speight offers numerous examples through which the utility of conceptualising 'the Jew' within the discourse of 'nation' is disrupted. *NMTQ* also engages in this conceptual interrogation. While Powell and Driver confine their discussions of the relationship of 'the Jew' to British and the relationship of 'the Jew' to Israel without offering a perspective on the utility of 'nation' more generally, their discussions do offer a number of points worth recounting. Powell and Driver present a conceptualisation of 'the Jew' in which, for much of the relevant episode, it appears that

Israel is represented as the 'true nationality' of all Jews yet, through narrative developments the role of Israel is significantly downplayed and the Britishness of the Jew is reasserted. Powell and Driver diverge from Speight in their incorporation of Israel within a British Jewish identity, not as a site of Jewish loyalty but in an affective role that emphasises origin rather than allegiance. Manny openly declares his ongoing loyalty to Britain at the episode's close while maintaining an affection for Israel.

Key also to these programmes' discussions of the 'nationhood' of 'the Jew' is their discussion of Jewish masculinity. It was argued in this chapter that British conceptions of masculinity in this period were largely structured as a form of national identity with nation-specific ideas of emotional stoicism alongside nationalised Western discourses of physical strength and sexual ability, and hairiness. Parliamentary sources eschew any discussion of Jewish 'nationhood', yet sitcoms demonstrate the significance of this issue in contemporary discussions of Jewish nationality. *TDUDP* offers a number of stereotyped discourses of Jewish masculinity through Alf Garnett that combine to offer a construction of Jewish masculinity that emphasises the Otherness of the Jewish male within the British context. His diminutiveness, his sneakiness, his lack of hair, and his sexual inadequacies all incorporate antisemitic discourses of Jewish masculinity. In constructing Jewish masculinity as a pejorative alternative to traditional understandings of British masculinity, Speight constructs the male Jew as 'other'. It is not only in relation to British masculinity that this distancing process operates, however. Speight manufactures juxtaposition between Jewish masculinity and the masculinities of other groups also considered protected under the RRAs such as the Irish and non-'Whites'. Indeed, his construction of 'Black' masculinity incorporates many more discourses found in conceptualisations of traditional British understandings of male virtue. The cumulative effect of this is to construct 'the Jew' and particularly the Jewish man as a particular 'Other' outside categories of both the ' "White"/British/Same' and the 'non-"White"/"Other" '. This construction is complicated however by Alf Garnett's insistence that he is not Jewish but British. This speaks, I have argued to a crisis of British masculinity in the post-war period. Alf's masculinity is lacking according to traditional British constructions of masculinity, but his 'nationhood' remains in flux. If Alf is interpreted as a British character as he professes throughout the programme, then his lack of masculine virtue must be taken as an indictment of ideas of British masculinity. Therefore, in order to preserve the mythical discourse of British masculinity, Alf must be read as Jewish and 'the Jew' thereby constructed as 'Other'. I would argue that this sharp differentiation between Jewish and British masculinities is indicative of a crisis of British masculinity in the post-war years resulting from the presence of non-'White' male migrants/citizens who were represented as possessing a more assertive, sexually powerful masculinity a set of discourses established initially as a

means of justifying imperial control but alter becoming perceived as a threat to equally long-standing ideas of British masculinity. The consequence of this, to which the above work on *TDUDP* speaks, was a sharp differentiation between British forms of masculinity and other 'White' non-British forms of masculinity, such as the Jewish masculinity. Speight's complex construction of Alf Garnett strikes at the heart of this question, threatening British ideals of masculinity by representing a British nationalist as unambiguously un-masculine.

In contrast, *NMTQ* offers a more nuanced representation of Jewish masculinity. While Manny is sexually inexperienced, he, unlike Alf, is not lacking in sexual drive, he also does not back down from fights or physical exertion, indeed he is able to resolve conflict through his words as opposed to avoiding conflict. Within this programme Jewish masculinity is constructed as differentiated from, though not in so sharp a manner as *TDUDP*, from British masculinity. A major point of differentiation between *NMTQ* and *TDUDP*'s representations of Jewish masculinity is the similarities drawn within *NMTQ* between Jewish masculinity and other forms of masculinity embodied by 'White' non-British groups and the difference between Jewish masculinity and non-'White' forms of masculinity. I would suggest that this too speaks to anxiety around the security of British masculinity in this period, but that it does so in a different way. While *TDUDP* constructs Jewish masculinity in a novel way, *NMTQ* constructs Jewish masculinity within a larger discourse of 'White' national difference alongside forms of masculinity like Irishness but differentiate these from forms of non-'White' masculinity represented through the character of the football referee. This reinforces the national difference of 'the Jew' within the programme but also strikes at the heart of the 'Black' *vs* 'White' binary discussed in Chapter 2 by demonstrating the heterogeneity of masculinities between groups conceptualised as 'White'.

If we take these investigations and reframe them through a postcolonialist theoretical lens we can fruitfully demonstrate a number of key points. Just as we may speak in terms of the colonialist discourses of 'colour' and 'race', so too, it might be argued, might one talk of a colonialist discourse of 'nation' and it is within this discourse of 'nation' that one finds a preponderance of parliamentary evidence linking Jews to a form of 'nationhood' outside of one understood as British. Evidence from parliamentary debates shows an assessment of Jewish 'nationhood', not only in relation to British 'nationhood' but to a specifically Jewish 'nationhood'. This might well be understood in Bhabhaian terms as a form of discursive power serving to render the highly complex relationship of Jews to the idea of 'nationhood' simultaneously both alien to the Western imaginary and entirely knowable within its rubric of 'nation'. Concurrently there is also a tendency not to implicate Israel in such parliamentary discussions of Jewish 'nationhood'. We might therefore offer a nuanced interpretation of parliamentary discussions of Jewish 'nationhood' in which there is no single hegemonic

understanding of the positionality of Jews within the discourse in relation to or opposition with British 'nationhood', indeed these conversations are characterised by an essential ambiguity on a number of points, on whether Jews may be legitimately understood to possess a distinct 'national origin' or 'nationality' (as two distinct elements) and, if they did, how far that distinct 'nationality' or 'national origin' allowed for them to be considered as a protected 'nationality' or 'national origin' under the strictures of the RRAs. I would suggest, taking my lead from Bhabha, that the ambiguity in these conversations is a pertinent example of his ideas regarding hybridity and the operation of or resistance to colonialist discursive power. Jewish hybridism within the discourse of 'nationhood' is established through interventions in Parliament that both question and reinforce the ideas of a unique Jewish 'nationhood'. 'The Jew' consequently exists neither as 'Same' nor 'Other' but as an 'in-between'. This is, discursively, a precarious position to occupy and it is key to note that Jews consistently regard themselves as not possessing a distinct form of 'nationhood'. It has been demonstrated above that Jews in the BoDs did not think, when the RRB was first being developed, that they would be included in its terms (which included 'national origins' in 1965 and expanded to include 'nationality' in 1968). In both of those legislative processes there is evidence to suggest that contemporary Jews regarded their relationship to the legislation as ambiguous. This existence in the liminal, in-between space produced in the legislative debates is filled by discursive interventions outside Parliament among which are the two sitcoms under examination.

These sitcoms demonstrate alternative interventions into this discursive rubric. *TDUDP* offers a mimetic example wherein Alf Garnett, a Jewish man who denies his Jewish identity, invests himself with the trappings of British (more often English) nationalism. In repeatedly reinforcing and reinscribing himself with such semiotic layering, he, to the audience that knows of his Jewish identity, encapsulates what Bhabha refers to as excess and slippage. Garnett 'must continually produce [his] slippage, [his] excess, [his] difference'.[525] In his excess he reveals both the nature of his mimicry and the artificiality of what he is mimicking. In mimicking British 'nationality' and nationalism he apes it, mocks it, and ultimately menaces it, becoming simultaneously British, Jewish, and a *collage* of British 'nationhood' that resists the strictures of the colonialist discourse of 'nation'.

Powell and Driver, by contrast, explicitly deal with the issue of Israel within the question of Jewish 'nationhood'. Through their work, and through the nature of Manny as a Jewish man who does not deny he is Jewish, they enact not mimesis but hybridity. For Manny, his understanding of himself as Jewish allows for him to simultaneously support Israel and be a proud Briton. He does not invest himself with the excess of Alf Garnett and thus he does not

525 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 126.

experience the slippage. It is a simple, less satirical, less disruptive, and more ameliorative discursive intervention, but one that has undeniable power in carving out a specifically Jewish positionality within this discursive space of power-knowledge.

5

'We cannot just make words mean what we want them to mean'[526]

'The Jew' as 'Ethnicity' and 'Ethnic Origin'

While 'national origin' was relatively well-defined in parliamentary debates, 'ethnic origin' is perhaps the most elusive concept used in the RRAs. Soskice presented an argument to the Commons that explicitly paired the four criteria into 'race and colour' and 'ethnic and national origin'.[527] This chapter will proceed to explore how 'the Jew' was conceptualised as an 'ethnic origin'. First however, must come an understanding of what ethnic, the most intangible criterion utilised in the RRAs, meant. Parliament summarily failed to offer any consistent theorisation of 'ethnic origin', this was largely a matter of convenience and expediency.

'Ethnic' was explicitly used as a 'catch-all' term for difference parliamentarians would not, could not, contain within 'colour', 'race', or 'nation'. Its definition was largely left to the judiciary. This interpretation is important when examining these Acts through the lens of 'the Jew' as it is through the use of the word 'ethnic' that the Jews are widely considered to be brought within the scope of the Acts.

Early in the 1965 Act's Second Reading debate in the House of Commons the use, and meaning, of the word 'ethnic' was broached by Anthony Buck. Soskice replied:

> We hope, by the use of the word 'ethnic', to cover everybody who is neither of a particular national origin nor of a particular racial origin but who would be distinguished by colour.[528]

There is, then, in in this statement, an assumption within Government circles of the time that 'ethnic' is connected to 'colour' but is distinct from both 'race' and 'nation'. There is no indication as to how 'ethnic' is connected to 'colour'—merely that it is assumed to be so. However, Soskice's two supporting examples—the 'Maltese and Cypriots'—are not groups that are in any consistent way distinguished in 'colour' terms. This definition is also directly

526 Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, c. 291.

527 Hansard, HC, 16 July 1965, vol. 716, c. 971.

528 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 932.

contradicted by Soskice's 'grouping'; statement that connected 'ethnic origin' more closely to 'national origin' than to 'colour'. Soskice's 1965 definition(s) of 'ethnic origin' are poorly supported, however what they make clear is the existence in Government at the time of a discourse around difference distinct from 'colour', 'race', and 'nation'—hazily defined as those were.

Later in the same day's debate, Soskice, in a reply to Bernard Braine, posits a 'hierarchy' of differences when discussing the specific idea of how 'the Jew' is brought under the RRA:

> I would have thought a person of the Jewish faith, if not regarded as caught by the word 'racial' would undoubtedly be caught by the word 'ethnic', but if not caught by the word 'ethnic' would certainly be caught by the scope of the word 'national'.[529]

Clearly then, 'ethnic' is incorporated into these discussions as a stop-gap measure between forms of difference that cannot be characterised as racial or national. Soskice's argument constructs difference as a multi-level function: there is an evident belief that that 'race' forms the most basic taxonomy of global human society, on some plane within categories defined by 'race', Soskice locates ethnic difference. Again, there is no clear indication of how ethnic discourse and racial discourse intersect, only that they do (but are not congruous), that this difference is substantive enough to warrant 'ethnic origin' being included in the statute as an independent way of defining a 'protected' group and that this has particular relevance in discussing 'the Jew', it is significant that this discourse is first utilised as a way of defining the difference of 'the Jew'.

Norman St John-Stevas, speaking in the same debate some minutes later, also broached the issue of 'ethnic origin'. He discussed the 'widespread religious and ethnic prejudice [in Northern Ireland]'.[530] Here, St John-Stevas, intentionally or otherwise, appears to advance a connection between religion and 'ethnicity'. While this has become a principal criterion of the definition of 'ethnicity' adopted in UK law since the 1982 *Mandla v. Dowell-Lee* judgement, in 1965 this suggestion was immediately refuted by Soskice, who replied: 'religion is the problem in Northern Ireland not ethnicity or nationality'.[531] This reply creates a conceptual distinction between religion and 'ethnicity', that, it will be shown remained a consistent and contentious element of these debates, particularly with regard to the Jews, and also implicates ideas of 'nation' into the discussion, a concept completely absent from St John-Stevas' original remark. What also goes unremarked on by any participant in the debate is that in Soskice's discussion of the difference of 'the Jew' the singular characteristic that he utilises to

529 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 933.

530 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 941.

531 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 942 (my emphasis).

define the identity of all Jews is their 'faith' and that he then goes on to define the Jews, if not by 'race' and 'nation' then certainly by their 'ethnic origin', drawing together by implication the ideas of 'ethnic origin' and religion which he then goes on some minutes later, to separate in reply to St John-Stevas in relation to Northern Ireland. The ways in which the St John-Stevas question and Soskice's answer draw together and push apart ideas of 'ethnicity', religion, and 'nation' shows that there was very little comprehension, and even less cohesion, regarding understandings of 'ethnicity' in the UK Parliament of the time.

Some parliamentarians attempted to lend clarity to these issues over 'ethnic origin' by consulting dictionaries or other learned texts, to little end as these definitions only served to compound the confusion and repeatedly introduce the question of religion into the debate, which, as briefly remarked above, and will be shown in greater detail below, successive Governments refused to countenance. It is again noteworthy that one of the principal points at which this attempt to draw on dictionary authority rests on an understanding of 'ethnic' derived from old Hebrew. David Renton, speaking in the Third Reading debate of 1965, argued for the removal of 'ethnic' from the Bill on the grounds of ambiguity:

> The dictionaries, so far as I have been able to ascertain, do not agree upon whether it is derived from the Greek word *ethnos* meaning 'a race', or *ethnikos* which means 'a heathen or pagan'. If it is derived from *ethnos* then we do not need to have 'ethnic' in the Bill at all as we have already got the word 'race' in the context in which 'ethnic' is used […] If the word is derived from *ethnikos* and means 'a heathen or pagan', then even more we should try to keep it out of the Bill because […] the Bill has nothing to do with religion.[532]

Sir D. Walker Smith echoed this understanding of *ethnikos*' etymology when discussing the RRB 1968 in reply to a question from Percy Grieve regarding the ethnic status of Yorkshiremen.[533] However, Lord Hailsham, speaking in 1976 reinscribes Renton's second proposed etymology of 'ethnic':

> The word from which 'ethnic' was derived in Greek was used by the Jews to represent anybody who was not a Jew, and was translated in the Bible as 'Gentile'. The word in the New Testament means anyone who is not a Christian and bears no relation to race whatever.[534]

532 Hansard, HC, 16 July 1965, vol. 716, cc. 969–70.

533 Hansard, HC, 9 July 1968, vol. 768, c. 429.

534 Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, c. 74.

What emerges through these calls to authority is the emphasis on religion that was clearly inherent in several parliamentarians' understandings of the word 'ethnic'. It is compelling to note that these religious understandings of 'ethnic' were also derived from particular understandings of 'the Jew' and the ways in which Ancient Jews utilised the concept that would become 'ethnic', in Hailsham's reading.

Other parliamentarians utilised dictionary definitions to offer a means, not of exploring the indefiniteness of the term but to show its inadequacy. See for instance the following from Lord O'Hagan in 1976:

> I was uncertain what the word 'ethnic' meant, apart from its popular association with coloured dresses that are rather trendy at the moment, and Afro hair styles. But I noticed in the 1972 supplement to the *Oxford English Dictionary* that there is a new meaning in English listed and it goes: 'Ethnic—pertaining to or having common racial, cultural or linguistic characteristics especially designating a racial or other group within a larger system', and I suspect—indeed, I have been told—that the insertion of the word 'ethnic' was to cover groups such as the Jews, who may be classed as a race or as a denomination or as something falling between the two, because whatever else 'ethnic' does it covers a wide variety of categories.
>
> What may be 'ethnic' now may not be 'ethnic' in a few years' time. […] There are many people now who show characteristics which are primarily cultural but which may disappear as they, their children and their grandchildren become more wholly absorbed into the customs, manners and traditions of British society. In those circumstances, of what use is the word 'ethnic'?[535]

Lord O'Hagan offers a number of points of discussion within this extract. First, he is among the very few parliamentarians who draw a specific connection between the word 'ethnic' and the realm of culture with references to dresses, hairstyles, and the linguistic definition offered by the *Oxford English Dictionary*'s 1972 supplement (it is worth noting that the modern version of the *OED* has dispensed with any reference to 'race' from its present definition.[536] Second, O'Hagan demonstrates the frailty of this connection by questioning the extent to which culture is immutable—'what is "ethnic" now may not be "ethnic" in a few years' time'—this was a rare opinion at this time and indeed remains so. It will be shown in later sections that a number of parliamentarians increasingly viewed culture as ethnically or racially contingent and, as a consequence of their perspectives on these concepts as largely

535 Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, cc. 70–71.

536 See 'Ethnic', OED Online, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/64786?redirectedFrom=ethnic#eid> (accessed 4 September 2019).

biologically-defined, saw culture as a fixed and homogenous function of biology, dismissing the possibility for cultural 'borrowing' or hybridity as at best a dilution, and at worst a betrayal, of one's own cultural inheritance. Third, O'Hagan explicitly remarks on the fact that ethnic had been particularly relevant in bringing 'the Jew' within the scope of the RRAs due to their being 'something falling between' a racial and a religious group—though it is important to note that at this point the idea of religious groups being included within the scope of the legislation in and of themselves was still not countenanced by the Government's representatives in debate. While it is evident that parliamentarians were aware of the importance of these questions, what remains consistent is their contentedness to merely allude to these issues and not to interrogate or attempt to reach any resolution on them, no other speaker engages with O'Hagan's points, valuable as they are, and he himself does not pursue them with any great rigour.

Parliamentary handling of the word 'ethnic' was, therefore, brief, and so confused were members' understandings of the term that many of the attempts to get to grips with it, rare and cursory as they were, resorted to the age-old trope of dictionary references as a means of structuring one's answer. Whatever attempts there were to critically assess the term and to demonstrate its vagueness, its polysemiology (and therefore its inutility as a statutory tool) were abject failures as it persisted in its inclusion in the well-inscribed criteria of difference throughout the three legislative processes under examination here. Often, these assessments criticism came from unlikely sources. Enoch Powell, in his many lengthy contributions to the Third Reading debate in 1976 offered the following example of the complexities of the term in relation to 'race':

> One can imagine the kind of interrogation which would be necessary. The potential employer is interviewing Jones, an applicant from South Wales, for a job:
>
> 'What is your race, Mr. Jones?'
>
> 'I am a Welshman. I am one of the Cymry.'
>
> 'Yes, it is all very well for you to say that you are a Welshman. I do not mind putting that down under the place here which says "race", but what is your ethnic origin?'
>
> ' "Ethnic origin"? Is that different?'
>
> 'Yes, it is, because we have a form here from the commission, and under "B" it says "race" but when I go down to "D" I find "ethnic origin". '
>
> 'Well, come to think of it,' replies Jones, 'my grandfather on my mother's side when the mines were opened in this valley—mind you, I am not absolutely sure but I am giving you information to the best of my ability—came from Ireland.'

> ‘Your maternal grandfather came from Ireland?’
>
> ‘Yes, so I have always heard.’
>
> ‘Thank you, Jones. That has helped a great deal, because this must be something to do with your ethnic origin. Can you tell me what part of Ireland he came from? The difficulty is that we have these pesky people in Ulster, and according to my understanding they are a different race there from the people in the rest of the island of Ireland, and so for all I know they may be of a distinctive ethnic origin’.[537]

The earnestness with which Powell engaged in this conceptual exploration has already been called into question in earlier chapters (see above p. 103) yet it is important to note that certain parliamentarians were far from ignorant of the vagaries of utilising such an amorphous concept in everyday life. This is particularly relevant in the case of ‘ethnic origin’ as many parliamentarians were aware of the multiple potential etymologies (and therefore significations) of the word. Nevertheless, Powell’s hypothetical offers a compelling demonstration of the central issue plaguing the use of the word ‘ethnic’: its ambiguous relationship to ideas of ‘nation’ and ‘race’.

‘Ethnic Origin’, Religion, and ‘the Jew’

The frequency with which the role of religion is raised in relation to ‘ethnic origin’ and the consistency with which its inclusion in the official understanding of the term was rejected is worth considering here. It is noteworthy that the importance of having ‘religion’ included in these criteria is brought up, nearly exclusively, in relation to Jews.

Sir Dingle-Foot, then Solicitor General, speaking in 1965, opined that, with regard to the Jews ‘I do not think that the word “national” would be appropriate, but I think that the words “racial” or “ethnic” would be appropriate’.[538] This statement on the status of Jews as a group comes in reply to a question from Jeremy Thorpe regarding whether attacks against ‘people of the Jewish religion or Jewish extraction’ would be covered by the terms of the Bill under discussion.[539] Due to the phrasing Thorpe opted for in his question, the extent to which religion structures Dingle-Foot’s opinion on the racial and ethnic nature of Jewish group identity is unfortunately unclear. What can be said however is that Dingle-Foot, in contrast to other Government spokespeople of the time does not explicitly separate religion from the Bill’s provisions, it may be reasonable to suggest therefore, that Dingle-Foot incorporates religion into his conceptualisation of the Jews as a racial or ethnic, but not a national, form of

537 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1634.

538 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1044.

539 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1044.

identity group. This issue emerges again in 1968 in a speech by Maurice Orbach who states that: 'under the term "ethnic origin" we can include Jews of all kinds, whether religious or non-religious'.[540] This encapsulates a number of points of discussion around the status of Jews in relation to 'ethnic origin'. Thorpe's initial question to Dingle-Foot offers the idea that to be Jewish requires one to be either 'of the Jewish religion' or 'of Jewish extraction', ideas that may be, but are not necessarily, related. This demonstrates a central conflict running throughout any mention of Jews and their (un)knowability in these debates. The Solicitor General attempts to define the Jews as either racial or ethnic but separates them from ideas of 'nation'. It is unfortunate, but unsurprising, that the Solicitor General does not offer much in the way of justification for this categorisation beyond the notion that ethnic allows the Government to include Jews who are both religious and non-religious. This seemingly distances the idea of Jewish 'ethnicity' from ideas of religion, a rare opinion in Parliament as for many participants in these debates it is precisely religion that characterises the Jews and it is often a source of comment that religion is not being included in the terms of the Act. This leads several parliamentarians to question whether the Jews are protected under the Act at all, a matter that Anthony Buck regards as of supreme importance as: '[…] what concerns most of us more than anything else is the possibility of anti-Semitism, that it should not have been made absolutely clear that Judaism [*sic*] and Anti-Semitism is caught by Clause 1'.[541] Buck is one among many parliamentarians who speak in such terms though it is important to note that, in spite of his insistence on the primacy of religion as an identifier of Jewishness, he still offers the separate notions of (presumably) '[anti-]Judaism' and antisemitism as forms of 'Jew-hatred'.

Buck's concerns are echoed by figures such as Norman St John-Stevas,[542] Lord Soper,[543] John Page,[544] Barnett Janner,[545] and Fenner Brockway.[546] All of the above speakers demonstrate that the lack of inclusion of religion in the Bill creates a situation in which the Jews can be subjected to prejudice and hate speech as long as the speaker argues that it is against the Jews as a religion that they are speaking and writing rather than against the Jews

---

540 Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, c. 99.

541 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1044.

542 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 959.

543 Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, cc. 115–16.

544 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1847.

545 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 960; and Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, c. 55.

546 Hansard, HL, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, c. 1053; Hansard, HL, 14 June 1966, vol. 275, c. 2; Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278 cc. 1840–41; Hansard, HL, 26 July 1967, vol. 285, c. 970; Hansard, HL, 25 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 1273; and (in discussion with Baroness Tweedsmuir of Belhevie, Lord Harris of Greenwich and Lord George-Brown) Hansard, HL, 27 September 1976, vol. 374, cc. 47–52.

as a ‘colour’, racial or ethnic or national group. The foregoing discussion has demonstrated that there is such a lack of understanding about the ways in which religion and these other concepts intersect (particularly in relation to the Jews) as to fail to offer Jewish people any degree of protection in the courts under these laws. None of these speakers goes far beyond a statement of the issue. Little is said about the ways in which Jews incorporate religion into their identity as a group and how this relates to ideas of ‘race’, ‘nation’ and its corollaries, or ‘ethnic origin’ and its own related terms. The perspective on the relationship between Jewish identity and religion is projected onto the group by parliamentarians of whom very few have any degree of personal experience of being part of this group identity. This was not only an issue brought to parliamentarians from within their own ranks: Lord Soper spoke in 1966 of a letter he received from the BoDs stating ‘ “[w]e should very much like to see the introduction of “religion” so as to avoid the doubts which exist as to whether the Jews are covered in any of the existing categories of “colour, race, or ethnic, or national origins” ’.[547] The difficulties of categorising the Jews as one of these other forms of difference are also mentioned in another form by John Page who argued that to define the Jews as an ethnic group would render Jewish hospitals or convalescent homes, that refused to admit non-Jews, illegal.[548]

The Government offers some limited justification for the lack of inclusion of religion in the terms of the Bill and it speaks to the overarching effect of the Act to remove an individual’s agency, and that of many forms of identity groups, in forming their own identity. Lord Stonham, speaking in the Lords in 1966 argued that: ‘Religious belief, I think we would all agree, is a matter of conscious choice; race or national origin is not a matter of choice’.[549] This is a typical response to any comment about religion and, it carries a veneer of rationality founded as it is on Enlightenment conceptualisations of the sovereignty of the individual and the independent conscience. However, it flagrantly ignores the extent to which, in the case of the Jews, religion is bound up with other forms of communal identity and the more general extent to which religion is determined by one’s family, one’s upbringing and therefore one’s culture or descent.[550] A second justification, that holds even less water, comes from Sir Dingle-Foot, speaking in 1965:

> I appreciate that my hon. Friend seeks to distinguish the case of the Jews who, he says, may be subject to attack both on racial and on religious grounds. With great respect, I found that distinction rather unreal. I agree—we all agree—that nothing is more loathsome and more contemptible than expressions of anti-Semitism. But those

547 Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1862.

548 Hansard, HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1847.

549 Hansard, HL, 26 July 1967, vol. 285 c. 970.

550 See Lord Sorensen’s contribution (Hansard, HL, 19 December 1966, vol. 278, c. 1904).

> expressions are not, at any rate in 99 cases out of 100, based on theological considerations. When there are attacks upon the Jews—such attacks as we had in London at the time of the passage of the Public Order Act— they are not directed merely against those who observe the Mosaic law. They are directed against Jews as a race.[551]

Dingle-Foot either ignores, diminishes, or fails to comprehend a number of factors in this statement. First, he fails to acknowledge that simply because 99% of cases of violence against Jews (an unsubstantiated and likely hyperbolic claim) are based on 'race' rather than religion does not in any way negate the importance of the apparently 1% of cases that are based on religion. Second, he offers no evidence to support his contention of racial motivation with regard to Jews; this flies in the face of evidence produced by Quintin Hogg from the BoDs which highlights the high number of attacks on synagogues.[552] Third, he fails to comprehend that, in the case of the Jews, whose definition as a group is so protean, the boundaries between religion and what general parliamentary opinion considered 'race' are not nearly as sharply defined as he supposes. Janner shows the conflation of these two understandings of difference with regard to the Jews in a question he puts to Lord Stonham in 1966.[553] He asks whether recent attacks on synagogues will lead to a strengthening of the provisions of the Acts. When he is told that prosecution for these attacks on synagogues will not be possible he replies: '[…] does not the fact that the present law does not allow prosecution for this incitement against the Jewish race indicate there is a need to amend the law?', further demonstrating the complicated connection between 'race' and religion in the case of the Jews.[554]

The Government's insistence that, with regard to the Jews, religion should not be considered legitimate grounds for prosecution under the new laws is further undermined by the frequency with which violence against synagogues is mentioned within the debates. It is rare, in fact, for parliamentarians to discuss discrimination or violence against Jews without referencing threats or attacks against synagogues. Responses from the Government generally make recourse to the idea that such attacks would be prosecuted under the normal course of the law as acts of arson or destruction of property, however this wilfully ignores the significant antisemitic motivation of such attacks and undermines the Government's own insistence that the Jews are protected under the specific laws of the race relations policy

551 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1043.

552 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 1062.

553 Hansard, HL, 14 June 1966, vol. 275, cc. 2–4.

554 Hansard, HL, 14 June 1966, vol. 275, c. 2.

framework. Paul Rose utilises just such an incident to demonstrate the 'loophole' created by the RRA's inclusion of 'ethnic origin' and exclusion of religion highlighted above.[555]

In sum, parliament's consideration of the role of religion in defining 'the Jew' is poor. While its significance is noted by some backbench participants, their arguments are largely reduced to simple statements rather than delineations of the significant points at which religious, racial, ethnic and national identity intersect in the Jewish case. Government representatives, for their part, largely ignore such pleas, arguing variously that 'the Jew' is already protected or that attacks on Jewish property are able to be prosecuted under pre-existing laws, and thus defining 'the Jew' in 'colour', racial, ethnic or 'nation' terms, going against the advice of British Jewry's most noted representative body, the BoDs. Contemporary Jews are largely unable to utilise this third space of contact to determine their location in relation to 'ethnicity' discourse, they are located rather than locate themselves, and they are unable to develop any degree of legal recognition for the hybridic identities they attempt to advance.

By contrast, the discussions of the role of 'ethnic origin' in defining the Jews in *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*, offer deeper investigations into the relationship of Jewish identity with religion as well as the ways it interacts with other forms of identity and 'difference'. It must be stated as a preamble to this discussion, that these programmes never use the word 'ethnic' or 'ethnicity' with regard to any group. There are a number of possible explanations for this silence. It may be taken as Speight, Powell and Driver attempting to discredit the very notion of 'ethnicity' through removing it from their programmes (though this is unlikely, particularly in Speight's case as it is unlikely he would have left such an idea unexplored or uncriticised). The writers may have been ignorant of the concept or its significance, though again their engagement with ideas of 'difference' in other forms suggests otherwise. What is significant however is that while parliamentarians often utilise religion as a key site of Jewish identification, yet refuse to utilise this concept in explicitly bring the Jews within the scope of the RRAs, these sitcoms also broach religion as a site of Jewish group identification and utilise it in such a way as to present a clear perspective (in one case) on the nature of Jewish identity.

More compelling explanations may be, that as the above discussion has shown, 'ethnic origin' was so polysemic, so invested with converging and conflicting meanings that it ultimately became a bloated and useless concept that could simultaneously mean almost anything and as a consequence meant nothing. This would render it a largely useless concept upon which to base comedy or jokes as, if nothing else, jokes require an object with a vaguely

555 Hansard, HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c.929.

coherent definition, something patently lacking from 'ethnicity'. A final explanation may be that this is an indication that the term 'ethnic origin' and its derivatives was inserted into the debate unilaterally by parliamentarians as a means of allowing the 'protection' of groups they thought required protection but whose definition in any terms way raised too many conceptual issues, i.e. the Jews. If we follow this explanation, the absence of 'ethnicity' from the sitcoms under discussion becomes readily understandable. The 'difference' of Jews outside discourses of 'colour', 'race', and 'nation', is not absent from these comedies, it is simply not discussed in ethnic terms as this concept was neither widely held or particularly useful in assessing Jewish 'difference'. While parliamentarians required such a *mot juste* to achieve their intended goals, comedies, with no such pressure to provide solutions, were able to assess the 'difference' of Jews in ways that took into account the specificity of Jews without resorting to a homogenising process of labelling. Therefore, the following discussion will be based around the ways in which Jewish difference is explored in these comedies in terms beyond 'colour', 'race', and 'nation'. Three major strands of discussion emerge as a result: culture, language and religion, though there are naturally intersections between the three.

Contained within Mike's 'identification' of Alf as Jewish are references to Alf's family name. Mike posits that Alf's grandfather was called Solly Diamond and asks 'who changed [your surname] eh? Was it you or your old man?'.[556] This constructs Jewishness as identifiable through a person's name as it is clearly intended to be utilised as 'evidence' for Mike's assertion that Alf is Jewish. This is echoed in *NMTQ* when Manny supposedly goes to Israel to fight and Patrick comments that he would find it difficult to call up to check on him as 'calling up Israel to find a Jewish soldier called Cohen? That'd be a laugh'.[557] This speaks to patterns of Jewish surnames. This was a well-established means of identifying British Jews, even by British Jews themselves. Two BoDs' studies of British Jewish communities, in Hackney and in Sheffield from this period, utilised Jewish surnames as a means of finding participants.[558] Thus, Jewish names are identified as a legitimate means of identifying Jews. Once again however the relationship between the name as a cultural signifier—a carrier of social meaning—and the name as an inherited signifier of descent is unresolved in both of the

556 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

557 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.3 Ep.1 'Old Soldiers Never Die' (21 August 1969).

558 Barry A. Kosmin & Nigel Grizzard, *Jews in an Inner London Borough (Hackney): A Study of the Jewish Population in the London Borough of Hackney based upon the 1971 census* (London: Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1975); available online at <https://archive.jpr.org.uk/object-uk329> (accessed 26 August 2019); and Barry A. Kosmin, Marzy Bauer & Nigel Grizzard with an historical introduction by Kenneth Lunn, *Steel City Jews: A Study of Ethnicity and Social Mobility in the Jewish Population of the City of Sheffield, South Yorkshire* (London: Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1976); available online at <https://archive.jpr.org.uk/object-uk328> (accessed 26 August 2019).

programmes given above. The examples given offer ambiguous constructions of the Jewish name as it is positioned between ideas of family and ideas of culture.

However, the case of Alf offers an addendum to this discussion, and a counter-discourse with regard to naming. The notion that Garnett or his father changed their name from Diamond to Garnett speaks to the historical changing of Jewish names, and is perhaps symbolic of something precious (Diamond) being diminished (Garnet[t]). This changing to what were considered 'more British' names is attested in Sydney Harris' 1972 study, as is the tendency for Jews whose names were not changed, to question, but not deny, the Jewishness of those who had changed their names.[559] This demonstrates the precarious relationship of Jewishness to the idea of names and, concomitantly, to ideas of 'the Jew as culture'. Even without the name 'Diamond' with which to identify him, Alf is still considered Jewish thus there must be, within *TDUDP*'s treatment of Jewishness, some essential element to Jewishness that a changed name cannot remove.

A final point at which *TDUDP* presents the discourse of Jewishness as a form of cultural difference comes from the discussion of the importance and Jewishness of Tottenham Hotspur F.C. Alf is always the one to argue that Tottenham are a Jewish club and he, before a Tottenham *vs* West Ham game in series four, says that he expects a large number of 'Tottenham Hotspur Jews' to come to Upton Park the next day to support their team.[560] This constructs Tottenham support as a form of Jewish identification for Alf. The veracity of this assertion is almost immediately undermined by Else when she interjects that Alf's father supported Tottenham. In response Alf shoots her a glowering look. The audience, by this point in the series, is well aware of Alf's insistence that his father was not Jewish thus through her brief interjection, Else simultaneously undermines both Alf's assertion that support for Tottenham is an aspect of British Jewish culture and his insistence that his father was not Jewish.

The intersection of Jewish culture and religious practice is also advanced by Alf in his discussion of Tottenham. He suggests that Tottenham always play on Sundays because 'their God' would be angered were they to play on the Sabbath and that Tottenham's stands are always 'full of rabbis'.[561] No character offers a rebuttal of these claims and they are allowed to stand as interesting indicators of the ways in which Jewish religious and cultural practice were thought to intersect. It is left for the audience to recognise the patent absurdity of the remarks.

---

559 Sydney Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 14:1 (1972), 63–84 (p. 79–80).

560 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1972).

561 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.7 'Jesus Christ Superstar' (26 December 1972).

The concept of 'the Jew as religion' is also given some degree of examination in *TDUDP*. The final line of 'Intolerance' is delivered by Else, wherein she says to Alf: 'If you're Jewish then you didn't ought to have eaten that pork chop'.[562] This is a clear and explicit reference to the widely known Jewish religious prohibition on eating pork. For Else, clearly, this is an essential part of being Jewish which she ascribes to Alf and admonishes him for not obeying. However, it is important to note that Else locates Alf's Jewishness as a precursor to his not being supposed to eat pork. The abstention form pork is constructed as a manifestation of, rather than a condition of, one's Jewishness. Else still sees Alf as Jewish even without eating pork, offering an alternative understanding of the role of religion in defining Jewishness. Else persists in labelling Alf as Jewish throughout the remainder of the programme's episodes, this does not however stop her from serving him full English breakfasts, including bacon and sausages, in many of these episodes.

Alf, when discussing the Washkansky heart transplant, states that a Jewish body would never accept a Gentile heart as 'it wouldn't be what they would call kosher would it?'.[563] In making this remark Alf sacralises the Jewish body and renders it biologically incompatible with 'Gentility'. Alf's contention is that the Jewish religion is inexorably tied to the Jewish body and that the 'incompatibility' of Jew and Gentile is made manifest by the physical Jewish rejection of Gentile hearts. Of course, this ridiculous notion is recognised as such by the audience as it is followed by substantial laughter and mockery by other characters. Nevertheless, this speaks to established discourses of 'the Jew' as 'the people of the body' a community that has internalised a very personal relationship with God through the idea of the chosen people. This idea of the sacral Jewish body carries with it important, far-reaching ideas in which religion and biology intersect.

NMTQ offers a less ambiguous stance on the role of culture and religion in defining 'the Jew'. Previous sections have shown that this programme largely eschews definitions of 'the Jew' based on 'colour', 'race', or 'nation' terms, rather, it constructs 'the Jew' in a manner that highlights the cultural and religious 'difference' of Jews. Here too are found instances of excessive Jewish gesticulation, though these are not referenced as with *TDUDP*, they are incorporated as performative elements to highlight Manny Cohen's Jewishness and they stand unremarked and unassessed as an identifier of Manny's Jewishness.

Manny makes extensive use of Yiddish and what he says are old Jewish proverbs such as 'Hope is a good breakfast but a bad supper'[564] though these are not always of Jewish

562 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

563 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.3 Ep.2 'The Blood Donor' (12 January 1968).

564 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.1 Ep.4 'Man Shall Not Live By Bread Alone' (16 December 1967).

provenance.[565] This particular example, of Baconian derivation, must be viewed through the lens of how Jewish culture was perceived. The depth of knowledge of Bacon's work that would be required to understand the provenance of the phrase is not something that the general viewer would be expected to hold, one can presume therefore that there is some element of the phrase that Powell and Driver considered essentially Jewish and therefore acceptable to the audience as a Yiddish proverb. Quite what this ephemeral Jewishness is contained within is largely immaterial in this instance, it is enough to remark that this particular phraseology was thought to be sufficiently 'Jewish' and for Manny's knowledge of it to be taken as an indicator of his Jewish identity. The implication is that the meaning of the proverb is closed to one unless one possesses the necessary cultural capital to divine its meaning. This seemingly reinforces the idea of Jewishness as an essentially cultural basis of identity. For those who possess the requisite knowledge however, an alternative reading presents itself. The phrase is not Jewish, but English and knowledge of this problematises and renders comical the notion that it contains within it an essential 'Jewish' wisdom.

Other elements of Manny's language serve to reinforce ideas of 'the Jew' as culture. His use of humour is based on word-play, fatalism, and irony, elements that have been highlighted by Sarah Blacher Cohen and others as key to understandings of Jewish humour.[566] His frequent use of Yiddish idioms such as 'schmutter', 'in schtuck', and 'oy gevalt' also point to his inculcation with a set of Jewish cultural discourses intended to construct his identity as a Jewish man in cultural rather than racial, 'colour', or national terms.

It is through his religious observance and the ways in which Judaism structures his life, however, that Manny is most often identified as Jewish. He has a close relationship with Rabbi Levy (played by Cyril Shaps) and aims in a fifth series episode (which the BoDs and their correspondents found so distasteful; see above pp. 74–75) to be appointed as honorary cantor at the synagogue.[567] Much of his social circle is based around those he attends synagogue with, including Lewtas and Israel Bloom. The football match discussed above is conceived as an interfaith football match and is discussed as such within the programme rather than an international match or a match to promote good race relations.[568] Lewtas, commenting on a photograph of Manny's cousin Lionel, mistakenly identifies him as the new

565 There is evidence to suggest that this phrase is actually derived from Francis Bacon. See *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount of St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England*, ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis & Douglas Denon Heath, 15 vols (London: Longman, Green & Co. *et al.*, 1857–1874), VII (1859), *Literary and Professional Works Vol. II*, 168.

566 See the essays in *Jewish Wry*, ed. Blacher Cohen.

567 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.5 Ep.5 'The Not So Kosher Cantor' (12 January 1971).

568 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.5 Ep.1 'And Ecumenicals to You' (15 December 1970).

Catholic Pope and comments, when corrected: 'Oh, I thought for a moment we'd got the business back'.[569] This certainly references the relationship between the Jewish and Christian faiths and may be read as an attempt to construct, ahistorically, the Papacy as an old Jewish institution. Lewtas implies that Christianity has, as a result of electing a Jewish man to lead it, come back into the fold and closer to God. Going deeper into this statement however offers a possible antisemitic reading. The idea of world religious leadership being a Jewish 'business' constructs an intersection between faith and culture: the stewardship of souls becomes not only a divinely accorded role but part of Jewish commercial activity—a potentially harmful reading of Lewtas' statement that echoes antisemitic discourses of Jewish subversive power. Such a reading is unlikely to be a dominant one however given the blasé way in which Lewtas makes the remark and the laughter with which it is received. As has already been discussed in this chapter, it is apparent from Powell's own words that the programme was conceived as an exploration of interfaith relations. Therefore, it should not be surprising to find 'the Jew' constructed as a religious form of identity within this programme.

'Acting Jewish'. Jewish Behaviour: (I) Insularity and Endogamy

A number of points have become evident in the foregoing pages: the significance of the role that 'ethnic origin' and 'ethnic(ity)' clearly played in parliamentarians' understanding of way in which 'the Jew' was brought within the scope of the RRAs; the significant pitfalls earlier chapters have demonstrated in applying ideas of 'colour', 'race' and 'national origin' to the Jews and, the obviation of the role of religion in functioning as a unifying aspect of Jewish identity in the context of the RRAs. Therefore a question presents itself: if parliamentarians could not agree that Jews were sufficiently homogeneous to be classed as a 'colour', 'race', 'nation', or 'national origin', but could be classed as an 'ethnic origin' or 'ethnicity' without reference to religion, what was the factor that parliamentarians held to be the unifying characteristic of Jewishness and in what ways were Jews to be considered 'grouped'?

The following sections will demonstrate the manner in which the idea of 'the Jew' in parliamentary debates was suffused with stereotyped discourses of both individual and collective behaviour. The effect of this conception of the Jew as a collection of behaviours passed on culturally down the generations overrode the lived experience of contemporary British Jews and forced an alien form of group identification on them which, just as with 'colour', 'race', and 'nation' had little foundation in reality. These sections will show the significant role that stereotype played in parliamentary constructions of 'the Jew' between 1965 and 1976. A key element of this will also be the demonstration that such behavioural

569 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.1 'Blood is Thinner than Water' (25 June 1970).

constructions were not historical but—in the philosophical sense—ideological and artificial to boot. These sections will argue that this is indicative of a nascent tendency to racialise culture that would experience its fullest expression under the Thatcher governments of the 1980s. Following Martin Barker's work, *The New Racism*, these sections will show the extent to which behaviour was constructed as an outgrowth of culture and, contemporaneously, the extent to which culture was constructed as an operation of 'race'. It will show that stereotyped discourses of Jewish behaviour were key to the parliamentary constructions of 'the Jew' in these debates and that the uncritical 'common sense'-based inclusion of these discourses led to a substantial degree of confusion over the status of 'the Jew' within the categories of 'difference' that structured the Acts. It will go on to show that *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*, also broach these stereotyped discourses of behaviour, yet do so with a greater degree of interrogative intent.

Perhaps the most important 'behavioural' discourse discernible within the parliamentary debates is the supposed 'insularity' of 'the Jew'. There is a tendency to construct Jews as an exclusive community. This was not a new discourse; it found expression in Parliament even in the midst of the Second World War. The Earl of Listowel argued that Jewish nationalism, just as strongly as antisemitism 'regard[s] the Jews as a separate people from the gentiles and as strangers and aliens in whatever country they may have settled over however long a period of time […] encouraging that unfair discrimination between Jews and non-Jews in social life'.[570] I would argue from this that the 'discrimination […] in social life' referred to by Listowel is conceptualised as a two-way process enacted both by non-Jews towards Jews and by Jews towards non-Jews as a result of antisemitism and Jewish nationalism respectively. 'The Jew' therefore becomes a simultaneously exclud*ed* and exclus*ive* form of identity and a community typified by an explicit desire for 'insularity' in its social life.

Throughout the debates Jews are consistently constructed as a 'community' or a 'people'. The extent to which such epithets are derived from racial, religious, or cultural origins has been discussed throughout this thesis. Here, it is the consistent use of these signifiers to describe the Jews that is most noteworthy. A community is conceptualised within these debates as a cohesive, autarkic, and culturally closed entity. It is the same term applied to the British when arguing in favour of greater restrictions on immigration. It is implied within such arguments that 'the British people' or 'the British community' do not require any additional elements to achieve cohesion (indeed it is only through the active control of and limitation of those elements that cohesion can be maintained) and that to add such elements artificially (for instance through anti-discriminatory legislation that proscribed the conduct of

570 Hansard, HL, 10 September 1942, vol. 124, cc. 350–52.

social relations or an increase in immigration) would be to damage that cohesion.[571] In applying the same perspective on 'community' to the Jews, parliamentarians demonstrate a conceptualisation of 'the Jewish community' as a separate, cohesive whole that exists alongside, rather than within, a wider 'British' community, conceptualised as a non-'colour', non-racial, and non-national entity. A key distinction in these two constructions of community is however that while the British community is constructed as essentially gregarious, tolerant, and beneficent, the Jewish community is marked by a sense of latent hostility to outside groups and a desire to be not only distinct but truly separate.

In 1966 Maurice Orbach argued that it was the responsibility of the Government and Parliament 'to endeavour to stop the creation of ghettos'.[572] This short statement offers two points for analysis, first, that the creation of ghettos is an impediment to good race relations and second, that the creation of ghettos is a natural development that requires State intervention in order to be controlled or countered. It is notable that throughout these debates the word 'ghetto' is regularly used as a negative consequence of immigration. It alludes to the original Venetian Jewish ghetto. Its negative associations are with reflecting upon as they reveal an understanding of 'the Jew' as 'naturally' inclined to seek separation from a host group (in spite of the patently ahistorical foundation of such a view). Orbach demonstrates an inaccurate understanding of history as the first ghetto was not a natural creation by the Jews but an enforced Venetian State policy.[573] Orbach therefore inaccurately constructs separate living as a natural tendency of minority groups and through his terminology links this idea specifically to the Jews echoing long-held ideas of innate Jewish insularity. 'Ghetto' also appears in these debates in a quotation from a pamphlet published by the Greater Britain Movement entitled Spearhead, quoted by Bernard Weatherill.[574] It contains a section headed 'Gleanings from the Ghetto' that is entirely devoted to antisemitic conspiracy theories. This further demonstrates the assumed connection between 'the Jew' and the idea of separate living, particularly as part of virulent antisemitic discourse. Weatherill, nor any other member of the house involved in the debate, makes any attempt to discredit these sentiments. In writing about the apparent power of the Jew in such a section, the Greater Britain Movement

---

571 See for variations on this theme in relation to 'the British', Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 53–54; HL, 10 March 1965, vol. 264, cc. 147–48; and HL, 16 December 1969, vol. 306, c. 1072. See also in relation to 'the Jew' Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 1013, 1031 & 1039; HC, 23 November 1965, vol. 721, c. 418; HL, 16 December 1969, vol. 306, c. 990; and HC, 8 July 1976, vol. 914, c. 1847 among others.

572 Hansard, HC, 16 December 1966, vol. 738, c. 900.

573 The webpage for the Museo Ebraico di Venezia refers to the creation of the ghetto as a '[necessary] decree to organize [the Jews'] presence'; available online at <http://www.museoebraico.it/en/ghetto/> (accessed 20 August 2020).

574 Hansard, HC, 16 July 1965, vol. 716, cc. 1007–08.

implies through the use of the word ‘gleanings’ that the ‘information’ contained within the section was extracted or overhead in spite of the ‘secretive’ goings-on within the Jewish community.

Most often in these debates, however, the term ‘ghetto’ is utilised in association with non-‘White’ migrants. There is a consistent explanation for the creation of these new ‘ghettos’ evident within these debates; certain members of Parliament and peers (most often from the Labour or Liberal parties) suggest that this is largely the consequence of a poorly administered housing policy on the behalf of the State and local councils. Baroness Asquith of Yarnbury in 1965 and Lord Donaldson of Kingsbridge in 1968 both point to the more rigorously thought-out approach taken by the Dutch State in housing migrants.[575] In specifically distributing migrants across the country and utilising boarding houses until housing was available rather than private rented housing, it is argued, the Dutch Government avoided the tendency of migrants to settle together and to set up multiple occupancy dwellings. It is argued, specifically by Baroness Asquith, that in doing so, the Dutch State avoided a sense of ‘invasion’ amongst the autochthonous population and the creation of ghettos among the migrant population. The process of divesting ‘ghetto’ of its specifically Jewish signification is also evident in a further contribution from Baroness Asquith in which she says: ‘as in America we are faced here with the problem of the ghetto—that is, with the concentration of a minority group in a given area’.[576] This is echoed by Lord Soper in 1968, discussing the ‘racial intemperance and racial prejudice that now exists in those ghettoes and among the dark and Black people themselves’.[577] The role of the American race relations experience in re-defining ‘ghetto’ as a term divested of a specific relationship to ‘the Jew’ and instead as a term applied to the non-‘White’ experience, points to the ambiguity with which the Jews were constructed in Parliament. The discourse of a natural inclination towards separate living becomes, in Parliament, not a specifically Jewish discourse but a discourse of Otherness in general, what remains significant is that the word ghetto, while it loses its specificity in relation to the Jews to adopt a more general connotation with the ‘Other’, it does no fully lose its connection to ‘the Jew’, perpetuating the notion that ‘the Jew’ exists within the category of the ‘Other’.

A further consideration within this discourse is the role and regular appearance of ‘the East End’ as a touchstone for discussions of ‘the Jew’ in Britain. Throughout these debates, politicians often refer to the ‘East End of London’ yet this is not always accompanied by an explanatory comment regarding why that area is mentioned. The locale was a well-known

575 See Hansard, HL, 10 March 1965, vol. 264, c. 82; and HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, cc. 140–41.

576 Hansard, HL, 7 June 1967, vol. 283, c. 459.

577 Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 115

area of Jewish migrant settlement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the lack of explanation accorded this term indicates its development into a touchstone of Jewishness and British Jewish history and identity, this requires no explanation on the part of parliamentarians. This points to the marking of the East End as a Jewish space—part of a process in which the space itself is racialised. This is certainly a consistent theme across all available sources that touch upon this issue. Georgia Brown's episode of *One Pair of Eyes* (see Chapter 1 pp. 33–36) is largely a paean to the Jewish heritage of the area but both comedies under examination here are set in the East End, in Wapping and in Whitechapel. While this is not explicitly spoken of in terms of a 'ghetto' the implication is clear, that the East End is an area associated with 'the Jew' in London. There is some discussion of the ongoing migratory processes from the East End to the North London suburbs, however this is rare and rarely connected to insularity. The role of the East End in these debates is to indicate an area that is largely culturally homogeneous where the vast majority of amenities are directed towards the needs of a specific group. Evidence suggests however, from Georgia Brown's exploration of the area in an episode of *One Pair of Eyes*, that such a construction of the area as a Jewish enclave is far from historically accurate.

Several studies of Britain's Jewish population exist from this period. For the most part they concern themselves with demographic statistics: specifically, births, deaths, and marriages. This might well be taken as indicative of an historical insularity among British Jews. However, a 1962 conference held at University College London, entitled 'Jewish Life in Modern Britain' and later published as a series of articles edited by Julius Gould and Shaul Esh in 1964 presents a contrary view.[578] The articles and the edited minutes of the post-paper discussions helpfully included within the volume, point to a construction of the Jewish population not as 'the Jew in Britain' but as 'the British Jew' wherein the overriding thesis transforms 'Jewish Life in Modern Britain' into 'Modern British Jewish life' what emerges is not a conflict between 'Jewish Life' and 'Modern Britain' but their compatibility and the social and cultural engagement of the 'Modern British Jew'. Papers range across social, economic and religious themes and present a variegated, inconsistent, heterogeneous construction of insularity in the British Jewish population. While, necessarily, all articles take exclusively British Jewish people as their subjects they are often at pains to demonstrate the interactivity between this population and the non-Jewish British population in contemporary life. For instance, Ernest Krausz's work on the 'Economic and Social Structure of Anglo-

578 *Jewish Life in Modern Britain. Papers and Proceedings of a Conference held at University College London on 1st and 2nd April 1962, by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University Jerusalem, under the auspices of the Board of Deputies of British Jews*, ed. Julius Gould & Shaul Esh (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964).

Jewry' highlights the spread of British Jews across socio-economic groups and their engagement in a wider British economy, not simply in an economic ghetto.[579] Cecil Roth injects an historical dimension to this discourse, establishing the engagement with wider British society throughout the period of Jewish presence, first in England and later Britain more widely.[580] He highlights the significance of Jewish emancipation in the nineteenth century in achieving this and specifically discusses the 'irradiation' of the Jewish population away from towns, implicitly disrupting the notion of the East End as a Jewish enclave, though not explicitly drawing this conclusion.

However, it is significant that Roth goes on to conceptualise this irradiation as a potential disruptor, particularly in the previous generation of the 'fully rounded Jewish communal life' that could be experienced within such areas as the Jewish East End.[581] From this observation he highlights his fears for the future of British Jewry as a community. It is unfortunate that no post-lecture discussion is included following this chapter to indicate the prevalence of such views. Yet there is undoubtedly a sense of disquiet evident in the conclusions of many of the papers, particularly Norman Cohen's work on 'Trends in Anglo-Jewish Religious Life' which opens with the statement that: 'the great bulk of the community has only the slightest concern with Judaism' and closes with the pessimistic comment: 'Anglo-Jewish life might be improved or worsened by alterations in its leadership, but the underlying situation would remain unchanged'.[582] These statements evidence the presence of a degree of insularity in Jewish academic circles. The 'Jewish life in Modern Britain' conference was key for prompting further research during the period under discussion in this thesis as several pieces of demographic research were produced during this time. Predominantly focusing on births, marriages, and deaths among the Jewish population, work by Barry Kosmin, Norman Grizzard, Marzy Bauer, S. J. Prais, and Marlena Schmool echoed work earlier in the century by statistician Simon Rosenbaum in the context of the Aliens Act 1905.[583] These works

---

579 Ernest Krausz, 'The Economic and Social Structure of Anglo-Jewry', in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, 27–41

580 Cecil Roth, 'The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Context of World Jewry', in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, 93–110.

581 Roth, 'The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Context of World Jewry', 109.

582 Norman Cohen, 'Trends in Anglo-Jewish Religious Life', in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, 41–67 (pp. 42 & 54).

583 See Kosmin & Grizzard, *Jews in an Inner London Borough (Hackney)*; Kosmin, Bauer & Grizzard, *Steel City Jews*; S. J. Prais, 'Synagogue statistics and the Jewish population of Great Britain, 1900–1970', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 14:2 (1972), 215–28; and S. J. Prais & Marlena Schmool, 'The size and structure of the Anglo-Jewish community 1960–65', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 10:1 (1968), 5–34. See also Simon Rosenbaum, 'A contribution to the study of the vital and other statistics of the Jews in the United Kingdom', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 68:3 (1905), 526–62.

invariably demonstrate a concern regarding the demographic and social integrity of Britain's Jewish community (constructed as a cohesive community—in the absence of any rationale as to why this is must be so). There is then an overwhelming Jewish academic concern regarding the status of the British Jewish population and this may feasibly be interpreted as indicative of an historical insularity at this time.

Another notable study conducted during this period that may shed additional light on this issue is Sydney Harris' qualitative study 'The Identity of Jews in an English City'.[584] This valuable and under-utilised study, conducted in the midst of the period under examination here, offers insight into the degree to which contemporary British Jews people in a south-western city conceptualised their own sense of Jewishness and their relationship to both Jews and non-Jews. There is significant and telling evidence from this paper that indicates the widespread existence of a sense of separateness among these people in relation to non-Jews and a preference for the company of fellow British Jews in both professional and social relationships. One respondent was quoted as saying: 'Jewish community life is a form of segregation'.[585] Responses to Harris' questions indicated that 65% of Orthodox Jews would prefer to have exclusively Jewish friends.[586] A further set of questions revealed a degree of preference towards hiring Jewish professionals with respondents commenting variously that: 'I would always go for the Jewish professional man. I don't think because of his professional ability, but simply because one prefers to associate with one's own kind' and 'I have a Jewish doctor and accountant and we understand each other'.[587] This speaks to a measure of insularity among certain members of the Jewish population of Harris' chosen city and it is probable that these ideas were just as commonplace across the rest of Britain.

In contrast, other respondents to the same set of questions in Harris' study showed an 'exsular' perspective of the Jewish population, emphasising its outward-looking and engaged nature and highlighted interactivity over 'intra-activity'. Only twenty-five percent of adherents to Liberal Judaism expressed a preference for Jewish friends and a number of them argued that it either made no difference to them whether the professionals they employed were Jewish or that they specially avoided employing Jewish professionals.[588] This goes some way to demonstrating that the notion of Jewish insularity is not necessarily a general historical trend and may require recasting through a religious or even generational lens to be

584 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 63–84.

585 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 78

586 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 78

587 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 80

588 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 78

fully understood and is not a pattern of behaviour that may be taken as essential for identifying a person as 'Jewish'.

Another indication of the role that the 'insularity' of Jews discourse played a role in the construction of 'the Jew' in the RRA debates comes from a statement made in 1968 by Lord Saltoun wherein he describes the Jews as, 'people who have been customarily subjected to inbreeding for fifteen centuries'.[589] This is a clear reference to a perceived distaste for exogamy among Jews. This idea has become so well ingrained that it has been utilised as a sociological model for a pluralist form of integration.[590] This discourse certainly has a degree of historical evidence to indicate its existence among Jews. The Talmud decrees that *kiddushin* (that is, the Jewish institution of marriage) cannot exist between Jewish and non-Jewish people.[591] The extent to which this prohibition has been followed in practice has been the subject of both historical and sociological research with varying findings. Work by Kosmin, Grizzard, and Bauer from the period in which the RRAs were being formulated, for instance, shows no reference to intermarriage in the survey of Hackney Jewry of 1975.[592] This refers to 'Jewish marriages' but this is inadequately defined, potentially indicating a marriage between two professing Jews, between a Jew and a non-Jew, or even a religiously sanctioned marriages between two people not from Jewish families but who profess Judaism, there is no reference to or commentary on the Talmudic law within which one may frame an assumption about the intended definition. There is no reference to 'intermarriage'; within this survey, again, the significance of this omission is ambiguous: it fails to indicate conclusively whether intermarriages are being included, and therefore, tellingly, marked as 'Jewish marriages') or excluded from the findings. It is possible to conject, from the survey's emphasis on Orthodox Jewish communities in Hackney (largely a result of synagogue records being the source from which the pool of respondents was populated) that this introduced a *de facto* exclusion of exogamic marriages but this is not indicative of a proscription on exogamy outside Orthodox Jewish circles. The 1976 report on Sheffield Jewry offers more concrete evidence on this question. Its section on methodology contains an explicit reference to the status of intermarriage within the survey. It states that:

> Regarding marriage rites it was decided to dispense with any reference to church ceremonies' because it was felt that this might offend respondents and that anyone in this

589 Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 94.

590 See Raya Muttarak & Anthony Heath, 'Who intermarries in Britain? Explaining ethnic diversity in intermarriage patterns', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61:2 (2010), 275–305 (pp. 279–80).

591 See the *masekhet Kiddushin*, ch. IV, 68b, n.p.; available online here <http://halakhah.com/pdf/nashim/Kiddushin.pdf> (accessed 22 July 2019).

592 Kosmin & Grizzard, *Jews in an Inner London Borough (Hackney)*.

> situation was very unlikely to be interested in the survey. In the event the latter assumption was proven correct as there was no indication that any person in the survey was in this category: all the intermarried couples claimed to have been involved only in civil ceremonies.[593]

Yet, in 1968 the *Jewish Chronicle* reported the 'controversial viewpoint' expressed about intermarriage by Paul Rose. The controversial opinion in question being: ' "I am neither for it nor against it" […] "It is not for me to set myself up as a judge on whether people intermarry or not" '.[594] Perhaps a more controversial statement from Rose came when he characterised anxieties around intermarriage as ' "ghetto mentality, a petty snobbery and the stifling narrowness" that still pervaded much of Orthodox Jewish thinking'.[595]

This speaks to a number of assertions about Jewish reactions to exogamy in this period. It is notable that in the survey 'exogamous' couples were included within a construction of the Jewish community of Sheffield but were marked as exogamous in the process. This is closely tied, as expected, to religious affiliation, with exogamous couples exclusively being married in civil ceremonies. This echoes earlier sections of this chapter which demonstrated the prevalence of religion in understandings of 'the Jew' and importantly in Jewish self-identification, but highlighted the important role of non-religious, cultural forms of identification alongside this within the Jewish population. The Sheffield survey's section on 'marriage patterns' also broaches the topic of intermarriage head on, opening with the remark that '[o]ne current concern has been the possibility of attrition caused by intermarriage'.[596]

There is then, within this survey an indication that exogamy was a cause of concern for British Jews. What neither of these surveys indicate, however, are the reasons underpinning this concern. The extent to which reactions to exogamy are framed by religious proscriptions, social pressures, or a post-Shoah concern with population levels and 'integrity'/'authenticity' is not entered into in these surveys save for the cursory statement above. Once again, Sydney Harris' qualitative work offers a compelling answer to this question. He shows that most of the Orthodox and a minority of Liberal respondents to his questions argued against intermarriage of Jews and that it was a significant issue for them.[597] The overriding reason for this was a concern that the resultant children of such marriages would exist between two cultures and that any element of Jewishness would eventually be lost through the overwhelming prevalence of non-Jewish culture. Respondents remarked that children would

---

593 Kosmin, Bauer & Grizzard, *Steel City Jews*, 7.

594 Meir Persoff, 'Leaders clash on intermarriage', *Jewish Chronicle*, 5 April 1968, p. 38.

595 Persoff, 'Leaders clash on intermarriage', p. 38.

596 Kosmin, Bauer & Grizzard, *Steel City Jews*, 17–18 (p.17).

597 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 75–77.

be ‘mixed up’ and that, ‘[i]ntermarriage makes children less Jewish’.[598] This concern, however, appears predominantly confined to Orthodox Jews as Harris points out that 32% of his respondents, were themselves married to non-Jews and that this proportion was overwhelmingly Liberal or non-practising in their religious observance.[599] Harris goes further and provides evidence to suggest that intermarriage has been, for some respondents, a spur to intensify their connection to their Jewish identity rather than an impediment.[600] He argues that this is most often associated with Liberal or previously non-practising Jews. What Harris demonstrates therefore is a variegated understanding of exogamy across British Jewry, drawn along broadly religious lines. He demonstrates a strong (but not necessarily deterministic) correlation between the orthodoxy of one’s religious leanings and the negativity of one’s perceptions of exogamy. Thus, research into historical Jewish perceptions of exogamy do not support Lord Saltoun’s homogenising characterisation of the Jews as ‘customarily’ supporting inbreeding. For contemporary British Jews, ‘marrying out’ did not necessarily imply a diminishing of one’s identity as a Jew nor that of ones’ children.

As a comparison, *NMTQ* offers several explorations of the significance of and perspectives on exogamy within British Jewry. In particular, the final episode of the sixth series, ‘Mix Me a Marriage’.[601] The episode’s plot consists of two discussions around the theme of exogamy and cultural (though importantly not biological) mixing. The two tailors find a baby left on their doorstep and initially decide to raise it themselves, debating in the process how best to do so. The pair both assume that the baby will be raised in accordance with their own identities and a debate arises as to the need to provide the child with certainty of identity, how to achieve this, and which identity is most beneficial for a child. Later, the pair discover that the child has not been abandoned, but left by its aunt in Lewtas’ care. The aunt is mistakenly identified by the pair as the child’s unmarried mother which prompts Patrick to propose marriage. Upon realising that the child is not, in fact, fatherless, but the product of a ‘mixed marriage’ he utilises negative discourses of exogamy to attempt to persuade the child’s unmarried aunt to reconsider her acceptance of his proposal, most significant of which echoes the notion of children being ‘mixed up’ by existing between two cultures discussed above. Lastly, throughout the episode, a sub-plot has concerned the apparent disappearance of Patrick’s cousin Shelagh from her home in Ireland. She is thought to have come to London to marry a man of whom her family did not approve. The two tailors place a notice in the *Catholic Herald* asking her to contact them; it is revealed later in the

598 Harris, ‘The identity of Jews in an English city’, 76.

599 Harris, ‘The identity of Jews in an English city’, 76.

600 Harris, ‘The identity of Jews in an English city’, 77.

601 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.6 Ep.7 ‘Mix Me a Marriage’ (14 September 1971).

episode that the notice was placed in the *Jewish Chronicle* instead. The last scene of the episode sees Shelagh arrive at the workshop and, when questioned about how she happened to see the notice in the *Chronicle*, reveals that her husband is Jewish. This prompts a brief discussion from the two tailors on this point which is compounded by the revelation that Shelagh's husband is Manny's cousin and that the two tailors are now related by marriage.

A number of discursive threads are discernible within these conversations. First, the notion of a 'mixed marriage' is marked unambiguously as a negative in dialogue between the two characters. There is a lack of counter-argument of this point as the final revelation that Patrick and Manny's cousins have married comes in the very last scene, indeed in the preantepenultimate line. There is, therefore, little space or time for any alternative perspective to be constructed either via the operation of *pathos* or something more explicit, it is left to the audience to critique the negative construction of exogamy throughout the programme. Second, discussions around 'mixed marriages' in the episode are structured largely around concerns regarding culture. Culture is constructed as a cohesive, monolithic entity of which each identity group possesses a unique variety that is incompatible with any other. Manny and Patrick give voice to this perspective when discussing the future of their 'adopted' baby. They engage in intense debate concerning the faith within which the child will be raised (as, for both characters, faith is largely a precursor to, and determinant of, culture). They agree, however that it is best for the child to be raised within one 'coherent' set of cultural discourses.

An alternative interpretation of the programme's treatment of exogamy is possible however. When referring to Shelagh's running away from Ireland with a man who is only described to him as 'not a Catholic', Manny refers to such a relationship as 'a tricky situation', he also reveals that his cousin was cut out of his family business by his father after revealing that he was in a relationship with a non-Jewish woman, causing the two tailors conclude that 'mixed marriages cause an awful lot of botheration'. This characterisation stands in stark contrast to the account given by Shelagh in her appearance as a woman for whom there is no conflict between her own identity and her husband's. Her lived experience of a 'mixed marriage' demonstrates the significant degree of artificiality and 'constructedness' that contributes to the perceptions of 'mixed marriages' demonstrated by the tailors. Additionally, the baby's aunt Doreen rejects Patrick's negative construction of exogamy claiming that she would still wish to marry him in spite of the differences between them pointing to a generational shift occurring around this time in relation to 'mixed marriages'. It is arguable from this that Powell and Driver intend a construction of anxiety around exogamy as a generational, rather than culturally consistent, discourse, though the absence of personal testimony from these writers on this point confines this conclusion only

to the realm of the possible rather than the probable. With regard to the specific question of anxiety around exogamy as a discourse of Jewishness the very structure of the episode constructs such anxiety as characteristic of both Irish Catholic and Jewish people. Once again, therefore, Jewishness is subsumed within a broader understanding of 'difference' and the 'Other'.

TDUDP, by contrast, offers little in the form of discussions around exogamy and its significance for British Jews. There are no explicit references to exogamy or concerns about it raised within the dialogue of the programme. Alf is never faced with an exogamous marriage outside of his own family upon which he might comment either in cultural or racial terms. There are points however at which he makes reference to Mike and Rita's marriage as a 'mixed marriage' and he demonstrates a concern that his grandson be brought up to support West Ham F.C. rather than Liverpool F.C.[602] however these are rare and are usually cast in terms of his disregard for the City of Liverpool rather than the ethnic and cultural background of Liverpudlians. He constructs Liverpudlians as primitive and less technologically advanced than Londoners but this is not explicitly connected to ideas of exogamy.[603] Alf's own marriage however, if he is read as Jewish character, offers an unacknowledged representation of an exogamous marriage within the programme.

Alf and Else's marriage occupies a liminal position in relation to ideas of exogamy. Else constructs Alf as Jewish consistently throughout the programme while Alf, as has been shown, repeatedly rejects any assertion that the is Jewish. For Else, then the marriage is undoubtedly exogamous while for Alf, his rejection of Jewish identity creates a tension within his marriage, he may not wish his marriage to be exogamous but he lacks any control over how other people perceive it. This tension is never explicitly commented upon within the programme. Else makes several comments regarding Alf's family's reactions to her. She often claims that Alf's mother 'begged' Else to marry her son.[604] It is known from previous episodes that Alf's marking as Jewish is derived from his paternity (though this may be as a result of non-Jewish perspectives on heredity and identity being applied to a Jewish context as it is well known that in Jewish culture, Jewish identity is matrilineal rather than patrilineal), his mother is not identified as Jewish and was therefore potentially part of an exogamous marriage, though again, this is not commented upon explicitly and it is also heavily implied at multiple points that Alf's mother was often unfaithful to her husband thus problematising

602 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.1 'To Garnett a Grandson' (13 September 1972).

603 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966); S.1 Ep.6 'From Liverpool with love' (18 July 1966); S.5 Ep.1 'TV Licence' (2 January 1974); S.7 Ep.1 'Moving in with Min' (5 November 1975).

604 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.2 'Hair Raising' (13 June 1966); S.2 Ep.2 'Sex Before Marriage' (2 January 1967).

Alf's paternity. Previous chapters have shown that Alf does appear to exist between two forms of identity, this may be taken as Speight lending credence to one of the key anxieties around exogamy. However Alf's own daughter Rita offers an alternative reading. She demonstrates no sense of conflict between the two forms of identity open to her; clearly the notion of Jewishness as a matrilineal form of identity is not prevalent within the programme and therefore identification as Jewish is open for her, she is able to navigate being simultaneously Jewish and non-Jewish and being married to a non-Jewish man without the anxieties demonstrated by Alf, a man identified as Jewish by others and consumed with self-hatred as a result, and by a significant number of Harris' respondents who demonstrate a sense of responsibility to ideas of Jewish 'authenticity'.[605] This may be interpreted as generational difference or alternatively it may be taken as supporting the perspective found by Harris of fears that exogamy leads to Jewish identity being wiped out in a matter of generations.[606] This constructs exogamy in a manner that neither wholly supports not wholly counters the perspectives evidenced within Hansard records and studies of contemporary British Jewry. The apparent indelibility of Jewish identity leads to Alf being unable to eschew it completely, yet his rejection provides grounds for Rita's complete subsummation within discourses of British identity. What may be concluded from the available evidence is that concerns around exogamy were far more prevalent among older and more Orthodox Jews while younger and Liberal/Reform Jews demonstrated less concerns around the issue. In homogenising the perspective of 'the Jew' regarding exogamy, parliamentarians fail to account for historical and cultural change, mistakenly concretising a transient set of cultural mores as what it means to be 'Jewish' and 'de-subjectifying Jewish people, removing from them the agency to determine what (if anything) it means to be Jewish in cultural terms.

It is apparent from the foregoing evidence that there was, in Parliament, an overriding construction of 'the Jew' as insular and that this was connected to heritage and culture. This discourse consisted of a number of assumptions and threads: that 'the Jew' constitutes a cohesive, self-sufficient community that does not require input from external sources; the construction of the 'East End' as a Jewish space; and a preference for endogamy joined with an anxiety around exogamy. It is notable that a number of these discourses were also applied, in Parliament, to West Indian and South Asian migrants and their children. These non-'White' groups were also constructed as cohesive communities and as occupying 'ghettoised' spaces.[607] Endogamy and anti-exogamic anxieties are constructed specifically as Jewish behaviours. Evidence from sitcoms of the time demonstrates the plurality of views around the

605 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 66.

606 Harris, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', 76.

607 Hansard, HL, 7 June 1967, vol. 283, c. 459; and 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 115.

insularity of Jews. Both *NMTQ* and *TDUDP* offer nuanced interrogations of this concept. *NMTQ* offers an explicit discussion of the concept while *TDUDP*'s remains a matter of audience inference and interpretation. No evidence exists to demonstrate the extent to which these ideas were read into the comedies by contemporary audiences. What becomes apparent in this analysis is the connection of behaviour to heritage within parliamentary discourses of 'the Jew' compared to the 'generationalisation' or even individualisation of such discourses within sitcoms. The perceived 'patterns of behaviour' of Jews in general, are constructed as, if not a product of, then affected by, heredity. Of course, however heredity was considered as more than social, but personal, as the following section explores through the lens of gesticulation as 'Jewish' behaviour.

'A Dead Giveaway'. Jewish Behaviour: (II) The Jewish Gesture

During the first exchange in which the status of Garnett's Jewishness is explored, Mike refers to Alf's gesticulation saying: 'It's a dead giveaway, waving your hands around like that'.[608] Alf's gesticulation is a reflexive behaviour. The extent to which it was learned from other members of his family or the extent to which it is constructed as an inherited 'Jewish' behaviour is however left ambiguous showing an awareness of the potential intersection of racial and cultural discourses within the Jewish context (see below). Alf immediately stops waving his hands around and is admonished by Mike for the consequent obfuscation of his Jewishness, Mike saying: 'It's a well-known fact that Jews are very emotional people, Mr Diamond'.[609] This ties gesticulation explicitly to emotiveness and sensitivity, yet retains the ambiguity around the extent to which *TDUDP* constructs gesticulation as an inherited or learned behaviour. Gesticulation often appears in allusions to Alf's Jewishness, as for example in 'TV Licence' wherein Alf, in the midst of a tirade is waving his hands around and notices that Mike and Rita are mocking him for doing so, at which point he promptly folds his arms and puts his hands under his armpits.[610] This reinforces the construction of Garnett's gesticulation as reflexive, even instinctive. This silent, allusive referent to Alf's status as Jewish speaks to the extent to which gesticulation has become an othered (specifically as Jewish) physical behaviour. This is followed in a later episode by Mike ironically problematising Prince Charles' status as non-Jewish by saying Charles has 'a big nose and keeps his hands behind his back, you know, to stop him waving them around)'.[611]

608 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

609 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.1 Ep.4 'Intolerance' (27 June 1966).

610 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.1 'TV Licence' (2 January 1974).

611 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.4 Ep.1 'To Garnett a Grandson' (13 September 1972).

These examples, though limited, nonetheless offer rich ground for analysis when contextualised diegetically, within their historical context, and in the wider context of discourses about Otherness within the programme. Alf's 'gesticulation' in 'Intolerance' leads to a statement by Alf that Mike has 'Mick hands', explicitly linking his hands to a racial construction of Mike's Irish identity. Mike takes up this point and connects Alf's gesticulation to his 'Jewish hands'. This constructs gesticulation as not a behaviour of Jews but as something intrinsic and physiognomic. This example is of particular value as this exchange does not exist within the script for this episode. Evidence that this exchange was improvised by Mitchell and Booth is also provided by Mark Ward in his *A Family at War*.[612] Within this context these remarks take on new significance. It is unlikely that Warren Mitchell made up these lines entirely 'in the moment'. He was often involved in script preparation and Speight particularly sought his opinions when writing about Jews and Jewishness.[613] Booth's taking up of this idea and, through his declaration, linking Jewishness and 'Jewish gesticulation' to the hands—as a manifestation of Jewish physiognomy—particularly as a non-Jewish man himself speaks to an understanding of the contemporary currents of thought around the tendentious nature of 'the Jew' as a racial category and an attempt to disrupt such ideas by making the plainly ridiculous assertion that a form of behaviour is intrinsically linked to a body part and that such a body part can be racialised in such a manner as to call it 'Jewish'.

Further supporting the contention that these statements function as a disruption of the idea of gesticulation as a signifier of 'the Jew' is the tremendous audience laughter in response, particularly following Booth's connection of gesticulation to the idea of 'Jewish hands'. As stated in Ward's *A Family at War*, Mitchell had invited friends and acquaintances of his to that episode's recording—all of them Jewish.[614] Following the taping, Speight, finding out that a substantial proportion (if not a majority though Ward is not clear on this point) of the audience were Jewish, spoke to them, and asked whether they had found the jokes antisemitic (this had been a concern of his before the episode had been recorded). The audience responded emphatically that the episode was not, in their opinion, antisemitic, but rather functioned as a counter to antisemitic ideas. Within this context then, the laughter produced by the 'Jewish hands' remark can be interpreted as a recognition of the absurdity of the statement by a group of people for whom Jewishness was not necessarily something physically embodied by 'the Jew' but something artificial and historically contingent, though still, by implication, harmful.

---

612 Ward, *A Family at War*, 74–78.

613 Ward, *A Family At War*, 75.

614 Ward, *A Family At War*, 76–77.

Mike's othering of Prince Charles may also be read in a way that casts it as disruptive of the 'Jewish gesticulation' idea. The use of the royal family as a site for the negotiation of meaning for Jewishness has already been discussed above in relation to 'the Jewish nose'. In suggesting that Charles is exhibiting 'Jewish behaviour' in private that he must physically repress in public, Speight uses Mike to speak to ideas of sublimating Jewishness as discussed throughout this thesis but also highlights the historical roots of the 'Jewish gesticulation' discourse. Charles' lack of gesticulation is more readily explained through royal propriety, a lack of emotional display, and a perception that such display in public amounts to a social *faux pas*.

It is widely held that among the principal themes of Enlightenment-era culture and thought were the simultaneous separation of Man from Nature and, consequently, the necessity and moral value of precedence and indeed dominance over Nature: not only in terms of its organisation and categorisation but in manifestly physical terms through the mastery of one's own natural impulses (violence, passion *etc.*). This led and influenced many transformations in the development from a 'medieval' culture to a 'modern' culture including the development of the chivalric ideal into the courtly idea of 'civility' in Johann Huizinga's and Norbert Elias' theses.[615] This found expression in books of conduct that emphasised the deliberateness of the ideal physical movement. Edward Muir has argued that 'gestures became after the sixteenth century the most important visible signs for establishing, sustaining and recognising differences'.[616] Eva Holmberg suggests a religious dimension to this othering: discussing early modern English representations of gesture as part of Jewish religious rituals within the context of an increasingly austere English Christian worship that eschewed the external in favour of the internal (see previous work above p. 134 *fn.* 460; and p. 145).[617] She utilises passages from writers such as Samuel Purchas, Thomas Coryate, and George Sandys who wrote in the seventeenth century of the strangeness and even, at times,

615 See Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages: A Study of the Forms of Life, Thought and Art in France and The Netherlands in the XIVth and XVth Centuries*, Kindle Edition (San Francisco: Pickle Partners, 2016 [1st Dutch ed. *Herfstijj der Middeleeuwen: studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink, 1919)]); and Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000 [1st German ed. *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation* (Basel: Urizen, 1939)]). See also Barbara H. Rosenwein, 'Worrying about emotions in history', *American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), 821–45 for an exploration of the impact of Elias' ideas on the historiography of emotion.

616 Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe. New Approaches to European History* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 1997), 126; cited in Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination*, 70.

617 Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination*, 53–104 (esp. 69–82).

absurdity of Jewish religious gesture.[618] Jewish gesture came to be represented as indicative of a barbarity and an exoticism that might broadly be analogised with Edward Said's work on 'orientalism'.[619] 'The Jew' becomes a signifier of mystery, primitivity, and fundamentally, Otherness.

In both of these perspectives 'the Jew' becomes othered through gesture and is constructed as emotionally or religiously excessive which creates distance between 'the Jew' and *politesse* or between 'the Jew' and godliness. Yet these forms of othering are not mutually exclusive. In representing gesture as an expression of religious excess, early modern English writers constructed the 'wrongness' and Otherness of the Jews—religiously, culturally, and even, Holmberg suggests, socio-economically: gesture was perceived as an 'important means of social differentiation'.[620] At this point the two constructions outlined above intersect as the Otherness of 'the Jew' becomes not just a religious discourse but one that feeds into emerging 'proto-class' discourses. 'The Jew' is therefore subsumed within a 'palaeo-lower-class' barbarity alongside non-Jews of similar socio-economic status. The idea of the Jewish gesture as a racial marker then loses all meaning in such a context as it becomes not a signifier of Jewishness but a signifier of 'class'.

Taking this historical context into account offers valuable context for understanding the way that 'gesture is utilised in *TDUDP* and particularly in the statement about Prince Charles outlined above. In suggesting that Charles, part of the royal family, is unable to control his gesticulation, Mike utilises discourses of Jewish Otherness to strike at the heart of a central British institution: the propriety and comportment of its royals and with it the Victorian notion of the 'stiff upper lip'. This suits his explicit republican perspective. His use of discourses of Jewishness in order to achieve this has particular relevance given his knowledge of Alf's distaste for the Jewish identity he is regularly connected to. For Alf, Jewishness therefore becomes a threat to a central pillar of the form of identity to which he clings most dearly. The racial identity of the royal family is a key facet of Alf's understanding of Britishness and is incorporated into his theological conception of the world in which the royal family is a literal embodiment of God upon earth. He argues in 'State Visit', that the Queen is a direct descendant of God via the prophet Muhammad.[621] Mike then asks whether Muhmmad was 'one of your [Alf's] coons?' before ruminating on the implications this has for the Queen's racial identity. Both of these examples utilise discourses of Otherness to disrupt the racial status of the British royal family and both result in fierce aggression from Alf in

618 Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination*, 69–82 (esp. 73 & 78).

619 Said, *Orientalism*.

620 Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination*, 77.

621 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.2 Ep.9 'State Visit' (20 February 1967).

response to this attack on his own form of identity. Speight goes no further in this example to counter this stereotypical discourse of Jewishness—it is clearly being utilised for a different purpose—however, it is notable that there is little consistency in the ways in which the 'Jewish gesticulation' discourse is utilised within the programme. This heterogeneous approach in itself disrupts the credibility of the discourse and lays its shortcomings as a signifier of 'the Jew' bare.

A final form of contextualisation regarding *TDUDP*'s handling of 'the Jewish gesture' is the role that 'the gesture' plays in the programme's representation of other forms of 'difference'. Anthony Booth, through his performance, creates an element of ambiguity around the particularity of 'gesture' as a discourse of Jewishness. Mike identifies as, variously: Irish, British, and Liverpudlian. None of these identities are mutually inclusive or exclusive with Jewish identity and thus, Mike's gesticulation when talking animatedly—to a similar degree as Alf—creates a conceptual ambiguity within the 'Jewish gesticulation' discourse. However, this ambiguity is not made explicit, as Mike's use of gesture is neither commented upon nor racialised: Alf's remark about 'Mick hands' is confined exclusively to the red 'colour' of the skin on Mike's palms, not the gestures they enact. While this does nothing to counter the discursive association between excessive gesticulation and barbarism or primitivity, rather in some ways it reinforces it (Alf consistently represents the Irish as primitive and his perception of Liverpudlians is largely framed by his anti-Irish prejudice) what Speight does achieve is the sublimation of gesture within a general—not specifically Jewish—perspective of Otherness. This is joined by the gesticulation of non-'White' characters such as the 'Black' cockney 'spiv' character, and the lack of gesticulation from Jewish characters such as Millie and her mother Ruby. Other Jewish actors within the programme, such as Alfie Bass, Rita Webb, Adrienne Posta, and Harold Berens do not incorporate gesture into their performances in the same manner as Mitchell. Some knowledge of the identity of the various actors in the programme therefore opens up increasing levels of disruption for the audience in their interpretation of Jewish gesticulation.

These examples of gesticulation being explicitly connected to Alf's Jewishness are usefully contrasted with *NMTQ*, wherein Manny does gesture far more than Patrick, but this gesticulation is not explicitly connected to his Jewishness. Nor, in this programme, do other Jewish characters gesticulate as much as Manny, Lewtas exhibits a degree of gesticulation but the several rabbi characters and Manny's own mother do not.[622] Ostensibly, it is left for the audience to connect the two discourses, which, as the above conclusions drawn about Powell

622 In his other work, for instance in *The Vicar of Dibley* (BBC, 1994–1998) John Bluthal does not include gesticulation in his performance to the same extent, though the identity of such characters as Frank Pickle as Jewish is uncertain.

and Driver's (non-)coverage of the 'Jewish nose' show, was not a connection supported by the programme as it presents a perspective on Jewishness that diminishes the importance of the racial in favour of religious and cultural foundation of Jewishness. Within *NMTQ*, Manny's gesticulation is not explicitly racialised, therefore it must be interpreted as a performative element introduced by John Bluthal. His motivations in incorporating such a discourse into his performance are unclear. The role of gesture as a signifier of a more general Otherness is also incorporated within this programme. The referee for the inter-religious football match exhibits wild displays of gesture, both when functioning as a referee and during his remonstrations with the team captains about the abuse he received following the match.[623] This does implicitly limit the extent to which gesticulation can be constructed as a marker of 'the Jew' however there is little evidence within the programme that such disruption was intended or made explicit.

What has been demonstrated, particularly with regard to Garnett is the manner in which gesticulation as a specific marker of 'the Jew' crosses boundaries from the behavioural to the racial. It is uncertain from the programmes whether gesticulation is a learned behaviour or something innate. Alf taps his hands under his armpits as if to stop them moving of their own accord, as though there were some 'Jewish force' compelling their movement over which he has no control. This idea is patently absurd and would, were it a person's reding of the character necessarily engender laughter due to the discursive slip provoked by this stereotyped action being performed by the self-denying Jewish and proudly British Alf Garnett.

'Helpless in our Hands': Jewish Subjectivity and 'the Jew' as Victim

A principal discourse about 'the Jew' demonstrated throughout the foregoing chapters of this thesis is the tendency for parliamentarians to construct 'the Jew' as a passive object, rather than an active 'subject'. This has been shown predominantly through reference to the agency of Jews to determine for themselves both whether, and due to what criteria, they were protected under the auspices of the RRAs. While Chapter 4 explored aspects of this in relation to representations of Jewish masculinity, this section will take a view of this issue irrespective of gender and instead offer a view based on the perception of the Jewish relationship with prejudice, victimhood, and subjectivity. This section will make what have heretofore been passing references more explicit and draw out the root of this 'objectification' and 'pacification' of the Jew: the tendency to construct 'the Jew' as a victim.

623 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.5 Ep.1 'And Ecumenicals to You' (15 December 1970).

The objectification of the 'Other' has a lengthy history yet in this case it must be understood as inflected not through ideas of 'the enemy' as might be assumed, but through ideas of the 'victim'. This process, bordering on the infantilisation of the group upon whom it is visited, must be understood as an operation of power. By marking the 'Other' as a victim, as incapable of self-defence and requiring protection, this discourse limits the agency of the 'Other' and provides those who would exercise power over that Othered group with a justification for doing so. This has been shown particularly with reference to the 'infantile' or 'childlike' 'Black' slave in the American context and may also be seen in parliamentary construction of 'the Jew' in the RRAs 1965–1976.[624] While the infantilisation of Jewish people is evident in these sources, it is not predicated on the same set of discourses. While the infantilisation of the 'Black' slave is largely constructed from a supposed lack of mental and emotional maturity, the infantilisation of 'the Jew' is based upon a supposed lack of physical ability and therefore the 'inability' of Jews to protect themselves from the aggression of others.

The key events that framed the construction of Jews as victims in the legislative debates of this period were the persecutions German Jews experienced under the Nazi regime, culminating in the Holocaust and the systemised murder of millions; and, the experiences of British Jews who were subjected to aggressive bigotry and violence by the British Union of Fascists in the 1930s. Both of these sets of events were explicitly referenced in the legislative debates as justification for the passage of the RRAs.[625] The activities of the British Union of Fascists towards the Jews led in 1936 to the passage of the POA that provided for the arrest, fining and/or imprisonment of those who wore uniforms signifying membership of political organisations; those who '[used] threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour with intent to provoke a breach of the peace or whereby a breach of the peace is likely to be occasioned'; criminalised quasi-military organisations; and granted the police powers to ensure order during public processions (including the removal of banners and flags under

624 The infantilisation of enslaved Africans and later African Americans to justify slavery and the plantation system has been shown through explorations and deconstructions of the 'Sambo' stereotype wherein 'Black' adults are characterised as carefree, happy-go-lucky, and irresponsible. See Lydia Plath, 'North Carolina and Nat Turner: Honour and Violence in a Slave Insurrection Scare', in *Black and White Masculinity in the American South, 1800–2000*, ed. Lydia Plath & Sergio Lussana (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 16–37 (p. 22); and the work of Joseph Boskin, in particular his *Sambo: The Rise and Demise of an American Jester* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1986); and, with Joseph Dorinson, 'Ethnic humor: subversion and survival', in *American Humor*, ed. Arthur Power Dudden with Peter M. Briggs, *American Quarterly*, 37:1 (1985), 81–97.

625 See among many other examples Hansard, HC, 23 March 1965, vol. 709, c. 377; HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, cc. 956, 962, 964–65 & 1004; HC, 26 July 1965, vol. 268, cc. 1010–13; HC, 27 May 1966, vol. 729, c. 937; HL, 7 July 1966, vol. 275, cc. 1250–51; and HL, 15 November 1976, vol. 377, c. 1095

certain conditions).[626] The passage of this Act was explicitly motivated by the desire to protect the Jews for whom, along with communists, the British Union of Fascists reserved their most virulent expressions of hatred.[627] This recent history of persecution and the perceived success of the protective measures granted to the Jews who were, in the words of one peer 'helpless in our hands', conditioned the ways in which the Jews were constructed during the legislative debates around the RRAs.[628]

The construction of 'the Jew' as a passive object and victim of prejudice has two distinct strands within parliamentary sources from this period: the construction of 'the Jew' as 'the good migrant'; and the construction of 'the Jew' as a victim of an ongoing legacy of bigotry and violence combined with the inability of 'the Jew' to defend themselves against this. These discourses combine to create a construction of 'the Jew' in which a meek, defenceless people are subjected to bigotry in spite of their willingness to subsume their own identities and cultures in order to better fit in. It is against this fictive model that contemporary West Indian and South Asian migrants were tested and considered wanting as they were deemed unwilling or unable to shed their previous forms of identity and subsume themselves within an—also mythical—'British identity', to the degree that 'the Jew' was thought to have done.

The notion of 'the Jew' as the 'good migrant' was a unique product of the post-war era and contrasts sharply with responses to actual Jewish migration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Responses to Eastern European Jews fleeing pogroms in the Russian empire have been explored by a number of historical studies most notably those by Bernard Gainer and David Glover who have established the character and intensity with which Jews were conceptualised as undesirable immigrants to have incorporated into British life and British society.[629] This was countered by the work of many British Jews already

---

626 *Public Order Act 1936*, ch. 6 (Edw. 8 & 1 Geo. 6), I.5.

627 What is notable, in passing, is the complete separation of this legislation from ideas of 'race'. While the protection of Jews was paramount in causing the passage of the Act, it was not described as 'an Act to protect Jews' but an Act to protect everybody from political violence and 'insulting words or behaviour', the protection of the Jews was a necessary result of this, as was the protection of any other minority. By contrast, the RRAs were constructed as, and passed in order to, protect non-'White' migrants from discrimination therefore it was framed by ideas of 'colour', 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'national origin'.

628 Hansard, HL, 10 September 1942, vol. 124, c. 344.

629 See Bernard Gainer, *The Alien Invasion: The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905* (London: Heinemann Educational 1972); and Glover, *Literature, Imagination and Diaspora in Fin-de-Siècle England*. See also shorter form studies such as Jill Pellew, 'The home office and the Aliens Act, 1905', *The Historical Journal*, 32:2 (1989), 369–85; and Helena Wray, 'The Aliens Act 1905 and the immigration dilemma', *Journal of Law and Society*, 33:2 (2006), 302–23. The atmosphere into which Eastern European Jews came at this time is demonstrated acutely in Malvery, 'The Alien Question. II.—The Promised Land'.

resident in the country though the reasons for their doing so have been widely debated.[630] Concerns around the migration of Jews to Britain coalesced around the apparent 'dirtiness' and criminality' of Jews as well as concerns about the creation of 'ghettos' and the 'inevitable' separation of the newly arrived community from the host community with its concomitant anxieties. In his work on the Aliens Act 1905 David Glover has shown that a significant factor in seeking to limit immigration in this time period was to ensure the appropriate level of integration (importantly not assimilation) for the new arrivals.[631] Concerns around the status of the East End are also demonstrated from these years. By the 1960s the anxieties of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were no longer directed at Jews but at West Indian and South Asian migrants. Jews were now held up as an example of ideal immigration: maintaining a sense of identity without attempting to separate themselves from British society (though the intricacies of this distinction were so nuanced that, as this thesis has shown, it was no longer possible for politicians to demonstrate why Jews were different enough to need protecting under the RRAs.

Examples abound from parliamentary sources demonstrating this shift in perception of 'the Jew' and the conceptual shift that maintains anxieties around immigration in spite of the apparent proof that immigration and integration could work without harming the identities of the participants. A notable example comes from Maurice Orbach, speaking in 1968 which is worth quoting at some length:

> Everything that has been said by the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton, South-West [Enoch Powell] about the attitudes that people are adopting towards coloured people was said about my parents, 60 years ago. A Royal Commission Report exists, and can be read, in which witness after witness testifies to the fact that the Jews were dirty and shiftless; that they created slums and were blacklegs, and that in all ways were as bad as some of the Black barbarians that the right hon. Gentleman described in his notorious speech. *The Jews have proved that they can be integrated in this country* and during the 28 years in which I have been working on this problem I have found no difficulty in conciliating

630 Efforts to house and employ Eastern European Jews are covered by Georgia Brown's *One Pair of Eyes* episode and are further demonstrated in Gainer, *The Alien Invasion*, esp. chs 2 & 3. Efforts to counter the antisemitic discourses of the time is also apparent in documents produced by Jewish leadership organisations such as London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews, *A Defence of The Alien Immigrant & Objections to The Aliens Bill* (London: The London Committee of Deputies of British Jews, 1904); and *The Aliens Bill, 1905: Report of London Committee of Deputies of British Jews* (London: Wertheimer, Lea & Co., 1905) by the same organisation, demonstrating that efforts to ameliorate the migration process were not just economic but intellectual.

631 Glover, *Literature, Imagination and Diaspora in Fin-de-Siècle England*, 101–21.

> either employers or employees to accept Jews in trade unions, trade associations or in employment generally.
>
> During that very ugly period for the Jewish community—1947 to 1949—I found no difficulty in approaching employers who had exercised discrimination, or whose employees had exercised discrimination. For years I meditated upon this fact and considered that I was a very bright, charming gentleman who happened to be able to get beyond the irrationality of the person whom I was addressing and show him the logic of accepting a person on the basis of merit rather than religion.[632]

Orbach's argument here concerns the ability of Jews to be accepted into Trade Unions and the world of employment more generally in relation to the ongoing issues that contemporary West Indian and South Asian migrants were experiencing in the same sphere. In offering up 'the Jew' as a minority that has successfully overcome bigotry to the extent that their involvement in the world of employment is unremarkable, Orbach constructs Jews as the ideal minority.

A further aspect of the construction of 'the Jew' as the ideal minority is demonstrated best in a 1962 quotation from then Home secretary Henry Brooke in response to questions regarding proposed legislation to outlaw antisemitic organisations: 'I made a comprehensive statement […] for which I have since been thanked by a number of members of the Jewish community'.[633] This statement, highlights the importance of constructing 'the Jew's' relationship to the non-Jew as one of indebtedness and gratitude. In describing Jews as grateful for his paying attention to the matter of their being subject to bigotry, Brooke constructs the Jews as the 'ideal minority' simultaneously indebted to, grateful to, and under the protection of, the non-Jewish State and populace.

In spite of these pronouncements that seemingly mark 'the Jew' as a successfully integrated minority, there is a consistent tendency in parliamentary records towards the construction of the Jew as helpless. Quintin Hogg offered one such example in 1965:

> I had believed and hoped that the Jewish people had suffered enough in our life-time without having this frightful thing rearing its head again. I should have thought that the example of their suffering was enough in our time to stop people from attacking other men.[634]

Baron Hirshfield also speaks to this in his interjection in 1968:

---

632 Hansard, HC, 23 April 1968, vol. 763, cc. 98–99; my emphasis.

633 Hansard, HC, 15 November 1962, vol. 667, c. 548.

634 Hansard, HC, 16 July 1965, vol. 716, cc. 1062–63.

> [The Jew] has been the victim down the ages of propaganda of the pattern which—alas!—is now heard here, and which has been affecting the most fair-minded citizens.[635]

Throughout parliamentary debates around the RRAs, the importance of the Jewish experience as indicating the necessity for State action is highlighted. It is argued repeatedly that the inability of Jews to defend themselves in the face of antisemitic aggression, whether as a result of their being outnumbered, inclined to pacifism, or physically unassertive demonstrates the need for legislation to proscribe relations between minority and majority. The construction of the Jews as a helpless yet successful minority group is therefore an essential aspect of the internal logic of the RRAs: in order to foster 'ideal integration' between a helpless minority and a majority that include bigoted elements, legislation is necessary.

What is ignored in these debates are the significant efforts made by Jews to resist bigotry and violence that counter the construction of 'the Jew' as helpless. The Battle of Cable Street in 1936 goes unremarked upon in these debates as do the significant efforts made by Jews to utilise the courts to enforce the RRAs, with limited success as Didi Herman has shown.[636] The construction of 'the Jew' as a passive object of hate is therefore demonstrably ahistorical and this idea is interrogated in both *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* in different ways.

Throughout the run of *TDUDP*, Johnny Speight consistently contests the notion of 'the Jew' as an object of prejudice. Alf Garnett, whose contested status as Jewish has been demonstrated throughout this thesis, is the most vocal, vociferously prejudiced and aggressive character in the programme, indeed so much so that this has formed a large part of the programme's historical legacy. In utilising Alf as a bigot, Speight demonstrates that Jews can exhibit prejudice just like non-Jews. Garnett's prejudice seemingly extends to everyone he considers 'other' to himself, particularly in 'colour' and racial, but also in national, ethnic, sexual, gender, generational, and regional terms. This includes individuals whose status as Jewish is less uncertain than Alf's demonstrating that the Jewish relationship with prejudice is not homogenous or essential and is largely a matter of individual experience and inclination. Alf is himself often the target of prejudice based on his apparent Jewish heritage. He refers to his childhood and his being attacked by non-Jewish children, including, it seems, Else:

> ALF *[to Rita, gesturing to Else]* I'll tell you something about her, and all her friends and bloody relations, they made our life a misery down this road they did, they persecuted us…they didn't have no real Jews down this street so they made out that we was Jews just so they could have a bit of fun an' call out to us in the street

635 Hansard, HL, 15 July 1968, vol. 295, c. 80.

636 Herman, *An Unfortunate Coincidence*, 138–42.

and not sitting next to us in school, I had to sit next to a bloody Black boy all one class!

ELSE That was nothing to do with your religion

ALF […] aspersion cast about your race and they're all running down the street after you yelling names 'long nose' and 'Jewboy' and 'Ikey Mo'.

MIKE And you Tories don't?

ALF No, we've got a bit more respect we have. If God wants to make them Jews fair enough it's his business. If God wants Jews in the world, he's got his reasons for it […] if he feels that he wants to make Jews, he don't see 'em like we do. Anyway it ain't supposed to be a perfect world is it? It was always said that he would send down things to try us.[637]

A series of compelling points may be made from this exchange. It is notable that Alf refers to the abuse as 'persecution' and that it was directed at him and his family because '[the abusers] didn't have no real Jews'. This point is compelling as it ties closely with the concept Speight played with in his *If There Weren't Any Blacks, You'd Have to Invent Them* regarding the manufacturing of the 'Other' as a necessary mirror against which an 'in group' can be created.[638]

Else offers a potential counter to this proposal when she argues that the abuse was nothing to do with Alf's 'religion'. This statement marks Jewish identity as an unequivocally religious form of identity, an idea already explored above in the parliamentary context and grounded in Speight's own understanding of Jewish identity.[639] Alf's recitation of examples of the names he was called demonstrate that, as well as incorporating some elements of religion ('Ikey Mo' being derived from 'Isaac' and 'Moses', Jewish names with a significant religious foundation), the reference to 'long-nose' and 'jewboy' seem to indicate a foundation in 'race', morphology, and heredity. Garnett is directly referred to as 'Ikey' in the series on the family holiday to Bournemouth by his taxi driver and is also insulted by Kenny Lynch through reference to his 'Jew conk', further demonstrating the multi-faceted foundations upon which antisemitic name-calling was based. Further in the above exchange, Alf demonstrates

637 *Till Death Us Do Part*, S.5 Ep.7 'Paki Paddy' (28 February 1974).

638 See *If There Weren't Any Blacks You'd Have to Invent Them*, Television Movie, dir. Charles Jarrott, written by Johnny Speight, tx. 4 August 1968; or *If There Weren't Any Blacks You'd Have to Invent Them*, Television Movie, dir. Bill Hays, written by Johnny Speight, tx. 3 March 1974.

639 See Speight's autobiographies *It Stands to Reason*, 218; and *For Richer, For Poorer*, 127 wherein he asserts that the fundamental reason he could not be Jewish was because he was Catholic, establishing his own understanding of Jewish identity's essential aspect as religious.

the nuanced portrayal of the Jewish relationship to prejudice by himself exhibiting prejudice against Jews indicating that he does not know why God made them but that he may have done so to 'try us'.

NMTQ offers an interesting corollary to *TDUDP*'s portrayal of the Jewish relationship with prejudice. This takes place predominantly in the episode 'Without Prejudice' via a conversation between Manny and Patrick.[640] Patrick argues to Manny that no-one is without prejudice and that the best approach is for everybody to accept this: recognise their prejudice and do what they can to make sure that the way they think does not affect the way they act towards each other. He recounts the particular example of his friendship with a woman named Sheila's husband at his church. He remarks that he knows someone at his church '[…] and sure he's a sambo'. Manny reacts incredulously at this remark and Patrick, thinking he requires clarification continues 'you know, a wog'. The pair discuss the nature and implication of using such language to describe those marked as racially 'other' but Patrick contends that it makes no difference what he calls Sheila's husband, that he doesn't act differently towards him compared to any other member of the congregation. He continually, throughout the episode refers to his acquaintance as 'Sambo'.[641] It is important however to note that he does not use such language around Sheila, only Manny suggesting that it does affect the way he acts around 'Black' people. It is arguable that such a perspective on the nature of prejudice is rooted in Catholic perspectives on human nature. It may be argued that Catholic thought on human nature sees humans as inherently flawed following the Fall, and that the best way to counter this is, in a sense, not to: through an acceptance of the emotional as a natural expression of the divine (this is the central point where Catholic metaphysics differs from both Protestant metaphysics (which incorporates the utilisation of the rational to condition the natural) and Jewish metaphysics which configures the relationship of body and soul to see human nature as perfectible.[642] The immediate, emotional response to difference is accepted in Patrick's world-view because he sees it as an aspect of human imperfectability. He sees it as an unfortunate but natural consequence of an encounter with difference. He sees himself as able to separate thought from action just as Catholic doctrine (and Christian

640 *Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width*, S.4 Ep.2 'Without Prejudice' (2 July 1970).

641 Note, not 'the Sambo' but 'Sambo' making the epithet essentially Sheila's husband's name through the episode, a linguistic pattern that Powell and Driver would repeat in *Love Thy Neighbour*.

642 Catholic thought holds that, while human nature is imperfectible, humans can still commit acts in the furtherance of their own salvation; this leads to Patrick's view that he can accept his prejudiced thoughts but not allow them to affect the manner in which he engages with his fellow parishioners.

doctrine more generally) separates soul (Thought) from body (Action). Contrast this with Manny's perspective on difference and its own Jewish intellectual origins become clear.[643]

Manny entirely rejects Patrick's assertions that content matters more than form or intent with regard to racially inflected language. He continually asks that Patrick refrain from using words such as 'Sambo' and 'wog' to refer to other people. While we could relate this to Manny's own experience as part of a group that has consistently experienced this othering process and the use of such language against them, the fact that Patrick does not share this opinion marks this perspective on language within the programme as a particularly Jewish perspective and not simply a matter of being 'othered'. How far this perspective was shared among Jews living in Britain at the time is uncertain, Harris' qualitative study does not, unfortunately, investigate this, it does, however investigate the significant experiences of prejudice that British Jews have experienced including the use of aggressive or insulting language, this would appear to indicate that the use of language intended to insult was a notable part of the British Jewish experience at the time but it does not demonstrate the relative significance that British Jews gave to the idea that such language can be expressed devoid of any insulting intent.[644] A brief exchange in parliamentary sources from 1965 already quoted above (p. 143) appears to demonstrate the significant impact that the simple word 'Jew', a word apparently innocuous in Peter Thorneycroft's opinion, has had on David Kerr's life experience.[645] While Thorneycroft argues that words such as 'coloured' may be used as simple descriptors, Kerr offers the rebuttal that such words can be intended to offend when the very idea of possessing that quality, is seen as a negative. This is clearly closely connected to the opinion that Manny puts forward: he indicates that these words have a history and that their use takes place within a context that they cannot be separated from simply by one individual's non-bigoted intentions.

Once again, we can find the roots of Manny's outlook on prejudice in his theology. Jewish theology holds that due to all things coming from God, all things are therefore good. It

---

643 Jewish theology holds that body and soul are intrinsically linked, that one's thoughts and one's actions cannot be separated (*cf.* the interpretation of Catholic theology above *fn.* 642). Rabbi Schneur Zalman of Liadi (1745–1812) in *Tanya* (1796) argues that while what is human is imperfect it can be made perfect. Thus, in contrast to Catholic theology, Jewish thought does not accept the impulsive but demands its control. See Shais Taub, ' "My name is…and I am a Human Being: The Jewish idea of Perfection', n.d., *Chabad.org* <https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/757758/jewish/My-Name-is-and-I-am-a-Human-Being.htm> (accessed 12 March 2016). See also, Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, 'The Problem of the Body for the People of the Book', in *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*, ed. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992), 17–46.

644 Harris, 'The Identity of Jews in an English City', 73–74.

645 Hansard, HC, 23 November 1965, vol. 721, c. 429.

states that man is perfectible but that this perfectibility relies on a choice exercised through free will between following the good impulse (*yetzer tov*) and the bad impulse (*yetzer ra*). Manny's emphasis on form can be connected to this theological tradition: if man is perfectible and this relies on conscious choice, then it is reasonable to suggest that Manny would disagree with Patrick's reticence with regard to prejudice in society. While Patrick seeks to accept an unchanging human nature, Manny sees human nature as essentially changeable. For Manny, people must choose to act and think differently if racism and other forms of prejudice are to be countered and eradicated. It is this perspective that leads him to argue against Patrick's use of language and what ultimately leads him to fall into abjection when he is faced with how far he personally has to go in order to live out his own ideals. Manny's closing speech on the matter is an impassioned declaration of these Jewish tenets, he entirely upends the foundation of the race relations rubric by arguing that Sheila should not apologise for being 'Black' any more than he should apologise for being Jewish. Contrast this statement with the core assumption of race relations legislation—that the 'fact' of difference is the problem—and we see Manny arguing that it is reactions to or even the very idea of difference that cause problems. This is an attitude that would gain more credence in the political mainstream in later decades and would be accompanied by a surge in identity politics that would see difference as a source of strength rather than conflict. It is arguable then that Manny's and Patrick's views on difference and prejudice based on that difference can be seen as outgrowths of their theological perspectives. Religion is thus accorded an increasingly privileged place within *NMTQ's* narrative. It functions as both the foundation for defining what Jewishness means as well as the foundation for the main characters' perspectives on difference and prejudice. One can find adherents of both of these perspectives on prejudice within parliamentary debates on Race Relations legislation, some arguing that prejudice is a natural outcome of different groups living side by side and others arguing that prejudice comes from pre-existing ideas of what difference means and that these can be overturned.

Another notable example, which complicates and variegates the representation of the Jewish relationship with prejudice and bigotry in *NMTQ* also comes from this particular episode. When Manny finally goes to the train station to meet Sheila and identifies her as 'Black', he runs away, refusing the prospect of a relationship with her. It is made very clear in his ensuing conversation with Patrick that Manny's refusal to meet with Sheila and develop a relationship with her was because she was 'Black'. Manny is at this point unaware that Sheila is actually the wife of Patrick's fellow parishioner mentioned above and that the encounter was orchestrated by Patrick in order to prove his point. Manny acknowledges that he was and is prejudiced and harbours unassessed assumptions about and towards people he identifies as 'Black'. When Sheila, at Patrick's invitation, appears at the shop to 'confront' Manny, he

engages in a lengthy tirade against his own prejudices and the prejudice he sees in contemporary British society. As part of this monologue Manny picks up a book of swatches and refers to the colour description of one of them as 'nigger brown'. This is the only use of this reprehensible word in either series under examination and its use by Manny, in the context of his own justification for arguing against the use of such words, lends a compelling nuance to the programme's construction of the Jewish relationship with prejudice. As with *TDUDP*, Jews within *NMTQ* are constructed as both the object of, and purveyors of, prejudice, not simply victims. The significance of Moshe Dayan, symbol of Israel's military might and the stereotype of the 'muscle Jew', to Manny's Jewish identity, further reinforces this view that Jews are not passive victims but active agents.[646] This runs entirely counter to the ways in which Jews are constructed in parliamentary sources of the same period.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated first that there was little to no agreement around the use of the word 'ethnicity' or its derivatives among parliamentarians of this period. Even with recourse to dictionaries and etymological works, MPs and peers were unable to agree a definition of the final criterion to be used to identify the 'Other' and thus, those who were to be protected under the RRAs. This chapter has shown the significant degree of overlap between understandings of 'ethnicity' and those of 'colour', 'race', and 'nation'. The indefiniteness is a crucial failing of parliamentarian logic and thus of legislative quality. This was acknowledged by several MPs and peers who made explicit reference to the need to have lawyers and the judiciary lend clarity to the situation. It has also been shown that, in spite of its protean nature, ethnic was the most important term utilised within the Acts when discussing the status of 'the Jew' in relation to ideas of 'Same' and 'Other', it was by virtue of their 'ethnicity' that 'the Jew' was thought to be protected by the RRAs' precepts. The ethnic status of 'the Jew' is not justified within the debates around the RRAs, it is merely assumed without argumentation, dispute, or logic. As a result, the word 'ethnicity' simultaneously gains and loses all meaning within the RRAs: becoming simultaneously polysemic and asemic.

646 For explorations of the 'muscle Jew' as a concept, a construction of Jewishness as physically and geopolitically assertive and active, see Marilyn Reizbaum, 'Max Nordau and the Generation of Jewish Muscle', *Jewish Culture and History*, 6:1 (2003), 130–51; Todd Samuel Presner, *Muscular Judaism: The Jewish Body and the Politics of Regeneration* (London/New York: Routledge, 2007); Daniel Boyarin, *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (Berkeley/London: Univ. of California Press, 1997), 76–77 & 309; and Gavin Schaffer, 'Unmasking the "muscle Jew" ', *passim*.

The question remains then, if 'ethnicity' is never defined, yet 'the Jew' is intimately tied to it, in what ways are Jews explicitly and consistently constructed as 'different'? This chapter has shown the significant role that religion and ideas of religious difference play in parliamentarian understandings of 'the Jew' and the role of religion in forming the basis of Jewish identity outside Parliament in sitcoms. What is remarkable is that religion, one of the few points on which nearly all parliamentarians agree distinguishes 'the Jew' as a group identity, is explicitly and repeatedly rejected by successive Governments as a legitimate criterion of difference on which the RRAs may be based. The constant refrain that religion is a matter of choice, of conscience, and therefore something that is within the realm of individual agency, differentiates it from qualities like 'colour', 'race', and 'nation' or 'national origin' as these latter are determined prior to one's birth. This ignores two important facts: that one's 'nation' is a politico-legal status and can thus be changed largely at will; and that one's religion is determined to a great extent for a great many people by their upbringing and is therefore closely tied to one's family and heritage which may be determined by 'colour', 'race', or 'nation' and is therefore not entirely separated from one's conscience and agency but this connection is far weaker than supposed and argued by the Governments of 1965, 1968, and 1976.

The role of 'culture' in tying 'the Jew' to the RRAs has also been demonstrated. Just as with 'ethnicity', 'culture' is utilised as a catch all term allowing parliamentarians to demarcate the boundaries of 'same' and different' within these debates. 'The Jew' is one of the principal sites in which this idea is applied. Parliamentarians were unerring in their belief that 'the Jew' was 'different' enough to be protected under the RRAs yet, as foregoing chapters have shown, they could not be convincingly categorised as different according to 'colour', 'race', or 'nation' or 'national origin' and successive Governments, as this chapter has shown, rejected the idea that they could be protected under the auspices of religion. The question remains then, how were the Jews considered 'different' enough to be unequivocally protected under the RRAs? This burden is borne entirely by 'culture'. Once again however, the indefiniteness of this term is evident from the sources. One is compelled therefore to investigate the pragmatics of what is said and the implications of seemingly throwaway comments regarding the character of Jews and the ways in which certain behaviours are described as Jewish. This has been detailed in earlier chapters through an investigation of the 'hypersensitive' Jew and in this chapter through a delineation of the supposed 'insularity' of 'the Jew' and the construction of the Jewish relationship with prejudice as one of perpetual victimhood and passivity. Both of these latter discourses have been demonstrated to be ahistorical and evidence of the persistent stereotyping of 'the Jew' in order to reinforce their supposed Otherness: to borrow a phrase from Barnett Janner, 'the Jew has been persecuted

because he is a Jew', clearly, to parliamentarians of this time to 'be a Jew' was to be constructed within particular discourse of behaviour identified as un-British and therefore 'Other'.[647]

This chapter then proceeded to pose the questions, in what ways were Jews conceptualised as 'different' outside of Parliament in the sitcoms *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*, and did such representations corroborate with those that were enshrined in law? Both of these programmes eschew any reference to 'ethnicity', demonstrating its inutility in popular discourse around difference. Its lack of meaning, one might argue, made it difficult to attack in a satirical manner in the way that Speight, Powell, and Driver had launched critiques of the other ideas of difference under examination here. What is evident is that within *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* there is a demonstrable exploration of the significance of religion to the status of Jewish identity and that both comedies offer different perspectives. While *TDUDP* offers a complex construction with regard to the religious basis of Jewish identity, *NMTQ* is whole-hearted in its advocacy of Jewish identity being, at its core, a religious form of identity. While it offers critiques of 'colour', 'race', and 'nation' as the basis for Jewish identification, no such rejoinders are offered in relation to religion. *TDUDP*, by contrast, is unequivocal in attacking any monolithic basis for Jewish group identity. Alf Garnett is not a professing, practising Jewish man yet he is identified as Jewish by other characters, he demonstrates that he is not 'culturally Jewish' yet his identification is unchanged, other characters show that he is paternally Jewish and therefore, under Jewish cultural norms, not Jewish, yet they persist in identifying him as Jewish. What is notable is the emphasis that is placed on culture—and specifically behaviour—in relation to Alf.

The weight of meaning that 'ethnicity' is forced to carry within the RRAs in relation to 'the Jew' is not backed up by any legitimation and explicitly excludes the religious form of identity that many British Jews held as the basis of their identity. The significant overlap of 'ethnicity' with ideas of culture has been laid bare and, in the Conclusion to this thesis, the relationship of 'the Jew' to culture will be reconceptualised not as a form of protection but as a form of power-knowledge.

In the same manner as other chapters of this thesis the evidence accumulated in this chapter will now be recast in light of the work of postcolonialist theorists, especially Bhabha, to demonstrate the viability of this thesis' contention that the RRAs are best understood as a form of power-knowledge, as colonialist-minded interventions into inter-personal relations that serve more to restrict, categorise and paint over the lived experiences of the people whom they purportedly protected. 'Ethnicity' was key for parliamentary interventions in justifying

647 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 960; my emphasis.

the incorporation of Jews as a protected minority within the RRAs yet, as this chapter has shown, no parliamentarian offers anything close to a comprehensive explanation as to why this is so. In Bhabhaian terms, this is easily understood as part of colonialist discourse that seeks to subsume the 'Other' within a Western colonialist discourse that simultaneously maintains its strangeness but demonstrates that it can be understood within Western ideas such as 'ethnicity' or 'ethnic origin'. This chapter sought to invert this logic and ask the question from the other side, if 'ethnicity' is the key to understand the 'difference' of Jews, yet 'ethnicity' is not defined, what then is thought to be 'different' about Jews. What became apparent was the role of religion both within Parliament and without as the basis for why Jews are 'different'. For some interventions this was expressed in a narrow, purely theological, way, for others it was expanded into a more holistic sense of 'cultural difference' that was nevertheless rooted in religious difference. This focus on religion as the foundation of Jewish subjectivity and distinction is found in the papers of the BoDs and in the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle* (see Chapter 1 above). This is also supported by the work of Powell and Driver in *NMTQ*, in which Manny's identity as Jewish is primarily driven by his religion and the central conflict in the programme that is played for laughs is a religious one with his Catholic colleague. In Bhabhaian terms this can be understood as the creation of a specifically Jewish positionality within the discursive space of 'ethnicity', one that highlights religious difference but demonstrates, in tandem with the work seen in other chapters, that this religious specificity does not necessarily correlate to an essential difference. This preserves the hybridity of Jews especially due to the ambiguity surrounding how far religious specificity manifests in cultural and behavioural signs. *TDUDP* offers an alternative view, one that refuses to 'pick a side' and that best demonstrates Bhabhaian ideas of ambiguity, heterogeneity, and (colloquially) 'messiness'. It does not confine its critique of Jewish difference to the ideas of 'colour', 'race', or 'nationhood' but continues apace, through the character of Alf Garnett, particularly through processes of slippage as he repeatedly refuses to be labelled as Jewish yet behaves in ways that other characters utilise as a means of labelling him as Jewish. It demonstrates that Alf's mimetic processes, by which he overlays his Jewish identity, are both a site of resistance and subject to non-Jewish disruption thereby demonstrating acutely the inherent tension in the process and the liminality of the Jewish position within this discursive rubric.

Within Parliament the behaviour of Jews appears to be the consistent thread that runs through marking them as 'different;' enough to be considered a protected minority. This behaviour, across the sources can have two discursive threads drawn from it: insularity and gesticulation. Within the parliamentary third space, little is done to counter these ideas, though research outside Parliament has demonstrated the complex picture and ambivalent

attitude that Jews had towards ideas of both insularity and exogamy which was not reflected in Parliament which instead relied on reinscribed ideas of 'Jewish' social behaviours. While gesticulation is not broached in Parliament, it is in *TDUDP* and to some extent *NMTQ*. In *TDUDP* it may well be regarded that gesture is utilised as a potential force of disruption questioning the line between discourses of behaviour as learned and behaviour as innate and heritable, provoking an intersection between thee discourses and a potential for resisting them both utilising 'the Jew' to do so. Within *NMTQ*, the tendency is to represent gesticulation, unremarked upon, as part of a cohesive whole, successfully hybridised within a British Jewish character, not as something to be remarked upon.

A number of questions remain then, if race relations is understood in such Bhabhaian terms and that sitcoms represent a key site of third space negotiation of which parliamentary debates was also a part, why were Jews unable to secure the inclusion of religion into the terms of the RRAs and why, if contemporary Jews understood themselves a religion, where they considered included in the RRAs without the inclusion of religion in their terms? Additionally, why was culture—understood as a pattern of behaviour, habits, or a way of life—now deemed to be a justifiable foundation upon which to racialise people? This notion of racial difference as behaviour dressed as 'ethnicity' is specifically applied to Jews within the debates as a justification for them being included as a protected minority. I would suggest that doing so indicates the opening up of a new discursive space around difference that—as with 'colour', 'race', and 'nationhood' —operates as a third space in which Jews come into contact with non-Jews and contest the meaning and nature of Jewish specificity. These are the key questions emerging from this thesis' investigations, a historical one and a more discursive one. Their answer both in historical and discursive terms, will be discussed in the Conclusion to this thesis and will tie this thesis' work together and place it within a broader academic context.

Conclusion

> If race relations could be solved by joking and laughing it would be an excellent thing.[648]

Merlyn Rees' statement above demonstrates a significant thread that has become evident throughout this thesis. It exemplifies the existence in parliamentary sources of, at best, a scepticism, at worst a systemic institutional arrogance, regarding the handling of race relations and, by extension, 'difference' and Jewishness (as this has been shown to be a critical aspect of these discourses) in extra-parliamentary media. Little regard is given to the value of extra-parliamentary sites of discourse production. Privilege is implicitly accorded to the formal, the legal, and the political discourses produced about difference and 'the Other' in Parliament. This is a further indication of the disdain in which popular cultural interventions into contemporary debates and on ideas like 'colour', 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'nation' were held in Parliament. This can be seen further in the flippant dismissal of characters like Alf Garnett as one-dimensional fonts of bigotry rather than the satirical, interrogative, and *carnivalesque* focal points of a more comprehensive working through of the implications of the race relations discourse and the concepts upon which it was based than that which contemporary parliamentarians had achieved. This thesis has demonstrated the complexity of this issue and presented a counter to Rees' position.

This thesis began with a number of aims. To investigate the manner in which Jewish difference was conceptualised in parliamentary and extra-parliamentary sources at a transformative moment in the UK's relationship with difference; to investigate what the concepts which formed the basis upon which 'difference' was understood within the RRAs ('colour, race [and] ethnic [and] national origin') were understood to mean and how these concepts were applied to Jews who were universally understood to be a group protected under the terms of the RRAs; and finally to investigate the extent to which and nature of the differences between parliamentary and sitcom handlings of these four concepts in relation to Jewishness.

What this thesis has shown is that while the lived experience of Jews and the history of Jewish victimisation was significant in the drawing-up of the RRAs, the manner in which Jewishness was discussed in these debates was based upon the ahistorical discursive construction 'the Jew'. While Jews were universally accepted as one of the groups to be

---

648 Hansard, HC, 18 December 1969, vol. 793 c. 1539.

protected under the terms of the RRAs, the concepts that the RRAs utilised to define which groups were to be protected: 'colour', 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'nation' were vague, protean, imperfectly defined, and subjected to (at most) very little and (most often) no, theoretical debate in parliamentary sources (and by extension in the RRAs that resulted therefrom). This lack of clarity is particularly evident when investigating the ways in which Jewish identity and Jewish 'difference' were constructed. The discursive, abstract construction of 'the Jew' is based largely in stereotype and draws on structures of thought that Martin Barker and Étienne Balibar have described as 'new racism' or 'neo-racism' respectively. The consequence of this is a Foucauldian power-knowledge discourse of Jewishness in which the status of Jews as 'Other' becomes legally codified despite the means by which this Otherness is justified being spurious.

While 'colour' formed a key plank of far-right discourses and constructions of Jewish difference (in keeping with a lengthy history of such discourses) this played almost no role in parliamentary constructions of Jewish Otherness. There was a disregard for the potential construction of 'the Jew' as a form of 'colour'-based difference that stands in stark contrast to the primacy that 'colour'-based discourses of difference were given in the debates and in prompting the formulation of the RRAs. The RRAs themselves were predicated upon a binary between ' "Black"/"Other"/protected' and ' "White"/"Same"/constrained'. What emerges as a result of this silence is not a construction of 'the Jew' as 'White' or 'Black' but as neither/both. This liminality only served to reinforce the idea of 'the Jew' as Other. This silence was not replicated in *TDUDP* or *NMTQ*, both of which offered, to a greater or lesser degree, an awareness of the history of the Jewish relationship to ideas of 'colour', specifically of 'blackness' and, in the case of *TDUDP* disrupted this idea through the use of tendentious Jewishness of Alf Garnett, playing off the Jewish identity of the man who played him. These discussions utilised comic mechanisms to problematise the relationship of 'the Jew' to ideas of 'whiteness' and 'blackness' which, ultimately, reveals the historically- and culturally-contingent basis of the idea of 'colour' as a marker and discourse of difference. *TDUDP* deconstructs the parliamentary binary utilising 'the Jew' as a means to do so, while *NMTQ* limits of discussions of 'colour' to non-Jewish individuals, establishing that the identity of its Jewish characters is not predicated on 'colour'.

Though 'colour' was the *de facto* concept utilised to identify protected groups under the RRAs, *de jure* it was via the concept of 'race' that they were defined and categorised as 'Other'. 'Race' is subjected to twin processes of excoriation and utilisation within the debates around the RRAs. While 'colour' was understood as a marker of 'race' the two were not seen as synonymous. MPs and peers attacked expressions of 'racism' but offered no question about the validity of the concept upon which that idea rested. Indeed, much of the content of the

debates shows an uncritical acceptance of 'race' as an ontological fact. 'Race' was the overriding concept by which difference was conceptualised within the RRAs and within the debates with the tautological passage '[a] "racial group" means a group of persons defined by reference to 'colour, *race* or ethnic or national origins' going unchallenged and the links between them unexplained.[649] While 'race' is not given any explicit conceptual boundaries or shape in the debates, in practice it becomes clear that it is understood as the individual and collective expression of genetically inherited and biologically determined phenological and behavioural markers, as such, 'blood' is a notable theme in the parliamentary records from the RRAs. There is evidence that 'the Jew' was widely, though not universally, understood as and described as a racial category in the parliamentary debates, though there is also evidence suggesting an awareness of the pitfalls of such a characterisation. *TDUDP* offers a comprehensive critique of 'race' and uses Jewishness as a tool to achieve this. Through episodes such as 'The Blood Donor', Speight deconstructed the notion of 'race' as blood and the racialisation of 'the Jew' through comedic juxtaposition and disjuncture. Racial stereotyping, while present in *TDUDP*, and to an extent *NMTQ* is, in these programmes, examined, deconstructed, and used to attack 'race' as the basis for Jewish group identification. Investigations into the idea of 'the nose' and 'the gesture' as racial markers of 'the Jew' demonstrate an ability within sitcom to deconstruct and disrupt such received stereotyped understandings of racial identity.

The 1971 court case *Ealing London Borough Council v Race Relations Board* prompted the inclusion of 'nationality' alongside 'national origin' in the RRA 1976. This was one of the few moments at which one of the criteria of difference utilised in the Acts and their debates was lent any refinement though the basis upon which this distinction was made was largely confused and vague. While 'nationality' is understood in more political terms in these debates, this is not universal and the boundary between 'nationality' and 'national origin' (and between 'national origin' and 'ethnic origin', or even 'race') is uncertain, unexplored, and uncritically incorporated into the 1976 RRA. When applied to Jews, there are two overriding strands of debate: the significance of Israel for 'the Jew' and 'the Jew's' relationship to British 'nationality' and British 'national origin'. While 'the Jew' is rarely discussed in terms of Israeli nationality, Israel takes on increasing importance when discussed as a 'national origin', conversely, British 'national origin' is rarely attributed to 'the Jew' but British 'nationality' often is. There is no indication that the British 'nationality' of 'the Jew' has any implication for parliamentarians on the alleged Otherness of 'the Jew': consequently Jews may be of British 'nationality' but the discursive content of 'the Jew' means that they

649 *The Race Relations Act 1965*, ch. 73, §1 (1); my emphasis.

are still unequivocally understood as 'Other'. Evidence from sitcom demonstrates interrogations of both of these threads. The significance of Israel for contemporary Jewish identity is a specific and regular point of discussion in *NMTQ*, revealing the many vagaries of the general parliamentary position on this question. The programme demonstrates that Israel has very little bearing for British Jews beyond a religious or cultural significance that does not extend into a sense of 'national origin'. A key plank of the programmes' disruption of ideas of 'nation' and of the Jewish relationship to ideas of British 'nationality' is through their discussions of masculinity. While masculinity is a key touchstone of ideas of 'nationhood' and of national identity, this is not discussed explicitly in the parliamentary sources and is only touched on tangentially through concerns about the safety of British women. Explorations of Jewish masculinity in sitcoms demonstrates a tendency to deconstruct the idea of British masculinity and British national identity through 'the Jew'. While there is an established history of representing Jewish masculinity as 'Other' to and inferior to non-Jewish masculinities, the sitcoms under examination here disrupt his discourse and, with it the very notion of masculinity as a national characteristic.

The central problem in the handling of 'ethnic origin' in parliamentary debates was the simultaneous lack of any clarity over its meaning and the importance placed upon the word as a 'catch all' term that might be utilised to unequivocally include groups that did not quite fit into any of the previous categories. In the absence of any definition, it is necessary to utilise a deductive rather than inductive approach and ask, in the case of the Jews, what was the primary means by which their 'difference' was asserted that meant they should be included as a protected group due to their 'ethnic origin' or 'ethnicity'? Through this analysis it becomes apparent that two alternative grounds for understanding 'the Jew' as different exist: culture and religion. In parliamentary debates religion as invariably rejected by successive Governments in spite of many contributors suggesting it for inclusion (including, it should be noted, many Jewish contributors). This was also the expressed wish of the Jewish BoDs. All of these arguments were rejected on the grounds of religion being a matter of individual choice. Culture is universally utilised as a means of marking 'the Jew' as different, however the meaning of 'Jewish culture' is so replete with ahistorical stereotype (isolationist, overly sensitive, dirty, and sexually rapacious) that it has becomes both conceptually untenable and subsumed within a wider discourse of the cultural difference of 'the Other' as these characteristics are regularly ascribed to non-Jewish 'Others' who are also considered protected groups under the RRAs. What is also notable is the tendency to discuss these ideas of Jewish culture as heritable, aided naturally by the tendency within these debates and which was codified in the 1968 RRA, to conceptualise ethnic difference as racial difference. By way of contrast, the cultural difference of Jews is given no credence in sitcoms, it is a moot

discourse in these programmes; what stands as a coherent discourse of Jewish difference however, specifically in *NMTQ*, is religion.

It is plain that Jewishness, the nature of what it means to be Jewish, was a fraught term at this time. Evidence has been provided to demonstrate that there were a number of different discursive concepts that were applied to Jews to characterise their 'difference'. These include 'colour', 'race', 'nationality', 'national origin', 'ethnicity', 'ethnic origin', culture, and religion. While parliamentarians relied on 'ethnic origin' (understood as, but not confined to, cultural difference) to put the Otherness of Jews beyond doubt under the provisions of the RRAs, it has been shown that in parliamentary debates, many different, often overlapping, and even conflicting, discourses were applied to Jews to conceptualise their 'difference'. Outside Parliament it has also been demonstrated that many different conceptualisations of the provenance of Jewish difference existed in the UK at this time. In parliamentary debates there is little to no accord as to the question of 'why' Jews are 'different' but a universal assuredness that they are. This is a clear example of what Zygmunt Bauman has described as 'allosemitism', a belief in the indelible Otherness of the Jew or 'the essential ambivalence of the stranger', devoid of any rigorous argumentation or theorisation.[650] What has also been shown is that sitcom, an anarchic, taboo-embracing, *carnivalesque* genre of television was able to produce situations in which the supposed Otherness of Jews was utilised as a means to critique the very concepts that were being used to frame that Otherness in parliamentary statutes and debates.

Martin Barker's seminal *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Politics of the Tribe* attempts to engage with the prevalence given to culture by the Conservative Party in the 1970s and 1980s. He argues that, based on a Humean approach to human nature as inexorably tied to affect, instinct, and the need for boundaries as a site of stability, the Conservative Party in this period developed a wholly novel conception of intergroup relations in British politics based on the tenets of sociobiology. In sum, he posits that the Conservative Party in this period came to conceptualise groups as an outcome of an immutable human nature, that such groups develop distinct 'ways of life' (in a Raymond Williams-esque sense) and that therefore the exclusion of those who embody a different 'way of life' was both an inevitable and natural consequence. Barker goes on to argue that this justification for xenophobia is racist as it 'sees as biological […] groupings that are the result of social and historical processes'.[651] Barker sees the emphasis placed on culture—as legitimate grounds for the creation of an inclusive/exclusive binary—as disingenuous, and demonstrates that it rests on a racialisation

650 Bauman, 'Allosemitism', 143.

651 Barker, *The New Racism*, 4.

of culture through the methodology of sociobiology, a branch of pseudoscientific literature progressing from the legitimate idea that genes can determine, to an extent, human behaviour. Sociobiology takes this further and assumes that this can be applied to sociology as well. Therefore, if the sociology of a people who share similar genetic markers is determined by those genetic markers then the culture and the 'way of life' of that group is also biologically determined. To attempt to hybridise or change cultures through contact with others is both impossible and undesirable—by running counter to biology such actions are thought to be unnatural.

What this thesis has shown, is that this process began earlier than Barker posited. This thesis has demonstrated the existence of a racialisation of culture as early as the 1960s and has demonstrated that 'the Jew' was a key construction in its development. In offering four criteria of 'difference' as a means of identifying those who might be 'protected' by the RRAs and by ineffectively arguing for the inclusion of British Jews under any of their terms save for culture, parliamentarians of this period demonstrate first that culture was the primary means by which 'the Jew' as understood to be 'different'; that the difference of Jews was universal and immutable regardless of how long they or their families had been resident in the UK; that cultural difference, under the terms of the RRAs constituted racial difference and, therefore, that Jews could never conclusively be conceptualised as the 'same' as 'White' British people. This feeds into Bauman's 'allosemitism', the belief in the difference of Jews not predicated on a hierarchy but on the 'fact' of their Otherness.

This thesis has also shown that an important site of semiosis regarding the construction of racial difference and its relationship to culture, may be found in the arena of popular culture. In contrast to the stereotyped, fundamentally political, manner in which Jewish difference was constructed as cultural and thereby as racial, in parliamentary sources, sitcoms demonstrate that this process was not universal and, in fact, demonstrate that sitcom functions as an important site of resistance to this process. In *TDUDP* and *NMTQ*, Jewish difference is subjected to a significant degree of theorisation, deconstruction, parody and, consequently, the only criteria upon which Jewish identity might be based that emerges from this assessment in a relatively cohesive form, is religion. Both comedies, to varying degrees assess the notion of biological difference and its relationship to culture and assess Jewish difference in this light. It has been shown that, simultaneous to this, both comedies utilise 'the Jew' to disrupt notions of biological and cultural difference in tandem with comedic devices of irony, satire, *pathos*, and disjuncture. These mechanisms disrupt nascent understandings of Jewish difference within the race relations discourse and move further towards establishing fresh understands that separate culture from biology.

I want to go further however, and reconceptualise the RRAs, as understood through the lens of the new racism, in the light of a Foucauldian understanding of discourse, of the concept of power-knowledge, and of Bhabhaian analysis. Foucauldian discourse as 'a strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known' functions as a both a determinant of and a framework within which subjectivity exists and thereby forms the basis upon which 'the Other' (or in more Foucauldian terms, the 'alter') is determined and the relationship between the subject and the 'Other' is constructed.[652] Foucauldian 'power-knowledge' ties together 'power' and 'knowledge' in a reconceptualisation of both in which those who possess the power to force an act also by extension have the power to determine not only what is known but, importantly in this case 'who' is known and how they are known. This knowing, or, to borrow a term used throughout this thesis, constructing, in turn becomes a function of power in which those who 'know' have power and those who have power may know.

Applied specifically to the subject of this thesis it becomes apparent that the RRAs are a naked demonstration of power-knowledge in action, particularly when assessed through an examination of the role British Jews and the idea of 'the Jew' played in their passage and the discourse within which they existed. The discourse of race relations constitutes a 'strongly bounded area of social knowledge' predicated on a series of assumptions regarding the nature of relations between people identified or identifying themselves as belonging to different groups that have been racialised ('racial groups'). This leads to the race relations discourse containing within it a binary relationship between the 'Other' and 'the Same' (demonstrated in the debates as corresponding to 'Black' and 'White' respectively). Within the race relations discourse four criteria (constituting discourses in themselves) of designating Otherness exist—'colour', 'race', 'ethnic origin', and 'national origin'. As demonstrated in the analysis throughout this thesis all of these criteria are subsumed within a single category of 'race' wherein any group identified as being characterised by their 'colour, race or ethnic or national origin' is categorised as a racial group. It has been shown that each of these criteria was applied to 'the Jew' in varying degrees and always with limited success due to the inability of parliamentarians to provide any degree of theorisation or justification for their declarations. What has become apparent in the foregoing chapters has been a consistent location of 'the Jew' as an object of 'power-knowledge' emanating from Parliament. 'The Jew' becomes knowable only to the extent that Otherness is established, confirmed, and reified. This has material implications for contemporary Jews who, in spite of their own identities are marked, permanently not only as 'Other' but as a racial 'Other' by parliamentary statute. Attempts

652 See 'Discourse', in Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies*, 70–73 (p. 70).

made by contemporary Jews to define themselves as a religion are rejected outright as matters of conscience and therefore beyond the scope of the RRAs. The RRA debates demonstrate then, an uncertainty around what form of 'difference' 'the Jew' is in tandem with an unshakeable belief that 'the Jew' does in fact constitute a form of 'difference'. It is difficult, when assessed in relation to the repeated characterisation of Jews as the archetypal 'assimilated minority', to conceptualise the RRAs as anything other than operations of power, mechanisms by which Jewish difference is successively abstracted, constructed, affirmed, reified, and continually taken as self-evident within a new, emerging discourse of difference. Within this discourse of race relations, 'the Jew' is marked as a form of difference regardless of this difference's ahistoricism.

This must be understood within a long history of Jewish othering by non-Jews, that Jewish difference is, in the RRAs founded in 'culture', racialised, and coagulated with other forms of sociobiologically-defined 'difference' of the time (i.e. those appended to West Indian and South Asian migrants). It becomes apparent that the RRAs were not, despite noble intentions in their creation, devices that protected minorities from discrimination, they were, in fact, statutory devices which reified outdated and ahistorical colonialist ideas of what constituted the 'Other'. By looking at these laws and the debates around them through the lens of 'the Jew' it becomes apparent that parliamentarians had little mind for either subtleties and heterogeneities of identity groups or for the agency of the people whose identities they constructed and passed into law. It is clear, that in the name of domestic political expediency, they concretised, setting in statutory stone, a harmful understanding of who was 'different' and how that difference was understood.

In contrast, the sitcoms under examination here may be understood as a site of semiotic resistance against the power-knowledge dynamic evident from parliamentary sources. Comedic mechanisms like satire, parody, hyperbole, and disjuncture operate as a means by which the 'meaning' of 'the Jew' and, therefore the 'knowability' of 'the Jew' and by extension British Jews, may be contested. Analysis of *TDUDP* and *NMTQ* has demonstrated a consistent theme of assessment and argumentation, disruption and subversion of the forms of 'difference' utilised in the RRAs and voted into statute. Particularly through the lens of 'the Jew' these comedies show that, contrary to the surety with which 'the Jew' was marked as 'Other' in Parliament, the understanding and conceptualisation of Jewish 'difference' in the UK at this time was not homogenous; there were more competing discourses of Jewish difference than are revealed in parliamentary sources from this period.

TDUDP, in utilising the character of Alf Garnett, who possesses a contested form of Jewishness that he rejects and that other characters reinforce, offers deconstructions of ideas of 'colour', 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'nation' to varying degrees as forms of identity through the

medium of Alf Garnett. The importance of the contested, liminal nature of Alf's Jewish identity in facilitating these deconstructions cannot be overstated, it is the central uncertainty, the backdrop against which the uncertainty around the criteria of difference utilised in parliamentary sources is demonstrated, discussed, and rendered evident. While Speight does not offer a comprehensive or cohesive view of what functions as the core of Jewish identity himself, he does demonstrate that the concepts handled by, and signed into law by contemporary parliamentarians, are woefully lacking when applied to the idea of Jewishness. A further means by which this disruption is rendered even more telling is that it is constructed by a Jewish actor and a non-Jewish writer. This combination acutely demonstrates that ideas on Jewish identity cannot be determined by one's own identification. While Warren Mitchell was proud of his Jewish identity, his work on this programme and from what is known about his contributions behind the scenes, show him to be highly critical of the forms of identity professed in parliamentary sources. Conversely, while Johnny Speight was not Jewish, his work demonstrated an intense dislike for the discursive structures that emphasized divisions between people and inhibited people's agency.

NMTQ, also offers disruption and subversion of 'colour', 'race', 'nation', and parliamentary conceptualisations of 'ethnicity' as culture by utilising 'the Jew' as a means of assessing them. Through the character of Manny, the surety with which parliamentary sources stereotype 'the Jew', Jewish life and Jewish culture, is revealed and laid bare in its ahistoricity. Vince Powell and Harry Driver, in developing this programme demonstrate a willingness to assess, while not as bitingly or viciously satirical as Speight, the discursive structures that frame Jewish subjectivity in this comedy. While they would eschew attacking the idea of 'race' and would in fact go on to produce *Love Thy Neighbour*, a comedy which has been widely regarded as being predicated on the idea of 'race' as a source of humour, through Manny, they offer a systematic disruption of ideas of 'colour', 'race', and 'nation' while positing a substantive case for the construction of Jewishness as a religious form of identity, something that closely aligned with contemporary British Jews' understandings of their own identity.

This thesis has demonstrated the utility of sitcom as a source for historical sources of Otherness and its nature as well as the value of utilising these sources in tandem with, and in opposition to, more orthodox historical sources. In utilising these sources in this novel way an important new reformulation of the RRAs as power-knowledge mechanisms has been demonstrated and, moving forward, such an approach stands to offer increasingly diverse perspectives on important social concepts that function through discourse, the historiographies of which have been dominated by traditional written sources. The source of sitcom as a source for uncovering subversive and disruptive discourses, particularly when

contemporary with the establishment of oppressive and marginalising ones, is key for the reconceptualisation of popular culture as a 'marketplace' of ideas, a democratic, often anarchic sphere wherein ideas may take root and structures of power, as well as the discourses that uphold them, may be questioned.

Tying this all together, as throughout this thesis, is the postcolonialist analytical framework developed by Homi Bhabha. Utilising his ideas it is possible to understand more fully the operations of power at work. We must understand that discussions around ideas of 'colour', 'race', 'nation', and 'ethnicity' as examples of third space, areas in which those who possess power and those upon whom that power is exerted negotiate positionalities and establish hybridities. In the examples discussed in this thesis what is at stake is the idea of having one's identity legally concretised in the form of a statute, forever, legally marking one as different and conditioning one's relations with those not inscribed as different, giving them a legally-defined character that marks them out. Jews occupy a liminal position within this third space and were able to intervene to a far greater extent in parliamentary debates than non-Jewish groups who were also implicated in the discourses of 'colour', 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'nation'. Nevertheless, in spite of what this thesis has shown to be the relatively consistent attempt by contemporary British Jews to have their specificity understood as religious, these attempts were overridden, demonstrating that in spite of a Jewish presence at the highest levels of the State and a reasonably consistent argumentation, that colonialist discourses of power were still applied to the Jews in ways that marked them as racially different in spite of the lack of inclusion of religion in the RRAs themselves. Thus, in Bhabhaian terms, the hybridism of Jews within these discourses is fundamentally characterised by the utilisation of their liminality to justify their oppression by which I mean, in this context, their inscription as a racial 'Other'. What I would further suggest is that the ideas of Martin Barker and Etienne Balibar, and my application of them here, may be synthesised within this Bhabhaian framework. I would argue that the discourse of 'new racism' that utilises cultural difference as a marker of racial difference can be understood as a new form of Bhabhaian colonialist discourse that drives towards the othering and therefore oppression of people in the face of widespread condemnation of ideas of difference based on heredity and 'colour'. It provides a seemingly 'rational' basis for Otherness and therefore what is evident from this thesis' discussions around the way that Jewish difference was identified as primarily cultural (see Chapter 5) indicates the opening up of a new third space in which Jews are compelled to now establish a new hybridity to negotiate their positionality within a society that is developing new laws that condition relations between individuals on the basis of their racial identity. Consequently, though the debates functioned as a potential third space, Jews were unable to utilise this space effectively to legalise their own vision of

their identity as Jews, this was overridden and colonialist forms of discourse were utilised to legally locate 'the Jew', and therefore Jews, within an oppressive set of discourses and concretised their 'difference'.

At the same time this thesis has also demonstrated the existence of another, different sphere of this third space in which the hybridism of Jews was utilised far more as a form of resistance to power than as a form of power exerted over them. *NMTQ* offers an example of hybridism as resistance. Demonstrating through the character of Manny the variegations of Jewish identity in relation to discourses of 'colour', 'race', 'ethnicity', and 'nation' while also highlighting the significant, arguably the *definitive* role, that religion plays in Jewish identity. *TDUDP*, conversely, offers an example of Bhabhaian mimicry in which the character of Alf Garnett, a Jewish man who denies his Jewish identity yet who has it continually reinscribed by other characters invests himself with the signs of non-Jewish identity forms to such an extent and reinscribes this form of identity so vociferously that he exemplifies what Bhabha has referred to as the 'excess' and 'slippage' of mimicry. In doing so Garnett demonstrates the utility of the mimetic process as a form of resistance to colonialist forms of power. By continually reinforcing the ambiguity of Garnett (within the context of his being performed by a Jewish actor), Speight and Warren Mitchell enact an excoriating satirical attack on these discourses, demonstrating the importance of comedy, specifically sitcom as a third space due to its relationship to representing 'real' situations and contemporary social conflicts. This melds with the real exercise of power in parliamentary circles to demonstrate that resistance to colonialist forms of power, even if they are exercised in a non-colonial setting but with an analogous tendency towards oppression through racial marking, is not the preserve of the political sphere but can be enacted powerfully outside in the realm of culture as Bhabha and Said had demonstrated in other contexts. Consequently, sitcom offered a third space that Jews were able to utilise far more effectively to demonstrate the ways in which Jewish identity transgresses the bounds of oppressive discourses, were able to represent hybridised identities and in some cases utilise mimicry rooted in stereotype to potentially disrupt these oppressive discourses.

Finally, throughout this thesis there have been numerous points at which the discussion of one of these discursive spheres nudges up against, intersects with or overlays another. That this occurs within the context of a study of the discursive location of 'the Jew', a liminal, ambiguous, precarious positionality, is no coincidence when postcolonial theory offers a lens. What becomes apparent is that in attempting to locate 'the Jew' within these discursive bounds, the concepts themselves falter, 'the Jew' exceeds them, transgresses them and in doing so reveals them as the products of History, not Nature, that they are. While this does not engender a neatness of structure, that is, to an extent, the point. These concepts were, as

Soskice indicated, intended to catch all forms of difference and, as has been shown, produce them at the same time, legalising difference in the context of deep social change.

* * * * *

In March 2021, the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities released a report that was attacked for concluding that there was no or limited evidence of institutional, systemic or structural racism in the UK.[653] While the report contained a section on 'The Language of Race' this section focused exclusively on the vagaries of terms such as 'institutional', 'systemic', and 'structural' and ignored the fact that the report itself perpetuates untheorised terms such as 'race', 'ethnicity', 'nation', and 'colour' in ways that often overlap, to take just one instance:

> […] you can be treated differently because of your *skin colour* […] A multi-*ethnic* democracy like ours cannot function properly if people can denigrate their *fellow citizens* in such deplorable terms on the grounds of their *race*.[654]

This suggests that these three terms may be used interchangeably while the foregoing thesis has shown that these ideas have all been invested with a wide variety of meanings over time and require, if they are to be applied in such a way that structures or describe peoples' lived experiences of 'difference' rigorous theorisation, assessment, and scepticism about their very efficacy as discourses. A further notable aspect of this report was the complete lack of any coverage of Jews but for a brief reference to them as an 'ethnic minority group'.[655]

What this report points to, in the context of this thesis, is the continuing reification of ideas of 'race' and 'ethnicity' as structuring concepts for political, social, and cultural discourse. The lack of attention paid to the significance of the terms in which 'difference' is conceptualised in this report is stark and speaks to a preoccupation with the countering the effects of racism and not of dismantling the harmful concepts of 'race' and 'ethnicity' themselves, which, in this author's opinion, are equally, if not more urgently, required. This report confirms that the manner in which 'difference' is expressed and handled in political circles is damaging and is in need of reformulation along lines that do not reify concepts upon which bigotry, violence, and imperial oppression have been based.

---

653 Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities: The Report*, 13 March 2021; available online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities> (accessed 13 March 2021).

654 Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities*, 29; my emphasis all.

655 Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities*, 6.

Also in 2021, comedian David Baddiel published his brief work *Jews Don't Count*.[656] In this work, Baddiel demonstrates the persistence of many of the issues demonstrated throughout this thesis in relation to Jews and, in some ways, their inversion. While this thesis has demonstrated a State determined to understand Jews as 'Other', Baddiel argues that, from the standpoint of the 2020s, Jews should be regarded as a minority but are not due to changing ways in which 'minorities' are defined. Baddiel particularly references the rise of the idea of BAME as a determinant of minority identity with its concomitant focus on 'colour', which, he argues, has led to Jews being disregarded as a minority and consequently to antisemitism not being addressed with commensurate rigour. In October 2023, Tanya Gold, writing in *The New Statesman* echoed this, arguing that discourse around Jewish identity and its relationship to British identity has developed to such an extent that, 'I am neither British nor Jewish but a poor impersonation of both'.[657]

Yet, there is, in the cultural realm, still a discursive space in which Jews are able to mark out an effective hybridity. Robert Popper's *Friday Night Dinner* (2011–2020) has become among the most well-regarded sitcoms produced in Britain, becoming so critically successful as to be remade in America and regularly repeated on television. The programme covers the familial life of a British Jewish family on a Friday evening. There are frequent references to the family's Jewish identity and the programme is structured around a specifically Jewish 'situation', yet it has received acclaim from wide audiences for the universality of its humour and the relatability of its characters across discursive lines of identity.[658] The characters in the comedy combine discourses of Jewish identity with British identity in a manner reminiscent of Manny Cohen, showing that hybridity *is* possible.

Future research into this question must broach the question of why 'difference' is reformulated in such a way as it was at this time, why particular ideas of difference would be, in an unprecedented move, reified in statute and set in stone boundaries between 'Same' and 'Other' that could not be crossed. It is this author's intention, in future work, to propose an answer to this question. What emerges from this thesis is a snapshot of a transformative moment in the UK's relationship with 'difference', the consequences of which are still

656 David Baddiel, *Jews Don't Count* (London: TLS Books, 2021).

657 Tanya Gold, 'Out of the Ordinary: As anti-Semitism ignites everywhere, I feel the discord of being both British and Jewish', *The New Statesman*, 20–26 October 2023, 27.

658 See, for instance, Rachel Aroesti, 'Farewell *Friday Night Dinner*: the joyous Jewish sitcom that became a national treasure', *The Guardian*, 26 May 2021; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2021/may/26/farewell-friday-night-dinner-the-joyous-jewish-sitcom-that-became-a-national-treasure> (accessed 27 July 2021).

evident today. The RRAs provided a mechanism by which harmful ideas of what and who is 'different' were placed on the statute book and set in stone with real legal implications for those towards whom they were directed. The effect of this othering, of West Indians, of Africans, of South Asians, and of Jews, was a restriction of the conceptual bounds of British identity. It is my contention that this restriction was a reaction to patterns of non-'White' migration by legally-British citizens into a post-imperial country struggling to come to terms with its declining geopolitical status. I would further suggest that this reformulation and restriction of who could legitimately call themselves 'British' is a consequence of an institutionally racist State structure which, having been deprived of its imperial or colonial 'Other' against which British identity had been constructed and maintained in the nineteenth century, sought to establish a new mechanism by which the 'Other' could be identified and categorised, and sought to reify that Otherness as natural and in as wide terms as possible. The effect of this on Jews it has been shown, was the transformation of 'the Jew', now invested with a myriad of discourses of Otherness and 'difference' that fail to stand up to scrutiny, even of contemporary extra-parliamentary sources but which were given real social, political, cultural, and legal weight. Jews, it seems became the unknowable and essential Other demonstrating that, regardless of the reason, to quote Barnett Janner, 'the Jew is persecuted because he is a Jew'.[659]

659 Hansard, HC, 3 May 1965, vol. 711, c. 960.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Holdings

The BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham, Reading, UK

R78/1816/1
R78/2367/1
R78/2811/1
R78/2811/2
T12/1253/1
T12/1254/1
T12/1255/1
T12/1321/1
T12/1321/2
T12/1322/1
T16/175/1
T16/175/2
T16/569
T16/572
T16/707
T16/727
TV ART 3
TV ART 4

The London Metropolitan Archives

ACC/3121/E/04/0403
ACC/3121/B/06/002/038
ACC/3121/E/04/0330
ACC/3121/E/04/0331
ACC/3121/E/04/0079
ACC/3121/E/04/0080
ACC/3121/04/0395
ACC/3121/B/06/003/008
ACC/3121/C/02/002/018
ACC/3121/C/02/002/016
ACC/3121/C/13/001/017
ACC/3121/C/13/001/018
ACC/3121/C/13/001/019
ACC/3121/C/13/001/019
ACC/3121/E/02/035
ACC/3121/E/04/0043
ACC/3121/E/04/0889
ACC/3121/E/04/0319
ACC/3121/E/04/0319
ACC/3121/E/04/942
ACC/3121/G/01/001/42
ACC/3121/G/01/001/43
ACC/3121/G/01/001/44
ACC/3121/G/01/001/45
ACC/3121/G/01/001/46
ACC/3121/G/01/001/47
ACC/3121/G/01/001/48
ACC/3121/C/21/001/001
ACC/3121/C/21/001/002
ACC/3121/C/06/001/001
ACC/3121/A/041
ACC/3121/A/042
ACC/3121/A/043
ACC/3121/A/049
ACC/3121/A/050

The National Archives

CAB 128/37/35
CAB 128/37/35
CAB 128/39/27
CAB 128/39/47
CAB 128/39/58
CAB 128/39/73
CAB 128/41/47
CAB 128/42/31
CAB 128/42/32
CAB 128/42/33
CAB 128/42/36
CAB 128/42/37
CAB 128/42/74
CAB 128/43/28
CAB 128/43/4
CAB 128/43/46
CAB 128/44/1
CAB 128/44/20
CAB 128/47/2
CAB 128/49/1
CAB 128/49/10
CAB 128/49/11
CAB 128/50/19
CAB 128/50/54
CAB 128/50/57
CAB 128/50/58
CAB 128/51/6
CAB 128/52/11
CAB 128/53/20
CAB 129/117/39
CAB 129/118/3
CAB 129/118/65
CAB 129/119/11
CAB 129/119/16
CAB 129/120/12
CAB 129/120/23
CAB 129/121/27
CAB 129/121/35

CAB 129/121/40
CAB 129/121/41
CAB 129/121/42
CAB 129/121/43
CAB 129/122/43
CAB 129/122/9
CAB 129/130/16
CAB 129/132/3
CAB 129/133/10
CAB 129/134/25
CAB 129/134/28
CAB 129/135/12
CAB 129/135/25
CAB 129/135/34
CAB 129/135/35
CAB 129/135/36
CAB 129/136/2
CAB 129/139/22
CAB 129/139/33
CAB 129/141/17
CAB 129/143/19
CAB 129/143/23
CAB 129/149/10
CAB 129/154/26
CAB 129/157/8
CAB 129/158/17
CAB 129/159/20
CAB 129/164/16
CAB 129/167/6
CAB 129/171/12
CAB 129/183/23
CAB 129/184/18
CAB 129/189/13
CAB 129/191/22
CAB 134/1996
CAB 134/1997
CAB 134/1998
CAB 134/1999
CAB 195/24/24
CAB 195/24/34
CAB 195/24/50
CAB 195/25/25
CAB 195/25/29
CAB 195/25/35
CAB 195/25/47
CAB 195/25/5
CAB/128/44/37
CK 2/198
HO 376/20
HO 376/28
HO 376/6
HO 376/9
LO 2/460

The ITA/IBA/ITV Archive, Special Collections, Univ. of Bournemouth, UK

3049/9
5096/2/2
AR/R/1700/04
R8036
RK/3/108
RK/3/110
RK/3/112
RK/8/254; IBA000416
RK/8/479; IBA/00419
RK/9/128; A/A51/0179/2
RK/16/66

The *Jewish Chronicle* [Online] Issues Dated

4 March 1960
12 March 1960
18 March 1960
22 April 1960
3 June 1960

17 January 1964
24 January 1964
21 February 1964
8 May 1964
22 May 1964
18 September 1964

26 March 1965
9 April 1965
16 April 1965
23 April 1965
30 April 1965
7 May 1965
14 May 1965
21 May 1965
28 May 196
4 June 1965
11 June 1965
18 June 1965
2 July 1965
30 July 1965
5 November 1965
26 November 1965
24 December 1965

25 February 1966
18 March 1966
25 March 1966
8 April 1966
22 April 1966
29 April 1966
6 May 1966
13 May 1966
20 May 1966
3 June 1966
17 June 1966
24 June 1966
1 July 1966
15 July 1966
5 August 1966
12 August 1966
26 August 1966
2 September 1966
16 September 1966
23 September 1966
7 October 1966
14 October 1966
21 October 1966
18 November 1966
2 December 1966
9 December 1966
16 December 1966
23 December 1966

6 January 1967
20 January 1967
27 January 1967
17 February 1967
24 February 1967
3 March 1967

10 March 1967
17 March 1967
21 April 1967
28 April 1967
5 May 1967
19 May 1967
2 June 1967
9 June 1967
11 August 1967
18 August 1967
1 September 1967
15 September 1967
22 September 1967
13 October 1967
3 November 1967
10 November 1967
17 November 1967
24 November 1967
1 December 1967
8 December 1967
15 December 1967
22 December 1967
29 December 1967

5 January 1968
19 January 1968
26 January 1968
9 February 1968
16 February 1968
23 February 1968
15 March 1968
22 March 1968
5 April 1968
12 April 1968
19 April 1968
26 April 1968
3 May 1968
17 May 1968
31 May 1968
7 June 1968
14 June 1968
19 July 1968
2 August 1968
9 August 1968
23 August 1968
30 August 1968
13 September 1968
20 September 1968
1 November 1968
15 November 1968
22 November 1968
29 November 1968
13 December 1968
20 December 1968
27 December 1968

3 January 1969
10 January 1969
17 January 1969
24 January 1969
31 January 1969
14 February 1969
14 March 1969
21 March 1969
28 March 1969
11 April 1969
18 April 1969
30 May 1969
11 July 1969
18 July 1969
1 August 1969
15 August 1969
5 September 1969
12 September 1969
19 September 1969
26 September 1969
14 November 1969
21 November 1969
28 November 1969
5 December 1969

20 March 1970
24 April 1970
1 May 1970
12 June 1970
19 June 1970
17 July 1970
28 August 1970
11 September 1970
18 September 1970
25 September 1970

1 January 1971
15 January 1971
12 February 1971
19 February 1971
12 March 1971
19 March 1971
26 March 1971
2 April 1971
16 April 1971
4 June 1971
18 June 1971
9 July 1971
23 July 1971
30 July 1971
6 August 1971
13 August 1971
27 August 1971
3 September 1971
10 September 1971
17 September 1971
1 October 1971
15 October 1971
29 October 1971
12 November 1971

1 January 1972
28 January 1972
18 February 1972
7 April 1972
14 April 1972
21 April 1972
26 May 1972
2 June 1972
14 July 1972
1 September 1972
13 October 1972
3 November 1972
10 November 1972
17 November 1972
29 December 1972

2 February 1973
9 February 1973
23 February 1973
9 March 1973
24 March 1973
4 May 1973
18 May 1973
25 May 1973
22 June 1973
29 June 1973
20 July 1973
14 September 1973
21 September 1973
26 October 1973
23 November 1973
30 November

4 January 1974
11 January 1974
25 January 1974
1 February 1974
15 February 1974
1 March 1974
29 March 1974
5 April 1974
12 April 1974
24 May 1974
31 May 1974
21 June 1974
26 July 1974
2 August 1974
9 August 1974
16 August 1974
30 August 1974
4 October 1974

17 January 1975
24 January 1975
31 January 1975
7 March 1975
11 April 1975
18 April 1975
25 April 1975
16 May 1975
23 May 1975
30 May 1975
6 June 1975
18 July 1975
12 September 1975
19 September 1975
26 September 1975
3 October 1975
7 November 1975
5 December 1975
12 December 1975

2 January 1976
20 February 1976
27 February 1976
19 March 1976
26 March 1976
2 April 1976
9 April 1976
7 May 1976

14 May 1976
28 May 1976
11 June 1976
2 July 1976
9 July 1976
23 July 1976
13 August 1976
3 September 1976
24 September 1976
1 October 1976
8 October 1976
22 October 1976
29 October 1976
5 November 1976
19 November 1976
10 December 1976
17 December 1976

25 February 1977
11 March 1977
13 May 1977
27 May 1977
17 June 1977
19 August 1977
26 August 1977
14 October 1977
21 October 1977
28 October 1977
4 November 1977
18 November 1977
9 December 1977
16 December 1977
23 December 1977

Parliamentary Sources

Legislation

The Aliens Act 1905, 5 Edw. 7, ch. 13.
The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914, 4 & 5 Geo. 5, ch. 17.
The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1918, 8 & 9 Geo. 5, ch. 38.
The Aliens Restriction (Amendment) Act 1919, 9 & 10 Geo. 5, ch. 92.
The Public Order Act 1936, 1 Edw. 8 & 1 Geo. 6, ch. 6.
The Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962, ch. 21.
The British Nationality Act 1964, ch. 22.
The Race Relations Act 1965, ch. 73.
The Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968, ch. 9.
The Race Relations Act 1968, ch. 71.
The Immigration Act 1971, ch. 77.
The Race Relations Act 1976, ch. 74.

Act Papers

The British Broadcasting Corporation, *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1964–65*, Cmnd. 2823 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1965).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1965–66*, Cmnd. 3122 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1966).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1966–67*, Cmnd. 3425 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1967).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1967–68*, Cmnd. 3779 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1968).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1968–69*, Cmnd. 4216 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1969).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1969–70*, Cmnd. 4520 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1970).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1970–71*, Cmnd. 4824 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1971).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1971–72*, Cmnd. 5111 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1972).

The Independent Television Authority, *Annual Report and Accounts 1964–65*, House of Commons Papers no. 26 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1965).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1965–66*, House of Commons Papers no. 214 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1966).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1966–67*, House of Commons Papers no. 120 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1967).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1967–68*, House of Commons Papers no. 278 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1968).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1968–69*, House of Commons Papers no. 4 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1969).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1969–70*, House of Commons Papers no. 177 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1970).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1970–71*, House of Commons Papers no. 3 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1971).

—— *Annual Report and Accounts 1971–72*, House of Commons Papers no. 1 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1972).

Racial Discrimination: A Guide to the Race Relations Act 1976 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1977).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1968–69, House of Commons Papers no. 259 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1969).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1969–70, House of Commons Papers no. 304 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1970).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1970–71, House of Commons Papers no. 413 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1971).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1971–72, House of Commons Papers no. 320 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1972).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1972–73, House of Commons Papers no. 384 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1973).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1973–74, House of Commons Papers no. 221 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1974).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1974–75, House of Commons Papers no. 446 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1975).

Report of the Community Relations Commission for 1975–76, House of Commons Papers no. 51 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1976).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1966–67, House of Commons Papers no. 437 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1967).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1967–68, House of Commons Papers no. 262 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1968).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1968–69, House of Commons Papers no. 270 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1969).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1969–70, House of Commons Papers no. 309 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1970).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1970–71, House of Commons Papers no. 448 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1971).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1971–72, House of Commons Papers no. 296 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1972).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1972, House of Commons Papers no. 297 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1973).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1973, House of Commons Papers no. 144 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1974).

Report of the Race Relations Board for 1974, House of Commons Papers no. 409 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1975).

Report of the Race Relations Board January 1975–June 1976, House of Commons Papers no. 3 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1976).

Cabinet Memorandum on Racial Discrimination and Incitement to Racial Hatred, C. (65) 23, 17 February 1965.

Cabinet White Paper on Racial Discrimination, Cmnd. 6234, 11 September 1975.

Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting, Cmnd. 6753, March 1977.

Film, Radio & Television Programmes

Ahmed, Samira, 'The Glass Menagerie, Conrad Shawcross, Sitcoms at 60', *Front Row*, BBC Radio 4, 8 August 2016; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b07mvxsq> (accessed 8 August 2016).

The Alf Garnett Saga, film, dir. Bob Kellett, 1972.

Brown, Georgia, 'Who are the Cockneys Now?', *One Pair of Eyes*, BBC 1, 17 August 1968; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/p00t3mkz/one-pair-of-eyes-georgia-brown-who-are-the-cockneys-now> (accessed 15 August 2015).

From Briarwood to Barisal to Brick Lane (dir. Sanchita Islam, 2001), London Arts Board; available online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ed-HkGvVGKw> (accessed 10 August 2016).

Hughes, Bettany, 'Comedy', *The Ideas That Make Us*, BBC Radio 4, 28 January 2014; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03s6zmg> (accessed 25 August 2014).

—— 'Hospitality', *The Ideas That Make Us*, BBC Radio 4, 29 January 2014; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03s76cm> (accessed 26 August 2014).

—— 'Justice', *The Ideas That Make Us*, BBC Radio 4, 20 September 2013; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03b2zb9> (accessed 26 August 2014).

Keith, Penelope, *BBC: The Secret Files*, BBC 4, 27 July 2015; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b06455ch/bbc-the-secret-files> (accessed 24 December 2015).

If There Weren't Any Blacks You'd Have to Invent Them, teleplay, dir. Charles Jarrott, tx. 4 August 1968.

If There Weren't Any Blacks You'd Have to Invent Them, teleplay, dir. Bill Hays, tx. 3 March 1974.

'Marty Feldman Johnny Speight Interview 1966', YouTube video, user: chatham43, 19 June 2012; available online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UqR_S9nWe-g> (accessed 17 February 2016).

Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width, television series, written by Vince Powell & Harry Driver, ITV (ABC s. 1–2; Thames Television s.3–6), tx. 18 February 1967–14 September 1971.

Never Mind the Quality, Feel the Width, film, dir. Ronnie Baxter, 1973.

Schneider, David, 'Curb Your Judaism', *Seriously Funny*, BBC Radio 4, 11 October 2011; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b015n6q1> (accessed 13 July 2015).

Till Death Us Do Part, television series, written by Johnny Speight, BBC 1, tx. 6 June 1966–16 Feb 1968; 13 September 1972–16 December 1975.

Till Death Us Do Part, film, dir. Norman Cohen, 1968.

Younge, Gary & Jonathan Freedland, 'Roots and Holocaust: When TV Taught Us a History Lesson', BBC Radio 4, 6 May 2017; available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b08p55kd> (accessed 18 May 2017).

Maps and Non-Moving Images

Arkell, George, *Jewish East London* c.*1899*, (Oxford: Old House, 2012).

Databases, Journalism, Opinion Pieces, Pamphlets and Research Reports

Anon., *British Jewry in Battle and Blitz* (Leicester: Cardinal Press, 1943).

Anon., *Race Relations in Britain: A Register of Current Research* (London: Commission for Racial Equality, 1983 [1st ed. 1980]).

Applebaum, Shimon, *Were There Jews in Roman Britain?* (London: Jewish Historical Society, 1953).

Bethnal Green and Stepney Trades Council, *Blood on the Streets: A Report by Bethnal Green and Stepney Trades Council on Racial Attacks in East London* (London: Bethnal Green and Stepney Trades Council, 1978).

Board of Deputies of British Jews, *Annual Report 1963* (London: Woburn Printing Co., 1963).

—— *Improving Race Relations—A Jewish Contribution. A Report and Recommendations by the Working Party on Race Relations of the Board of Deputies of British Jews* (London: Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1969).

British Broadcasting Corporation, *BBC Handbook 1973* (London/Tonbridge: The Whitefriars Press, 1972).

—— *BBC Handbook 1974: Incorporating the Annual Report & Accounts 1972–73* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation [assoc. The Whitefriars Press], 1973).

—— *BBC Handbook 1975: Incorporating the Annual Report & Accounts 1973–74* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation [assoc. The Whitefriars Press], 1974).

—— *BBC Handbook 1976: Incorporating the Annual Report and Accounts 1974–75* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation [assoc. The Whitefriars Press], 1975).

—— *BBC Handbook 1977: Incorporating the Annual Report and Accounts 1975–76* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation [assoc. The Whitefriars Press], 1976).

British Broadcasting Corporation & Commission for Racial Equality, *Five Views of Multi-Racial Britain: Talks on Race Relations Broadcast by BBC TV*, with an intro. by John Twitchin (London: Commission for Racial Equality, 1978).

The British Council of Churches' Working Party on Britain as a Multi-Racial Society, *The New Black Presence in Britain: A Christian Scrutiny. A Statement by The British Council of Churches' Working Party on Britain as a Multi-Racial Society* (London: British Council of Churches' Community and Race Relations Unit, 1976).

Buchler, Geoffrey, 'Warren Mitchell', *The Jewish Chronicle*, 15 December 2015, n.p.

Butterfield, Herbert, *Historical Development of the Principle of Toleration in British Life, The Robert Waley Cohen Lecture 1956* (London: The Epworth Press, 1957).

Central Office of Information Reference Division, *Race Relations in Britain*, Central Office of Information Reference Pamphlet 108 (London: HM Stationery Office, 1977).

Chakrabarti, Shami, *The Shami Chakrabarti Inquiry*, 30 June 2016; available online at <https://labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Chakrabarti-Inquiry-Report-30June16.pdf> (accessed 31 June 2016).

Cohen, Steven & Keith Kahn-Harris, *Beyond Belonging: The Jewish Identities of Moderately Engaged British Jews: Highlights of the UJIA Study of Jewish Identity* (London: United Jewish Israel Appeal [assoc. Profile Books], 2004).

Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities: The Report*, 13 March 2021; available online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities> (accessed 13 March 2021).

Domnitz, Myer, *Learning to Live with Our Neighbours: Programmes in Human Relations for Schools and Youth Clubs* (London: The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1965 [1st ed. 1962]).

—— *Judaism and Inter-Group Relations: Information Notes* (London: The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1974 [1st ed. 1967]).

Gold, Tanya, 'Out of the Ordinary: As anti-Semitism ignites everywhere, I feel the discord of being both British and Jewish', *The New Statesman*, 20–26 October 2023, 27.

Hall, Stuart, 'Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse', Paper for the Council of Europe Colloquy on 'Training in the Critical Reading of Television Language'. Organised by the Council & The Centre for Mass Communication Research, University of Leicester, September 1973; available online at <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/1to8and11to24and38to48/SOP07.pdf> (accessed 21 March 2018).

Hooper, Rachel, *Act Now: A Report on Race Relations in Britain, Following a Survey August–September 1969 with Special Reference to the Response of the Churches and of the Church Missionary Society* (Watford: The Church Missionary Society [assoc. C. H. Peacock], 1970).

Kosmin, Barry A. & Nigel Grizzard, *Jews in an Inner London Borough (Hackney): A Study of the Jewish Population in the London Borough of Hackney based upon the 1971 census* (London: Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1975); available online at <https://archive.jpr.org.uk/object-uk329> (accessed 26 August 2019).

—— Marzy Bauer & Nigel Grizzard with an historical introduction by Kenneth Lunn, *Steel City Jews: A Study of Ethnicity and Social Mobility in the Jewish Population of the City of Sheffield, South Yorkshire* (London: Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1976); available online at <https://archive.jpr.org.uk/object-uk328> (accessed 26 August 2019).

London Committee of Deputies of British Jews, *A Defence of The Alien Immigrant & Objections to The Aliens Bill* (London: The London Committee of Deputies of British Jews, 1904).

—— *The Aliens Bill, 1905: Report of London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews* (London: Wertheimer, Lea & Co., 1905).

Malvery, Olive Christian, 'The Alien Question. II.—The Promised Land', *Pearson's Magazine*, 19 (1905), 525–32.

Picciotto, James, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (London: Trubner & Co., 1875); available online at <https://archive.org/details/sketchesofangloj00picciala/page/n6> (accessed 15 December 2018).

Polack, Albert I., *Tolerance: Can it be Taught?* (London: The Council of Christians and Jews, 1964 [1st ed. 1951]).

The Radio Times Online Archive, The BBC Genome Project; available online at <https://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk/> (accessed 2 March 2018).

Report of the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration; with Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix, 4 vols (London: HM Stationery Office, 1905 [1st ed. 1903]) I–IV; available at <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiuc.6967953;view=1up;seq=9> (accessed 15 December 2018).

Rose, E. J. B. *et al*, *Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations* (London: Oxford U. P., 1969).

Rosenberg, David, *Facing Up to Antisemitism: How Jews in Britain Countered the Threats of the 1930s* (London: Jewish Cultural and Anti-Racist Project of the Jewish Socialists Group, 1985).

Tower Hamlets Arts Project, *Auschwitz and East London* (London: Tower Hamlets Arts Project, 1983).

United Reformed Church, *Christians and Jews in Britain: A Study Handbook for Christians. An Exploration by a group of Christians and Jews under the Auspices of the Mission and Other Faiths Committee of the World Church and Mission Department, the United Reformed Church* (London: The United Reformed Church, 1983).

Waterman, Stanley & Barry Kosmin, *British Jewry in the Eighties: A Statistical & Geographical Study* (London: Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1986).

Online Sources

Alibhai-Brown, Yasmin, 'In-your-face racism has returned and few are fighting against it', *The Independent*, 9 November 2014, n.p.; available online at <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/in-your-face-racism-has-returned-and-few-are-fighting-against-it-9850050.html> (accessed 10 November 2014).

Anon., 'Enoch Powell's "Rivers of Blood" Speech', *The Telegraph*, 6 November 2007, n.p.; available online at <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3643823/Enoch-Powells-Rivers-of-Blood-speech.html> (accessed 20 April 2018).

Anon. [Arnold S. Leese], *Our Seditious Cartoon Book* (Hollywood: Sons of Liberty, 1938); available online at <https://archive.org/details/ourseditiouscartoonbookleese/page/n1/mode/2up> (accessed 22 September 2017).

Anon., 'Warren Mitchell', *The Times*, 16 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/obituaries/article4614651.ece> (accessed 17 November 2015).

Anon., 'Ghetto', Museo Ebraico di Venezia; available online at <http://www.museoebraico.it/en/ghetto/> (accessed 20 August 2020).

Aroesti, Rachel, 'Farewell *Friday Night Dinner*: the joyous Jewish sitcom that became a national treasure', *The Guardian*, 26 May 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2021/may/26/farewell-friday-night-dinner-the-joyous-jewish-sitcom-that-became-a-national-treasure> (accessed 27 July 2021).

Behr, Rafael, 'Marmite Nation: Is the idea of Britishness broken beyond repair?', *The Guardian*, 7 July 2015, n.p.; available online at <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jul/07/marmite-nation-britishness-english-scottish-nationalism> (accessed 13 July 2015).

Bourne, Jenny, 'The Race Relations Act 1965—Blessing or Curse?', Institute of Race Relations Blog, 13 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/the-race-relations-act-1965-blessing-or-curse/> (accessed 20 November 2015).

Brooks, Richard, 'Death do us part from Alf, lovable TV bigot', *The Times*, 15 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/death-do-us-part-from-alf-lovable-tv-bigot-3nb0rzmvzb5> (accessed 16 November 2015).

Burnett, Jon, 'The Rehabilitation of a "Race Martyr" ', Institute of Race Relations Blog, 2 October 2014, n.p.; available online at <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/the-rehabilitation-of-a-race-martyr/> (accessed 4 October 2014).

Evans, Sophie Jane, 'Alf Garnett star Warren Mitchell dies aged 89 surrounded by his loved ones after months of "poor health" ', *The Mail Online*, 14 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3318366/Alf-Garnett-star-Warren-Mitchell-dies-age-89.html> (accessed 30 November 2015).

Goodwin, Clayton, 'Charles Hyatt', *The Guardian*, 24 February 2007, n.p.; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2007/feb/24/guardianobituaries.television> (accessed 3 June 2017).

Halalkha.com; Full text of the English *Talmud*; <http://halakhah.com/> (accessed 22 July 2019).

Hawkin, Abe, 'Alf Garnett is back and he's cleaned up his act (a bit): BBC dusts off the one episode of *Till Death Us Do Part* with NO racist remarks—but sexism aplenty', *The Mail Online*, 23 August 2016, n.p.; available online at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3754343/Alf-Garnett-s-cleaned-act-bit-BBC-dusts-one-episode-Till-Death-NO-racist-remarks-sexism-aplenty.html> (accessed 4 September 2016).

Kamm, Oliver 'The Fight's Gone Out of Me', *The JC*, 17 March 2016, n.p.; available online at <https://www.thejc.com/comment/columnists/the-%EF%AC%81ght-s-gone-out-of-me-1.61851> (accessed 20 March 2016).

Kapetopoulos, Fotis, 'When did I become "White"? ', *Neos Kosmos*, 31 October 2016, n.p., <https://neoskosmos.com/en/2016/10/31/dialogue/opinion/when-did-greeks-become-white/> (accessed 3 January 2024).

Lawson, Mark, ' Warren Mitchell: there was more to him than Cockney foghorn Chairman Alf ', *The Guardian*, 14 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <http://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2015/nov/14/warren-mitchell-there-was-more-to-the-versatile-actor-than-cockney-foghorn-chairman-alf> (accessed 30 November 2015).

Laing, David, 'Kenny Lynch obituary', *The Guardian*, 18 December 2019, n.p.; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2019/dec/18/kenny-lynch-obituary> (accessed 19 December 2019).

Mounk, Yascha, 'Identity Crisis: The consequences of the West's moral confusion', *The Spectator*, 28 October 2023, 12–14.

Nathan, John, 'I fear more laughed with Alf Garnett than at him', *The JC*, 21 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <https://www.thejc.com/culture/tv/i-fear-more-laughed-with-alf-garnett-than-at-him-1.62870> (accessed 21 June 2019).

Purser, Philip, 'Warren Mitchell obituary', *The Guardian*, 14 November 2015, n.p.; available online at <http://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2015/nov/14/warren-mitchell> (accessed 16 November 2015).

White, Michael, 'Andrew Faulds: Passionate Labour MP of the Pre-Pager Era', *The Guardian*, 1 June 2000, n.p.; available online at <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2000/jun/01/guardianobituaries.obituaries> (accessed 20 March 2016).

Wilson, Benji, 'Till Death Us Do Part should have remained lost—BBC Four, review', *The Telegraph*, 1 September 2016, n.p.; available online at <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/tv/2016/09/01/til-death-us-do-part-should-have-remained-lost---bbc-four-review/> (accessed 4 September 2016).

Secondary Sources

Books & Edited Chapters

Abrams, Nathan, *The New Jew in Film: Exploring Jewishness and Judaism in Contemporary Cinema* (London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012).

—— (ed.), *Hidden in Plain Sight: Jews and Jewishness in British Film, Television and Popular Culture*, Cultural Expressions of World War II (Evanston: Northwestern U. P., 2016).

Alderman, Geoffrey, *Modern British Jewry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

—— *The Communal Gadfly: Jews, British Jews and the Jewish State. Asking the Subversive Questions. An Anthology* (Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2009).

Aldgate, Anthony, James Chapman & Arthur Marwick (eds), *Windows on the Sixties: Exploring Key Texts of Media and Culture* (London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2000).

Alibhai-Brown, Yasmin, 'The Media and Race Relations', in *Race Relations in Britain*, ed. Blackstone, Parekh & Sanders, 111–28.

—— 'Race Relations in New Britain', in *From Legislation to Integration*, ed. Anwar, Roach & Sondhi, 178–95.

Alter, Robert, 'Jewish Humor and the Domestication of Myth', in *Jewish Wry*, ed. Blacher Cohen, 25–36.

Altman, Sig, *The Comic Image of the Jew: Explorations of a Pop Culture Phenomenon* (Cranbury: Farleigh Dickinson U. P., 1971).

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London/New York: Verso, 2006 [1st ed. 1986]).

Andrews, Maggie, 'Butterflies and Caustic Asides: Housewives, Comedy and the Feminist Movement', in *Because I Tell a Joke or Two*, ed. Wagg, 50–64.

Ang, Ien, *Desperately Seeking the Audience* (London/New York: Routledge, 1991 [1st ed. 1990]).

Anthias, Floya & Nira Yuval-Davis (assoc. Harriet Cain), *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and the Anti-Racist Struggle* (London/New York: Routledge, 1996).

Antler, Joyce, *You Never Call! You Never Write! A History of the Jewish Mother* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2007).

Anwar, Muhammad, Patrick Roach & Ranjit Sondhi (eds), *From Legislation to Integration: Race Relations in Britain*, Migration, Minorities and Citizenship (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

—— ‘The Impact of Legislation on British Race Relations’, in *From Legislation to Integration*, ed. Anwar, Roach & Sondhi, 58–77.

Aridan, Natan, *Britain, Israel and Anglo-Jewry: 1949–1957*, Israeli History, Politics and Society (London/New York: Routledge, 2005).

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths & Helen Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* (London/New York, Routledge, 2002).

Azimon, Gilad, *The Wandering Who? A Study of Jewish Identity Politics* (Winchester/Washington: Zero Books, 2011).

Baader, Benajmin Maria, ‘Jewish Difference and the Feminine Spirit of Judaism in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Germany’, in *Jewish Masculinities*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, 50–71.

—— Sharon Gillerman & Paul Lerner (eds), *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History* (Bloomington: Indiana U. P., 2012).

—— ‘Introduction: German Jews, Gender, and History’, in *Jewish Masculinities*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, 1–22.

Back, Les & John Solomos, *Racism and Society*, Sociology for a Changing World (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996 [1st ed. 1994]).

—— (eds), *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader*, Routledge Student Readers (London/New York: Routledge, 2000 [1st ed. 1999]).

Baddiel, David, *Jews Don’t Count* (London: TLS Books, 2021).

Baker, Adrienne, *The Jewish Woman in Contemporary Society: Transitions and Traditions* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993).

Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky, A Midland Book (Bloomington: Indiana U. P., 1984 [1st ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965]).

Balibar, Étienne & Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London/New York: Verso, 1991 [1st French ed. *Race, nation, classe* (Paris: La Découverte, 1988)]).

Banton, Michael, *White and Coloured: The Behaviour of British People Towards Coloured Immigrants* (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. P., 1960).

—— *Racial Theories* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 1998).

—— ‘Race Relations’, in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. Goldberg & Solomos, 90–96.

Barker, Martin, *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe* (Frederick, MD: Aletheia Books, 1981).

—— ‘Analysing Discourse’, in *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, ed. Pickering, 150–72.

Bar-Yosef, Eitan & Nadia Valman (eds), *‘The Jew’ in Late-Victorian and Edwardian Culture: Between the East End and East Africa*, Palgrave Studies in Nineteenth-Century Writing and Culture (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Barrell, John, ‘Sir Joshua Reynolds and the Englishness of English Art’, in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 154–76.

Barry, Angela, ‘Black Mythologies: The Representation of Black People on British Television’, in *The Black and White Media Book*, ed. Twitchin, 83–102.

Bauman, Zygmunt, ‘From Pilgrim to Tourist—or a Short History of Identity’, in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. Hall & Du Gay, 18–36.

—— ‘Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern’, in *Modernity, Culture and ‘the Jew’*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 143–56.

Baumgarten, Murray, ‘Seeing Double: Jews in the Fiction of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Charles Dickens, Anthony Trollope, and George Eliot’, in *Between ‘Race’ and Culture: Representations of ‘the Jew’ in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 44–61.

Beatty, Aidan & Dan O’Brien (eds), *Irish Questions & Jewish Questions: Crossovers in Culture* (Syracuse: Syracuse U. P., 2018).

Beckett, Andy, *When the Lights Went Out: What Really Happened to Britain in the Seventies* (London: Faber & Faber, 2009).

Beer, Gillian, 'The Island and the Aeroplane: The Case of Virginia Woolf', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 265–90.

Bell, Ronald, *Riding Madly Off in All Directions* (Spennymoor, The Memoir Club, 2001).

Benn, Tony, *Out of the Wilderness: Diaries 1963–67* (London: Hutchinson, 1987).

—— *Office Without Power: Diaries 1968–72* (London: Hutchinson, 1988).

Bennington, 'Postal Politics and the Institutions of the Nation', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 121–37.

Berger, Maurice, 'The Mouse that Never Roars: Jewish Masculinity on American Television', in *Too Jewish?*, ed. Kleeblatt, 93–107.

Bergson, Henri, *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*, trans. Cloudesley Brereton & Fred Rothwell ([London: Wildside Press, 2008 (1st French ed. *Le Rire. Essai sur la signification du comique* [Paris: Éditions Alcan, 1900])]).

Bermant, Chaim, *Troubled Eden: An Anatomy of British Jewry* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1969).

Bernstein, Cynthia Goldin, 'Representing Jewish Identity Through English', in *English and Ethnicity*, ed. Brutt-Griffler & Davies, 107–30.

Bhabha, Homi K., *The Location of Culture* (London/New York: Routledge, 1994 [1st ed. 1993]).

—— 'Foreword. Joking Aside: The Idea of a Self-Critical Community', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, xv–xx.

—— (ed.), *Nation and Narration* (London/New York: Routledge, 2006).

—— 'Introduction: Narrating the Nation', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 1–7.

—— 'DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 291–322.

Bhabha, Homi, 'The Other Question', in *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Mongia, 37–54.

Bial, Henry, *Acting Jewish: Negotiating Ethnicity on the American Stage and Screen* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 2005).

Biale, David, 'Blood and Belief: An Introduction to a Jewish Symbol', in *Jewish Blood*, ed. Hart, 14–30.

Biberman, Matthew, *Masculinity, Anti-Semitism and Early Modern English Literature: From the Satanic to the Effeminate Jew* (London/New York: Routledge, 2004).

Bidwell, Sidney, *Red, White & Black: Race Relations in Britain*, with an intro. by Michael Foot (London: Gordon Cremonesi, 1976).

Bignell, Jonathan, *Media Semiotics: An Introduction* (Manchester/New York: Manchester U. P., 2002 [1st ed. 1991]).

Bindman, David, 'No Laughing Matter: Visual Humor in Practice and Theory', in *No Laughing Matter*, ed. Rosenthal, Bindman & Randolph, xiii–xix.

Blacher Cohen, Sarah (ed.), *Jewish Wry: Essays on Jewish Humor*, Humor in Life and Letters (Detroit: Wayne State U. P., 1990).

—— 'Introduction: The Varieties of Jewish Humor', in *Jewish Wry*, ed. Blacher Cohen, 1–15.

Black, Gerry, *Living Up West: Jewish Life in London's West End* (London: London Museum of Jewish Life, 1994).

Blackstone, Tessa, Bhikhu Parekh & Peter Sanders (eds), *Race Relations in Britain: A Developing Agenda* (London: Routledge, 2005 [1st ed. New York, 1998]).

Booth, Tony, *Stroll On* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1989).

—— *Labour of Love* (London: Blake, 1997).

—— & Stephanie Booth, *What's Left? A Political Memoir* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002).

Boskin, Joseph, *Sambo: The Rise and Demise of an American Jester* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1986).

—— 'Beyond *Kvetching* and *Jiving*: The Thrust of Jewish and Black Folkhumour', in *Jewish Wry*, ed. Blacher Cohen, 53–79.

Bourne, Stephen, *Black in the British Frame: Black People in British Film and Television, 1896–1996* (London/Washington: Cassell, 1998).

Bowlby, Rachel, ‘Breakfast in America—*Uncle Tom*’s Cultural Histories’, in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 197–213.

Boyarin, Daniel, *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (Berkeley/London: Univ. of California Press, 1997).

—— ‘*Goyim Naches*, or, Modernity and the Manliness of the *Mentsch*’, in *Modernity, Culture and ‘the Jew’*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 63–87.

Boyarin, Jonathan & Daniel Boyarin (eds), *Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish Cultural Studies* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1997).

—— ‘So What’s New?’, in *Jews and Other Differences*, ed. Boyarin & Boyarin, VII–XXII.

Brah, Avtar, Mary J. Hickman & Máirtín Mac an Ghaill (eds), *Thinking Identities: Ethnicity, Racism and Culture*, Explorations in Sociology (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999).

—— ‘Thinking Identities: Ethnicity, Racism and Culture’, in *Thinking Identities*, ed. Brah, Hickman & Mac an Ghaill, 1–21.

Brennan, Timothy, ‘The National Longing for Form’, in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 44–70.

Brockway, Fenner, *98 Not Out* (London: Quartet Books, 1998).

—— *Inside the Left: Thirty Years of Platform, Press, Prison and Parliament* (Nottingham: Spokesman, 2010 [1st ed., London: Allen & Unwin, 1942])

Brod, Harry, ‘Of Mice and Supermen: Images of Jewish Masculinity’, in G*ender and Judaism: The Transformation of Tradition*, ed. Rudavsky, 279–93.

—— ‘The Construction of the Construction of Masculinities’, in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 19–32.

Brodkin, Karen, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick/London: Rutgers U. P., 1998).

Bronner, Simon J. (ed.), *Framing Jewish Culture: Boundaries and Representations*, Jewish Cultural Studies (Oxford/Portland, OR: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2014).

—— ‘Introduction’, in *Framing Jewish Culture*, ed. Bronner, 1–29.

Brook, Stephen, *The Club: The Jews of Modern Britain* (London: Pan Books, 1990).

Brook, Vincent, *Something Ain’t Kosher Here: The Rise of the ‘Jewish’ Sitcom* (New Brunswick/London: Rutgers U. P., 2003).

—— (ed.), *You Should See Yourself: Jewish Identity in Postmodern American Culture* (New Brunswick/London: Rutgers U. P., 2006).

Brotman, Adolph G., ‘Jewish Communal Organisation’, in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, 1–27.

Brutt-Griffler, Janina, ‘Race and Ethnicity in the English-Speaking World’, in *English and Ethnicity*, ed. Brutt-Griffler & Davies, 277–300.

—— & Catherine Evans Davies (eds), *English and Ethnicity*, Signs of Race (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

Bucaria, Chiara & Luca Barra (eds), *Taboo Comedy: Television and Controversial Humour*, Palgrave Studies in Comedy (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

Bulmer, Martin & John Solomos (eds), *Racism*, Oxford Readers (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1999).

Burkett, Jodi, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain: Britishness, ‘Race’ and the Radical Left in the 1960s* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Burton, James, ‘Reframing the 1950s: Race and Representation in Recent British Television’, in *Adjusting the Contrast*, ed. Malik & Newton, 71–89.

Byers, Michelle & Rosalin Krieger, ‘Something Old is New Again? Postmodern Jewishness in *Curb Your Enthusiasm*, *Arrested Development*, and *The O.C.*’, in *You Should See Yourself*, ed. Brook, 277–97.

Callaghan, James, *Time and Chance* (London: William Collins & Sons, 1987).

Carpenter, Humphrey, *A Great Silly Grin: The British Satire Boom of the 1960s* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2000).

—— *That Was Satire That Was: Beyond the Fringe, the Establishment Club, Private Eye and That Was The Week That Was: The Satire Boom of the 1960s* (London: Victor Gollancz, 2000).

Carroll, Bret E. (ed.), *American Masculinities: A Historical Enyclopedia* (New York: The Moschovitiz Group, 2003).

Cashmore, Ellis (ed.), *Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations* (London/New York: Routledge, 2001 [1st ed. Keegan Paul, 1984]).

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (University of Birmingham), *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain* (London/New York: Routledge [assoc. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies], 1994 [1st ed. 1982]).

Cesarani, David, 'Dual Heritage or Dueling Heritages? Englishness and Jewishness in the Heritage Industry', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 29–41.

—— *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 1994).

Chapman, Anthony J. & Hugh C. Foot (eds), *It's a Funny Thing Humour. Proceedings of the International Conference on Humour and Laughter, Cardiff, Wales, 1976* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1977).

Cheyette, Bryan, *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875–1945* (Cambridge, Cambridge U. P., 1995).

—— (ed.), *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature* (Stanford: Stanford U. P., 1996).

—— 'Introduction: Unanswered Questions', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 1–15.

—— & Laura Marcus (eds), *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, Contraversions (Stanford: Stanford U. P., 1998).

—— 'Introduction: Some Methodological Anxieties', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 1–20.

Coates, Ken & Richard Silburn, *Poverty: The Forgotten Englishman* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970).

Cohen, Phil & Carl Gardner (eds), *It Ain't Half Racist, Mum: Fighting Racism in the Media* (London: Comedia [assoc. Campaign Against Racism in the Media], 1982).

Cohen, Steve, *It's the Same Old Story: Immigration Controls Against Jewish, Black and Asian People, With Special Reference to Manchester* (Manchester: Manchester City Council Public Relations Office, 1987).

—— *That's Funny You Don't Look Anti-Semitic: An Anti-Racist Analysis of Left Anti-Semitism*, ed. Libby Lawson & Erica Burman (Leeds: Beyond the Pale Collective, 1984).

Cohn-Sherbock, Dan, *The Crucified Jew: Twenty Centuries of Christian Anti-Semitism* (London: HarperCollins, 1992).

Cole, Tim, ' "Marvellous Raisins in a Badly-Cooked Cake"—British Reactions to the Screening of *Holocaust*', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 71–89.

Collar, Anna C. F., 'Networks and Ethnogenesis', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 97–111.

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (New Haven/London: Yale U. P., 1992).

Collins, Michael, *The Likes of Us: A Biography of the White Working Class* (London: Granta Publications, 2004).

Connell, R. W., 'Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities', in *Handbook of Studies of Men and Masculinities*, ed. Kimmel, Hearn & Connell, 71–89.

Cooke, Jim, *Television Sitcom*, BFI Dossier 17 (London: BFI Publishing, 1984).

Cooper, Howard & Paul Morrison, *A Sense of Belonging: Dilemmas of British Jewish Identity* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson [assoc. Channel 4 Television], 1991).

Corner, John, *Critical Ideas in Television Studies*, Oxford Television Studies (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2007).

Daniel, W. W., *Racial Discrimination in England: Based on the PEP Report*, with an intro. by Mark Abrams, Pelican Books (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969 [1st ed. 1968]).

Daniels, Therese & Jane Gerson (eds), *The Colour Black: Black Images in British Television* (London: BFI, 1989).

Davis, Helen, *Understanding Stuart Hall* (London: Sage, 2004).

Davis, Moshe, 'The Theme of the Conference', in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, IX–XII.

van Dijk, Teun A., *Elite Discourse and Racism*, Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations (London: Sage, 1993).

—— 'Discourse and Racism', in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. Goldberg & Solomos, 145–59.

Dorff, Elliott N., 'Ethics of Judaism', in *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*, ed. Neusner & Avery-Peck, 373–92.

Downing, John & Charles Husband, *Representing 'Race': Racisms, Ethnicity and the Media* (London: Sage, 2005).

During, Simon, 'Literature—Nationalism's Other? The Case for Revision', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 138–53.

Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard (ed.), *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992).

—— 'Introduction: People of the Body', in *People of the Body*, ed. Eilberg-Schwartz, 1–16.

—— 'The Problem of the Body for the People of the Book', in *People of the Body*, ed. Eilberg-Schwartz, 17–46.

Elias, Norbert, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000 [1st ed. *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation* (Basel: Urizen, 1939)]).

Ellmann, Maud, 'The Imaginary Jews: T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 84–101.

Endelman, Todd M., *The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000*, Jewish Communities in the Modern World (London: Univ. of California Press, 2002).

English, James F., *Comic Transactions: Literature, Humor, and the Politics of Community in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Ithaca/London: Cornell U. P., 1994).

English, Richard & Michael Kenny (eds), *Rethinking British Decline* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Fanon, Frantz, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (London: Pluto Press, 1986 [1st French ed. Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1952]).

—— *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington, with a Preface by Jean-Paul Sartre (New York: Grove Press, 1963 [1st French ed. Paris: François Maspero, 1961]).

Favell, Adrian, *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*, Migration, Minorities and Citizenship (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).

Fay, Stephen with Liam Haydon, *An Analysis of Homi K. Bhabha's 'The Location of Culture'* (London: Macaat International, 2017).

Felsenstein, Frank, ' "If you tickle us do we not laugh?": Stereotypes of Jews in English Graphic Humor of the Georgian Era', in *No Laughing Matter*, ed. Rosenthal, Bindman & Randolph, 49–75.

Fenton, Steve, *Ethnicity: Racism, Class and Culture* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

Fethergill Zwicker, Lisa, 'Performing Masculinity: Jewish Students and the Honor Code at German Universities', in *Jewish Masculinities*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, 114–37.

Finestein, Israel, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry 1800–2000* (London/Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002).

Forrest, David & Beth Johnson (eds), *Social Class and Television Drama in Contemporary Britain* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Random House, 1995 [1st French ed., *Serveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975)]).

—— *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London/New York: Routledge, 2002 [1st French ed. *Les Mots et les choses* (Parsi: Gallimard, 1966)]).

—— *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, trans. A. M. Sheridan (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003 [1st French ed., *Naissance de la clinique: une archéologie du regard médical* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963)]).

—— *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London/New York: Routledge, 2004 [1st French ed. *L'archéologie du savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969)]).

—— *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Richard Howard (London/New York: Routledge, 2008 [1st French ed. *Folie et Déraison: Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1961)]).

—— *Lectures on the Will to Know: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1970–1971 and Oedipal Knowledge*, ed. Daniel Defert, trans. Graham Burchell (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013 [1st French ed. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2011]).

—— *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Vintage Books, 2015 [1st ed. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980]).

—— *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley, 4 vols (London: Penguin Random House, 2020 [1st French ed. *L'Histoire de Sexualité. La Volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976)]), I, *The Will to Knowledge*.

—— *Power: Essential Works 1954–84*, ed. James D. Faubion, trans. Robert Hurley *et al.* (London: Penguin Random House 2020).

Foxman, Abraham H., *Jews and Money: The Story of a Stereotype* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Frankel, William (ed.), *Friday Nights: A Jewish Chronicle Anthology, 1841–1971*, selection A. B. Levy, intro. William Frankel (London: Jewish Chronicle Publications, 1973).

Freedman, Jonathan, 'Henry James and the Discourses of Antisemitism', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 62–83.

Freud, Sigmund, *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*, trans. James Strachey rev. Angela Richards, *The Pelican Freud Library*, 15 volumes (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976 [1st German ed. *Der Wiz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten* (F. Deuticke, 1905)] [1st English ed. *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious* trans., with an intro. by A. A. Brill (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916)]), VI.

Freud Lowenstein, Andrea, 'The Protection of Masculinity: Jews and Projective Pawns in the Texts of William Gerhardi and George Orwell', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 145–64.

Fryer, Peter, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (London/Boulder: Pluto, 1984).

Gainer, Bernard, *The Alien Invasion: The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905* (London: Heinemann Educational, 1972).

Galperin, William, 'Romanticism and/or Antisemitism', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 16–26.

Gamson, Joshua, ' "It's been a while since I've seen, like, straight people", Queer Visibility in the Age of Postnetwork Reality Television', in *A Companion to Reality Television*, ed. Ouellette, 227–82.

Garnet, Mark & Richard Weight, *Modern British History: The Essential A–Z Guide* (London: Pimlico, 2004).

Garrard, John A., *The English and Immigration 1880–1910* (London: Oxford U. P., 1971).

Gat, Moshe, *Britain and the Conflict in the Middle East, 1964–7: The Coming of the Six-Day War* (London: Praeger, 2003).

Gee, James Paul, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (London/New York: Taylor & Francis, 2001).

Geller, Jay, '(G)nos(e)ology: The Cultural Construction of the Other', in *People of the Body*, ed. Eilberg-Schwartz, 243–82.

—— *The Other Jewish Question: Identifying the Jew and Making Sense of Modernity* (New York: Fordham U. P., 2011).

—— *Bestiarium Judaicum: Unnatural Histories of the Jews* (New York: Fordham U. P., 2018).

George, Victor, & Irving Howards, *Poverty Amidst Affluence: Britain and the United States* (London: Edward Elgar Press, 1991).

Gerson, Judith, 'Family Matters: German Jewish Masculinities among Nazi Era refugees', in *Jewish Masculinities*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, 210–32.

Gertel, Elliot B., *Over the Top Judaism: Precedents and Trends in the Depiction of Jewish Beliefs and Observances in Film and Television* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2003).

Gillespie, Marie, *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change*, Comedia (London: Routledge, 1995).

Gillman, Neil, 'Contemporary Jewish Theology', in *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*, ed. Neusner & Avery-Peck, 441–60.

Gillota, David, 'The New Jewish Blackface: African American Tropes in Contemporary Jewish Humor', in *Jews and Humor*, ed. Greenspoon, 225–36.

—— *Ethnic Humor in Multiethnic America* (New Brunswick/London: Rutgers U. P., 2013).

Gilman, Sander L., *Jewish Self-Hatred* (Baltimore/London: John Hopkins U. P., 1986).

—— *The Jew's Body* (New York/London: Routledge, 1991).

—— *Freud, Race, and Gender* (Princeton: Princeton U. P., 1993)

—— 'The Jewish Body: A Foot-note', in *People of the Body*, ed. Eilberg-Schwartz, 223–42.

—— ‘The Jew’s Body: Thoughts on Jewish Physical Difference’, in *Too Jewish?*, ed. Kleeblatt, 60–73.

—— ‘Mark Twain and the Diseases of the Jews’, in *Between ‘Race’ and Culture: Representations of ‘the Jew’ in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 27–43.

—— *Love + Marriage = Death: And Other Essays on Representing Difference*, Stanford Studies in Jewish History and Culture (Stanford: Stanford U. P., 1998).

—— *Jewish Frontiers: Essays on Bodies, Histories, and Identities* (New York/Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan Seacaucus, 2003).

—— *Multiculturalism and the Jews* (London/New York: Routledge, 2006).

—— ‘Whose Body Is it Anyway? Hermaphrodites, Gays, and Jews in N. O. Body’s Germany’, in *Jewish Masculinities*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, 138–51.

Gilroy, Paul, ‘Steppin’ Out of Babylon—Race, Class and Autonomy’, in *The Empire Strikes Back*, 276–314.

—— *‘There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack’: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (London: Hutchinson, 1987).

Gledhill, Christine, ‘Genre and Gender: The Case of Soap Opera’, in *Representation*, ed. Hall, 337–86.

Glenn, Susan A., ‘ “Funny, You Don’t Look Jewish”: Visual Stereotypes and the Making of Modern Jewish Identity’, in *Boundaries of Jewish Identity*, ed. Glenn & Sokoloff, 64–90.

—— & Naomi B. Sokoloff (eds), *Boundaries of Jewish Identity* (Seattle/London: Univ. of Washington Press, 2010).

—— ‘Introduction: Who and What is Jewish?’, in *Boundaries of Jewish Identity*, ed. Glenn & Sokoloff, 3–11.

Glover, David, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-Siècle England: A Cultural History of the 1905 Aliens Act* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge U. P., 2012).

Goldberg, David Theo, *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

—— & Michael Krausz (eds), *Jewish Identity* (Philadelphia: Temple U. P., 1993).

—— & John Solomos (eds), *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, Blackwell Companions in Cultural Studies (Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002).

Goodwin, Peter, *Television Under the Tories: Broadcasting Policy 1979–1997* (London: BFI Publishing, 1998).

Gotzmann, Andreas, ‘Respectability Tested: Male Ideals, Sexuality, and Honor in Early Modern Ashkenazi Jewry’, in *Jewish Masculinities*, ed. Baader, Gillerman & Lerner, 23–49.

Goulbourne, Harry, *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Post-Imperial Britain*, Comparative Ethnic and Race Relations (Cambridge/New York/Portchester: Cambridge U. P., 1991).

Gould, Julius & Shaul Esh (eds), *Jewish Life in Modern Britain. Papers and Proceedings of a Conference held at University College London on 1st and 2nd April 1962, by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University Jerusalem, under the auspices of the Board of Deputies of British Jews* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964).

Green, Jonathon, *All Dressed Up: The Sixties and the Counterculture* (London: Pimlico, 1999).

Greenspoon, Leonard J. (ed.), *Jews and Humor*, Studies in Jewish Civilization (West Lafayette: Purdue U. P., 2011).

Griffiths, Peter, *A Question of Colour?* (London: Leslie Frewin [assoc. Anchor Press], 1966).

Grossberg, Lawrence, ‘Identity and Cultural Studies—Is That All There Is?’, in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. Hall & Du Gay, 87–107.

Gruen, Erich S., ‘Romans and Jews’, in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 423–36.

Gunew, Sneja, ‘Denaturalizing Cultural Nationalisms: Multicultural Readings of “Australia” ’, in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 99–120.

Haarmann, Harald, ‘Ethnicity and Language in the Ancient Mediterranean’, in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 17–33.

Haines, Joe, *Glimmers of Twilight: Harold Wilson in Decline* (London: Politico’s [assoc. Methuen], 2003).

Hall, Stuart, *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural* Studies, ed. David Morley & Kuan-Hsing Chen, Comedia (London: Routledge, 1996).

—— ‘Gramsci’s Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity’, in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. Morley & Chen, 411–41.

—— 'Introduction: Who Needs "Identity"?', in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. Morley & Chen, 1–17.

—— 'New Ethnicities', in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* ed. Morley & Chen, 442–51.

—— & Paul Du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (London: Sage, 2003 [1st ed. London/Thousand Oaks, 1996]).

—— (ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, Culture, Media and Identities (London: Sage [assoc. The Open University], 2002).

—— 'Introduction', in *Representation*, ed. Hall, 1–12.

—— 'The Work of Representation', in *Representation*, ed. Hall, 13–74.

—— 'The Spectacle of the "Other" ', in *Representation*, ed. Hall, 223–90.

—— *Cultural Studies 1983: A Theoretical History*, ed. with an intro. by Jennifer Daryl Slack & Lawrence Grossberg, Stuart Hall: Selected Writings (Durham, NC: Duke U. P., 2016).

—— *The Fateful Triangle: Race, Ethnicity, Nation*, ed. with an intro. by Kobena Mercer, with a foreword by Henry Louis Gates Jr. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 2017).

—— *Selected Writings of Race and Difference*, ed. Paul Gilroy & Ruth Wilson Gilmore (London/Durham, NC: Duke U. P., 2021).

Hall, Thomas D., 'Ethnicity and World-Systems Analysis', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 50–65.

Halsey, A. H. & Josephine Webb (eds), *Twentieth-Century British Social Trends*, Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Hargreaves, Hunter, 'Tan TV: Reality Television's Postracial Delusion', in *A Companion to Reality Television*, ed. Ouellette, 283–305.

Hart, Mitchell B., *Jewish Blood: Reality and Metaphor in History, Religion, and Culture*, Routledge Jewish Studies Series (London: Routledge, 2009).

—— ' "Jewish Blood": An Introduction', in *Jewish Blood*, ed. Hart, 1–13.

Haschemi Yekani, Elahe, *The Privilege of Crisis: Narratives of Masculinities in Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, Photography and Film* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2011).

Hennessy, Peter, *Having it So Good: Britain in the Fifties* (London: Penguin, 2007).

Henriques, Julian, David Morley & Vana Goblot (eds), *Stuart Hall: Conversations, Projects and Legacies* (London: Goldsmiths Press, 2017).

Herbert, Joanna, 'Masculinity and Migration: Life Stories of East African Asian Men', in *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain*, ed. Ryan & Webster, 189–204.

Herman, Didi, *An Unfortunate Coincidence: Jews, Jewishness and English Law* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2011).

Hiro, Dilip, *Black British, White British: A History of Race Relations in Britain* (London: Paladin, 1992).

Hirsch, Afua, *Brit(ish): On Race, Identity and Belonging* (London: Vintage, 2018).

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan; Or, The Matter, Forme, & Power of A Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civill*, ed., with an intro. by W. G. Pogson Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965 [1st ed. 1651).

Hobson, Dorothy, *Channel 4: The Early Years and the Jeremy Isaacs Legacy* (London & New York: I. B. Tauris, 2008).

Homberger, Eric, 'Some Uses for Jewish Ambivalence: Abraham Cahan and Michael Gold', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 165–82.

Howe, Irving, 'The Nature of Jewish Laughter', in *Jewish Wry*, ed. Blacher Cohen, 16–24.

von Hodenberg, Christina, *Television's Moment: Sitcom Audiences and the Sixties Cultural Revolution* (New York/Oxford: Bergahn Books, 2015).

Hoggart, Richard, *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life* (London: Penguin Classics, 2009 [1st ed. Chatto, 1957]).

Holmberg, Eva Johanna, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination: A Scattered Nation* (Farnham/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011).

Horlacher, Stefan (ed.), *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, Global Masculinities (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

—— 'Charting the Field of Masculinity Studies; or, Toward a Literary History of Masculinities', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 3–18.

—— 'Towards Comparative Masculinity Studies: On the Interdependence of National Identity and the Construction of Masculinity', in *Post-World War II Masculinities in British and American Literature and Culture: Towards Comparative Masculinity Studies*, ed. Horlacher & Floyd, 1–14.

—— & Kevin Floyd (eds), *Post-World War II Masculinities in British and American Literature and Culture: Towards Comparative Masculinity Studies* (London/New York: Routledge, 2016).

Huddart, David, *Homi K. Bhabha*, Routledge Critical Thinkers (London/New York: Routledge, 2006).

Huizinga, Johan, *The Waning of the Middle Ages: A Study of the Forms of Life, Thought and Art in the XIV^th^ and XV^th^ Centuries*, Kindle Edition (San Francisco: Pickle Partners, 2016 [1st ed. *Herfstijj der Middeleeuwen: studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink, 1919]).

Hutchinson, John & Anthony D. Smith (eds), *Ethnicity*, Oxford Readers (Oxford/New York: Oxford U. P., 1996).

Iganski, Paul, Vicky Kielinger & Susan Peterson, *Hate Crimes Against London's Jews: An Analysis of Incidents Recorded by the Metropolitan Police Service 2001–2004* (London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research, 2005).

Jackson, Paul, *Colin Jordan and Britain's Neo-Nazi Movement: Hitler's Echo*, A Modern History of Politics and Violence (London: Bloomsbury, 2017).

Jacobson, Matthew Frye, *Whiteness of a Different Colour: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard U. P., 1998).

Jakobovits, Immanuel, 'An Analysis of Religious Versus Secularist Trends in Anglo-Jewry, Especially During the Past Fifteen Years', in *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 33–48.

Janner, Elsie, *Barnett Janner: A Personal Portrait*, ed. Gershon Levi (London: Robson Books, 1984).

Jenkins, Roy, *A Life at the Centre* (London/Basingstoke: Macmillan London [assoc. Billing & Sons], 1991).

Jensen, Olaf, 'The Holocaust in British Television and Film: A Look Over the Fence', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 115–25.

Jewish Women in London Group, *Generations of Memories: Voices of Jewish Women* (London: The Women's Press, 1989).

Jinks, Rebecca, 'Holocaust Memory and Contemporary Atrocities: The Imperial War Museum's Holocaust Exhibition and Crimes Against Humanity Exhibition', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 142–59.

Johnson, Aaron P., 'Ethnicity: Greeks, Jews and Christians', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 376–89.

Johnson, Catherine & Rob Turnock (eds), *ITV Cultures: Independent Television Over Fifty Years* (Maidenhead: Open U. P., 2005).

Jordan, James, ' "And the Trouble is Where to begin to Spring Surprises on you. Perhaps a Place you Might *Least* Like to Remember." *This is Your Life* and the BBC's Images of the Holocaust in the Twenty Years Before *Holocaust*', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 90–114.

Julius, Anthony, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2010).

Kahn-Harris, Keith & Ben Gidley, *Turbulent Times: The British Jewish Community Today* (London: Continuum, 2010).

Kamm, Jürgen & Birgit Neumann (eds), *British TV Comedies: Cultural Concepts, Contexts and Controversies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

—— 'Introduction: The Aesthetics and Politics of British TV Comedy', in *British TV Comedy*, ed. Kamm & Neumann, 1–20.

Kane, Thomas R., Jerry Suls & James T. Tedeschi, 'Humour as a Tool of Social Interaction', in *It's a Funny Thing Humour. Proceedings of the International Conference on Humour and Laughter, Cardiff, Wales, 1976*, ed. Chapman & Foot, 13–17.

Kapuściński, Ryszard, *The Other*, trans. Antonia Lloyd-Jones, with an intro. by Neal Ascherson (London/New York: Verso, 2018 [1st Polish ed. 2006]).

Katz, David S., 'The Marginalization of Early Modern Anglo-Jewish History', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 60–77.

Kershen, Anne J., *Strangers, Aliens and Asians: Huguenots, Jews and Bangladeshis in Spitalfields 1660–2000*, British Politics and Society (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2005).

Kimmel, Michael, 'The "Crisis" of Masculinity in Seventeenth-Century England', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 89–108.

——, Jeff Hearn & R. W. Connell (eds), *Handbook of Studies of Men and Masculinities* (London: Sage, 2005).

Kleeblatt, Norman L. (ed.), *Too Jewish? Challenging Traditional Identities* (New Brunswick: New York Jewish Museum [assoc. Rutgers U. P.], 1996).

Klein, Emma, *Lost Jews: The Struggle for Identity Today* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996).

Krausz, Ernest, 'The Economic and Social Structure of Anglo-Jewry', in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, 27–41.

—— 'Concepts and Theoretical Models for Anglo-Jewish Sociology', in *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 17–25.

Kuglmass, Jack, 'Jewish icons: Envisioning the Self in Images of the other', in *Jews and other Differences*, ed. Boyarin & Boyarin, 30–53.

Kushner, Tony (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, Immigrants and Minorities Series (London/Portland: Frank Cass, 1992).

—— 'Heritage and Ethnicity: An Introduction', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 1–28.

—— 'The End of the "Anglo-Jewish Progress Show": Representations of the Jewish East End, 1887–1987', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 78–105.

—— 'Remembering to Forget: Racism and Anti-Racism in Post-War Britain', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 226–41.

—— 'Antisemitism', in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. Goldberg & Solomos, 64–72.

—— 'Racialization and "White European" Immigration to Britain', in *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice*, ed. Murji & Solomos, 207–26.

—— *Anglo-Jewry Since 1066* (Manchester: Manchester U. P., 2009).

—— *The Battle of Britishness: Migrant Journeys, 1685 to the Present* (Manchester/New York: Manchester U. P., 2012).

—— 'Loose Connections? Britain and the "Final Solution" ', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 52–67.

Kynaston, David, *Austerity Britain 1945–48: A World to Build* (London: Bloomsbury, distrib. Macmillan, 2008).

—— *Austerity Britain 1948–51: Smoke in the Valley* (London: Bloomsbury, distrib. Macmillan, 2008).

—— *Family Britain 1951–57* (London: Bloomsbury, 2010).

—— *Modernity Britain. Volume I, Opening the Box, 1957–59* (London Bloomsbury, 2013).

—— *Modernity Britain. Volume II*, *A Shake of the Dice, 1959–62* (London Bloomsbury, 2014).

Laing, Stuart, *Representations of Working-Class Life: 1957–64* (Basingstoke/London: Macmillan, 1986).

Landsberg, Alison, 'Politics and the Historical Film: *Hotel Rwanda* and the Form of Engagement', in *A Companion to the Historical Film*, ed. Rosenstone & Parvelescu, 11–29.

Langham, Raphael, *250 Years of Convention and Contention: A History of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–2010* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2010).

Lassner, Phyllis, ' " The Milk of Our Mother's Kindness Has Ceased to Flow": Virginia Woolf, Stevie Smith, and the Representation of the Jew', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 129–44.

Last, Mercia, *Race Relations in Britain*, Longman Social Science Studies 2nd Ser., ed. Richard Cootes (London: Longman, 1980).

Lawrence, Errol, 'Just Plain Common Sense: The "Roots" of Racism', in *The Empire Strikes Back*, 47–94.

—— 'In the Abundance of Water the Fool is Thirsty: Sociology and Black "Pathology" ', in *The Empire Strikes Back*, 95–142.

Lawson, Tom, 'The Holocaust and Colonial Genocide at the Imperial War Museum', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 160–68.

Lederhendler, Eli (ed.), *Ethnicity and Beyond: Theories and Dilemmas of Jewish Group Demarcation*, Studies in Contemporary Jewry (New York: Oxford U. P., 2011).

Lee, C. P., ' "Yeah. And I used to be a Hunchback": Immigrants, Humour and the Marx Brothers', in *Because I Tell a Joke or Two*, ed. Wagg, 165–79.

Lerman, Antony, *Whatever Happened to Antisemitism? Redefinition and the Myth of the 'Collective Jew'* (London: Pluto, 2022).

Lerner, Michael & Cornel West, *Jews & Blacks: A Dialogue on Race, Religion, and Culture in America* (London: Plume [assoc. Penguin], 1996).

Lester, Anthony, 'From Legislation to Integration: Twenty Years of the Race Relations Act', in *Race Relations in Britain Agenda*, ed. Blackstone, Parekh & Sanders, 22–35.

—— 'The Politics of the Race Relations Act 1976', in *From Legislation to Integration*, ed. Anwar, Roach & Sondhi, 24–39.

—— & Geoffrey Bindman, *Race and Law*, Law and Society (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).

Levenberg, S., 'The Development of Anglo-Jewry, 1962–1977', in *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 175–80.

Levin, Salmond S. (ed.), *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life, 1870–1970: Lectures to Commemorate the Centenary of the United Synagogue* (London: United Synagogue, 1973).

—— 'Introduction', in *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life, 1870–1970*, ed. Levin, v–vii.

Levitt, Laura S., 'Reconfiguring Home: Jewish Feminist Identity/ies', in *Gender and Judaism: The Transformation of Tradition*, ed. Rudavsky, 39–51.

Lewisohn, Mark & Dick Fiddy (eds), *Radio Times Guide to TV Comedy* (London: BBC Worldwide, 2003).

Lichtenstein, Rachel, *On Brick Lane* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2007).

Lipman, Maureen, *How Was It For You? Home Thoughts from a Broad* (London: Futura, 1986).

—— *Something to Fall Back On* (London: Futura, 1988).

—— *Thank You For Having Me* (London: Futura, 1991).

—— *When's it Coming out? The Thoughts of Chairperson Mo* (London: Warner, 1993).

—— *You Can Read Me Like a Book* (London: Warner, 1996).

—— *Lip Reading* (London: Robson, 2000).

—— *Past-it Notes* (London: JR Books, 2009).

Lipman, Sonia L. & Vivian D. Lipman (eds), *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977. Papers and Proceedings of a Conference held at Hillel House, London on March 13, 1977, by the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Institute of Jewish Affairs* (New York: K. G. Saur, 1981).

Lipman, Vivian D., 'The Development of London Jewry', in *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life*, ed. Levin, 43–56.

Little, Duncan, ' "No one Believed What We had Seen": British Soldiers who Witnessed Mass Murder in Auschwitz', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 13–30.

Littlewood, Jane & Michael Pickering, 'Heard the One about the White Middle-Class Heterosexual Father-in-Law? Gender, Ethnicity and Political Correctness in Comedy', in *Because I Tell a Joke or Two*, ed. Wagg, 291–312.

Littlewood, Roland & Maurice Lipsedge, *Aliens and Alienists: Ethnic Minorities and Psychiatry* (London: Routledge, 1993 [1st ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962]).

Locke, Terry, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Continuum Research Methods Series (London/New York: Continuum, 2004).

Lockyer, Sharon & Michael Pickering (eds), *Beyond a Joke: The Limits of Humour* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Lockyer, Sharon (ed.), *Reading Little Britain: Comedy Matters on Contemporary Television* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2010).

Lomas, Kathryn, 'Ethnicity and Gender', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 483–96.

Luraghi, Nino, 'The Study of Greek Ethnic Identities', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 213–27.

Malik, Sarita, *Representing Black Britain: A History of Black and Asian Images on British Television*, Culture, Representation, and Identities (London: Sage, 2002).

—— 'How *Little Britain* does "Race" ', in *Reading Little Britain*, ed. Lockyer, 75–94.

—— & Darrell M. Newton (eds), *Adjusting the Contrast: British Television and Constructs of Race* (Manchester: Manchester U. P., 2019 [1st ed. 2017]).

—— 'Introduction', in *Adjusting the Contrast*, ed. Malik & Newton, 1–19.

Marks, Laura, 'Carers and Servers of the Jewish Community: The Marginalized Heritage of Jewish Women in Britain', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 106–27.

Marmur, Dow, 'The Challenge of Secularism', in *Jewish life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 49–57.

Marquand, David & Anthony Seldon (eds), *The Ideas that Shaped Post-War Britain* (London: Fontana Press, 1996).

Marriott, John, *Beyond the Tower: A History of East London* (New Haven/London: Yale U. P., 2011).

Martin, S. Rebecca, 'Ethnicity and Representation', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 356–75.

Marwick, Arthur, *British Society Since 1945*, The Penguin Social History of Britain (London: Penguin, 2003 [1st ed. Allen Lane, 1982]).

Mason, David, *Race & Ethnicity in Modern Britain*, Oxford Modern Britain (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1995).

May, Stephen, 'Multiculturalism', in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. Goldberg & Solomos, 124–44.

McDowell, Linda, *Redundant Masculinities? Employment Change and White Working Class Youth* (Malden, MA/Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

McInerney, Jeremy (ed.), *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2014).

McKenzie, Robert & Allan Silver, *Angels in Marble: Working Class Conservatives in Urban England* (London: Heinemann Educational, 1968).

McSmith, Andy, *No Such Thing as Society: A History of Britain in the 1980s* (London: Constable, 2011).

Medhurst, Andy, *A National Joke: Popular Comedy and English Cultural Identities* (London: Routledge, 2002).

Melamed, Avraham, *The Image of The Black in Jewish Culture: A History of the Other*, trans. Betty Sigler Rozen, Routledge Curzon Jewish Philosophy Series (London: Routledge Curzon, 2003).

Mendes-Flohr, Paul, 'Secular Forms of Jewishness', in *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*, ed. Neusner & Avery-Peck, 461–76.

Mercer, Kobena, 'Carnivalesque and grotesque: What Bakhtin's Laughter tells Us About Art and Culture', in *No Laughing Matter*, ed. Rosenthal, Bindman & Randolph, 1–19.

Mergenthal, Silvia, 'A Man Could Stand Up: Masculinities and the Great War', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 189–208.

Michael, Robert, *A History of Catholic Antisemitism: The Dark Side of the Church* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Miles, Robert & Annie Phizacklea, *White Man's Country: Racism in British Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 1984).

Miles, Robert, *Racism After 'Race Relations'* (London: Routledge, 1993).

—— & Malcolm Brown, *Racism*, Key Ideas (London: Routledge, 2003).

Mills, Brett, *The Sitcom*, TV Genres (Edinburgh: Edinburgh U. P., 2009).

Mills, Sara, *Michel Foucault*, Routledge Critical Thinkers (London/New York: Routledge, 2003).

Mongia, Padmini (ed.), *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader* (London/New York: Routledge, 2020).

Morrell, Robert & Sandra Stewart, 'Men in the Third World: Postcolonial Perspectives on Masculinity', in *Handbook of Studies of Men and Masculinities*, ed. Kimmel, Hearn & Connell, 90–113.

Mufti, Aamir R., *Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture* (Princeton: Princeton U. P., 2007).

Mulhearn, Francis, 'English Reading', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 250–64.

Munson, Rosario Vignolo, 'Herodotus and Ethnicity', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 341–55.

Murji, Karim & John Solomos (eds), *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2005).

Nahshon, Edna (ed.), *Jews and Shoes* (Oxford: Berg, 2008).

Nathoo, Ayesha, *Hearts Exposed: Transplants and the Media in 1960s Britain*, Science, Technology and Medicine in Modern History (Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Navasky, Victor S., *The Art of Controversy: Political Cartoons and Their Enduring Power* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013).

Nayak, Anoop. ' "Pale Warriors": Skinhead Culture and the Embodiment of White Masculinities', in *Thinking Identities*, ed. Brah, Hickman & Mac an Ghaill, 71–99.

Neale, Steve & Frank Krutnik, *Popular Film and Television Comedy*, Popular Fictions Series (London: Routledge, 1990).

Neusner, Jacob, 'Defining Judaism', in *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*, ed. Neusner & Avery-Peck, 3–19.

—— & Alan J. Avery-Peck (eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*, Blackwell Companions to Religion (Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003).

Newland, Paul, *The Cultural Construction of London's East End: Urban Iconography, Modernity and the Spacialisation of Englishness*, Spatial Practices (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008).

Newman, Aubrey, 'Setting the Scene: Anglo-Jewry in 1870', in *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life, 1870–1970*, ed. Levin, 1–12.

—— 'Recent Research in Anglo-Jewish History', in *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 75–82.

—— *The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–1985: A Brief Survey* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1987).

Newman, Chaim (ed.), *Gentile and Jew: A Symposium on the Future of the Jewish People* (London: Alliance Press, n.d. [*c.* 1945]).

Newton, Darrell M., *Paving the Empire Road: BBC Television and Black Britons* (Manchester: Manchester U. P., 2011).

Nicholls, William, *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate* (Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1995).

Nobil Ahmad, Ali, 'Gender and Generation in Pakistani Migration: A Critical Study of Masculinity', in *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain*, ed. Ryan & Webster, 155–70.

Nochlin, Linda, 'The Couturier and the Hasid', in *Too Jewish?*, ed. Kleeblatt, XVII–XX.

Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, intro. by Alex Massie (London: Polygon, 2021 [1st ed. London: Secker & Warburg, 1949]).

Ouellette, Laurie (ed.), *A Companion to Reality Television* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2014).

Palmer, Jerry, *The Logic of the Absurd: On Film and Television Comedy* (London: BFI Publishing, 1987).

Pannell, Norman & Fenner Brockway, *Immigration—What is the Answer?* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965).

Parekh, Bhikhu, 'Reflections on (1) The Language of Racism; (2) The Legacy of Colonialism; (3) Prejudice and the Press', in *The Black and White Media Book*, ed. Twitchin, 111–23.

—— 'National Identity in a Multicultural Society', in *From Legislation to Integration*, ed. Anwar, Roach & Sondhi, 196–211.

Park, Robert Ezra, *Race and Culture* (New York: Free Press, 1950).

Paton, George E. C., Chris Powell & Stephen Wagg (eds), *The Social Faces of Humour: Practices and Issues*, Popular Cultural Studies (Aldershot: Arena/Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1996).

Patterson, Sheila, *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain 1960–1967* (London: Institute of Race Relations [assoc. Oxford U. P.], 1969).

Paul, Kathleen, *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era* (Ithaca/London: Cornell U. P., 1997).

Pearl, Jonathan & Judith Pearl, *The Chosen Image: Television's Portrayal of Jewish Themes and Characters* (Jefferson/ London: McFarland & Co., 1999).

Pearse, Holly A., 'Negative Interfaith Romances and the Reassertion of Jewish Difference in Popular Film', in *Framing Jewish Culture*, ed. Bronner, 217–38.

Pelligrini, Ann, 'Whiteface Performances: "Race", Gender and Jewish Bodies', in *Jews and other Differences*, ed. Boyarin & Boyarin, 108–49.

Pickering, Michael, *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001).

—— (ed.), *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, Research Methods for the Arts and Humanities (Edinburgh: Edinburgh U. P., 2008).

—— 'Engaging with History', in *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, ed. Pickering, 193–213.

Piertese, Jan Nederson, 'Europe and Its Others', in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. Goldberg & Solomos, 17–24.

Pines, Jim (ed.), *Black and White in Colour: Black People in British Television Since 1936* (London: BFI Publishing, 1992).

Plath, Lydia, 'North Carolina and Nat Turner: Honour and Violence in a Slave Insurrection Scare', in *Black and White Masculinity in the American South, 1800–2000*, ed. Plath & Lussana (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 16–37.

—— & Sergio Lussana (eds), *Black and White Masculinity in the American South, 1800–2000* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009).

Plesske, Nora, ' "Sambo" and "Snowflake": Race and Race Relations in *Love Thy Neighbour*', in *British TV Comedy*, ed. Kamm & Neumann, 83–98.

Porter, Lorraine, 'Tarts, Tampons and Tyrants: Women and Representation in British Comedy', in *Because I Tell a Joke or Two*, ed. Wagg, 65–93.

Powell, Enoch, *A Nation Not Afraid: The Thinking of Enoch Powell*, ed. John Wood (London/Beccles: William Clowes & Sons [assoc. B. T. Batsford], 1965).

—— *Still to Decide*, ed. John Wood (London: Cox & Wyman [assoc. B. T. Batsford], 1972).

Powell, Vince, *From Rags to Gags: The Memoirs of a Comedy Writer*, Biography Series (Clacton-on-Sea: Apex, 2008).

Prais, S. J., 'Polarization or Decline? A Discussion of Some Statistical Findings on the Community', in *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 3–16.

Pramaggiore, Maria, 'History as Palimpsest: Stanley Kubrick's *Barry Lyndon* (1975)', in *A Companion to the Historical Film*, ed. Rosenstone & Parvelescu, 30–52.

Prell, Riv-Ellen, 'Why Jewish Princesses Don't Sweat: Desire and Consumption in Postwar American Jewish Culture', in *Too Jewish?*, ed. Kleeblatt, 74–92.

—— *Fighting to Become Americans: Assimilation and the Trouble Between Jewish Women and Jewish Men* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999).

—— 'The Utility of the Concept of "Ethnicity" for the Study of Jews', in *Ethnicity and Beyond*, ed. Lederhendler, 102–08.

Presner, Todd Samuel, *Muscular Judaism: The Jewish Body and the Politics of Regeneration* (London/New York: Routledge, 2007)

Procter, James, *Stuart Hall*, Routledge Critical Thinkers (London: Routledge, 2004).

Rabinow, Paul (ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon, 1984).

Ragussis, Michael, *Figures of Conversion: 'The Jewish Question' and English National Identity*, Post-Contemporary Interventions (London/Durham, NC: Duke U. P., 1995).

—— *Theatrical Nation: Jews and Other Outlandish Englishmen in Georgian Britain*, Haney Foundation Series (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

Ratcliffe, Peter, *'Race', Ethnicity and Difference: Imagining the Inclusive Society*, (Maidenhead: Open U. P., 2004).

Ravven, Heidi M. & Lenn Evan Goodman (eds), *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy*, SUNY Series in Jewish Philosophy (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002).

—— 'Introduction', in *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy*, ed. Ravven & Goodman, 3–16.

Reeves, Frank, *British Racial Discourse: A Study of British Political Discourse About Race and Race-Related Matters*, Comparative Ethnic and Race Relations Series (Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 2009).

Reger, Gary, 'Ethnic Identities, Borderlands and Hybridization', *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 112–26.

Reisigl, Martin & Ruth Wodak, *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism* (London: Routledge, 2001).

Reitter, Paul, *On the Origins of Jewish Self-Hatred* (Princeton/Oxford: Princeton U. P., 2012).

Reizbaum, Marilyn, 'A Nightmare of History: Ireland's Jews and Joyce's *Ulysses*', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 102–13.

Renan, Ernest, 'What is a Nation?' , in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 8–22.

Renton, David, *The Spice of Life: The Memoirs of The Rt. Hon. Lord Renton P.C., K.B.E., T.D., Q.C., D.L.* (London: Calder Walker Associates, 2006).

Rex, John & Robert Samuel Moore, *Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook* (London: Oxford U. P., 1979 [1st ed. 1966]).

Rex, John, *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State: Working Papers in the Theory of Multiculturalism and Political Integration*, Migration, Minorities and Citizenship (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996).

Richmond, Colin, 'Englishness and Medieval Anglo-Jewry', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 42–59.

Robbins, Bruce, 'Telescopic Philanthropy: Professionalism and Responsibility in *Bleak House*', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 213–30.

Robertson, Ritchie, 'Historicizing Weininger: The Nineteenth-Century German Image of the Feminized Jew', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 23–39.

Romanska, Magda & Alan L. Ackerman (eds), *Reader in Comedy: An Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2017).

—— 'Introduction', in *Reader in Comedy*, ed. Romanska & Ackerman, 1–15.

Rose, Jacqueline, 'Dorothy Richardson and the Jew', in *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature*, ed. Cheyette, 114–28.

Rosenstone, Robert A., 'The Historical Film as a Mode of Historical Thought', in *A Companion to the Historical Film*, ed. Rosenstone & Parvelescu, 71–87.

—— & Constantin Parvulescu (eds), *A Companion to the Historical Film* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

—— 'Introduction', in *A Companion to the Historical Film*, ed. Rosenstone & Parvelescu, 1–8.

Rosenthal, Angela, David Bindman & Adrian W. B. Randolph (eds), *No Laughing Matter: Visual Humor in Ideas of Race, Nationality, and Ethnicity*, Interfaces: Studies in Visual Culture (Lebanon, NH: Dartmouth College Press, 2016).

Roth, Cecil, 'The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Context of World Jewry', in *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, ed. Gould & Esh, 93–110.

Rozbicki, Michal Jan & George O. Ndege, *Cross-Cultural History and the Domestication of Otherness* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Rudavsky, T. M. (ed.), *Gender and Judaism: The Transformation of Tradition* (New York/London: New York U. P., 1995).

—— 'Introduction', in *Gender and Judaism: The Transformation of Tradition*, ed. Rudavsky, XIII–XVII.

Ryan, Louise & Wendy Webster (eds), *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain* (New York/Abingdon: Routledge, 2018).

—— 'Introduction', in *Gendering Migration*, ed. Ryan & Webster (New York/Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), 1–18.

Sacks, Jonathan, *Future Tense: A Vision for Jews and Judaism in the Global Culture* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2009).

Saha, Anamik, 'Scheduling Race', in *Adjusting the Contrast*, ed. Malik & Newton, 50–70.

Said, Edward W., *Culture & Imperialism* (New York: Random House, 1994).

—— *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004 [1st ed. Pantheon, 1978]).

Salomon, Sidney, *The Jews of Britain*, intro. Harry Samuels (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1939).

Sandbrook, Dominic, *Never Had it So Good: A History of Britain from Suez to the Beatles* (London: Abacus, 2006).

—— *White Heat: A History of Britain in the Swinging Sixties* (London: Abacus, 2007).

—— *State of Emergency: The Way We Were: Britain, 1970–1974* (London: Allen Lane, 2010).

—— *Seasons in the Sun: The Battle for Britain, 1974–1979* (London: Penguin, 2013).

Santner, Eric L., 'My Own Private Germany: Daniel Paul Schreber's Secret History of Modernity', in *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, ed. Cheyette & Marcus, 40–62.

Sartre, Jean–Paul, *Anti–Semite and Jew: An Exploration of the Etiology of Hate*, trans. George Joseph Becker (New York: Schocken Books, 1995 [1st French ed., *Réflexions sur la question juive* (Paris: Morihien, 1946)]).

—— *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003 [1st French Edition, *L'Être et le néant* (Paris: Gallimard, 1943)]).

Schaffer, Gavin, *The Vision of a Nation: Making Multiculturalism on British Television, 1960–80* (Houndmills/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

—— ' "You Don't Cure a Problem by Sweeping it Under the Carpet": Jews, Sitcoms and Race Relations in 1960s Britain', in *Hidden in Plain Sight*, ed. Abrams, 115–35.

—— 'Framing *the Fosters*: Jokes, Racism and Black and Asian Voices in British Comedy Television', in *Adjusting the Contrast*, ed. Malik & Newton, 176–95.

Schiff, Ellen, *From Stereotype to Metaphor: The Jew in Contemporary Drama*, SUNY Series in Modern Jewish Literature and Culture (Albany: SUNY Press, 1982).

Schoene, Berthold, 'Baffled Hopes and Bad Habits: Men, Marriage, and Queer Conformity in Queer Theory and Gay Representation', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 209–28.

Seaton, Jean, '*Pinkoes and Traitors': The BBC and the Nation, 1974–1987* (London: Profile Books, 2015).

Sharples, Caroline, 'Holocaust on Trial: Mass Observation and British Media Responses to the Nuremburg Tribunal', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 31–50.

—— & Olaf Jensen (eds), *Britain and the Holocaust: Remembering and Representing War and Genocide*, Holocaust and its Context (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

—— 'Introduction', in *Britain and the Holocaust*, ed. Sharples & Jensen, 1–12.

Shindler, Colin, *Ploughshares into Swords: Israelis and Jews in the Shadow of the Intifada* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1991).

Siapkas, Johannes, 'Ancient Ethnicity and Modern Identity', in *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. McInerney, 66–81.

Silverman, Eric, *A Cultural History of Jewish Dress*, Dress, Body, Culture (London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

Silverman, Max & Nira Yuval-Davis, 'Jews, Arabs and the Theorisation of Racism in Britain and France', in *Thinking Identities*, ed. Brah, Hickman & Mac an Ghaill, 25–48.

Simpson, David, 'Destiny Made Manifest: The Styles of Whitman's Poetry', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 177–96.

Smith, Richard, ' "The Black Peril": Race, Masculinity and Migration During the First World War', in *Gendering Migration*, ed. Ryan & Webster, 19–34.

Smith Wilson, Dolly, 'Gender, Race and the Ideal Labour Force', in *Gendering Migration*, ed. Ryan & Webster, 89–104.

Snead, James, 'European Pedigree/African Contagions: Nationality, Narrative, and Communality in Tutuola, Achebe, and Reed', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 231–49.

Sokoloff, Naomi B., 'Jewish Character? Stereotype and Identity in Fiction from Israel by Aharon Appelfeld and Sayed Kashua', in *Boundaries of Jewish Identity*, ed. Glenn & Sokoloff, 43–63.

Sollors, Werner, 'Ethnicity and Race', in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, ed. Goldberg & Solomos, 97–104.

Solomos, John *et al*, 'The Organic Crisis of British Capitalism and Race: The Experience of the Seventies', in *The Empire Strikes Back*, 9–46.

Solomos, John, *Race and Racism in Britain*, 3rd ed. (Houndmills/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003 [1st ed. 1993]).

Sommer, Doris, 'Irresistible Romance: The Foundational Fictions of Latin America', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 71–99.

Sounes, Howard, *Seventies: The Sights, Sounds and Ideas of a Brilliant Decade* (London: Pocket Books, 2007).

Spedding, James, Robert Leslie Ellis & Douglas Denon Heath (eds), *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount of St Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England*, 15 vols (London: Longman, Green & Co. *et al*, 1857–1874) VII, *Literary and Professional Works Vol. II* (1859).

Speight, Johnny, *The Thoughts of Chairman Alf: Alf Garnett's Little Blue Book; Or, Where England Went Wrong* (London: Robson Books, 1973)

—— *Till Death Us Do Part*, ed. John Frederick Burke (London: Pan Books, 1967).

—— *Till Death Us Do Part* (London: Woburn Press, 1973).

—— *It Stands to Reason: A Kind of Autobiography* (Walton-on-Thames: M. & J. Hobbes, 1973).

—— *For Richer, For Poorer: A Kind of Autobiography* (London: BBC Books, 1991).

Squires, Catherine R., 'The Conundrum of Race and Reality Television', in *A Companion to Reality Television*, ed. Ouellette, 264–82.

Steyn, Juliet, *The Jew: Assumptions of Identity* (London: Cassell, 1999).

Stott, Andrew, *Comedy*, The New Critical Idiom (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014).

Stratton, Jon, *Jewish Identity in Western Pop Culture: The Holocaust and Trauma Through Modernity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Strinati, Dominic, *An Introduction to Studying Popular Culture* (London/New York: Routledge, 2000).

Strinati, Dominic & Stephen Wagg (eds), *Come on Down? Popular Media Culture in Post-War Britain* (London/New York: Routledge, 1992).

Summers, Anne, *Christian and Jewish Women in Britain, 1880–1940: Living with Difference*, Palgrave Critical Studies of Antisemitism and Racism (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

Swift, Simon, *Hannah Arendt*, Routledge Critical Thinkers (Abingdon, Routledge, 2009).

Telushkin, Rabbi Joseph, *Jewish Humor: What the Best Jewish Jokes Say About the Jews* (New York: Perennial, 2002).

Thom, Martin, 'Tribes within Nations: The Ancient Germans and the History of Modern France', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Bhabha, 23–43.

Todorov, Tzvetan, *On Diversity: Nationalism, Racism, and Exoticism in French Thought*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard U. P., 1993).

Trubowitz, Lara, 'Acting Like an Alien: "Civil" Antisemitism, the Rhetoricized Jew, and Early Twentieth Century British Immigration Law', in *'The Jew' in Late Victorian and Edwardian Culture*, ed. Bar-Yosef & Valman, 65–79.

Turner, Alwyn W., *Crisis? What Crisis? Britain in the 1970s* (London: Aurum, 2013).

Twitchin, John (ed.), *The Black and White Media Book: Handbook for the Study of Racism and Television* (Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books, 1988).

Verma, Gajendra, 'Attitudes, Race Relations and Television', in *The Black and White Media Book*, ed. Twitchin, 123–30.

Vice, Sue, *Jack Rosenthal*, The Television Series (Manchester/New York: Manchester U. P., 2009).

—— '*Grandma's House* and the Charms of the Petit Bourgeoisie', in *Social Class and Television Drama in Contemporary Britain*, ed. Forrest & Johnson, 245–60.

Vorspan, Albert, *Great Jewish Debates and Dilemmas: Jewish Perspectives on Moral Issues in Conflict in the Eighties* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1980).

Wagg, Stephen (ed.), *Because I Tell a Joke or Two: Comedy, Politics and Social Difference* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998).

—— ' "At Ease, Corporal": Social Class and the Situation Comedy in British Television, from the 1950s to the 1990s', in *Because I Tell a Joke or Two*, ed. Wagg, 1–31.

Ward, Mark, *A Family at War: The Unofficial and Unauthorised Guide to Till Death Us Do Part* (Tolworth: Telos Publishing, 2008).

Webber, Jonathan, 'Representing Jewish Culture: The Problem of Boundaries', in *Framing Jewish Culture*, ed. Bronner, 33–76.

Webster, Wendy, *Englishness and Empire 1939–1965* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2005).

—— 'Britain and the Refugees of Europe 1939–50', in *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain*, ed. Ryan & Webster, 35–52.

Weight, Richard, *Patriots: National Identity in Britain 1940–2000* (London: Macmillan, 2002).

Whickham, Phil, 'Twenty-First Century British Sitcom and "the Hidden Injuries of Class" ', in *Social Class and Television Drama in Contemporary Britain*, ed. Forrest & Johnson, 201–14.

Whitehouse, Mary, *Ban This Filth! Letters from the Mary Whitehouse Archive*, ed. Ben Thompson (London: Faber & Faber, 2012).

Williams, Bill, 'Local Jewish History: Where Do We Go From Here?', in *Jewish Life in Britain, 1962–1977*, ed. Lipman & Lipman, 95–108.

—— 'Heritage and Community: The Rescue of Manchester's Jewish Past', in *The Jewish Heritage in British History*, ed. Kushner, 128–46.

Williams, Jack, *Entertaining the Nation: A Social History of British Television* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2004).

Williams, Mark, 'Passing for History: Humor and Early Television Historiography', in *No Laughing Matter*, ed. Rosenthal, Bindman & Randolph, 176–200.

Williams, Raymond, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana, 1988 [1st ed. Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1976]).

Wills, Clair, *Lovers and Strangers: An Immigrant History of Post-War Britain* (London: Penguin, 2018 [1st ed. Allen Lane, 2017]).

Wilson, Harold, *The Labour Government 1964–1970: A Personal Record* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson [assoc. Michael Joseph], 1971).

—— *Final Term: The Labour Government 1974–1976* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson [assoc. Michael Joseph], 1979).

Winkgens, Meinhard, 'Cultural Hybridity and Fluid Masculinities in the Postcolonial Metropolis: Individualized Gender Identities in Hanif Kureishi's *The Buddha of Suburbia* and *The Black Album*', in *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Horlacher, 229–246.

Winter, Thomas, 'Crisis of Masculinity', in *American Masculinities: A Historical Encyclopedia*, ed. Carroll, 117–19.

Wisse, Ruth, 'No Joke: Making Jewish Humor (2013)', in *Reader in Comedy*, ed. Romanska & Ackerman, 355–58.

Wistrich, Robert S., *Anti-Semitism: The Longest Hatred* (London: Thames Mandarin, 1992).

Wybrow, Robert J., *Britain Speaks Out, 1937–87: A Social History As Seen Through the Gallup Data* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1989).

Zer-Zion, Shelly, 'The Wanderer's Shoe. The Cobbler's Penalty: The Wandering Jew in Search of Salvation', in *Jews and Shoes*, ed. Nahshon, 133–48.

Zupančič, Alenka, *The Odd One In: On Comedy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008)

Journal Articles

Aaronovitch, David, 'Maureen Lipman', *Jewish Quarterly*, 53:4 (2006), 22–24.

Aaron, Michele, 'The queer Jew and cinema: from *Yidl* to *Yentl* and back and beyond', *Jewish Culture and History*, 3:1 (2000), 23–44.

Abbas, Tahir, ' "Last of the dinosaurs": *Citizen Kahn* as institutionalisation of Pakistani stereotypes in British television comedy', *South Asian Popular Culture*, 11:1 (2013), 85–90.

Adler, Franklin Hugh, 'Antiracism, difference and xenologica', *Cultural Values*, 3:4 (1999), 492–502.

Ahmed, Abdul-Azim, 'Faith in comedy: representations of Muslim identity in British comedy', *South Asian Popular Culture*, 11:1 (2013), 91–96

Ahmed, Nasim, 'Race relations in Britain', *Pakistan Horizon*, 21:2 (1968), 108–15.

Alderman, Geoffrey, 'Jews and electoral politics in the United Kingdom: a contemporary note', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 52:1 (2010), 69–74.

—— 'London Jewry and the London mayoral election of 2012: a note', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 54:1–2 (2012), 87–92.

Alexander, Claire, 'Stuart Hall and "Race" ', *Cultural Studies*, 23:4 (2009), 457–82.

—— 'Making Bengali Brick Lane: claiming and contesting space in East London', *British Journal of Sociology*, 62:2 (2011), 201–20.

—— '*The Empire Strikes Back*: 30 years on', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37:10 (2014), 1784–92.

Alexander, Richard, 'British comedy and humour: social and cultural background', *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 9:1 (1984), 63–83.

Alibhai-Brown, Yasmin *et al*, 'Braithwaite, Silverstein and Shah: a roundtable on Black-Jewish-Muslim relations in Britain', *Jewish Quarterly*, 44:2 (1997), 19–30.

Allinson, Ewan, 'It's a black thing: hearing how whites can't', *Cultural Studies*, 8:3 (1994), 438–56.

Almog, Orna, 'An end of an era—the crisis of 1958 and the Anglo-Israeli relationship', 8:1 (1994), 49–76.

Anderson, Catherine E., 'Red coats and black shields: race and masculinity in British representations of the Anglo-Zulu war', in *Victorian Masculinities*, ed. Graeme Smart & Amelia Yeates, *Critical Survey*, 20:3 (2008), 6–28.

Andrews, Kehinde, Leah Bassel & Aaron Winter, 'The British Sociological Association race and ethnicity study group conference "mapping the field: contemporary theories of race, racism and ethnicity" ', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37:10 (2014), 1862–68.

Armstrong, Nancy, 'Who's afraid of the cultural turn?', *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 12:2 (2001), 17–49.

Aspinall, Peter J., 'Social representations of "mixed-race" in early twenty-first century Britain: content, limitations, and counter-narratives', *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 38:7 (2015), 1067–83.

Atluri, Tara, 'Lighten up?! Humour, race, and da off colour joke of Ali G', *Media, Culture & Society*, 31:2 (2009), 197–214.

Aughey, Arthur, 'Anxiety and injustice: the anatomy of contemporary English nationalism', *Nations and Nationalism*, 16:3 (2010), 506–24.

Backouche, Isabelle & Sarah Gensburger, 'Anti-semitism and urban development in France in the second world war: the case of *Îlot* 16 in Paris', *Contemporary European History,* 23:3 (2014), 381–403.

Bailkin, Jordanna, 'Leaving home: the politics of deportation in postwar Britain', *Journal of British Studies*, 47:4 (2008), 852–82.

Bale, Anthony P., 'Richard of Devizes and fictions of Judaism', *Jewish Culture and History,* 3:2 (2000), 55–72.

Banton, Michael, 'The race relations problematic', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 42:1 (1991), 115–30.

—— 'Three current issues in ethnic and racial studies', *British Journal of Sociology*, 56:4 (2005), 621–33.

Barberis, Peter, 'Introduction: the 1964 general election—the "not quite, but" and "but only just" election', in *The 1964 General Election—the 'Not Quite, But' and 'But Only Just' Election*, ed. Peter Barberis, *Contemporary British History* 23:3 (2007), 283–94.

Barker, Paul & Hanvey, John, 'Facing two ways: between the 60s and the 70s', *New Society* (27 November 1969), 847–50.

Barnes, John & Anthony Seldon, '1951–64: 13 wasted years? Part 1: the argument', *Contemporary Record*, 1:2 (1987), 19−21.

Barnett, Correlli, 'Reply to criticisms on the thesis of *The Audit of War*', *Contemporary Record*, 1:3 (1987), 33.

—— *et al.*, 'Britain's postwar industrial decline', *Contemporary Record*, 1:2 (1987), 11−18.

Barnum, David G. & John L. Sullivan, 'Attitudinal tolerance and political freedom in Britain', *British Journal of Political Science*, 19:1 (1989), 136–46.

Baron, Ilan Zvi, 'The Jewish question in the 21st century: an unanswered question? Exploring the Jewish question in literature and politics', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 56:1–2 (2014), 5–28.

Barthes, Roland & Lionel Duisit, 'An introduction to the structural analysis of narrative', in *On Narrative and Narratives*, ed. Roland Barthes & Lionel Duisit, *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation*, 6:2 (1975), 237−72.

Bartlett, Robert, 'Medieval and modern concepts of race and ethnicity', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31:1 (2001), 39–56.

Bebber, Brett, '*Till Death Us Do Part*: political satire and social realism in the 1960s and 1970s', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 34:2 (2014), 253–74.

Bentwich, Norman, 'The social transformation of Anglo-Jewry 1883–1960', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 2:1 (1960), 16–24.

Bernasconi, Robert, 'Where is xenophobia in the fight against racism?', *Critical Philosophy of Race*, 2:1 (2014), 5–19.

Bhattacharyya, Gargi, 'Rereading *The Empire Strikes Back*', in *Symposium: The Empire Strikes Back*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37:10 (2014), 1802–07.

Bidnall, Amanda M., 'West Indian interventions at the heart of the cultural establishment: Edric Connor, Pearl Connor, and the BBC', *Twentieth Century British History*, 24:1 (2013), 58–83.

Bindas, Kenneth J. & Kenneth J. Heineman, 'Image is everything? Television and the counterculture message in the 1960s', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 21:1 (1994), 22–37.

Blaazer, David, 'Sharks and Shylocks: Englishness and otherness in popular discourse on "the City" 1870–1914', *National Identities*, 18:2 (2016), 139–55.

Black, Lawrence, 'Whose finger on the button? British television and the politics of cultural control', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 25:4 (2005), 547–75.

—— & Hugh Pemberton, 'The winter of discontent in British politics', *The Political Quarterly*, 80:4 (2009), 553−61.

Blanchard, Simon, 'The two faces of channel four: some notes in retrospect', in *Channel 4 and British Film Culture*, ed. Paul McDonald *et al, Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 33:3 (2013), 365–76.

Bland, Benjamin, 'Holocaust inversion, anti-zionism and British neo-fascism: the Israel-Palestine conflict and the extreme right in post-war Britain', in *British Jewry, Antisemitism and the Holocaust: The Work and Legacy of David Cesarani*, ed. Dan Stone, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 53:1 (2019), 86–97.

Bland, Lucy, 'White women and men of colour: miscegenation fears in Britain after the Great War', *Gender & History*, 17:1 (2005), 29–61.

Bord, Joe, 'Voluntarism and conservative pluralism: reconsidering Jewish refugee assistance on the British home front 1939–44', *Contemporary British History*, 16:4 (2002), 17–50.

Boskin, Jospeh & Joseph Dorinson, 'Ethnic Humor: Subversion and Survival', in *American Humor*, ed. Arthur Power Dudden with Peter M. Briggs, *American Quarterly*, 37:1 (1985), 81–97.

Bowyer, Benjamin T., 'The contextual determinants of whites' racial attitudes in England', *British Journal of Political Science*, 39:3 (2009), 559–86.

Brook, Vincent, 'The four *Jazz Singers*: mapping the Jewish assimilation narrative', *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, 10:3 (2011), 401–20.

Brotz, Howard, 'The position of the Jews in English society', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 1:1 (1959), 94–113.

Brubaker, Rodgers & Frederick Cooper, 'Beyond "Identity" ', *Theater and Society*, 29:1 (2000), 1–47.

Buchan, Alastair, 'Multicoloured Britain', *International Journal*, 23:4 (1968), 520–30.

Bush, Jonathan A., ' "You're gonna miss me when I'm gone": early modern common law discourse and the case of the Jews', *Wisconsin Law Review*, 5 (1993), 1225–85.

Caplan, Jane & David Feldman, 'Laughing out loud: "official" humour in three dictatorships, introduction', *History Workshop Journal*, 79:1 (2015), 177–80.

Carson, John, 'A matter of policy: the lessons of recent British race relations legislation', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 8:2 (1976), 154–77.

Cesarani, David, 'The dynamics of diaspora: the transformation of British Jewish identity', *Jewish Culture and History*, 4:1 (2001), 53–64.

—— 'How post-war Britain reflected on the Nazi persecution and mass murder of Europe's Jews: a reassessment of early responses', *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 95–130.

Chakrabarti, Sumit, 'Moving beyond Edward Said: Homi Bhabha and the problem of postcolonial representation', *International Studies. Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal*, 14:1 (2012), 5–21.

Cohen, Deborah, 'Who was who? Race and Jews in turn-of-the-century Britain', *Journal of British Studies*, 41:4 (2002), 460–83.

Colley, Linda, 'Britishness and otherness: an argument', in *Britishness and Europeanness: Who Are the British Anyway?*, ed. Cynthia Herrup, *Journal of British Studies*, 31:4 (1992), 309–29.

Collins, Marcus, 'Pride and prejudice: West Indian men in mid-twentieth century Britain', *Journal of British Studies*, 40:3 (2001), 391–418.

Collins, Tony, 'Return to manhood: the cult of masculinity and the British union of fascists', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 16:4 (1999), 145–62.

Consonni, Manuela, 'The new grammar of otherness: Europe, the Shoah and the Jews', *Jewish History*, 24:2 (2010), 105–26.

Cooper, Davina & Didi Herman, 'Jews and other uncertainties: race, faith and English law', *Legal Studies*, 19:3 (1999), 339–66.

Cooper, Megan, 'Bond-men: An analysis of the James Bond films' impact on British masculinity of the 1960s', *History Matters: An Undergraduate Journal of Historical Research*, 14 (2017), 16–34.

Corbally, John, 'The jarring Irish: postwar immigration to the heart of empire', *Radical History Review*, 104 (2009), 103–25.

—— 'The othered Irish: shades of difference in post-war Britain, 1948–71', *Contemporary European History*, 24:1 (2015), 105–25.

Couldry, Nick, 'Illusions of immediacy: rediscovering Hall's early work on media', *Media, Culture & Society*, 37:4 (2015), 637–44.

Cranmer, Frank, 'Who is a Jew? Jewish faith schools and the race relations act 1976', *Law and Justice: The Christian Law Review*, 164 (2010), 75–83.

Davis, John, 'Rents and race in 1960s London: new light on Rachmanism', *Twentieth Century British History*, 12:1 (2001), 69–92.

Dean, Dennis, 'The race relations policy of the first Wilson government', *Twentieth Century British History*, 11:3 (2000), 259–83.

Dickey, Anthony, 'English law and race defamation', *New York Law Forum*, 14 (1968), 9–32.

Dowrick, F. E., 'Christian values in the legislative process in Britain in the sixties', *American Journal of Jurisprudence* 16:1 (1971), 156–83.

Dresser, Madge, 'The painful rite: Jewish circumcision in English thought 1753–1945', *Jewish Quarterly*, 44:2 (1997), 15–17.

—— 'Minority rites: the strange history of circumcision in English thought', *Jewish Culture and History*, 1:1 (1998), 72–87.

Eaton, Mick, 'Television situation comedy', *Screen*, 19:4 (1978), 61–90.

Eley, Geoff, 'Stuart Hall, 1932–2014', *History Workshop Journal*, 79:1 (2015), 303–20.

Elliott, Matthew, 'A review of cabinet papers January–March 1966', *Contemporary British History*, 11:1 (1997), 123–30.

—— 'A review of cabinet papers, April–June 1966', *Contemporary British History*, 11:2 (1997), 150–55.

—— 'A review of cabinet papers, July–September 1966', *Contemporary British History*, 11:3 (1997), 113–19.

—— 'A review of cabinet papers, October–December 1966', *Contemporary British History*, 11:4 (1997), 123–28.

Ellis, David, ' "The produce of more than one country": race, identity, and discourse in post-Windrush Britain', *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 31:2 (2001), 214–32.

Ellis, Nadia, 'Black migrants, white queers and the archive of inclusion in postwar London', *Interventions. International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 17:6 (2015), 893–915.

Emerson, Joan P., 'Negotiating the serious import of humor', *Sociometry*, 32:2 (1969), 169–81.

Endelman, Todd M., 'Fighting antisemitism with numbers in early twentieth-century Britain', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 52:1 (2019), 9–22.

Ewence, Hannah, 'Blurring the boundaries of difference: *Dracula*, the Empire, and "the Jew" ', *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 213–22.

—— 'The Jew in the *eruv*, the Jew in the suburb: contesting the public face and the private space of British Jewry', *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:3 (2010), 477–86.

Feldman, David, 'There was an Englishman, an Irishman and a Jew…: Immigrants and minorities in Britain', *The Historical Journal*, 26:1 (1983), 185–99.

—— 'Conceiving difference: religion, race and the Jews in Britain, *c.*1750–1900', *History Workshop Journal*, 76:1 (2013), 160–86.

Forman, John *et al*, 'Jews and the right: natural bedfellows?', *Jewish Quarterly*, 62:1 (2015), 18–22.

Foster, Kevin, 'Migrants, asylum seekers and British identity', in *Fortress Europe: Migration, Culture and Representation*, ed. Yosefa Loshitzky, *Third Text*, 20:6 (2006), 683–91.

Francis, Martin, 'The domestication of the male? Recent research on nineteenth- and twentieth-century British masculinity', *The Historical Journal*, 45:3 (2002), 637–52.

Free, Marcus, 'From the "other" island to the one with "no west side": the Irish in British soap and sitcom', *Irish Studies Review*, 9:2 (2001), 215–27.

Freedman, D., 'Modernising the BBC: Wilson's government and television 1964–1966', *Contemporary British History*, 15:1 (2001), 21–40.

Friedman, Norman L., 'Responses of blacks and other minorities to television shows of the 1970s about their groups', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 7:1 (1978–1980), 85–102.

Galchinsky, Michael, 'Africans, Indians, Arabs and Scots: Jewish and other questions in the age of empire', in *Liberalism and Anti-semitism*, ed. Bryan Cheyette & Nadia Valman, *Jewish Culture and History*, 6:1 (2003), 46–60.

Gat, Moshe, 'Britain and Israel before and after the Six Day War, June 1967: from support to hostility', *Contemporary British History*, 18:1 (2004), 54–77.

Gidley, Ben & Keith Kahn-Harris, 'Contemporary Anglo-Jewish community leadership: coping with multiculturalism', *British Journal of Sociology*, 63:1 (2012), 168–87.

Gilbert, Ruth, 'Displaced, dysfunctional and divided: British-Jewish writing today', in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 267–80.

—— 'My big fat Jewish TV dinner: reflections on British Jewishness in *Friday Night Dinner* and *Grandma's House*', *Jewish Film & New Media: An International Journal*, 2:2 (2014), 181–200.

Gillota, David, 'Negotiating Jewishness: *Curb Your Enthusiasm* and the schlemiel tradition', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 38:4 (2010), 152–61.

Gilroy, Paul *et al*, 'A diagnosis of contemporary forms of racism, race and nationalism: a conversation with professor Paul Gilroy', *Cultural Studies*, 33:2, (2019), 173–97.

Gonzalez-Lesser, Emma, 'Bio-logics of Jewishness: media constructions of the nuances of race and ethnicity', *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 27:2 (2020), 517–36.

Gottlieb, Julie, 'Women and fascism in the East End', *Jewish Culture and History*, 1:2 (1998), 31–47.

Granville, Shannon, 'Downing Street's favourite soap opera: evaluating the impact and influence of *Yes, Minister* and *Yes, Prime Minister*', *Contemporary British History*, 23:3 (2009), 315–36.

Gundle, Stephen, 'Laughter under fascism: humour and ridicule in Italy, 1922–43', *History Workshop Journal*, 79:1 (2015), 181–97.

HaCohen, Ran, 'The "Jewish Blackness" Thesis Revisited', *Religions*, 9:7 (2018); n.p., available online at <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9070222> (accessed 25 November 2018).

Hamilton, Winifred H. 'Race relations and the law in England', *Washburn Law Journal*, 8:2 (1969), 167–87.

Harris, Sydney, 'The identity of Jews in an English city', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 14:1 (1972), 63–84.

Hartz, Steven J., 'Race relations and the law in Britain', *Temple Law Quarterly*, 41:4 (1968), 429–56.

Hay, Colin, 'The winter of discontent thirty years on', *The Political Quarterly*, 80:4 (2009), 545−52.

Healy, Murray, 'Were we being served? Homosexual representation in popular British comedy', *Screen*, 36:3 (1995), 243–56.

Herman, Didi, ' "An unfortunate coincidence": Jews and Jewishness in twentieth-century English judicial discourse', *Journal of Law and Society*, 33:2 (2006), 277–301.

—— ' "The wandering Jew has no nation": Jewishness and race relations law', in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 131–158.

Hersch, Charles, ‘ “Every time I try to play black it comes out sounding Jewish”: Jewish jazz musicians and racial identity’, *American Jewish History*, 97:3 (2013), 259–82.

Holdorph, Anne, ‘ “If I strive not after my own salvation, who shall strive for me, and if not now, when?” The role of religion in the West Central Jewish Working Girls’ Club, 1893–1939’, in *Women, State and Nation: Creating Gendered Identities*, ed. Fiona Reid & Stephanie Ward, *Women’s History Review*, 24:1 (2019), 37–52.

Holmes, Colin, ‘Violence and race relations in Britain, 1953–1968’, *Phylon*, 36:2 (1975), 113–24.

Howells, Richard, ‘ “Is it because I is black?” Race, humour and the polysemiology of Ali G’, *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 26:2 (2006), 155–77.

Jordan, James, ‘Assimilated, integrated, other: an introduction to Jews and British television, 1946–55’, in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 251–66.

—— ‘Another man’s faith? The image of Judaism in the BBC television series *Men Seeking God*’, in *Image Conscious: Jewish Visuals and Visualising Jews through the Ages*, ed. Hannah Ewence & Helen Spurling, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:3 (2010), 463–76.

—— ‘A wandering view: writing Jews and Jewishness on British television’, *European Judaism: A Journal for the New Europe,* 47:2 (2014), 50–59.

Jordan, Peter E., ‘Repressing the male gaze? Sidney J. Furie’s *The Leather Boys* and the growing pains of post-war British masculinity’, *Film Criticism*, 43:1 (2019); n.p., available online at <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/f/fc/13761232.0043.101/--repressing-the-male-gaze-sidney-j-furies-the-leather-boys?rgn=main;view=fulltext> (accessed 10 June 2019).

Julin, Grant, ‘Satire in a multi-cultural world: a Bakhtinian analysis’, *Comedy Studies* 9:2 (2018), 150–70.

Kalra, Virinder S., ‘Between emasculation and hypermasculinity: theorizing British South Asian masculinities’, *South Asian Popular Culture*, 7:2 (2009), 113–25.

Kassimeris, George & Leonie Jackson, ‘Negotiating race and religion in the West Midlands: narratives of inclusion and exclusion during the 1967–69 Wolverhampton bus workers’ turban dispute’, *Contemporary British History*, 31:3 (2017), 343–65.

Kenefick, William ‘Comparing the Jewish and Irish communities in twentieth century Scotland’, *Jewish Culture and History*, 9:2–3 (2007), 60–78.

Kerr, Paul, ‘Situation comedies…and television situations, surveyed’, *Screen*, 24:1 (1983), 71–74.

Kershen, Anne, ‘From *Mons Pays*, the *Shtetl* and the *Desh* to London’s East End: a rationale for comparative migrant studies’, in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2, (2010), 317–26.

Klaff, Lesley, ‘What is an English Jew?: The Legal Construction of Jewish Identity Under the UK Equality Act of 2010’, *Indiana Journal of Law and Social Equality*, 11:1 (2023), 208–28.

Klein, Bethany, ‘Entertaining ideas: social issues in entertainment television’, *Media, Culture & Society*, 33:6 (2011), 905–21.

Krausz, Ernest, ‘An Anglo-Jewish community: Leeds’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 3:1 (1961), 88–106.

Kushner, Tony & Hannah Ewence, ‘Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts’, in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 1–26.

Lamek, P. S. A., ‘In Re Lysaght: Hill v. The Royal College of Surgeons, [1965] 3 W.L.R. 391W.L.R. 391’, *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 4–1 (1966), 113–21.

Lasdun, James *et al*, ‘A symposium on jokes’, *The Threepenny Review*, 143 (2015), 14–17.

Lasson, Kenneth, ‘Racism in Great Britain: drawing the line on free speech’, *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, 7:2 (1987), 161–81.

Lerner, Julia, ‘ “Mixed Jew—it’s like being half pregnant”: Russian-Jewish mixedness in the bureaucratic encounter with the Jewish State’, in *A Rising Tide? Mixed Families in Israel*, ed. Sylvie Fogiel-Bijaoui, *Journal of Israeli History*, 36:2 (2017), 271–89.

Lugones, María, ‘Heterosexualism and the colonial/modern gender system’, *Hypatia*, 22:1 (2007), 186–209.

Lustgarten, Laurence, ‘The grounds of discrimination under the Race Relations Act 1976 in the United Kingdom’, *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 28:2 (1979), 221–40.

Maguire, Anna, ‘ “You wouldn’t want your daughter marrying one”: parental intervention into mixed-race relationships in post-war Britain’, *Historical Research* 92:256 (2019), 432–44.

Malik, Sarita, ‘Reflections on representing Black Britain’, *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 2022, n.p.; available online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2022.2138502> (accessed 2 July 2023).

Maloney, Paul & Adrienne Scullion, ‘Glasgow’s Jewish Institute players and their narratives of Scottish-Jewish identity’, in *Jews: Migration, Movement, Location*, ed. Hannah Holtschneider, *Jewish Culture and History*, 20:1 (2019), 80–98.

Mass, Sarah, ‘Sunday rites or Sunday rights? Anglo-Jewish traders and the negotiability of the mid-century sabbath’, *History of Retailing and Consumption* 2:1 (2016), 68–83.

McKenna, Ian B., ‘Racial Discrimination’, *The Modern Law Review*, 46:6 (1983), 759–70.

Mead, Matthew, ‘*Empire Windrush*: the cultural memory of an imaginary arrival’, in *Rerouting the Postcolonial*, ed. Janet Wilson, Fiona Tolan & Sarah Lawson Welsh, *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 45:2 (2009), 137–49.

Meer, Nasar, ‘Revisiting the crossroads: returning to *The Empire Strikes Back*’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37:10 (2014), 1793–1801.

Merwin, Ted, ‘Jew-Face: non-Jews playing Jews on the American stage’, *Cultural and Social History: The Journal of the Social History Society*, 4:2 (2007), 215–34.

Merziger, ‘ “Totalitarian humour”? National Socialist propaganda and active audiences in entertainment’, *History Workshop Journal*, 79:1 (2015), 181–97.

Mills, Brett, ‘Comedy verité: contemporary sitcom form’, *Screen*, 45:1 (2004), 63–78.

—— ‘ “Paranoia, paranoia, everybody’s coming to get me”: *Peep Show*, sitcom, and the surveillance society’, *Screen*, 49:1 (2008), 51–64.

Mintz, Lawrence E., ‘Ideology in the television situation comedy’, *Studies in Popular Culture* 8:2 (1985), 42–51.

Mulvey, Laura, ‘Visual pleasure and narrative cinema’, *Screen*, 16:3 (1975), 6–18.

Murray, Peter, ‘Big causes and small nations: Michael Sayers, writing, Fascism, Communism and Jewish-Irishness’, *Irish Studies Review*, 26:4 (2018), 531–48.

Nagel, Joane, ‘Masculinity and nationalism: gender and sexuality in the making of nations’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21:2 (1998), 242–69.

Nava, Mica, ‘Gender and racial others in postwar Britain’, in *Fortress Europe: Migration, Culture and Representation*, ed. Yosefa Loshitzky, *Third Text*, 20:6 (2006), 671–82.

Ordene, Jason, ‘Who is a Jew? An analytical examination of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom’s JFS case: why the matrilineal test for Jewish identity is not in violation of the Race Relations Act of 1976’, *Rutgers Journal of Law and Religion*, 13:2 (2012), 479–510.

Paul, Kathleen, ‘ “British subjects” and “British stock”: Labour’s postwar imperialism’, *Journal of British Studies*, 34:2 (1995), 233–76.

Pearlman, Estelle, ‘The representation of Jews on Edwardian postcards’, *Jewish Culture and History*, 6:1 (2003), 217–42.

Pellew, Jill, ‘The Home Office and the Aliens Act, 1905’, *The Historical Journal*, 32:2 (1989), 369–85.

Pickering, Michael, ‘Race, gender and broadcast comedy: the case of the BBC’s *Kentucky Minstrels*’, *European Journal of Communication*, 9:3 (1994), 311–33.

Pinar, William F., ‘Introduction’, in William F. Pinar, *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, & The Crisis of Masculinity*, *Counterpoints*, 163 (2001), 1–44.

—— ‘The “crisis” of white masculinity’, in William F. Pinar, *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, & The Crisis of Masculinity*, *Counterpoints*, 163 (2001), 321–416.

—— ‘The gender of violence’, in William F. Pinar, *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, & The Crisis of Masculinity*, *Counterpoints*, 163 (2001), 815–54.

—— ‘Black men: you don’t even know who I am’, in William F. Pinar, *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, & The Crisis of Masculinity*, *Counterpoints*, 163 (2001), 855–938.

—— ‘White men: I don’t even know who I am’, in William F. Pinar, *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, & The Crisis of Masculinity*, *Counterpoints*, 163 (2001), 939–80.

—— ‘ “I am a man”: The queer character of racial politics and violence in America’, in William F. Pinar, *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, & The Crisis of Masculinity*, *Counterpoints*, 163 (2001), 1113–64.

Pinto, Diana, ‘Negotiating Jewish identity in an asemitic age’, in *Jewish Identities in Contemporary Europe*, ed. Lucille Cairns & Andrea Reiter, *Jewish Culture and History* 14:2–3 (2013), 68–77.

Plain, Gill, ‘From Shorty Blake to Tubby Binns: *Dunkirk* and the representation of working class masculinity in postwar British cinema’, *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, 9:2 (2012), 177–97.

—— ‘Structures of authority: post-war masculinity and the British police’, *Itinéraires*, 2014:3 (2015); n.p., available online at <https://journals.openedition.org/itineraires/2613> (accessed 16 July 2018).

Plender, Richard, ‘Protection of immigrant and racial minorities: a survey in British legal history’, *William & Mary Law Review*, 13:2 (1971), 338–87.

Pollins, Harold, ‘Sociological aspects of Anglo-Jewish literature’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 2:1 (1960), 25–41.

Prais, S. J., ‘Synagogue statistics and the Jewish population of Great Britain, 1900–1970’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 14:2 (1972), 215–28.

—— & Marlena Schmool, ‘The size and structure of the Anglo-Jewish community 1960–65’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 10:1 (1968), 5–34.

Rabin, Dana, ‘The Jew Bill of 1753: Masculinity, Virility, and the Nation’, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39:2 (2006), 157–71.

Rattansi, Ali, ‘On being and not being brown/black-British: racism, class, sexuality and ethnicity in post-imperial Britain’, *Interventions. International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 2:1 (2000), 118–34.

Rawlings, Philip, ‘Judges, politics and property: the interpretation of legislation on race relations and immigration’, *Cambrian Law Review*, 16 (1985), 98–115.

Reizbaum Marilyn, ‘Max Nordau and the Generation of Jewish Muscle’, *Jewish Culture and History*, 6:1 (2003), 130–51

Roberts, Brian, ‘Blackface minstrelsy and Jewish identity: fleshing out ragtime as the central metaphor in E. L. Doctorow’s Ragtime’, *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 45:3 (2004), 247–60.

Rosenwein, Barbara H., ‘Worrying about emotions in history’, *American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), 821–45.

Rogin, Michael, ‘Blackface, white noise: the Jewish jazz singer finds his voice’, *Critical Inquiry*, 18:3 (1992), 417–53.

Saha, Anamik, ‘ “Beards, scarves, halal meat, terrorists, forced marriage”: television industries and the production of “Race” ’, *Media, Culture & Society*, 34:4 (2012), 424–38.

Samson, Maxim G. M., ‘*Krav Maga* and chicken soup: symbolic Jewish identities within and beyond the Jewish school’, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 40:6 (2019), 742–58.

Schaffer, Gavin, ‘Dilemmas of Jewish difference: reflections on contemporary research into Jewish origins and types from an Anglo-Jewish historical perspective’, in *Whatever Happened to British Jewish Studies? In Search of Contexts*, ed. Tony Kushner & Hannah Ewence, *Jewish Culture and History*, 12:1–2 (2010), 75–94.

—— ‘*Till Death Us Do Part* and the BBC: racial politics and the British working classes 1965–75’, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 45:2 (2010), 454–77.

—— ‘Unmasking the ‘muscle Jew’: the Jewish soldier in British war service, 1899–1945’, in *Racializing the Soldier*, ed. Gavin Schaffer, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 46:3–4 (2012), 375–96.

—— ‘Legislating against hatred: meaning and motive in section six of the Race Relations Act of 1965’, *Twentieth Century British History*, 25:2 (2014), 251–75.

—— & Saima Nasar, ‘The white essential subject: race, ethnicity, and the Irish in post-war Britain’, *Contemporary British History*, 32:2 (2018), 209–30.

Sharot, Stephen, ‘Native Jewry and the religious anglicization of immigrants in London: 1870–1905’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 16:1 (1974), 39–56.

Smart, Billy, ‘The BBC Television audience research reports, 1957–1979: recorded opinions and invisible expectations’, *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 34:3 (2014), 452–62.

Sobchak, Tom, ‘Bakhtin’s “carnivalesque” in 1950s British comedy’, *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 23:4 (1996), 179–85.

Solomos, John, ‘Rethinking *The Empire Strikes Back*: a response’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37:10 (2014), 1830–37.

Spracklen, Karl, ‘ “Yours is the Earth and everything that’s in it, and—which is more—you’ll be a man, my son”: Myths of British masculinity and Britishness in the construction and reception of Iron maiden’, *Metal Music Studies* 3:3 (2017), 405–19.

St Louis, Brett, ‘On “the necessity and the ‘impossibility’ of identities” ’, in *Stuart Hall and ‘Race’*, ed. Claire Alexander, *Cultural Studies*, 23:4 (2009), 559–82.

Tabili, Laura, ‘The construction of racial difference in twentieth-century Britain: the Special Restriction (Coloured Alien Seamen) Order, 1925’, *Journal of British Studies*, 33:1 (1994), 54–98.

—— ‘Race is a relationship and not a thing’, *Journal of Social History*, 37:1 (2003), 125–30.

Taylor, Becky, ‘Good citizens?: Ugandan Asians, volunteers and “race” relations in 1970s Britain’, *History Workshop Journal*, 85:1 (2018), 120–41.

Todorov, Tzvetan, ‘ “Race”, Writing, and Culture’, trans. Loulou Mack, *Critical Inquiry*, 13:1 (1986), 171–81.

Vaughan, James R., ‘ “Mayhew’s outcasts”: anti-Zionism and the Arab lobby in Harold Wilson’s Labour Party’, *Israel Affairs*, 21:1 (2015), 27–47.

Vice, Sue, ‘ “It’ll make ashenblotty of the seating-plan!” British-Jewishness in Jack Rosenthal’s *Bar Mitzvah Boy*’, *Jewish Culture and History*, 8:2 (2006), 1–28.

—— ‘ “Becoming English”: assimilation and its discontents in contemporary British-Jewish literature’, *Jewish Culture and History*, 14:2–3 (2013), 100–11.

Waterlow, Jonathan, ‘Sanctioning laughter in Stalin’s Soviet Union’, *History Workshop Journal*, 79:1 (2015), 198–214.

Waters, Chris, ‘ “Dark strangers” in our midst: discourses of race and nation in Britain, 1947–1963’, in *Twentieth Century British Studies*, ed. Pat Thane, *Journal of British Studies*, 36:2 (1997), 207–38.

Waters, Rob, ‘ “Britain is no longer white”: James Baldwin as a witness to postcolonial Britain’, *African American Review*, 46:4 (2013), 715–30.

Webster, Wendy, ‘Reconstructing boundaries: gender, war and empire in British cinema, 1945–1950’, *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 23:1 (2003), 43–57.

Więckowska, Katarzyna, ‘An interregnum: masculinity and British fiction at the turn of the century’, *Avant*, VI:1 (2005), 105–13.

Wray, Helena, ‘The Aliens Act 1905 and the immigration dilemma’, *Journal of Law and Society*, 33:2 (2006), 302–23.

Yemm, Rachel, ‘Immigration, race and local media: Smethwick and the 1964 general election’, *Contemporary British History*, 33:1 (2019), 98–122.

Yeo, Eileen Janes, ‘Gender and Jewish welfare work in Britain and the United States, 1880–1930’, *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women’s Studies & Gender Issues*, 34 (2019), 7–32.

Theses & Dissertations

Byrne, Christopher S., ‘No Laughing Matter: Representing English Racism in Post-War Situation Comedy, 1962–2010’, unpublished MA thesis (Univ. of Durham, 2013).

Godfrey, Sarah, ‘Nowhere Men: Representations of Masculinity in Nineties British Cinema’, PhD Thesis (Univ. of East Anglia, 2010).

Humphries, Sam, ‘Dressing Race: Clothes, Immigration and Youth Identities in Britain 1965–1972’, MPhil Thesis (Univ. of Birmingham, 2012).

King, Martin S., ‘ “Running like Big Daft Girls.” A Multi-method Study of Representations of and Reflections on Men and Masculinities through “The Beatles” ’, PhD Thesis (Univ. of Huddersfield, 2009).

Litwack, Caroline Forman, ‘ “You don’t have to be Jewish”: the representation of Jews on television sitcoms’, MA thesis (Georgetown Univ., 2006).

Phillips, Wendy, ‘Television sitcom production at the BBC 1973–1984: an integrated approach’, PhD Thesis (Univ. of Westminster, 2005).

Schwenz, Caroline Lee, ‘The Empire Laughs Back: Toward a Theory of Postcolonial Comedy in the Literatures of the Caribbean and South Asian Diaspora’, PhD Thesis (Emory Univ., 2017).

Whittaker, Kathryn Ann, ‘Representing the “Crisis” in Masculinity: British and North American Male Playwrights, 1990–2005’, PhD Thesis (Lancaster Univ., 2009).