HIS 350 – Masteroppgave i historie Våren 2009
Christine Valde

Between Scholarship and Activism

The Institute of Race Relations

1958 – 1970

Institutt for arkeologi, historie, kultur- og religionsvitenskap

Sammendrag

Masteroppgaven tar for seg den antirasistiske retningen som oppstod i politikk, akademia og ikke-statlige organisasjoner i Storbritannia på 1960-tallet. Den går nærmere inn på en tidsperiode fra 1958 til 1970 i historien til britiske Institute of Race Relations (IRR), og analyserer rollen denne ikke-statlige organisasjonen hadde i å forme antirasismen i Storbritannia på 1960-tallet, både politisk og akademisk. Denne tidsperioden i IRRs historie har i stor grad blitt oversett i tidligere forskning, og studien tilfører derfor nye perspektiver, ikke bare til IRRs historie, men også til utviklingen av antirasisme i Storbritannia generelt. Oppgaven ser på bakgrunnen for antirasismen som vokste frem i dette tiåret og klassifiserer de forskjellige aktørene innen denne antirasistiske strømningen. Samtidig gjør oppgaven rede for de mest sentrale begrepene i forbindelse med antirasisme og innvandring innenfor både akademia og politisk aktivisme fra 1950, 1960 og 1970-tallet. Hovedfokus ligger på IRRs historie hvor oppgaven tar for seg organisasjonshistorien, konsepthistorien og virkningshistorien til organisasjonen. Den gjør dette ved analyse av et utvalg av de viktigste publikasjonene til IRR, samt gjennomgang av parlamentsdebatter, mediedekning og komitérapporter. En viktig kilde er intervjuer med de som opplevde IRR i denne perioden både fra innsiden og utsiden, i tillegg til ansatte i lignende organisasjoner som dukket opp senere. Oppgaven presenterer IRR som en av de viktigste aktørene i prosessen med å forme den såkalte ”liberal hour” i Storbritannia fra 1966 til 1968. I denne perioden var både akademia og den lovgivende makten aktører; IRR hadde innflytelse og påvirkning på begge. Et gjennomgangstema er hvordan denne innflytelsen førte til en rollekonflikt for IRR mellom politisk aktivisme og vitenskapsidealet. Her er også temaet samfunnsnyttig vitenskap og spørsmålet om akademias samfunnsrelevans tatt opp i et samtidsperspektiv. IRR lå midt mellom akademisk og politisk antirasisme, og spørsmålet på 1960-tallet ble hvilken retning organisasjonen skulle velge.

Acknowledgments

As a foreigner researching a British organisation, I have had to depend on the help and guidance of many people. I owe the Institute of Race Relations a big thank you for allowing me access to their archived and un-archived material, for answering my many questions, and for letting me take up space with my computer and note books. I am especially thankful to IRR Company Secretary Jenny Borne for our e-mail correspondence and interviews. This project would have been impossible without the support and help of the Institute. The Runnymede Trust was very helpful in locating sources on their work, and I thank them for their kind suggestions and especially the helpful correspondence with research and policy analyst Jessica Mai Sims. Professor Michael Banton and Professor Nicholas Deakin both took time out of their busy schedules to read my outlines, give me connections to the right people, and answer my questions. I also thank Professor Banton for spending half a day with me in Downe and introducing me to the culinary experience of whitebait for lunch.

Thanks to my fellow MA students for their helpful criticisms and encouragement next to the coffee machine. I am also grateful to Simon Niziol for his excellent proof reading of my thesis. A special thank you to my patient Christopher, not only for making the late nights possible, but also for reading my drafts and helping me make the thesis comprehensible for those who are not studying the field.

At last, the biggest thanks are to my tutor, Professor Christhard Hoffmann, for his excellent guidance, expertise, critique and suggestions, and for allowing me to make this project my own.

Christine Valde

Bergen, May 2009

Contents

Frontispiece from the *Observer*, 13 July 1969.

1. Anti-racism in Britain

In 2002 a survey on British multiculturalism conducted by the BBC showed that 51% of the British population believed Britain to be a racist society. To the question: "Do you think that immigration has benefited or damaged British society over the past 50 years?" 44% of the interviewed answered "Damaged".[1] In a response to the poll, the chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, Gurbux Singh, urged Britons to learn about the history of immigration in Britain, and the positive impact it had made on the country.[2]

The background to this thesis is what has made the United Kingdom (UK) into the multicultural society it is today with focus on the anti-racist side of multiculturalism. The years from 1948 to 1958 have been described as "formative in the development of modern Britain's race relations".[3] During these years, immigration from the Commonwealth, and especially the New Commonwealth,[4] changed the ethnic composition of the United Kingdom and introduced a large number of people with different skin colours to that of the native Britons. By the end of the 1950s, this new diversity of the population had led to riots, conflict and discrimination towards the newcomers. The following decade was to be characterised by anti-racist responses to this: both academic and legislative.

One of these responses was the Institute of Race Relations (IRR), set up as part of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1952 and separated as an independent body in 1958. Fourteen years after its independence, in 1972, the Institute experienced a political conflict resulting in the resignation of its Council and the re-founding of the Institute of Race Relations, now with a clear left-wing political agenda. The main studies on the IRR have been critical of the Institute of the 1960s and described the period only as the prehistory of the conflict rather than a decade in its own light and with its own specific

[1] http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/uk/2002/race/survey.stm To the question: "Do you think Britain is a racist society?" 51% said they thought it was.
[2] http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/1993597.stm.
[3] Pilkington 1988: 9.
[4] See chapter 2 for definition of the New Commonwealth.

problems and challenges. Thus, the 1960s have to a large degree been overlooked when examining the history of the Institute of Race Relations, thereby omitting an essential part of both the history of the IRR and of the development of anti-racism in Britain in general.

In comparison with Norway, the United Kingdom has a long history of immigration and hence more experience of multiculturalism. Even if the history of Norway and the United Kingdom cannot be compared, there is a need to learn from other countries' experiences, successes and failures. When a country's ethnic composition is changed over a short period of time, conflict and discrimination are often the immediate results. In Britain, the responses to this situation included education of the public, activism and pressure on the legislative bodies, research on the subject, and anti-discriminatory legislation. This thesis aims to outline the anti-racist responses of the 1960s and the context in which they emerged. Its main focus is on the Institute of Race Relations as one of the most important actors in the responses of the 1960s and the role of the Institute in shaping the anti-racism of the decade.

1.1 Main question

It is necessary to examine the context in which the IRR acted during the 1960s, and here two main questions are raised:

1. What was the background to the emergence of anti-racist activities in Britain?
2. What were the different anti-racist responses?

Both questions are answered based on the existing research literature, but using my own classification of the different types of responses. A part of this thesis is to seek a more balanced presentation of the history of the IRR. In exploring the role of the IRR in the 1960s, three questions need to be addressed:

1. How was the Institute organised, financed and managed?
2. What kind of activities did the IRR develop? Did it have a specific scholarly or political message?

3. How was the IRR's contribution received and what impact did it have?

Throughout the thesis, the Institute's position between academic forum and government advisor – and critic – is discussed. As the Institute was focused mainly on the academic and the legislative anti-racist responses, the main question can be formulated as follows:

What was the role of the Institute of Race Relations in shaping anti-racism as a political and academic field in the United Kingdom in the 1960s?

1.2 The Institute of Race Relations

The reason for the choice of time frame from 1958 to 1970 is the beginning and development of the Institute of Race Relations together with certain developments in British migration and ethnic history. The Institute of Race Relations (IRR) was established in 1952, and in 1972 it was transformed from "an unofficial and non-political body, founded […] to encourage and facilitate the study of relations between races everywhere"[5] into, as the official description reads today an anti-racist 'thinktank'.[6] The first years of the 1970s have been thoroughly investigated in terms of this transition. I therefore set the main time frame from the Institute's independence in 1958 to the dawn of the conflict in 1970. However, in order to see the differences between the Institute in the 1960s and before and after, the thesis examines the IRR from its beginning until the change in 1972. In the 1960s, the UK passed several laws that restricted immigration and others to prohibit racist discrimination. Finally, the 1971 Immigration Act restricted immigration further for Commonwealth citizens and this law was retained until 1981 when it was replaced by the British Nationality Act. I look not only at the developments within the United Kingdom up until this law, but also at the 1970s in order to understand where the situation was heading and to see if the pre-1972 IRR, before the changes occurred, had an impact on the situation of the following decade.

[5] As stated in the cover of all IRR publications until 1972.
[6] As stated on the IRR website. http://www.irr.uk/about/index.html.

The Institute of Race Relations was one of the first organisations to study race relations within the UK. As the development of the IRR is closely linked with events and law-making in Britain, this too makes the Institute interesting in a historic perspective.

In this thesis, the focus lies on the domestic work of the IRR. It is, however, important to note that the Institute, especially during the first ten to fifteen years of its history, concentrated mainly on race relations abroad.

1.2.1 Previous research

The most extensive research on the Institute of Race Relations is a doctoral thesis published in 1985 by Chris Mullard. Mullard's focus is on the ideological conflict of the 1970s, with the 1950s and the 1960s seen mainly as its prehistory. Mullard found few positives in the work of the IRR before 1972. In his view, the "revolution" was necessary and justified. Along the same lines, Ambalavaner Sivanandan, the former librarian of the Institute and first Director of the new IRR after 1972, disassociated himself from the previous history of the Institute in a 29-page pamphlet written only two years after the conflict. An article examining the history of the Institute, written by its own staff, was published in the IRR's journal *Race and Class* six years after this, again expressing a clear distance from the pre-1972 Institute.

The other side also presented its version of the history. In 1984 Philip Mason, the director of the IRR during its first 17 years of existence, reviewed the Institute's history from 1952 to 1972. Like the IRR's own retrospective articles, this memoir does not provide a balanced portrait of the Institute's history, but rather presents the dichotomies of the struggle, often in an emotional manner. As Mullard focused on what he called the revolution of the black utopians against the white ideologists, his doctoral thesis is perhaps even more dichotomised than the works of those who experienced the conflict firsthand. In contrast, my thesis aims to provide a more balanced examination of the history of the Institute. The above-mentioned books and articles were all written relatively soon after the struggle of the 1970s. Perhaps this is the reason why none of them examined the role and impact the IRR had during the crucial period of the 1960s.

In order to provide the political context of this period, I have focused on four major studies. Erich Bleich's *Race Politics in Britain and France* examines the anti-discriminatory policy-making and what led up to it, while Randall Hansen's *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-war Britain* focuses on the legislation concerning immigration and citizenship status. From the academic branch that criticises the latter, I look at Kathleen Paul's *Whitewashing Britain* and Zig Layton-Henry's *The Politics of Immigration*. I also look at two books that outline the context in which the post-war immigration began: Laura Tabili's *"We ask for British Justice" Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain* and Paul B. Rich's *Race and Empire in British Politics*. In these books, the colonial history of Britain is examined in the light of racism. It is important to include the colonial history of the United Kingdom in order to understand the immigration from the end of the 1940s and the consequent responses. In most of these works, the Institute is used as an example of an influential non-governmental organisation, but the IRR as an organisation is not analysed, and neither is its history.

1.3 Definition of central terms

In the 1960s the term "racism" was not used. The equivalent used in the decade could be "racial discrimination", or, for the later 1960s, "racialism", which carried the same meaning. I use the expression "racism" in this thesis because it is the common expression today. "Racial discrimination" is defined as "the active or behavioural expression of racism […] aimed at denying members of certain groups equal access to scarce and valued resources".[7]

In *Racism After 'Race Relations'* Robert Miles stated that the expression "racism" takes up analytical problems because it carries the notion of "race", which again implies the acceptance of the existence of biological differences between human beings.[8] He therefore argued that there is a way of looking at social relations without employing

[7] Cashmore et al. 1996: 305.
[8] Miles 1993: 2.

"race" as an analytical concept. But even if science declares that there is no such thing as "race" to distinguish people, the concept, the idiom, and the discourse around it still exist. "Analytical concepts aim to be culture-free",[9] as Michael Banton argued in an article on their use. However, if the concept of "race" is cultural, how can we use it as an analytical concept? There is a close connection between "ordinary language" concepts and analytical concepts. The one takes over and simplifies a concept from the other, and vice versa. It is therefore dangerous to draw a sharp line between the two and declare one to be neutral.

As a Norwegian, it is also hard to accept the notion of "race". Here, I use this term only when referring to statements by other persons; *Race* in italics refers to the journal published by the IRR. To divide the immigrants of the time into races is, understandably, meaningless, impossible and wrong to me. The expressions "ethnic" and "ethnicity" date back to the end of the 1960s, distinguishing people on the basis of culture, history and language, in addition to biological features. They could seem more correct to use, but are not applicable in this thesis because it was actually a question of skin colour and not culture or language; the New Commonwealth immigrants came from three different continents and cannot therefore be said to come from the same ethnic group. Neither was it merely a question of having a different ethnicity from that of native Britons, as a large number of Eastern Europeans with a different ethnicity migrated to Britain during the same period – without causing the same question. These immigrants were not the subject of the political and academic debate in the 1960s. Throughout this thesis I therefore choose to use "non-white" in the meaning of the skin colour of those spoken of. I see that this expression is sometimes seen as anachronistic and even offensive.

Many researchers use the word "black" to describe people from Africa, Asia and the West Indies. The term emerged in the 1960s and is explained as a political label rather than a physical description,[10] meant to denote people who were citizens of the colonies. It

[9] Banton 2008: 16.
[10] Tabili 1994: 9.

is suggested that this term is preferable over “race” and “colour”,[11] but it is not used here, other than when referred to in statements made by others, because of the political connotations the term carried in the 1960s.

A term that is used throughout the thesis is “race relations”. The expression refers to the academic field of race relations that emerged within sociology in the 1940s, and entered academia in the UK in the 1950s. As part of the anti-racist response of the 1960s, race relations was both a field in social science as well as a topic in the debate on policy-making. It is defined as the relationship between subjectively different groups of people.[12] Today, the term is no longer in use in academia, colloquially or in politics. It is used in this thesis, without quotation marks, when referring to texts of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

1.4 Sources

This thesis combines the historiography and organisational history of scholarship and politics. Therefore the main sources are the works the Institute produced in the 1960s. As the Institute published some of the major works on race relations in the UK in the 1960s, many of these can be found in public libraries, even in Norway, today. The journals, pamphlets and other publications are found at the locations of today’s IRR. Still, some of the sources were not available to me. For instance, when looking at the history and structure of the Institute, and how this changed over the 1950s and 1960s, I have had to rely on previous literature and sporadic reports in the Institute’s journals because the annual reports of the IRR were still waiting to be archived at a different location, and not available to me. The reports and literature, however, provided the necessary material as they proved to be, with only a few exceptions, coherent with one another. Numbers and dates are therefore referred to in secondary sources.

In order to examine the message of the Institute I decided to analyse the work of the organisation and to what degree its concept was visible in its work. The main focus was

[11] Ibid.
[12] Miles 1993: 5.

on the Institute's journal *Race*, its *News Letter*, and the main domestic research project of the 1960s, the Survey of Race Relations (SRR). All three represented the whole or large parts of the decade and they were all available to me at the locations of today's IRR. A good co-operation with the IRR was vital, especially as a foreign student, as many sources were only available in complete volumes at their archive. It has been important to study these sources based on what they were: a learned journal; the newsletter of an organisation; and an academic survey. They are therefore not compared with each other, but rather used here as examples of different stages in the profile of the IRR.

The Institute of Race Relations was behind many of the major publications on race relations in the UK before, during and after the period I am looking at. Omitting secondary sources because they were published for the IRR would mean leaving out imperative work and perhaps missing the whole picture. There are, however, problems involved in using some of the publications as bibliography or secondary sources, others as primary sources, and many as both. It is therefore important for me to emphasise that chapter 2 is a background chapter where I look at literature, while chapters 3, 4 and 5 are chapters where I analyse sources.

When examining how the message of the Institute was received by the public and the political system I also look at the public perception of the Institute's work. Here, newspapers have proven to be a good source. The United Kingdom provides an excellent service with the British Library Newspaper Collection at Colindale and a wide selection of different newspapers is easily available. It has still been important to be aware of the different types of articles represented in newspapers, including the leading article, the comment article, the lead story and the caricature. These need to be analysed differently from one another, and cannot be seen as automatically representing the public view. What they can say is how the Institute of Race Relations was portrayed directly to the public.

Government reports and parliament papers contribute both official recommendations and political opinions in the shape of parliamentary debates. The problem here has been the

enormous amount of material and finding relevant sources among them. While the reports provide the official recommendations from governmental organisations, the parliamentary papers together with the debates show which issues were controversial and which were not before a Bill was passed. Interestingly, the Institute is mentioned not in parliamentary debates in the House of Commons, but in the House of Lords. This information in itself has proven to be a source that is examined further in chapter 5.

In history it is a privilege to interview those who had firsthand experience of historical events. The most rewarding, and at the same time the most difficult, source has been the oral source. The interviews I conducted required research, interview training, and contact with the right people who could get me in touch with the sources. The generation that experienced the events and worked in the field at the time may not be with us much longer. This makes it especially important to record their perceptions of what happened. I have interviewed important researchers of the 1950s, members of the IRR from the 1960s and 1970s, and I have thereby preserved material that has not yet been – and may not be – archived.

1.5 The politicisation of academia and the academisation of politics

At the beginning of 2009, a debate emerged in the media on the relevance of academic research. ”It is a prerequisite for democracy that scientists share their knowledge”, said the Professor of Biology at the University of Oslo, Dag O. Hessen.[13] But how was science to be made applicable outside the universities? The debate centred on whether scientific knowledge should be shared in order to create an informed and accessible public discourse, or whether the quest for relevance would create a subjective and commercialised business-oriented research.

In the UK at the end of the 1960s, the same discussion emerged, only with the politicisation of knowledge instead of its commercialisation as the danger. Politicians

[13] *Morgenbladet*, 2 January 2009. Original quote: “Det er en forutsetning for demokratiet at forskere deler sin kunnskap”.

were to a larger and larger degree requesting scientific knowledge in order to make informed decisions. In academia this meant a choice between the objective course, in which intellectual problems were solved, and the subjective approach, in which knowledge was produced for the practical purpose of policy recommendations. This polarisation of scholarship became especially evident in the social sciences, where politics and political matters were fields of analysis. Simultaneously, from the 1968 student movement came the implementation of social activism as a contrast to seemingly socially irrelevant academic research. The ideas and ideologies in academia at the end of the 1960s and early 1970s have to be seen in the light of the 1968 student movements. Non-governmental organisation such as the Institute of Race Relations, which were not attached to Universities or to legislative bodies, had to find a position between activism and scholarship.

My thesis is centred on these questions, how they emerged in the 1960s and how they generate debate in academia today. This discussion is taken further in the last chapter.

1.6 Structure

Chapter 2 of the thesis gives the political and academic background to the responses and what was responded to. It reviews the history of the academic field of race relations, also outside the United Kingdom, the colonial context for the post-war immigration, and how the legislative bodies and public reacted to the immigration. This part aims to divide the different anti-racist responses into applicable categories. Race theory, including Marxist theory, will also be examined in order to understand the position of the IRR through the 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s.

The next chapter aims to answer the first question concerning the Institute of Race Relations. Here, the organisation’s history is the focus and the chapter examines how the Institute was structured, financed and governed. It also reviews the publications and activities of the Institute that are examined further in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 focuses on the conceptual history of the organisation and what type of message the IRR's contribution represented. This is seen in comparison with government policy at the time and examined through a selection of IRR's publications. The chapter attempts to answer the second of the three questions asked at the beginning of this chapter.

Together with chapter 3 and 4, chapter 5 is empirical and aims to answer the main question. This chapter focuses on effect history – how the contribution of the Institute was perceived – and focuses on the third of the three questions. This also means that the influence of the IRR's work is examined. Here, it is natural to look into the next decade and the political debate around the Acts concerning race and immigration passed in the 1970s. But the legislation and governmental policy of the 1960s remains the main focus. In addition, influence on public opinion and academia is examined here. For the latter, a look into the next decade, and even up until publications of today, will be required.

Chapter 6 is a conclusion of the preceding chapters, but seen in a different perspective. Where did the Institute stand between the objectivity of academia and the subjectivity of the policy advisor, and how did this influence its evolution?

2. Responses to ethnic diversity in Britain

”The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line”[14]

In 1951 a survey conducted by the Central Office of Information revealed that half of the population in the UK had never met a “coloured person”.[15] Between 1953 and 1961 390,400[16] immigrants from the New Commonwealth[17] entered the United Kingdom, changing British society into the multicultural Britain we know today. A need for labour in the growing industries of the UK, together with free entry for all Commonwealth citizens, made the 1950s a period of massive immigration. At the end of the decade, however, rising unemployment and hostility towards the newcomers led to friction and even riots. During the following decade organisations with an anti-racist agenda emerged, trying to influence both policy-making and public opinion. Governmental legislation tried to control the number of immigrants on the one hand, and the conflicts that arose in the increasingly multicultural society on the other. In the academic world British researchers were beginning to look at the field of “race relations” not just in the colonies but also in a domestic light.

Before examining the anti-racist responses in Great Britain, however, it is necessary to look at the background to the changing demography. In this chapter, I will first look at race relations in colonial times, at the peak of the British Empire. Then I will outline the history of post-war immigration to the UK, as well as the conflicts and legislation of the time period.

The second part of the chapter is devoted to the responses: first the academic reaction, then the non-governmental organisations (NGO) that emerged as a response to the changes, and, finally, how the legislative forces responded. Academia may be seen as part of the non-governmental response, but will be looked at here separately from the

[14] W. E. B. Du Bois from *The Souls of Black Folk*, 1903.
[15] Patterson 1969: 1.
[16] See appendix 2.
[17] Former British colonies in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean.

NGOs that emerged as a consequence of the growing diversity within the population. In looking at the academic response I wish to reconstruct the primary theories of race at the time. What ideas existed about 'race' at the beginning of the 1950s and how did the academic field evolve through the 1960s? As researchers often insisted on objectivity, I will not focus on the anti-racist part of the academic response. However, when examining the political system and the NGOs it is the activities against discrimination that will be the focal point.

2.1 Historical background

By the end of the Second World War, immigrants had been coming in large numbers to the United Kingdom for centuries. The largest number of migrants to Great Britain had come from Ireland throughout the nineteenth century.[18] In the last decades of the century a large number of Jews from Russia and Romania settled in the country, causing some anti-Semitic responses. Also after the Second World War, a significant number of soldiers from the British colonies, having fought under British command, were allowed entry to the UK. It is important to note that although Britain was a country with a high number of immigrants, the number of emigrants was higher. Even after the Second World War, emigrants still outnumbered immigrants.[19]

2.1.1 The colonial system

At the peak of the British Empire, between the First and the Second World War, over a third of the world's population lived under British rule. The crown jewel, India, gained its independence from the British Empire in 1947, and over the next two decades most of the former colonies followed. The Commonwealth of Nations (CON) was established officially in 1931, originally as the "British Commonwealth of Nations", but "British" was omitted from the name in 1946 reflecting the growing independence of the colonies. There was a tradition of free movement within the empire, also for the peoples in the colonies. As British subjects, immigrants from the British colonies had the right to access

[18] The migrants from Ireland were internal migrants rather than immigrants as such, but still represented the largest group of migrants in the UK.
[19] Layton-Henry 1992: 2.

the United Kingdom, work in the civil service, vote, and serve in the armed forces. Military service was one of the major causes of the post-war migration from the Commonwealth to the UK. Serving in the British armed forces had widened the horizons of the colonial soldiers and they saw opportunities for work in Britain.[20] There had been a long history of an absence of restrictions on colonial immigrants entering the UK, and this had been reaffirmed by both the 1914 and 1948 Nationality Acts.[21]

The phrase "colour-line" originates from a book written by W. E. B. Du Bois in 1903 to describe the racial segregation in America. It was, however, also intended to describe relations between people of different skin colours also outside the United States. He claimed the colour line divided people into two categories, with everyone obliged to keep to one side or the other. In a 2008 article, Michael Banton described two types of colour divisions: the colour line, which divides people into distinct social categories, and the colour scale, in which people are divided by socioeconomic status with their skin colour as a component of this status. In Britain, he claimed, the colour scale was the stronger of the two because of the legacy of the Empire.[22] This meant that some Britons were familiar with non-white people as students and soldiers in the UK and as workers, colleagues or friends in the colonies, and that skin colour was only one of the factors dividing people in the United Kingdom.

It is essential that the reaction to non-white Commonwealth immigration is seen in light of Britain as a colonial power. Many Commonwealth immigrants felt British and saw the UK as the "mother country" before they came to the United Kingdom.[23] Research on Britain's colonial history has argued that racial discrimination in the 1950s, 1960s and later stemmed from imperial inequalities. Historian Laura Tabili has stated that because of the British Empire, New Commonwealth immigrants to the UK in the decades after the Second World War were already part of the British system, and were simply trying to

[20] Layton-Henry 1992: 11.
[21] Layton-Henry 1992: 9.
[22] Banton 2008: 2.
[23] Pilkington 1988: 10.

move within it.[24] Other research has suggested that even though the colonial history of the United Kingdom laid the foundations for immigration, the basis for the multicultural Britain was laid first with the immigration in the 1950s.[25]

2.1.2 The diversification of the population

After the Second World War two factors in particular helped change the ethnic composition of the British population. On the one hand, Britain experienced a lack of labour, and on the other, the colonies were starting to demand independence and, as a sign of their sovereignty, started to establish their own citizenships. Together these factors played a large role in the creation of the British Nationality Act of 1948 (1948 BNA); most researchers have seen this Act as a direct consequence of Canada's introduction of a separate Canadian citizenship in 1946.[26] The 1948 BNA introduced a common citizenship for all subjects of the United Kingdom as well as its colonies before 1 January 1949: as Citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies (CUKC). Those with this status as well as citizens of the Commonwealth of Nations had the right to enter, work, live and vote in the UK. All Commonwealth citizens and CUKCs were considered British subjects. This status was to be parallel with citizenship of the subject's home country and meant that a person from Canada was a British subject and a Canadian citizen. All in all, the Act embodied a very liberal policy towards Commonwealth immigration where all citizens of the Commonwealth were synonymous with British subjects and all were allowed unrestricted entry to the UK. The Act maintained the close link between Britain and its former colonies at the same time as the countries could express their growing nationalism.[27]

Between 1948 and 1962 about half a million primary migrants[28] entered the United Kingdom.[29] Most of these migrants were non-white and from the New Commonwealth, particularly India, Pakistan and the Caribbean. The immigrant workers occupied both

[24] Tabili 1994: 183.
[25] For instance, Goulbourne 1998: 29.
[26] Hansen 2000: 37 and Paul 1997: 14.
[27] Paul 1997: 17.
[28] Migrants without families in the receiving country.
[29] Hansen 2000: 19.

unskilled and skilled manual jobs especially in the textile industry, transport and manufacturing industry for male immigrants and in the Health Service for female, notably Caribbean, immigrants.[30] Poor and overcrowded houses crammed the indigenous British working class and the newcomers together and created tension. The newcomers also experienced colour bars in finding housing, with little or no official action to help them.[31] This created an environment in which the newcomers had to take what housing they could get and ghettoes of immigrant workers emerged.

2.1.3 Conflict and legislation

At the end of August 1958, riots broke out in the Notting Hill district in London and in Nottingham. There are several explanations of how and when the riots started, but the common narrative is that they were street riots between white and black youths, started by the former. In both places the riots lasted a few days and in total some 100 people were arrested, of whom 70 per cent were white and 30 per cent were black youths.[32] After this the situation on the street quickly calmed down. Still, the riots were a shock both to the British public and to the politicians, generating massive media coverage, political debates and opinion polls. Later research on the riots has emphasised that no lives were lost, that the riots only lasted a few days, and that the reaction of the British public may have been exaggerated.[33] Initially the riots were blamed on white unemployed hooligans, but the debate on the issue quickly turned to blaming the racist resentment some felt towards immigrants. As a result of the riots, the first polls on popular attitudes towards immigrants were conducted.[34] In the media the riots were covered extensively, transforming New Commonwealth migration from a regional to a national issue.[35] This led to a public and political debate about Britain's "open-door" policy for Commonwealth immigrants and the legal restriction of this immigration.

[30] Layton-Henry 1992: 46.
[31] Pilkington 1988: 53.
[32] Pilkington 1988: 128.
[33] Griffith et al 1969: vii and Hansen 2000: 81.
[34] Layton-Henry 1992: 38.
[35] Hansen 2000: 82.

With the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962 (1962 CIA) only those Commonwealth citizens with passports issued by the government were automatically allowed entry to the United Kingdom. Government-issued passports were to be issued from London and not from colonial governments for the passport holder to be exempted from control. This meant that Britons born in the UK, or Britons who had migrated to the UK before the Act was passed were not to be subject to migration controls when entering or leaving the country. Except for these, three categories of workers with employment vouchers were allowed entry. These were to be subject to migration controls and could be refused entry if they were, for instance, suspected of being criminals or a threat to the country's security. CUKCs who had independent capital and could support themselves and their dependants without working in the UK, or were students in the UK, or part of the armed forces, or were included in a government-issued passport, were also allowed entry. The latter implied family reunification and these citizens were also excluded from any restrictions when entering. The Act thus maintained the status of CUKCs, but divided this status into those with and those without UK government-issued passports, creating a situation where British subjects had the same citizenship, but different rights. Over the following two years there was a visible decline in immigration from the New Commonwealth. During the years before the act was passed, the numbers were high, particularly in 1961 during the debate about the 1962 Act, when 115,150 people arrived from Pakistan, India and the Caribbean. By 1963, this number was halved. However, family reunification and a continuing demand for cheap labour kept the number of immigrants steady from 1963 and throughout the decade.[36]

The 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act (1968 CIA) further restricted the 1962 CIA, differentiating between CUKCs who had the right to government-issued passports and those who did not. Asians who had moved within the British Empire to Africa to find work experienced difficulties and discrimination after the decolonisation of Africa. In Kenya "Africanisation policies" restricted the opportunities of the Asian population. They were either not granted local citizenship or did not apply for it. Until the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act their British citizenship had given them the safety of

[36] See appendix 3.

unrestricted entry to the United Kingdom, but after the act was passed they were no longer issued passports to enter the UK. This "Kenyan Asian Crisis" was a political and intellectual crisis in the UK,[37] because it raised the question of the responsibility of the government towards former colonies and their citizens. These 200,000 Kenyan Asians were part of a group of over a million people,[38] effectively stateless, with only CUKC passports, but no right to enter the United Kingdom after the 1968 Act.

One month after the passing of the 1968 Act, in April 1968, the Conservative politician and classical scholar Enoch Powell made his famous "Rivers of blood" speech in which he foresaw the future of Britain as "the River Tiber foaming with much blood",[39] recalling the fall of the Roman Empire, as a result of uncontrolled immigration and the special treatment of the non-white population through two race relations acts of the 1960s.[40] The speech received massive support from the British public and ensured his position in the immigration debate over the following years, even though he had to leave the shadow cabinet because of the "racist tone"[41] of the speech. A year before this, the British National Front had been formed. This was an extreme right party[42] that opposed immigration and British multiculturalism. It grew during the following decade and became the British National Party in 1982. Even though the National Front did not have much influence in the 1960s, its formation shows the growing anti-immigration and even racist climate.

In 1971 the Immigration Act (1971 IA) introduced the *right of abode* – the unrestricted right to live in the United Kingdom – into British nationality law. This right was to be given only to British citizens with a strong link to the British Isles, i.e. not citizens of the Commonwealth of Nations. This meant that a British subject, or a person of British nationality, was not automatically a British citizen and might not hold the right to enter the United Kingdom. With the 1971 Immigration Act almost all privileges in terms of

[37] Hansen 2000: 154.
[38] Hansen 2000: 178.
[39] Hansen 2000: 185.
[40] These Acts are explored below.
[41] As stated by the leader of the opposition, Edward Heath. Hansen 2000: 186.
[42] Hansen 2000: 175.

free movement enjoyed by Commonwealth citizens ceased to exist. Ten years later, with the 1981 British Nationality Act, Commonwealth citizens were no longer regarded as British subjects. This meant that the status of CUKC no longer existed. Instead, multiple categories of British nationality were created, and only those holding the category of British citizenship were given the right of abode.

2.2 The responses of the 1960s

The riots of 1958 marked a change in how Britain understood itself in respect to ethnic diversity. The fear the riots created together with a need to control the borders led to the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, but also to a fear of growing discrimination against the immigrants. Here the emphasis will be on the anti-discriminatory responses of the 1960s. A succession of the different responses will be presented, mainly because this suits the chronology best, but also, as will be shown later, because they influenced each other: the political response was influenced by the activities of the NGOs, and the non-governmental organisations started their anti-discriminatory work in many ways as a answer to the academic response.

The multicultural experience in the United Kingdom was not unique. It is important to see the United Kingdom also as a part of a changing world, in terms of population diversity. The former British colonies experienced independence, emigration and movements for an identity that was different from the colonial identity. In Europe the borders were changed and the need for a labour force drew people from both inside and outside the continent. In the United States the civil rights movement led to the Civil Rights Act 1964, outlawing all racial segregation in public places and in employment. The civil rights and black power movements also led to riots both for and against the Civil Rights Act throughout the 1960s. The murder of Martin Luther King Jr. in 1968 led to a number of riots all over America. As early as 1941, the Fair Employment Act had been passed in the United States, making racial discrimination illegal in the defence industry. As will be illustrated, these early events as well as thinking from the USA in the 1950s and 1960s were to be especially influential in the UK.

2.2.1 The academic response

One of the founders of the Chicago School of Sociology, Ezra Park, described race relations as

> the relations existing between peoples distinguished by marks of racial descent, particularly when these racial differences enter into consciousness of the individuals and groups so distinguished, and by so doing determine in each case the individual's conception of himself as well as his status in the community.[43]

Park pointed out that the individual was often concealed behind his racial type,[44] implying that there was indeed such a thing as "race", but that people within the races had to be seen as individuals. The Chicago School, which emerged in the 1920s and 1930s, was one of the first to study the field of race relations. Over the next decades, the notions of race, race relations and racial differences changed, but most of the academic work came from the United States. In 1944 the Swede Gunnar Myrdal published his major work *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* on the race relations situation in the United States, which was to lay the groundwork for the later legislation on affirmative action and racial integration in the USA. The tradition of studying one's own society as an anthropologist or a sociologist stemmed from the Chicago School and became common in academia in the United Kingdom in the 1950s. There was a strong connection between the USA and the United Kingdom, reaffirmed by the large number of West Indian immigrants, with a strong connection to the United States, who came to the UK in the 1950s and 1960s. Also, the accepted use of the term "race relations" in the United States made the term the established one in the UK.[45]

1948[46] saw the publication of *Negroes in Britain: a study of racial relations in English society*, the first study on the interaction between New Commonwealth immigrants and natives in the United Kingdom. The author, anthropologist Kenneth Little, warned of the

[43] Hughes et al. 1950: 81. Originally written in 1939.
[44] Hughes et al 1950: 246.
[45] Banton 2008: 2.
[46] The study was supposed to be published in 1947, but owing to production delays, it was not published until 1948.

possibility of racial friction in Britain in the future if economic differences were not solved. He suggested greater racial tolerance, equal opportunities for employment and social relations, and more education for black immigrants.[47] In 1950, Little received funding from the Nuffield Foundation for research at Edinburgh University and over the following eight years the first major studies of migrant groups in different parts of the UK were conducted in what became known as the Edinburgh studies. These were in many ways the pioneers in the field in the UK, but the studies concentrated mostly on the areas where immigrants had settled, and not on the reasons for the growing racism and discrimination, or on suggestions for future policy. However, the Commonwealth Sub-Committee of the National Executive Committee asked Kenneth Little for advice on the framing of anti-discriminatory legislation in 1952. Little was very positive towards such legislation and suggested organising it along the lines of the Fair Employment Practices Commission in the USA.[48]

In 1950 UNESCO issued *The Race Question*, a statement revised and signed by some of the best known researchers in their fields from all over the world, among them Gunnar Myrdal. The statement, consisting of fifteen points, stated that "'race' is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth"[49] and suggested that the term should be replaced with "ethnic groups" to avoid wrongful use. It condemned racism as morally wrong and stressed, "man is born a social being who can reach his fullest development only through interaction with his fellows".[50] With this, researchers were encouraged not to divide humans into races, but rather see them as part of the same species. Simultaneously, policy-makers were advised not to prevent "hybridisations" by stating that there was "no biological justification for prohibiting inter-marriage between persons of different ethnic groups".[51] Looking at the usage of the terms "race" and "colour" in academia over the next two decades, some of UNESCO's advice on not seeing race as a

[47] Little 1948: 163.
[48] Patterson 1969: 83. The Commission was created as part of the Fair Employment Act of 1941.
[49] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001282/128291eo.pdf
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.

biological factor was followed, but the expression "ethnic groups" instead of "race" came into use first at the end of the 1960s.[52]

Non-governmental organisations such as Political and Economical Planning (PEP),[53] a British policy think-tank, gathered statistics in the 1950s on how many immigrants entered, where they moved and what work they did. These numbers were, however, hard to establish because of the free movement policies for all British subjects. Groups associated with political parties also conducted studies on a smaller scale in the 1950s. For instance, the Bow Group, associated with the Conservative party, published the booklet *Coloured Peoples in Britain* in 1952.[54] It is important to note that the data collected on race relations and racial disadvantage, up to the 1970s, were collected primarily by private sources, such as Political and Economic Planning and the Institute of Race Relations (IRR),[55] and not by academia. Non-governmental organisations therefore have to be taken into account when examining the academic response of the 1950 and 1960s.

In 1955 Michael Banton, who had participated in the Edinburgh studies, published his first large work entitled *The Coloured Quarter*, which was a study of a part of London with a large immigrant population. While studying the changes in the demography he also vaguely suggested future policy with an emphasis on improving the situation for those immigrants already in the country: "Whether or not to permit further immigration is a straightforward political choice, but the problem of the social position of the immigrants who are already in the country is another matter."[56] Banton was to be one of the most important scholars of the sociology of race relations in Britain, trying to develop a coherent theory on the subject. In the 1950s, Banton later claimed, there was a switch from the usage of "colour" to "race" and "race relations" in the intellectual world. In popular language, use of the idiom "colour" continued. This switch among the

[52] The term "ethnic groups" was included for the first time in the *Oxford English Dictionary* in 1972.
[53] Today the Policy Studies Institute.
[54] Banton 2008: 4.
[55] Bleich 2003: 109.
[56] Banton 1955: 241.

intellectuals reflected political priorities.[57] It was partly to counter Nazi doctrines of race, but also, more importantly, to distinguish between the settled British population and the newcomers. In contrast with the other European countries, British colonial citizens were also British citizens and "race" therefore implied categories to distinguish between British citizens**.** The political scientist Erich Bleich, on the other hand, has focused on how the researchers of the late 1940s and 1950s were interested in race as a sociological phenomenon to be studied. Race was not yet seen as carrying negative connotations, according to him.[58]

The works of the 1950s in many ways held on to the idea of race as a natural divider between people. There was little discussion on whether "race" was a biological or social divider; the emphasis was on studying the differences it created. However, in 1955, the same year Banton's *The Coloured Quarter* came out, Anthony H. Richmond published his *The Colour Problem: A Study of Racial Relations* in which he investigated the colour-line in different parts of the world. One chapter was devoted to "Racial Relations in Britain". Here, he looked at the resentment of the indigenous UK population towards coloured colonial immigrants, concluding, "one-third is tolerant of coloured people, one-third is mildly prejudiced, and one-third is extremely prejudiced".[59] He also stated that colonial citizens had every right to immigrate to the United Kingdom, and that restrictions should only be applied to those who would not successfully adjust themselves to the new society.[60] By suggesting that the borders should be kept open to British subjects and that the population in the UK had to find a way of living together, Richmond investigated the negative sides of race as a divider as well as making suggestions for future policy.

The shock of the 1958 riots also caused a reaction from academic Britain and marked the beginning of a large number of publications and research activity both on the riots and on the general situation. Already in October 1958 James Wickenden published *Colour in*

[57] Banton 2008: 5.
[58] Bleich 2003: 39
[59] Richmond 1955: 240.
[60] Richmond 1955: 290.

Britain, a pamphlet commissioned by the Institute of Race Relations, which described the background to the riots and mapped the existing knowledge and lack of knowledge on race relations within the United Kingdom. The IRR had existed since 1952, but this was its first work on domestic race relations. The first book published by IRR on the subject, *Coloured Immigrants in Britain*, published in 1960, included a whole chapter on the situation in the United States and what the UK could learn from this.[61] Emphasis was on the combination of anti-discriminatory legislation together with education of the public to improve race relations.[62] The main basis for this chapter was Myrdal's work. In this book, the connection with USA was again evident. Over the next decade, academic institutions began to set up centres for research on race relations. The Centre of Multi-Racial Studies was made a department at the University of Sussex in 1965, and by and by other universities followed.

There was a change in the definition of "race" and the discipline of race relations during this decade. In 1967 Michael Banton wrote: "An approach to race relations from the standpoint of social science requires that race be viewed not as a biological category but as a sign by which a social category is defined."[63] This implies a switch from seeing "race" as a natural divider in studying it as a category by which people are divided. As described earlier, the terms "ethnic" and "ethnic group" came into use at the end of the 1960s. These terms reflected a classification that had less to do with physical appearance and more to do with a common history, language and culture. Still, the 1960s turned the intellectual problem of race relations of the 1950s into a policy problem. Banton described how references to "race" in the 1960s had a tendency to be regarded as the same as disputes over immigration.[64] In addition, in the 1980s and 1990s, the sociologist Robert Miles argued that the use of "race" in the discipline of "race relations" presented the differences that were studied as biological differences and disguised the social construct of the differences.[65] Today, "race relations" is seen as a discipline in sociology that studies the relations between groups that employ the idea of race to distinguish

[61] Griffith et al 1960: 181.
[62] Griffith et al. 1960: 215.
[63] Banton 1967: 5.
[64] Banton 2008: 3.
[65] Goulbourne 1998: 8.

themselves from each other. Moreover the discipline has in many ways been replaced with "social relations" where there is no need to employ the idea of "race" as an analytical instrument.[66]

In America, Marxist theories on race relations had emerged in the Chicago School as early as the 1940s. Most notable was Oliver Cromwell Cox's *Caste, Class and Race* from 1948. The author argued that racism had grown alongside capitalism, and he reduced "race" to a mere part of "class".[67] These ideas were found in Britain as part of the anti-racist response at the end of the 1960s. Here, immigrants from the New Commonwealth, who came to the United Kingdom for work, were put into the political colour "black".[68] The "black" population was seen as exploited by the "white" UK whenever the latter needed labour.[69] Ambalavaner Sivanandan continued the thoughts of Cox from the 1970s onwards. Sivanandan was a supporter of the movement for a black identity that was different from the common British identity. He took the Marxist theories further and included them in black consciousness. His thoughts on white oppression are embodied in the quote from a 1971 article:

> To argue, too, that Black Power in its reaction to racism is itself racist is to overlook the fact that racial prejudice is essentially the white man's problem. The black man is concerned merely to achieve his humanity. What keeps him from this achievement is white oppression. The need to oppress, the primitive notion of racial superiority, is the white man's burden.[70]

The idea of the immigration of the 1950s and 1960s being a form of white superiority exploiting the black immigrants continued also after the 1970s;[71] admittedly, without the claim that racism was only a white phenomenon, but still arguing that the restrictions on immigration in the 1960s and 1970s came not because of pressure from a racist population, but from racist governments.

---

[66] Miles 1993: 1.
[67] Rex and Mason 1986: 87.
[68] Nydal 2007: 284.
[69] *Race and Class* vol 21, no. 4, 1980.
[70] Sivanandan 1982: 65.
[71] For instance, Tabili 1994 and Paul 1997.

2.2.2 The responses of Non-Governmental Organisations

In her book of 1969 *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain 1960-1967,* Sheila Patterson listed four types of non-governmental organisations (NGO) concerned with race relations and immigrants in the 1960s; research and information NGOs, welfare and information NGOs, action and pressure groups, and immigrant NGOs.[72] The last category could be questioned, given that all organisations it included could have been placed under one of the other three.[73] After studying the different types of non-governmental organisations that worked against discrimination in today's light, they can be divided into

a) Research NGOs
b) Activist NGOs
c) Immigrant welfare NGOs

I shall focus on the first two. The NGOs of these categories often worked across the categories or worked together with other NGOs. The welfare NGOs were in many cases connected with governmental organisations, the church, or the social services. Their responsibility was to improve the living conditions of immigrants and the settled population in immigrant communities, and to act as links between the newcomers and existing organisations.[74] In the case of many welfare NGOs, the immigrants' welfare was only a small department of a larger organisation.

The organisations classified as Immigrant NGOs by Patterson could be placed either in the previous category or under the policy-oriented NGOs. Some of them had long traditions, such as the colonial workers' or colonial students' organisations that had been formed as anti-colonial organisations after World War One and turned into bodies fighting discrimination and restrictions on immigration after World War Two. They were many in number and worked against colonialism through lobbying and in collaboration with or as labour unions. The Co-ordinating Committee Against Racial Discrimination, formed in 1961, united many of these organisations and tried to oppose the passing of the

[72] Patterson 1969: 315.
[73] There were, interestingly, no immigrant NGOs that could be classified as research NGOs.
[74] Mason 1984: 131.

1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act. Later, the organisation also took up individual cases of discrimination.[75] These organisations had little influence on public policy. The Racial Adjustment Action Society (RAAS), formed in 1965 after a visit by African American human rights activist Malcolm X, was a secretive action group, strictly for black members, concerned with black awareness. It received negative press coverage, used enraged rhetoric, and was described as "militant" by Sivanandan.[76] What all these policy-oriented organisations had in common was that they used activism such as lobbying and pressure on the government to help reduce racial discrimination.

The first big umbrella organisation was the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD), created in 1964. This was the first and only national civil rights organisation in Britain. CARD did have a significant impact on the 1965 Race Relations Act, but collapsed in 1967. In a study on CARD from 1972 Michael Banton called the recent conflict within the Institute of Race Relations, which is examined in chapter 3, "a comparable dispute" to the conflict within CARD in 1967.[77] Therefore I will take a closer look at the organisation here. "The Campaign Against Racial Discrimination was founded in December 1964 to speak for a social and political movement that did not exist."[78] With these words Benjamin W. Heineman Jr. introduced his study on the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, interestingly published for the Institute of Race Relations in 1972, the year of the IRR's revolution.[79]

The organisation was founded after Martin Luther King's visit to London in December 1964, initially to serve as an umbrella organisation for the anti-discrimination work of immigrant organisations. The forming of the organisation as a result of a visit from a Civil Rights Movement leader from the United States is an indication of the close link between the USA and the United Kingdom, not only in academia, but also in activism. CARD was to serve as a pressure group to eliminate discriminatory legislation and promote policies that would ensure equal rights, and at the same time was to work for

[75] Patterson 1969: 313.
[76] Sivanandan 1982: 16.
[77] Banton 1972: 185.
[78] Heineman 1972: 1.
[79] The change in the Institute of Race Relations in 1972 will be investigated in chapter 3.

community development and build support from immigrants themselves. Its founders included Anthony Lester, member of the Society of Labour Lawyers and later founder of the Runnymede Trust, and the West Indian UK Labour politician David Pitt. Heineman's strong wording in the first sentence indicated the mix of white political activists and black union workers that constituted CARD. Banton's study of CARD, *Racial Minorities*, published the same year as Heineman's, also emphasised this duality of a policy press group and an immigrants' representation organisation. Still, a need was felt for such a group that could co-ordinate the different immigrant communities and pressure groups, so that they could combine their demands.[80]

The organisation was open to all groups who accepted the aims of CARD and it included Jewish, Arab and African organisations, trade unions, students and interracial groups. CARD, with a strong figurehead in the chairman of their Legal Committee, Anthony Lester, actively lobbied the Home Secretary Frank Soskice "to introduce a broad and enforceable law to tackle racial inequality".[81] The passing of the 1965 Race Relations Act nine months after the founding of CARD was regarded partly as the organisation's achievement. CARD had lobbied successfully so that the preceding Race Relations Bill had been altered to make racial discrimination a civil and not a criminal offence.[82]

After the passing of the 1965 act, CARD continued to work on it, organising volunteers to test the presence of discrimination and make complaints to the Race Relations Board.[83] CARD also worked with another organisation formed as a result of the act, the National Committee on Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI). According to Sivanandan, this co-operation deepened contradictions within the organisation, between those who wanted militant action, and those moderates who wished for co-operation with the political power.[84] The dividing forces within the organisation, and the conflict about what type of organisation CARD should be, became too strong and in 1967 the majority of CARD's

[80] Patterson 1969: 309.
[81] http://83.137.212.42/sitearchive/cre/anthology_04.html
[82] Ibid. Incitement to racial hatred and racial discrimination in public places was made a criminal offence. The rest of the 1965 Act was made civil in nature.
[83] Lester and Bindman 1972: 124.
[84] Sivanandan 1982: 17.

executive committee resigned and the organisation dissolved itself. Heineman described how CARD, in the end, became a name with which anti-discrimination activists did not want to be connected.[85] This was true for all sides of the conflict, indicating discontent with how the organisation had developed from both those who wanted to co-operate with the legislative bodies and those who wanted militant action.

Of the research NGOs, the Institute of Race Relations was the most well known in the 1960s. However, as chapter 3 will explore the history and organisation of the Institute in greater detail, I will not examine it here. Other non-governmental organisations, such as Political and Economic Planning, conducted research on race relations, but in the early 1960s only the IRR regarded the topic as its sole object. The research NGOs worked closely together with academic institutions and they are therefore included in this chapter under both the academic response and the response of the NGOs. The IRR's Survey of Race Relations in Britain (SRR), started in 1963 and published as *Colour and Citizenship* in 1969, was the most and first extensive work done on race relations in Britain. In 1968 the Runnymede Trust was formed by the former chairman of CARD's Legal Committee, Anthony Lester, and the director of the Survey of Race Relations, E.J.B. Rose. In its press release the Trust stated that it intended to bridge the gap between the growing body of research on race relations and the general public.[86] Its aim was to challenge racial discrimination. In 2000 it published an extensive report entitled *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, better known as the Parekh Report. This growing interest in multiculturalism and racial discrimination, demonstrated by the growing number of non-governmental organisations involved in the field, has been described as a "race industry" employing "race professionals".[87] These were the people who, according to the critics, made a living of trying to solve the problem of racism.

The government-appointed committees consisted of members from different NGOs, both policy-oriented and research-oriented, businessmen, academics, former colonial officers,

[85] Heineman 1972: 212.
[86] Runnymede Trust press release, 31 October 1968.
[87] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2008 and Goulbourne 1998: 124.

and politicians. For instance, the list of chairmen of the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants in the 1960s included CARD founder David Pitt and the Institute of Race Relations Director Philip Mason.[88] Common for the research-oriented organisations was that much of their work was conducted on behalf of governmental organisations, such as the 1968 PEP Report for the Race Relations Board and NCCI. From the mid-1960s, governmental funding helped the research on foreign and domestic affairs for non-governmental organisations.[89] The governments of this decade, however, did not finance any inquiry on their own policy, and the NGOs had to find funding for such research from private businesses. Still, the co-operation between the non-governmental organisations and the government committees is evident in the representation of NGO members in government committee boards.

2.2.3 The legislative response – quid pro quo

After fourteen years of Conservative governments, the Labour party took office in 1964. The thought of anti-discriminatory legislation had been on Labour's agenda since Kenneth Little's suggestions in 1952 for laws similar to those in the USA.[90] Legislation against discrimination had been on the Labour party programme before the election and a draft bill was set up by the Society of Labour Lawyers. The result, the 1965 Race Relations Act (1965 RRA), made it unlawful to discriminate "on grounds of colour, race, or ethnic or national origin" in certain public places. It also established the Race Relations Board (RRB) that was to take complaints on, investigate and report discrimination to the Attorney General. The Act also made it unlawful, on the same grounds, for a landlord to withhold consent when this was needed for disposal of tenancy. Last, the Act made it an offence to publish writings or speak in public "with the intent to stir up hatred against any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, ethnic, or national origin".[91] The latter would become a controversial point in later legislation. The Act recognised that racism was unwanted and that the government would use the law to

[88] Mason 1984: 142.
[89] Sivanandan 1974: 13.
[90] Patterson 1969: 83.
[91] Patterson 1969: 88.

combat it, but was limited in scope.[92] For instance, the Board could do nothing without the Attorney General's agreement, and the wish for a stronger law was increasing. And during the first year of the Board's existence, 70 per cent of complaints it received were outside the scope of the 1965 Act.[93] Two major issues, employment and housing, were not included in the Act. However, according to Home Secretary Frank Soskice, discrimination outside the public sphere could not be included in the legislation "without interfering unjustifiably with the rights of the individual".[94]

The so-called PEP Report of 1968 was a survey entitled *Racial Discrimination in England* undertaken by Political and Economical Planning on behalf of the Race Relations Board and the National Committee of Commonwealth Immigrants "to establish the extent of discrimination".[95] The report had a significant impact on the subsequent Race Relations Act 1968 (1968 RRA). The PEP report established that racial discrimination was "a serious and growing problem in Britain"[96] especially in matters of housing and employment, and was responsible for the almost no political opposition before the passing of the 1968 Race Relations Act (1968 RRA).[97] This Act expanded the duties of the RRB and the Board was no longer forced to go via the Attorney General to try a case. Emphasis was, however, still placed on negotiation and consolidation.[98] The new Act made it unlawful to discriminate on the same grounds as the 1965 RRA, but now included employment and housing. Also, the Community Relations Commission (CRC) was to replace the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants,[99] which had been a body founded to encourage the integration of immigrants through cooperation with local communities. Still, the Act relied on those discriminated against coming forward and filing complaints, something they were often hesitant to do.[100]

---

[92] Goulbourne 1998: 101.
[93] Lester and Bindman 1972: 128.
[94] Hansen 2000: 140.
[95] Patterson 1969: 101.
[96] Lester and Bindman 1972: 82.
[97] Interview with Michael Banton November 2008.
[98] Layton-Henry 1992: 53.
[99] In 1965, the NCCI had replaced the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Committee, which had been set up in 1962.
[100] Hansen 2000: 226.

In the IRR's *Colour and Citizenship* the years 1966-1968 were labelled "the liberal hour" of race relations in Britain, following Adlai Stevenson's doctrine of a time when all policy heads in a liberal direction to solve a social problem.[101] These years saw an increased awareness of the extent of racial discrimination, and this in turn created an apparent consensus among politicians that racial discrimination should not be tolerated, and, in the end, a law was created to outlaw such behaviour. According to Benjamin Heineman Jr, this apparent general agreement, that anti-discriminatory legislation was the solution, concealed conflicts that emerged after "the liberal hour", when the problem presented itself as more complex.[102] According to researchers, Home Secretary Roy Jenkins was responsible for the liberal years of Labour governments.[103] Even after James Callaghan succeeded as Home Secretary in 1967, Labour carried on Jenkins's policies and passed a new Race Relations Act. However, with the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act it was clear that "after indulging a year of Roy Jenkins's social liberalism, the party had returned to its roots"[104] and the focus of the government had now shifted from integration to immigration restriction.

With Roy Jenkins back as Home Secretary from 1974 the time had come to amend the 1965 and 1968 legislation. In 1975 the Sex Discrimination Act was passed and the 1976 Race Relations Act (1976 RRA) the following year was much inspired by this Act.[105] For instance, the preceding Bill incorporated "virtually the same language as that of the final version of Sex Discrimination Act".[106] A new PEP study had shown that despite the wider scope of the 1968 RRA, there were still high levels of racial discrimination. The 1976 Race Relations Act most importantly included indirect discrimination as unlawful, meaning that practices and procedures that could lead to disadvantages for racial groups were now included in the definition of discrimination.[107] This meant that individuals no longer had to come forward with complaints, but were now included in a larger group

[101] Rose et al 1969: 10. Later researchers, including Bleich, have agreed with the notion of a "liberal hour". Bleich 2003: 89 and Goulbourne 1998: 56.
[102] Heineman 1972: viii.
[103] For instance, Hansen 2000.
[104] Hansen 2000: 155.
[105] Macdonald 1977: 5.
[106] Bleich 2003: 99.
[107] Layton-Henry 1992: 58.

that looked after their interests. The 1976 RRA replaced both the Race Relations Board and the Community Relations Commission with the Commission for Racial Equality, which had much greater power of investigation and enforcement.[108] Also, those who felt that they had been discriminated against on the grounds of the Act could take their complaints directly to court. The 1976 RRA remained unchanged until it was amended by the Race Relations Amendment Act in 2000.

Ian Macdonald, in his book on the 1976 Race Relations Act, argued that an immigration law sees the black minority as the threat to law and order, while a race relations law sees denying the black minority protection of the law as the threat to law and order.[109] All three Race Relations Acts and the liberal 1948 British Nationality Act were passed while a Labour government was in office, while the 1962 and 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Acts and the 1971 Immigration Act were passed by Conservative governments.[110] Most researchers agree that the issue is more complex and not simply a question of the Conservatives being more racist than Labour,[111] but the laws may have given a symbolic indication of where the two parties stood in terms of race relations legislation.

2.4 Summary

With the 1948 British Nationality Act approximately 600 million[112] people from developing countries had the right to enter the United Kingdom. In 1958 the Nottingham and Notting Hill riots not only shocked the British public into the assumption that racism was growing in the United Kingdom, but also made the public aware of the presence of non-white immigrants in the country. Du Bois' prediction of the colour-line being the problem of the twentieth century proved to be true after the Second World War in Europe, Africa, Asia and the United States. The development in legislation concerning Commonwealth immigration in the following decade was twofold: on the one hand, restrictions on immigration from the Commonwealth, and, on the other, anti-

[108] Macdonald 1977: 1.
[109] Macdonald 1977: 19.
[110] See appendix 4.
[111] For instance, Hansen 2000.
[112] Hansen 2000: 5.

discriminatory legislation for those Commonwealth immigrants who were already in the country. The debates on anti-discriminatory legislation and immigration policy in the 1960s would emerge as the basis for the future multicultural Britain.

The political approach to the unfamiliar situation was, to a large extent, to seek advice. In the 1960s, politicians were to a larger and larger degree turning to experts for advice on policy. This chapter has shown how expert advice was used, and was in many cases the deciding factor, before bills were passed. The academic response to the changing racial composition was to study and understand the situation, but this was only done on a small scale at the beginning, and no advice was given in terms of legislation or suggestions of how to solve problems arising in the changing society. Instead, politicians turned to the non-governmental organisations for advice. Based on this, the anti-racist part of the political response to the increasingly multicultural population can be seen as policy-making through research; and one part of this response was the Institute of Race Relations.

3. From professional body to anti-racist think-tank – the history of the organisation

The history of the Institute of Race Relations (IRR) can be divided into three phases: first, from 1952 to 1958 as a race relations unit in Chatham House; in the second phase, from 1958 to 1972, as an independent academic institution; and in the third phase from 1972 as a voice for the minority, with focus on volunteer work and activism. Previous research has been influenced by these three phases and has focused on the ideological change from one phase to the next. The conflict at the beginning of the 1970s has been the focal point of the research and the years before have tended to be seen as leading up to the conflict. Here, the focus is on the continuity of the Institute and the work it performed between 1952 and 1972.

3.1 Previous research on the Institute of Race Relations

These three phases and the transition between them have influenced the research on the Institute. The history of the Institute has been seen as dichotomised and in the second phase the IRR has been portrayed as either a body submissively producing what the government needed to legitimate its legislation, or as a respected and independent research centre. A part of this thesis is to seek a more balanced reproduction of the history of the Institute of Race Relations.

The most extensive work on the Institute is Chris Mullard's doctoral thesis from 1985, entitled *Race, Power and Resistance*. The objects of the study, as mentioned in chapter 1, were affirmed in the introduction:

> To restate the broader and deeper problem this book attempts to discuss, […] a world in which black struggle against white power is an ongoing reality, is to state that this world existed in and was the Institute of Race Relations.[113]

[113] Mullard 1985: 9.

The years before the conflict started[114] were seen as leading up to the struggle. Mullard's doctoral thesis is the only entire book devoted to the IRR's history. The other works on the IRR are either short articles, a pamphlet, or contain only mentions of the Institute as part of another story. It is therefore important to outline how the Institute was organised and administered, and this chapter is devoted to the task.

Ambalavaner Sivanandan, the current director of the Institute of Race Relations, along with the staff of the IRR, has written several articles and a pamphlet on the conflict and the years leading up to it. The 30-page pamphlet was published only two years after the changes and was called *Race and Resistance: the IRR story*. Here, the conflict and resentment was still fresh and unabsorbed. Sivanandan also saw the 1960s as a prelude to the clash in 1972. Even decades after the conflict, Sivanandan still described the conflict in the same terms. In a retrospective article in 2008, he claimed the conflict over what the 'race problem' really was lay at the heart of the struggle within the IRR.[115] In the IRR's own journal, the researcher Jenny Bourne, together with Sivanandan, described how the conflict had exposed racism in white society. On the IRR's website, Bourne summarised the core of the conflict:

> Essentially the struggle at IRR challenged a multitude of race relations shibboleths: the 'problem' was not Black immigrants but White society; the government was not part of the solution but part of the problem; it was not a question of educating Black and Whites about integration, but of fighting institutional racism; it was not race relations that was the field of study, but racism; racism was a moral and political issue which necessitated taking sides; it was those who experienced racism who should be in command of the fight against it.[116]

In their work on the Institute, Mullard, Sivanandan, and the remaining IRR staff all shared the perception that the governments at the end of the 1960s were institutionally racist,[117] not taking into account the Labour governments that had introduced the Race Relations Acts in 1965 and 1968. Bourne and Sivanandan instead focused on the 1968

[114] Mullard saw the beginning of the revolution as coming at the end of 1969, when the IRR appointed new staff for two research programmes (IRSP and JUMPR). Mullard 1985: 22.
[115] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2008.
[116] http://www.irr.org.uk/2008/april/ha000026.html
[117] For instance, Sivanandan 1974: 13.

Commonwealth Immigrants Act and described it as "an Immigration Act from which all pretence of morality had fled".[118]

From the other side of the conflict, the history of the IRR was presented by the Institute's director during the first 17 years, Philip Mason, in the second part of his memoirs, *A Thread of Silk*, from 1984. Here, he described the beginning of the IRR, as well as the foreign trips he took on its behalf. The book gave a new insight into the leadership of the IRR in the 1950s and early 1960s and, in contrast to the studies on the IRR's history, depicted the government as an associate in educating the population for a better society. However, the author's personal feelings towards the conflict became evident in the name of the chapter in which it was described. While the other works on the conflict labelled it as a "revolution", Mason saw it as the "Death Agony",[119] describing his misgivings at the collapse of the organisation he felt he had built. Some facts in his memoirs did not agree with the numbers, dates and names in primary or secondary sources on the Institute. This could be owing to bad memory, but some of the incoherent facts put "his" side in the conflict in a better light; such as the voting at the final general meeting before the change, where his numbers are significantly higher than those given in other secondary sources.[120] Since the book is a memoir in which the personal experience and feelings of the writer are the essentials, it cannot be analysed as academic work. However, Mason saw the younger members of staff and their need for faster results as the core of the conflict.[121] He described how those in the post-1972 Institute "cut themselves off from those who they wished influence in order to be closer to those with whom they agreed".[122] In contrast, the staff from the other side of the conflict saw their need to fight white racism, and not faster research or the need to influence any part of the population, as the reason for the struggle. The memoir made it evident that, even after twelve years, he did not understand why there had to be a conflict, and this makes the book an interesting tool for comparison.

[118] *Race and Class*, vol. 20, no. 4, 1980.
[119] Mason 1984: 173.
[120] This voting is described in detail later in the chapter.
[121] Mason 1984: 185.
[122] Ibid.

3.2 The three phases of the Institute's history

Of the three phases of the Institute's history, the first has received the least attention from researchers. It is crucial that these first six years also be included in the history of the organisation in order to see the whole picture. The focus of my thesis is the second phase, from the Institute's independence in 1958 and throughout the 1960s. In previous research, this phase has been seen as a prelude to the conflict of the 1970s, and as either positive or negative in the light of the events of the following decade. These events and the new form of the IRR are examined briefly here, but the focus remains on the continuity of the Institute, and not on the break.

3.2.1 Under Chatham House

Chatham House is the familiar name of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), a non-profit NGO founded in 1920. In the aftermath of the First World War the founders of Chatham House believed that future diplomacy would depend on public opinion to a far greater extent than it had during the war. The public would therefore need to be better informed, and this was the idea behind the RIIA.[123] The Chatham House founders were firm believers in the Commonwealth idea – that there was a link between the former and existing colonies of Britain, and that a common constitutional framework would hold them together.[124] The RIIA had strict rules about not expressing a corporate view in the 1950s. It was regarded as being outside party politics and the mix of politicians connected to the Institute was well balanced with representatives from all sides. Still, Chatham House was part of the Establishment and its financial support came from firms mostly with international connections.[125] Today the well-known "Chatham House Rules" ensure an open discussion where nothing is to be published without the consent of those involved. Chatham House has therefore been known to host discussions involving state leaders and other influential people.[126]

[123] Mason 1984: 15
[124] Ibid.
[125] Mason 1984: 16.
[126] Interview with Michael Banton, 6 November 2008.

On 4 May 1950, the editor of *The Sunday Times*, H. V. Hodson,[127] gave an address at Chatham House in which he argued that the problem of race relations was the most important in world politics at the time. He focused on the colonial history of Europe as the reason for the status of race relations in the world, but emphasised that the problems of race differences lay in personal and group relations, and not in political institutions. He blamed these problems on ignorance and suggested that an Institute of Race Relations should be established "for the scientific and objective study of matters related to race and colour".[128] The Institute was to be under Chatham House, following its charter of not advocating particular policies or views, and "should be of university standing",[129] indicating a close connection with academia.

Two years later, the Institute of Race Relations was established as a unit of Chatham House. A former employee of the Indian Civil Service, Philip Mason, was hired as its Director. As we have seen, he was to hold this position for the next seventeen years. In addition to his position as a civil servant, Mason published books, both fiction and non-fiction, under the pseudonym Philip Woodruff. He was particularly interested in exploring the relationship between Britain and its former colonies,[130] and his past in the Indian Civil Service often formed the background to his books. The Council of Chatham House oversaw the Research Committee, which in turn oversaw the Board of Studies at Chatham House. For the activities of the IRR, Philip Mason was to be guided by the Board of Studies, and the staff answered to him. The Board of Studies opposed many of Mason's suggestions, especially when it came to concentrating on domestic race relations.[131] During the winter of 1957-58 arrangements were made to make the Institute an independent body and in April 1958 it became an independent organisation. Still, the connection with Chatham House remained close and friendly.

[127] Editor of *The Sunday Times* from 1950 to 1961.
[128] *International Affairs*, vol. 26, no. 3, 1950.
[129] Ibid.
[130] http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/1999/feb/03/guardianobituaries1
[131] Mason 1984: 18.

3.2.2 The independent Institute

As an independent Institute, the IRR was made up of three parts, of which the members formed one and the Council and the staff the other two. The Council was the governing body and met four times a year to decide on policy. Apart from the Chairman and President, the Council consisted of some 20 elected academics and businessmen, the latter often with business interests in Africa. The Membership of the Institute, on the other hand, consisted of individuals and organisations that paid a subscription. Anyone could become a member. Members elected the Council of Management and its chair, and the Council elected the Director. The staff of the organisation consisted of post-graduates, academics, journalists and administrators. In December 1969 Hugh Tinker, a Professor of Politics in the School of Oriental and African Studies, was appointed the new Director after Mason's retirement at the end of the year. By the end of the decade, the Institute employed more than forty people spread over its different projects.[132] The IRR was a company limited by guarantee,[133] meaning that there were no shareholders, but a group of members guaranteeing the organisation. The Institute retained any money it made.

In 1964 the Institute hired a new librarian, Ambalavaner Sivanandan, who was a Marxist and devoted to the idea of black consciousness.[134] He was to be a voice for the young, radical academics that joined the Institute in 1968 and 1969 when two new research programmes were set up. This new staff opposed what they saw as the "neo-colonial intentions"[135] of the Council. In accordance with Marxist theory, they saw racism as a consequence of the class system. They felt the Establishment and the government used racism to oppress the non-white population of the United Kingdom. The staff began voicing their opposition to co-operation with the Establishment and the government for these reasons. In addition, when the IRR was asked for assistance in outlining the 1971 Immigration Act, the staff saw it as helping the government to form a racist law.[136]

[132] Mullard 1985: 22.
[133] As stated in their Memorandum of Association, http://www.irr.org.uk/irr_history.
[134] Mason 1984: 144.
[135] Sivanandan 1974: 5.
[136] Interview with Jenny Bourne, 17 April 2008. For Marxist race theory, see chapter 2.

3.2.3 Conflict and re-founding

In January 1971 a fellow of the Institute's International Race Studies Programme named Robin Jenkins published a paper entitled *The production of Knowledge in the Institute of Race Relations* in which he attacked the IRR's research for being "a contribution to the ruling ideology"[137] for its bias towards Labour's, as he saw it, oppression of the non-white immigrant labour force. The Council asked Director Tinker to fire Jenkins, but instead he only reprimanded him. As a response to this disagreement, two staff members and three Council members wrote a report on what should be done in the Institute to solve the situation. The report was published in May 1971 and ended with the sentence: "Has the Director your confidence?"[138] By nine votes to two the Council answered *no* to this question and Tinker had to go.[139] At the annual general meeting in July that year the chairman, Harry Walston, was not re-elected to the Council, and those who supported the rebellious staff managed to elect five new members. This was the first time an election at the annual general meeting had been contested.[140]

In 1969 the monthly *News Letter* had changed its format to a quarterly magazine and its name to *Race Today*. The new format, though more popular than the old, was criticised by the Council as too expensive to produce and becoming more and more "opinionated". As Sandy Kirby, the new editor from March 1970, did not want to alter the new format, and Tinker, who had no confidence in the Council, supported his decision, the Council proposed the following: Tinker should go on study leave until his contract expired, a new Director of the Institute of Race Relations should be found, and *Race Today* should become independent – in opinion and financially – from the Institute. The proposals were put forward at an extraordinary general meeting in April 1972 where they were defeated by the Membership.[141] As a result, twelve members of the Council resigned and a new

[137] Sivanandan 1974: 20.
[138] Mason 1984: 180. The question was, according to Mason, only intended to be rhetorical to prove the Director's trust in the Council, but, to Mason's surprise, the Council answered "no".
[139] The intention was that Tinker should leave quietly in September the same year, but due to the events of the annual general meeting this did not happen. Mason 1984: 181.
[140] Sivanandan 1974: 21.
[141] According to Mason, the motions were defeated by 104 votes to 101, while the work of the new IRR claims the result was 94 to 8. In his doctorate Chris Mullard set the vote to 142 against 99, but this was

Council of Management was created. In the autumn of 1972, Tinker's contract expired and the Institute's librarian, Sivanandan, succeeded him as Director, becoming the new editor of the journal *Race* a year later. In 1973, the Institute moved into new premises in Pentonville, and, aside from Sivanandan, only two members of the former staff remained from the old IRR. After the change in 1972, the Institute referred to itself as an "anti-racist thinktank".[142] The limitation in activities as a consequence of the conflict, as well as the new audience of the Institute, is examined below.

3.3 Funding, fellowship and activities

When the Institute of Race Relations was set up as a branch of Chatham House it was with a guarantee of minimum three years' survival thanks to a £15,000 grant from the financial backers, the chairmen of various companies with interests mainly in Africa.[143] Hodson's idea was to start a whole new organisation, but his financial backers thought it best to start under a known body – Chatham House.[144] The funding for the work of the IRR came from an annual budget of £5,000, mostly from mining companies operating in Southern Africa. A quarter of this sum was paid to the Chatham House as regular costs. The Institute did not have a Council of its own and the Director answered to the Board of Studies of Chatham House. The former Governor of India, Lord Hayley, became the first Chairman of the Board of Studies. The Board consisted of politicians from several parties, members of the Chatham House, academics, media representatives, and representatives of the businesses that had provided money.[145] This meant that the financial backers continued to influence what research was being conducted by the IRR, and, just like in the rest of Chatham House, much of the research was on matters connected to the business interests of the founders in the former British colonies. The first research grant to the IRR, from the Rockefeller Foundation, was for a survey on race relations in Central Africa,[146] and Africa remained the focal point for research at the

---

with the inclusion of proxies. Mason 1984: 183; *Race and Class* vol 50, no. 2, 2008; and Mullard 1985: 167, respectively.

[142] http://www.irr.org.uk/about/index.html.

[143] Mullard 1985: 16.

[144] Mason 1984: 11.

[145] Mason 1984: 17.

[146] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no.1, 2008.

Institute for the next six years. As late as 1954, the Board of Studies at Chatham House was opposed to the suggestion that the Director should concern himself with work on the "signs of trouble in Britain for West Indian or Asian immigrants".[147] From 1955, however, the Board of Studies began collecting press cuttings on domestic race relations and summarising them. In 1957 Philip Mason wrote to the departments of social studies at the different universities of Britain asking for research on the immigrants who were coming to Britain at the time. He received very little positive response, except from the London School of Economics, and Edinburgh, where Kenneth Little[148] was conducting his research.[149] The Institute did not, however, publish any work of its own on race relations in the UK during these first six years.[150]

Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders[151] became chairman of the Council of the independent IRR in 1958. He collected members of the Board of Studies from Chatham House and with them made up the nucleus of the new Council. The £5,000 annual budget had restricted the activities of the IRR. After a suggestion from the Nuffield Foundation, the Institute invited chairmen of the leading businesses in Britain to dinner to discuss funding. The result was funding to the tune of £20,000 a year,[152] which gave the independent Institute greater freedom. Still, over the following decade the search for funding for its projects remained a permanent task for the IRR.

The possibility to move out from its Chatham House office and into its own premises in Jermyn Street came thanks to a five-year grant of £50,000 from the Nuffield Foundation. After this the IRR was still not only physically close to Chatham House, but also held lectures in the Institute's old premises and published articles by Chatham House staff in its journal. The new premises allowed the construction of a library for which the Institute purchased books on the subject of race relations. The collection and summarising of press

[147] Mason 1984: 28.
[148] See chapter 2.
[149] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.
[150] Sivanandan 1974: 8.
[151] A sociologist and Director of the London School of Economics, 1937-56, famous for his view that the high rates of reproduction in races of lower qualities limited the living standard of the races with higher qualities.
[152] Mason 1984: 95.

cuttings had been started by the Board of Studies while the Institute was a branch of Chatham House and was now continued in the Institute's library. The library collected press cuttings on race relations all over the world as well as in the UK, from a collection of some two hundred national and regional British newspapers.[153]

In November 1959, seven months after the Institute gained its independence, the first issue of the learned journal *Race* was published. *The Institute of Race Relations News Letter* (henceforth *News Letter*) was first published in April 1960, and became a monthly pamphlet from December the same year. Although the launch of the journal and *News Letter* came shortly after gaining independence, the expansion of the IRR's publishing effort was mainly the result of the quadrupling of financial support. Independence alone would not have enabled the Institute to expand its activities so rapidly. However, the continuity of the Institute's first phase was evident in its *News Letter*, which, until 1964, consisted of summaries of press cuttings as started by the Board of Studies in 1955.

The first output of the independent IRR came only six weeks after the Notting Hill and Nottingham riots,[154] when it published *Colour in Britain*.[155] The next year a survey of the existing material on British race relations was conducted and published in the 1960s as *Coloured Immigrants in Britain*.[156] Most of the publications of the Institute were on international race relations until 1968, when nine out of eleven publications where on domestic race relations. The Oxford University Press had agreed to publish practically anything the IRR submitted, using any money earned from some books to cover the losses on others. The Press had the right of veto but, according to Philip Mason, never exercised this.[157] In 1969, 112 books had been published through this agreement; 38 were sold out. This arrangement with the Oxford University Press produced an average of ten publications each year.

[153] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.
[154] See chapter 2.
[155] Wickenden, James. Oxford University Press, London: 1958.
[156] Griffith, J.A.G. et al. Oxford University Press, London: 1960.
[157] Mason 1984: 128.

It was with the £70,000 Nuffield Foundation grant in 1962 that the most extensive project of the Institute – the Survey of Race Relations (SRR) – was initially financed. The Survey, set up in 1963, was to be finished in 1968 and was led by E.J.B. Rose as director and Nicholas Deakin as assistant director. It consisted of 19 large and 22 smaller research projects on race relations within the UK. With further financial support from the Nuffield Foundation, the Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust and the Home Office, the Survey received a total of £104,290, spending £103,930 of it over the five years.[158] In 1969 the findings of the Survey were published in a book of over 800 pages, entitled *Colour and Citizenship*. It concluded with 33 "Findings and Recommendations"[159] for future policy. The Survey was to influence all the Institute's other activities on domestic race relations for the five years it lasted. The other main research programme for the Institute in the 1960s was the Comparative Study of Race Relations, financed by the Ford Foundation. This was a study comparing race relations in the Caribbean, Latin America and Asia, started in the autumn of 1960. The Central African Study, started while the IRR was a branch of the Chatham House, was continued throughout the 1960s. These two and the Survey of Race Relations in Britain were the three main research programmes of the decade. The majority of the other smaller research programmes were focused towards international relations.[160]

In all the Institute's publications of the 1960s, the inside cover included a statement that the IRR was precluded from expressing an opinion and that the opinions in the publications were those of the author and not of the Institute.[161] This would indicate that the IRR was not an activist NGO, in accordance with the definitions in chapter 2. The IRR was, however, represented in various governmental organisations, such as the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council in which Philip Mason was a Council member. Sheila Patterson left as editor of the IRR's *News Letter* in 1968 to become the editor of *New Community*, the journal of the Community Relations Commission, which

[158] Rose et al. 1969: 762.
[159] Rose et al. 1969: 676.
[160] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.
[161] For instance, Griffith et al. 1960.

had been created by the 1968 Race Relations Act.[162] The IRR also co-operated with the government, received funding from the government, and conducted research ordered by the government. Politicians and MPs also served on the Council of the IRR. The Institute also co-operated with other non-governmental organisations such as Political and Economic Planning, and sociology departments within the universities. When the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD) collapsed in 1967, two IRR members and David Pitt from CARD decided to start a new organisation to provide a media resource on race relations. This became the Runnymede Trust in 1968. The industrial unit of the Trust was initiated by the IRR as a body for more immediate research than the Institute's JUMPR[163] could provide.[164] The Chairman of the Advisory Committee was the IRR's E.J.B. Rose, director of the Survey, and the IRR Council member Dipak Nandy became the Trust's first Director, both underlining the close connection between the Institute and the Runnymede Trust.

The collaboration was with research NGOs, again indicating that the IRR was a research-oriented organisation. In its Memorandum of Association, however, it was stated that among the IRR's objects was to "consider and advise upon any proposals or endeavours to improve such [race – CV] relations, circumstances and conditions",[165] suggesting that advising on policy was part of the Institute's tasks. This discussion will be taken further in the next chapters as it is necessary to look at the content of the publications, analyse the agenda, and explore the influence of the Institute, in order to classify it as one or another type of non-governmental organisation. In this chapter, it is noted that the IRR had a connection with other NGOs, academic institutions, and, most importantly, successive governments. The latter could seem like a conflict for an organisation labelled as "non-governmental", but here it is important to note that in British NGOs in the 1960s and 1970s the activities of the officers of the NGOs tended to overlap between academic, non-governmental, and governmental activity.[166] The non-governmental organisations

[162] See chapter 2.
[163] The Joint Unit for Minority and Policy Research, the other of the two research programmes set up from 1969 under the IRR.
[164] *Race and Class*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1980.
[165] http://www.irr.org.uk/irr_history.
[166] Goulbourne 1998: 142.

did not hold a corporate view and they were not connected to or founded by governments or specific businesses.

In 1965, the IRR received a grant from the Home Office for £25,000 – of which £10,000 was reserved for research on domestic affairs.[167] The latter enabled the completion of the Survey of Race Relations.[168] This was the first government grant accepted by the Institute. This year, the first publication from the Survey was released. It was called *Colour and the British Electorate*, edited by Nicholas Deakin, and was on the role of race in the 1964 election.[169] Research connected to the SRR was printed in shorter articles in *Race* from July 1966. Before the government grant that year, the financial backing for the Institute had come solely from private contributors, the main being the Rockefeller Foundation, the Nuffield Foundation, Shell, and the Ford Foundation.[170] These contributors were often given their own seats on the IRR's Council.

From 1965 the Institute held its Annual Lecture at Chatham House, renamed the Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders Memorial Lecture a year later to commemorate the Council Chairman who had recently died in office. The IRR and the Royal Anthropological Institute co-sponsored the Universities Conference on Race Relations, held at London School of Economics in April 1966. The purpose of the conference was to exchange ideas between academic disciplines,[171] and from 1966 the IRR's Annual Race Conference was held each September, sponsored by the Royal Anthropological Association and the British Sociological Association. In addition, sporadic meetings were held by the Institute on race relations issues worldwide, mostly on African topics. Some of these were held at Whitehall, and some at Chatham House. The addresses given at these conferences, including those by politicians, were often printed in full in *Race*.

[167] Sivanandan 1974: 13.
[168] Rose et al. 1969: 762.
[169] During this election, the Labour candidate of Smethwick, Patrick Gordon Walker, was defeated by the Conservative Peter Griffith, who campaigned under the slogan: "If you want a nigger neighbour, vote Liberal or Labour". Hansen 2000: 132.
[170] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no 2, 2008.
[171] Patterson 1969: 292.

In 1969, with sponsorship worth $50,000 from the Ford Foundation, the Joint Unit for Minority and Policy Research (JUMPR) was set up in collaboration between the IRR and the University of Sussex. The Institute had first unsuccessfully attempted to get funds and co-operation from the government and then, again unsuccessfully, from the Social Science Research Council. The assistant director of the SRR, Nicholas Deakin, was the head of the JUMPR, which was supposed to continue the work of the Survey. Simultaneously, an international unit called the International Race Studies Programme (IRSP) was set up thanks to sponsorship worth $350,000 from the Ford Foundation. It was linked to the University of London and its International Area Studies and was lead by the Liberal politician and Professor of Politics Hugh Tinker. Now, at the end of the decade, IRR had an annual budget of £170,000 and a staff of 40.[172] The Institute co-operated to a much larger degree with university departments, but the main funding still came from private business sources.

The first Council members during the third phase in the IRR's history were a collection of community activists, media representatives and scholars. No businesses were represented. The Council members shared the belief that studying race relations should be to the benefit of the non-white population of the United Kingdom, and that white racism, rather than the non-white population, was the problem.[173] The publications did not initially reflect any change in the ideology of the Institute. The reason for this may have been that the books had been commissioned during the previous phase of the Institute's history, and also the fact that larger publications could not by their very nature respond quickly to change.[174] In any case, this gave the outside world a sense of continuity within the IRR.

After the conflict and the resignation of the Council in 1972, the foundations and trusts turned away from the IRR; Oxford University Press ceased publishing its books and the journal *Race*, which in 1975 became *Race and Class*. These developments forced the new Institute to rely heavily on volunteer work and a significantly smaller staff. The loss of

[172] Mullard 1985: 22.
[173] http://www.irr.org.uk/irr_history/
[174] Sivanandan 1974: 27.

funding did not happen immediately after the conflict, and as late as 1973 the foundations and trusts that had been connected to the Institute in the 1960s were still willing to keep it going.[175] *Race Today* had been separated from the Institute after the conflict and sold to Brixton where it became an independent political journal.[176] As mentioned, of the staff employed before the conflict, only three continued to work for the IRR after 1973. Still, the library, now led by volunteer workers, continued to collect press cuttings, and retained the collection of books that had been started under Chatham House. To collect money for the unfunded Institute, the copyright for all books published by the Oxford University Press for the Institute was sold along with the IRR's portfolio of stocks and shares. Financial support now came from new and non-business sources, such as the World Council of Churches.[177] The new Institute was able to set up a new body called *Towards Racial Justice*, concerned with the Third World in the metropolitan country, as early as April 1973.[178] However, even with the new sources of funding, the third phase in the IRR's history shows a significantly smaller scale of operations, both in terms of staff, funding and activities.

The conflict was not the first time the Institute had experienced the threat of losing financial support. The new form of the *News Letter* in 1969 had not only cost more money to produce, but the partisan line of the new pamphlet had scared off the providers of funding worth up to £20,000.[179] A year before the conflict, the Council had engaged a professional fund-raiser, Wells Management Consultants Ltd, to raise £450,000 over three years. The IRR was to pay £14,000 for the service, but not until the grants had reached £150,000. The money was to be raised from industry, however, and industry had been frightened by the increasing tension in the Institute after Robin Jenkins's paper. Because of this, Wells had only secured a grant of £130,000 when the Council resigned in 1972, and after this, the grants were withdrawn.[180] The old providers of funding,

[175] Sivanandan 1974: 27.
[176] *Race and Class*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1980.
[177] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2008.
[178] Sivanandan 1974: 28.
[179] Sivanandan 1974: 22.
[180] Sivanandan 1974: 25.

however, remained with the Institute into the third phase and smoothed the transition from business-oriented to community-oriented funding between 1972 and 1974.

3.4 Contributors and research fellows

The first and only editorial of the Institute's journal stated: "RACE aims to provide a forum for scholars to publish the results of their research and for informed people to express their views on the manifold aspects of race relations."[181] The first issue consisted of six articles about the academic approach to race relations in addition to reviews of books on the subject. For the next seven years the journal would consist of six to ten articles and a section of book reviews. From 1959 to 1972 the journal had four different editors with Simon Abbott as the longest running for the last seven years. The layout, however, remained more or less the same throughout the 1960s as the editors changed. Before July 1963, when it became a quarterly journal, *Race* was published biannually. Until 1968, Director Philip Mason regularly contributed one article per issue. The other contributors were scholars linked to universities in the United Kingdom, Canada and USA, and one or two contributors from the rest of Europe, Latin America, Africa or Australia, per issue. Contributions from the United States and Canada often outnumbered the British contributions. Over the first ten years, only two contributors to *Race* came from Asia.[182] The writers covered a wide range of fields within academia, including psychology, sociology, mathematics, law, medicine, and anthropology. From time to time a politician, organisation director, or clergyman would contribute an article. From 1963 some students, teachers and non-scholars were found among the contributors, but the majority remained professors and lecturers. The same year scholars from the West Indies began contributing one or two articles per issue.

The *News Letter* was written by the staff of the Institute. The layout in the beginning was eight to thirteen sections on events in different African countries as well as on World Affairs. The latter section would include announcements such as on the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. At the end of the pamphlet there would be announcements about the

[181] *Race*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1959.
[182] A Singaporean barrister in *Race*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1962, and an Indian lecturer in *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.

activities of the IRR and other organisations, as well as a list of recently published books on the subject. The style was short and informative on media events, but with a degree of summarising and interpretation of events as symptoms of a phenomenon, such as an increase of xenophobia.[183] From January 1961 a section on Britain was included in the pamphlet, with summaries of domestic news and events printed in the media during the previous month.

Most of the IRR's publications were commissioned by the Institute or written by its staff, but some of the books where simply given to them in finished form by the author and the IRR would have it printed in the name of the Institute. Some very well known names were among the authors such as John Rex and Robert Moore. [184] The Institute's close connection with UK universities became more and more evident towards the end of the 1960s, as the research staff at the IRR were post-graduates or academics often still connected to their universities. In addition to carrying out its own studies, the Institute also sponsored smaller studies carried out by researchers who were not connected to the IRR.

IRR staff who contributed articles to the *News Letter* was no longer anonymous from March 1966. From the November/December issue of that year a new section was added to the pamphlet, the "Race Relations Abstract". It was a short summary of all books published on race relations since the last issue. In July 1967, the "Quarterly Forum" was introduced as a new separate section in *Race*. In the introduction it said: "These eight years have also been a time of growing interest in and study of race relations."[185] The forum was meant to describe the work of other organisations working in the same field. Over the following years it was also used to print documents, such as Powell's famous "Rivers of blood" speech;[186] and correspondence between scholars or politicians.

[183] *News Letter*, October 1962.
[184] Both were British sociologists well known for their studies on ethnic and race relations. At the end of the 1960s the former was a Professor at the University of Warwick and the latter was a senior lecturer at the University of Aberdeen.
[185] *Race*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1967.
[186] See chapter 2.

Simultaneously, the *News Letter* began issuing pamphlets such as the PEP Report[187] in a seven-page supplement in April 1967, and the IRR fact paper "Numbers in Britain" in 1968.

From 1968 the readers of the *News Letter* became visible for the first time through the printing of letters to the editor.[188] The layout was changed, with six to nine sections on domestic affairs and only two on foreign. The New Year started with a new name for the *News Letter*: *Race Today*.[189] Editor Sheila Patterson was replaced by Peter Watson, who included a section in which staff from the IRR library reviewed pamphlet publications. Watson stayed as editor of the pamphlet for little over a year before Sandy Kirby took over in March 1970. This event was marked with the first regular editorial. Instead of the former unnamed writers from the IRR's staff, all items were now from named contributors from the staff, academia, and various organisations. Even the government's Race Relations Board had its own column along with the Community Relations Commission. *Race Today* became a deciding issue in the events of 1971 and 1972 because it now represented the voices of two groups that had not been heard within the IRR before: the staff and the non-white community. This had not come dramatically at the turn of the decade, but rather gradually from the mid-1960s.

The staff hired for the International Race Studies Programme and the Joint Unit for Minority and Policy Research were mainly young academics, many of whom had participated in the student movements in Europe in 1968.[190] Together with Tinker they managed to establish the principle that staff should be present when decisions on research, the organisation or the organisation's policy were to be made.[191] They did not have a vote, but they were able to communicate the opinion of the Institute's staff to the Council. This led to two staff representatives at all Council meetings, a monthly staff meeting and a number of committees in which staff participated. Among these was the executive committee where staff and Council met once a month. It was at the staff

[187] See chapter 2.
[188] *News Letter*, June 1968.
[189] *News Letter*, from 1969.
[190] Mullard 1985: 23.
[191] Ibid.

meetings, where everyone working at the Institute was present, that the IRSP staff, together with some people from the JUMPR, the library, *Race Today* and the publications section, turned against Deakin's proposals for research projects, and he was forced to hand them over to the Runnymede Trust.[192] At the same time, some staff members were recruiting their friends to the membership.[193] All this meant that the power in the Institute was beginning to move away from the Council and towards the staff. The staff had to answer to the Council, which decided the research focus. The Council had to answer to the Membership at the annual meeting when it came up for re-election, and in certain cases when it did not want to make decisions alone. However, by the beginning of the next decade, according to Philip Mason, the organisation was transforming itself into a republic, run from the bottom.[194]

Tinker refused to discharge Robin Jenkins on the basis of "defending academic freedom",[195] thereby defending everything the IRR stood for: the IRR was to encourage and facilitate the study between races everywhere, but the opinions expressed were those of the authors.[196] As a Director, defending the official standpoint of the Institute was Tinker's job. Still, the Council opposed him. The Council's rejection of Tinker's view, and its demand for Jenkins's dismissal led to very understandable opposition from the staff. I see the "revolution" not as a heroic opposition from the staff, but as a dichotomised conflict resulting in confrontation, which was generated by the Council of Management. With the decision to hold the Extraordinary General Meeting in April, the Council triggered the dismantling of the Institute. Still, the staff has been portrayed as the instigator. A conflict is inevitable when the intentions and opinions of those in charge do not agree with those of the ones who do the work. In the end, the Council simply did not reflect the opinions of the staff and conflict was unavoidable.

After the conflict, the staff began what Sivanandan labelled the "Counter-Revolution" against Director Tinker. The staff wished to work directly for the non-white community

[192] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2008. For the Runnymede Trust, see chapter 2.
[193] Mason 1984: 182.
[194] Mason 1984: 176.
[195] Mullard 1985: 25.
[196] Patterson 1969: inside cover.

and did not want the distance between staff and Director that Tinker seemed to outline.[197] When Sivanandan succeeded Tinker in September 1972, the Director worked alongside the staff, illustrated through, for instance, "stuffing envelopes in mass postal send outs".[198]

The new *Race and Class* consisted of articles written by "anti-imperialist activists and scholars"[199] thus maintaining the academic tradition, but moving towards a more politically opinionated journal. Some authors of IRR publications in the 1960s became Council members of the new Institute of Race Relations in the 1970s. One example is the IRR publication *Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook*[200] by John Rex and Robert Moore: both authors became members of the Institute's Council after the resignation of the old Council in 1972. This maintained a link with the IRR of the 1960s and, because of the authors' practical as well as theoretical approach to race relations, indicates that the publications of the Institute were beginning to change form, following a change in academia towards more ideological research, long before the conflict.

3.5 The audience of the Institute

Membership of Chatham House was restricted to British subjects and together with an expensive membership fee this restricted the audience of the IRR.[201] At the end of the first phase in the Institute's history, the Director of Chatham House felt that the Institute should take a more academic path, while the IRR Director felt the opposite was needed in order to reach a wider audience.[202] One of the reasons why there is so little knowledge of and research on the first period of the IRR might be just because its audience was such a narrow elite. Chatham House was a part of the Establishment and many of its Council members had business interests in the areas where research was being conducted. In its first six years, the IRR was subordinate to Chatham House's Board of Studies and to the

[197] Sivanandan 1974: 26.
[198] *Race and Class*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2008.
[199] http://www.irr.org.uk/irr_history/
[200] Published by the Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations in 1967.
[201] Sivanandan 1974: 2.
[202] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.

business interests of its members. Therefore, the major difference between the first and the second phase of the Institute was the widening of its audience.

The Council of the independent IRR consisted of many former Board of Studies members from Chatham House, and the funding, as we have seen, still came from businesses, trusts and funds with business interests. However, the increase in financial support, and having only one Council to answer to, gave the Institute much more freedom. With the creation of the library, the scope of the IRR could now include the community to a greater extent. The first librarian of the independent Institute was a Sikh woman, Narindar Uberoi, who functioned not only as a librarian but also as a bridge between the IRR and the Sikh women and children in Southall.[203] Once a week, the Institute held meetings for members to hear speakers on subjects about race relations in Britain and other parts of the world. The membership fee was deliberately kept low to include students and immigrants.[204] When Uberoi left the IRR to move to the USA in 1964 and Ambalavaner Sivanandan was hired as new librarian, the Institute kept the tradition of having a non-white librarian. This was, according to Director Philip Mason, so that non-white students should not be intimidated when they came to the library.[205] Sivanandan was born in Sri Lanka, and had fled persecution as a South Indian Tamil. He was to be of great importance not only, as we have seen, in the events of the IRR in the early 1970s, but also in continuing the expansion of the Institute's library. Together with Margaret Scruton, Sivanandan created the biennial Register of Research on Commonwealth Immigrants in Britain, described by *News Letter* editor Sheila Patterson as: "the most complete record of unpublished or ongoing research by subject".[206] Non-members of the Institute could now also apply to use the library.[207] This could include children with school projects and allow other people to gain insight into the subject and the activities of the Institute without having to take up membership.

[203] Mason 1984: 128.
[204] Mason 1984: 181.
[205] Mason 1984: 143.
[206] Patterson 1969: 292.
[207] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.

With all this, the IRR was, in the 1960s, turning more and more towards the immigrant community at the same time as providing a forum for scholars and researching areas where their providers of funding had business interests. *Race* covered a wide field of academic disciplines and thus targeted most academics while the *News Letter* provided brief easy-to-read news summaries for all who were interested in race relations. With the increasing financial support and number of projects, the Institute had the freedom to reach an even wider audience at the same time as the organisation concentrated less on business-oriented research.

After the conflict in 1972, the scope of the Institute did not change significantly, but the principle of which audience the Institute should address was reformulated. Fighting for the non-white community was now the target, rather than educating the white population. *Race and Class* was still targeted at academia, but with the decrease in financial support, publications and projects became fewer, and the academic audience was decreasing as well. Simply put, the scope of the IRR went from covering society and academia as well as the immigrant community to covering almost only the immigrant community in the third phase of the its history. This was to a large part due to pressures on funding after the conflict.

3.6 Summary

One of the main factors that shaped the first twelve years of the independent Institute's history was how it was funded. This influenced which audience the IRR reached and what activities it performed. The fluctuations in funding went hand in hand with the activities of the Institute. Some of its activities, which had existed for some time, became visible because the funding allowed them to expand. The transition from the first to the second phase led to the biggest change in the IRR's audience. Again, the increase funding allowed an expansion of activities, including an open library, new journals and pamphlets, and a wider audience. However, the learned journal *Race* continued the academic approach, and the Council maintained the connection to Chatham House. The focus of the IRR widened over the 1960s, except on business-oriented research, which declined. With the new form in 1972, this group was completely excluded from the

audience of the Institute, but the decline in focus on this type of activity had begun already during the latter half of the 1960s. Now, the reach of the Institute was limited even further with the academic world being less important, educating the population to become a multicultural society no longer being the aspiration, and all focus switching to the non-white community.

Most events were not reflections of the transition from one phase to the next, but occurred gradually within one phase. With the increase in funding, and not so much with the newly gained independence, there was a dramatic increase in publications and projects. The transition into the third phase created a great loss of financial support, but still, the journal, pamphlet, name, and some projects of the IRR were continued. Admittedly, Director Tinker did not continue in his position for long after the transition, and the staff wished to continue as a group. With Sivanandan, however, a new strong leader was appointed as Director.

The other main factor that shaped the IRR's history was ideology and the question of what the Institute's main task should be. This factor became important from the second half of the second phase, in the mid-1960s. The conflict at the beginning of the 1970s was a consequence not only of a value shift between two generations, but also of community changes and a politicisation of race at the end of the 1960s. This point is examined further in chapter 4.

4. "Precluded from expressing a corporate view"[208] – the message of the IRR

In an interview, the IRR's Company Secretary, Jenny Bourne, explained how the term "race relations", which is still part of the Institute's name, reflected the time in which it was set up, and its history, which was a consequence of the colonial system. She revealed that the name is now a misnomer because the IRR of today is opposed to racism, and that "anti-racism" is a very different thing from "race relations". The latter just describes any interaction between people of different ethnicities, and expresses no opinion, whilst "anti-racism" is a more political word.[209]

Over the twelve first years of the IRR's history as an independent organisation, its profile went through several changes. As mentioned, previous research has not recognised this variety in the Institute in the 1960s. Also, it has seen the organisation as constant in where it positioned itself up to the conflict in 1972. This chapter examines the position and message of the Institute between 1958 and 1970. As the IRR insisted, and still insists, on not holding a corporate view, one way to measure its point of view is through its publications. By looking at the activities of the organisation, this chapter suggests, in contrast with previous research on the IRR, that there were major changes within the IRR's standpoint even from the mid-1960s. The chapter intends to prove that the Institute did, indeed, hold a corporate view.

4.1 The IRR's message in previous research

Previous research on IRR has not generally focused on where the Institute positioned itself in the 1960s. In his doctoral thesis, Chris Mullard described how three main features decided the position of the Institute. Firstly, the IRR was to be a body of objective research that could be used by the government, academia and industry;

[208] The statement: "The Institute is precluded by the Memorandum and Articles of its incorporation from expressing a corporate view" appeared on the cover of all IRR publications.
[209] Interview with Jenny Bourne, 17 April 2008.

secondly, it was to remove racial tension in the interest of the Western world; and lastly, the Institute was to protect Western values, beliefs and interests through its work.[210] According to Mullard, the Council (or the governing body before 1958) addressed itself to these three features from the very beginning in 1952 until the change in 1972, meaning that he did not see any change in the standpoint the Institute took. He did, however, see a change in attitude among a few black staff members from the summer of 1967, which marked the beginnings of their realisation that they had to choose a path between – as he put it – supporting white oppression or resistive struggle.[211] Still, Mullard did not see any changes in the Institute's message as a result of this resistance before the 1971 IRR election. Mullard labelled the position of the Institute before this as "a liberal form of neo-colonial racism"[212].

Sivanandan, in his first work on the IRR from 1974, portrayed the Institute in the years before the conflict of 1972 as an organisation with a fixed stance in terms of its role in the anti-racist response. In later works, he saw Phillip Mason's 17 years as Director as a period of a constant position, but the first six years under Chatham House as a period when this viewpoint could not be fully carried out. Hence, he still regarded the 1960s, up till the last year of the decade, as a period of a consistent stance. Sivanandan saw the Institute under Mason as a research provider to prevent racial discrimination, because racism could be destructive to a democracy.[213] He argued that Hugh Tinker, Director from 1969, introduced a "laissez-faire liberalism" where staff member were allowed to research without ideological limitations.[214] By this he meant that during Tinker's three and a half years as Director before the conflict, the Institute simply did not hold a position regarding its anti-racist response. However, Sivanandan also described a period of the Institute overlapping Tinker and Mason as "managerial liberalism".[215] By this he meant that the Institute was only devoted to the empirical side of its work, and that it did

[210] Mullard 1985: 49.
[211] Mullard 1985: 38.
[212] Mullard 1985: 91.
[213] Sivanandan 1974: 7.
[214] Sivanandan 1974: 17.
[215] Ibid.

not hold a position, but changed its direction "with every wind the Government blew".[216] This period was coincided with the five years of the work on the Survey of Race Relations.

According to Phillip Mason the basic assumption behind both Chatham House and the Institute of Race Relations was that "thought, discussion, the publication of books and newspapers, can influence policy and opinion".[217] He saw it as the Institute's object to create a body of information to prevent racism, or, as he defined racism, for a nation to include two kinds of citizens, of whom one is regarded as inferior, getting a grip on the nation.[218] He believed that such social evils would be avoided if there were enough information to influence people's knowledge and opinion. The Survey of Race Relations was, as he saw it, the embodiment of this. Achieving influence over legislation was not among the Institute's objects. Still, as Director, Mason hoped that knowledge on the subject could influence those in power: "We had assumed that there was a fund of good will among most British people which could be encouraged if they knew more, that there was a good will too among many Members of Parliament and civil servants and that they could be gently nudged towards sensible courses of action."[219] All in all Mason did not see any changes or development in the position the Institute set for itself throughout the 1960s. He saw the viewpoint of the IRR as consistent, even from the very beginning under Chatham House, and best represented in the IRR's Survey of Race Relations.

Today, on the Institute's website, the IRR before the conflict is described as a "policy-oriented, establishment, academic institution"[220] again indicating that the Institute's position is not seen as changing over the first 20 years of its history. However, the website incorporates several positions at the same time. All works on the Institute have positioned it as a provider of information or research, but how the information was to be used, and by whom, has been explained differently. Mason saw it as the IRR's task in the

[216] Sivanandan 1974: 9.
[217] Mason 1984: 147.
[218] Mason 1984: 150.
[219] Mason 1984: 185.
[220] http://www.irr.org.uk/about/index.html.

1960s to provide knowledge for the population, while Mullard and Sivanandan saw the Institute as providing research to be used by the Establishment.

4.2 Three stages of the IRR's profile

In chapter 2, non-governmental organisations were divided into three categories: a) Research NGOs, b) Activist NGOs and c) Immigrant welfare NGOs. In this chapter I argue that the Institute of Race Relations positioned itself in the first two categories throughout the 1960s, and also introduced a new category of NGOs, between the two first, a category d) Policy-oriented NGOs, where the IRR also positioned itself during the decade. This latter type of non-governmental organisation would not only produce practical knowledge that could be used by the policy-makers, but also make direct suggestions for legislation. The research NGO, on the other hand, would focus on theoretical knowledge, and the activist NGO would use pressure rather than knowledge to make changes. Also, both the activist and the research NGO might not focus on changing legislation, but rather on targeting issues and providing forums for opinion or thought.

This chapter argues that three different stages of the IRR's standpoint during the 1960s can be illustrated through three different activities: *Race*, the Survey of Race Relations and *Race Today*, the former *News Letter*. It is important to note that these were different activities from very different parts the Institute and are therefore not to be compared. They do, however, provide good examples of the three positions IRR held during the 1960s, and are used as just that in this chapter.

Through its wide range of publications and by having a journal with research news and a newsletter with media news, the IRR managed to cover the field of race relations and stay on the cutting edge. Where the Institute discovered little or no coverage, it used its own researchers to cover the issue. This was consistent throughout the 1960s and had been becoming more important since the gaining of independence in 1958. *Race* represented the research forum, the Survey was the IRR's own research while the *News Letter* was the political and current events forum. The IRR's changing standpoint reflected the situation in the United Kingdom, so in this respect the Institute did not contribute any

new views. It was, however, the first British organisation to study the field so widely and extensively, and this position grew more important over the decade. The impact and perceptions of the IRR are discussed in the next chapter.

It would be misleading to see the publications as the Institute's collective voice. However, they can indicate changes within the organisation. The three activities presented in this chapter were all very collective projects and were all subject to constant control from the rest of the organisation. They are therefore good indicators of general tendencies within the Institute and within the group of people who worked in the field: the politicians, activists and contributors.

4.2.1 The IRR as a forum for theory and research – *Race*

During the first years of its independent existence, the IRR can be placed in the first of the categories mentioned in chapter 2: the research NGO. During this time, the IRR functioned as a forum for theory and research providing theoretical knowledge in the academic field of race relations. This is represented in the IRR's learned journal *Race*, founded in 1959, one year after independence. The first issue of *Race* consisted of six articles about the academic approach to race relations. The editorial stated that the journal was a forum for academics to publish articles on their research, but also for people to express their opinions. The latter, however, did not become a part of *Race* until 1963 when a former foreign student in the United Kingdom described the personal experience of the difficulties of being a non-white student in the UK.[221] This type of article remained, however, an exception. Indeed, some of the early articles also included suggestions for, or criticism of, legislation, but no direct opinions were expressed. Most of the articles were, as Erik Bleich described the research on race relations in the 1950s,[222] simply observations of immigrant or mixed communities. An example of such a contribution is an article by the American assistant professor Allen D. Grimshaw entitled "Factors Contributing to Colour Violence in the United States and Britain".[223] Here, the

[221] *Race*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1963.
[222] See chapter 2.
[223] *Race*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1962.

author compared racial violence in Britain and America in the light of theories on race relations, concluding that immigrants were no threat to the British community. However, he also warned against racism because "the same impotence makes unlikely major shifts in patterns of intergroup relations without the intervention of government authority".[224] This article depicts the typical approach of the *Race* contributor: a focus on theory and only vague suggestions for governmental policy.

Table of content in *Race*, 1959-1964 (number of articles on each category)

Publication	General theoretical on race relations	Domestic race relations	Race relations abroad
Vol. 1, no. 1, 1959	4		2
Vol. 1, no. 2, 1960	3	3	2
Vol. 2, no. 1, 1960	1		4
Vol. 2, no. 2, 1961	3		4
Vol. 3, no. 1, 1961	3		4
Vol. 3, no. 2, 1962		2	4
Vol. 4, no. 1, 1962	1	1	7
Vol. 4, no. 2, 1963		1	6
Vol. 5, no. 1, 1963		1	5
Vol. 5, no. 2, 1963	1	2	3
Vol. 5, no. 3, 1964	1	3	3
Vol. 5, no. 4, 1964			10*
Vol. 6, no. 1, 1964	1	2	4
Vol. 6, no, 2, 1964		2	7

* All articles in this issue were on the comparison between Chinese and African race relations

As the table shows, the main concern was with race relations abroad, but a steady number of articles dealt with the theoretical approach to the field of race relations. These theoretical articles could not be linked to a geographical place. In this category, there was

[224] Ibid.

a visible decline from 1963. After the third (of four) 1966 issue, theoretical articles appeared only sporadically with five such articles in total between this issue and the last of the 1970 issues. Domestic race relations remained a subordinate topic during this period and throughout the rest of the 1960s. Only in 1970 did the number of articles on domestic race relations per issue surpass the number on race relations abroad.[225]

Policy and legislation were rarely discussed in *Race*. The 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, for instance, was not discussed in any articles before it was passed. It was not mentioned in *Race* until 1965.[226] This is an example also of the lack of coverage of current events in the journal, demonstrating its theoretical standpoint and again suggesting that policy and practical knowledge were not the object of *Race* at the time. In 1965, the year when the 1962 CIA was first mentioned, opinions on legislation became visible in the *Race* articles for the first time and contributors began to include representatives from organisations and congresses, such as an Algerian representative of the Pan-African Congress of South Africa who argued that Apartheid had good sides as well.[227]

Race reflected the academic world connected to race relations, known as the "race professionals" in the United Kingdom.[228] When terms were used for the first time in *Race*, it reflected the development of terms within the academic world. In 1966, the term "ethnic" was used, without quotation marks, for the first time in a *Race* article,[229] reflecting a move from "race" towards "ethnicity" in academia. Before 1963, all contributors were connected to academic institutions, but after this year contributors started to include students and non-scholars. Still, the non-scholars were educated barristers, journalists, and editors, and, together with the students, appeared only sporadically in *Race*. The standpoint of the journal in these years could be compared to university approaches to race relations all over the world at this time. The difference was that *Race* covered a wider field by including more academic disciplines than a University

[225] From *Race*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1970.
[226] *Race*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1965.
[227] *Race*, vol. 6, no. 6, 1965.
[228] See chapter 2.
[229] *Race*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1966.

department would, such as mathematics, psychology, law, medicine, sociology and social anthropology. Also, *Race* was the first of its kind in the United Kingdom, a journal publishing only research articles related to race relations.

As reflected in *Race*, for the first six or seven years of its independent history the IRR was a theory-oriented research NGO. This is consistent partly with how the IRR of today regards the Institute of Race Relations in the 1960s. In the mid-1960s, the journal started to change. A need for more current events in the journal, as race relations became more and more a domestic matter, was met with the "Quarterly Forum" from 1967.[230] In that year, the main domestic issue became housing and schools, and these matters continued to dominate over the next three years. At the end of the decade, articles started including clear suggestions for policy-making. The change in the title to include "race *and group* relations"[231] from 1968 suggests that race relations had now broadened its field and race was no longer seen as the sole category for division between newcomers and the indigenous population. However, religion had been included as a divider in *Race* articles as early as 1965. The turn towards a politicised Institute, going beyond a merely advisory role, came with the Director's expression of a political view in the printed version of an address he had given at a conference. Here, Mason encouraged the continued fight against racial discrimination in the UK, and advocated the promotion of human rights.[232] From 1970 articles started to use examples from the United Kingdom to illustrate a general point. The domestic situation was now recognised as part of the world situation, and the Institute's Survey could be one of the reasons for this.

The question remains whether the journal of the Institute of Race Relations can be said to represent the whole Institute in a certain period. *Race* was only one of many IRR activities. However, these other projects were well represented in *Race*. In the second issue of 1965, as many as 5 out of 10 contributors were not connected to a university, and these articles were far more politicised as many of the contributors represented different

[230] See chapter 3.
[231] On the cover of all issues of *Race* from 1968. Italics added.
[232] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1968.

organisations.[233] Simultaneously, in 1964, projects from the IRR's Survey of Race Relations were beginning to be included in *Race*. This shows the transition to a new IRR standpoint, which again is best illustrated through the Survey of Race Relations. It also means that this connection and transition, through the highlighting of other parts of the IRR's activities, was indeed visible in *Race*.

4.2.2 The IRR as political advisor – the Survey of Race Relations

The Survey of Race Relations (SRR) was started in 1963 and the findings were published in 1969. However, it represents the main activity of the Institute from 1965 to 1967. The 33 findings and recommendations at the end of its summary, *Colour and Citizenship*, signified a new position for the Institute as a policy-oriented NGO. Linked to the Institute's new standpoint was an article by Philip Mason published in the *Guardian* on 23 December 1965. The article was published on the same day as Roy Jenkins took office as Home Secretary. Labour had come into power the year before, and together with the businessman and Labour supporter Sir Jock Campbell,[234] Mason wanted to guide the government towards a "coherent and consistent policy about immigration".[235] While Campbell was to discuss the matter directly with his friends in government, Mason was to publish the article. The essence of the article was that the borders should be closed almost completely while those immigrants already in the country should be integrated. The best-known sentence of the article was:

> We are determined to treat those immigrants who are here as kindly as we treat our older citizens; we are determined to cut down sharply the number of fresh entries until this mouthful has been digested.[236]

Apart from the controversy sparked by the last four words of the sentence, this indicated that the Director of the IRR was for restricting immigration and, at the same time, for anti-discriminatory legislation. A strongly worded article by its Director also indicated

[233] *Race*, vol. 6, no. 4, 1965.
[234] Campbell (later Lord Campbell) came from a family that had amassed its wealth from African slave trade. In 1971, he publically dissociated himself from his ancestors stating that profits should not be the sole purpose of business.
[235] Mason 1984: 132.
[236] *Guardian*, 23 December 1965.

that this was the position of the Institute and that it would try to influence the government. However, Mason left the lobbying to Campbell and the Institute continued to carry out research, with its main project being the Survey.

The connection with Labour and especially with Roy Jenkins, the Home Secretary from 1965 to 1967, was evident also in the summary of the SRR. *Colour and Citizenship* consisted of nine parts, of which one was devoted in its entirety to Roy Jenkins. As the chapter concluded, "the nearest we have yet come to a decent race relations policy domestically […] was reached during the Home Secretaryship of Roy Jenkins".[237] Within the Institute during this period, there were some who wanted to go beyond the production of information that the government could use to make informed decisions. In *Colour and Citizenship*, there was also criticism of governmental policy after Jenkins, such as the Kenyan Asians Crisis of 1968 when the government passed an act that prevented Asian British passport holders in Kenya from entering, leaving them stateless. The report criticised the Act for having damaged the concept of equal citizenship and reduced the structures of British nationality law "to a heap of rubble".[238]

While Mason still insisted that the Survey should be an objective collection of information to prevent racism,[239] those responsible for the Survey wanted a more direct influence on media and public opinion. This is evident in the decision to set up the Runnymede Trust in 1967. Rose and Deakin, the director and assistant director of the SRR, were at a conference with Anthony Lester and Dipak Nandy from the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD) when the Campaign collapsed. As a response, these four men decided to set up the Trust not only as a media resource, but also to correct misinformation.[240] As described in chapters 2 and 3, the Runnymede Trust was to provide more immediate research than the Institute of Race Relations could, but except for this the two bodies could be compared as the same type of organisation, only in

[237] Rose et al. 1969: 549.
[238] Rose et al. 1969: 627. For the Kenyan Asians Crisis, see chapter 2.
[239] Mason 1984: 150.
[240] *New Community*, vol. 14, no. 1/2, 1987.

different time periods. In comparison with the Trust's Parekh Report[241] of 2000, there was no tension between the main objects of the Survey.[242] This may have been because the Survey's objects were to provide information and to make proposals, while acting as the voice for the minority or finding a theoretical approach to race relations were not parts of its remit. The aim of serving as a voice for the minority was to become the object of the Institute in the years after *Colour and Citizenship* was published.

The reasons for this wish to provide information concerning contemporary events came partly from the politicisation of race during the second half of the 1960s. When the Survey was set up in 1962, the political discussion around race legislation had been calm since the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act. Six years later, the situation was very different. Enoch Powell had entered the politics of race relations in 1967; and the 1968 Race Relations Act had proven a striking contrast to the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of the same year. Before this CARD had collapsed and new non-governmental organisations, both activist, such as the Racial Action Adjustment Society, and research-oriented, such as the Runnymede Trust, had emerged. When *Colour and Citizenship* was published it was 200 pages longer than initially planned, and was much more concerned with the political side of race relations than could have been foreseen in 1962.[243]

Nicholas Deakin regarded the Kenyan Asians Crisis and the subsequent 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act[244] as the turning point for the IRR's change of agenda. Before this, the Institute had functioned as "a source of factual briefings and a point at which discussion of issues could take place",[245] and the Runnymede Trust had been created to handle campaigning questions. However, with the passing of the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act in March 1968, the line between the IRR's function as a provider of facts and meeting place for discussions, and the function that had been intended for the Trust, became blurred. In the Survey of Race Relations this became evident in the new way of approaching questions of political policy.

---

[241] See chapter 2.
[242] *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2000.
[243] *New Community*, vol. 14, no. 1/2, 1987.
[244] See chapter 2 for the Kenyan Asians Crisis and 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act.
[245] Correspondence with Nicholas Deakin, spring 2009.

As described in chapter 3, the Survey consisted of 19 larger and 22 smaller research programmes. The last part of the publication was called "Findings and Recommendations" where the writers gave short and clear advice on future policy for the government, based on the findings of the different research projects. The Institute's ideology on educating against racism can be found in this section of *Colour and Citizenship*, again suggesting that the study was a presentation of the IRR's policy. When it came to immigration, the Survey suggested greater consistency in immigration politics on the one hand, but still wanted no numerical limit on immigration. This was to be evaluated by parliament every year. The most important policy suggestion was that there should be equality between Commonwealth citizens and alien immigrants. Citizenship should be based largely on birth within the UK, and the system of a combined UK and Colonies citizenship should be abandoned.[246]

The first of the recommendation was that the responsibility of integration should be transferred to the Department of Social Affairs. This was because the problems were closely linked with the problems of the inner city and these had to be tackled by broader action.[247] The Survey concluded that the 1968 Race Relations Act was very successful, but section 6 of the 1965 Race Relations Act had to be changed, something that had not been done in the 1968 Act. Section 6 made it a criminal offence to incite others to racial hatred by speech or writing. The survey saw this as coming close to encroaching upon freedom of expression, and would also give those prosecuted unwanted attention and sympathy. The survey suggested the section should either be repealed or incorporated into the legislation relating to public order.[248] At the end of *Colour and Citizenship* came the suggestions as to how the public should be educated. Here the ideal was that the positive findings of the Survey should be disseminated in the right way in order to allow changes in the public's attitudes.[249] It should be added that the first page of *Colour and Citizenship* included a poem by W. A. Auden that ended with the phrase "We must love

[246] Rose et al. 1969: 751.
[247] Rose et al. 1969: 683.
[248] Rose et al. 1969: 688.
[249] Rose et al. 1969: 737.

one another or die", emphasising the urgency with which the authors called for functioning anti-discriminatory legislation.

Thus the view presented in *Colour and Citizenship* can be summarised as: stricter border controls for New Commonwealth immigrants; integration of those already in the country; and education of the rest of the population to prevent racial discrimination. This production of knowledge to be used by the government is consistent with the Institute's position in the 1960s as described by Sivanandan, Mullard and Mason. The level of direct suggestions for policy found in the Survey, however, is not mentioned in any of their works. Also, the policy-oriented IRR existed for only two or three years from 1965 to 1968, when the research projects for the Survey were finished and a more politicised Institute began to emerge. Randall Hansen has emphasised that when the IRR seized its focus on immigration control and turned all its attention towards aiding the government on integration at the end of the 1960s, "it was part of a broader shift within liberal opinion from open borders to integration".[250] In my view, this shift occurred within the IRR during what was labelled as the political "liberal hour" from 1966 to 1968.[251]

The publication of the SRR as *Colour and Citizenship* in 1969 shows this policy-oriented Institute of Race Relations. However, on the cover of the publication, as on all of the Institute's publications, a note insisted that the IRR was precluded from holding a corporate view and that the opinions expressed were those of the authors.[252] Benjamin Heineman Jr, in his book on CARD[253] commented on the Survey's suggestion to extend the 1965 Race Relations Act:

> The Institute of Race Relations and its 'Survey of Race Relations in Britain' while technically restricted in their charter from making corporate statements about public policy were in the persons of their highest officers in support of extending legislation.[254]

[250] Hansen 2000: 129.
[251] See chapter 2 for the "liberal hour".
[252] Rose et al. 1969: inside cover.
[253] See chapter 2.
[254] Heineman 1972: 128. This part of the book was actually written before *Colour and Citizenship* was published so Heineman could not make use of it for his own book, but because many of the research projects had been presented in forums such as *Race*, he could comment on the SRR's content.

By allowing its own major research programme, the Survey, to express strong recommendations on policy, the Institute revealed a new standpoint in terms of its anti-racist response. The impression that the Survey represented the viewpoint of the IRR is reinforced by the introduction in which several of Mason's articles were adapted to outline the myths and realities concerning the word "race".[255] By including the views of the Director in the introduction, the reader was given the feeling that the book represented the Institute itself. The SRR signified a turn from documenting the work of other researchers to contributing its own. It could be compared to Political and Economic Planning (PEP), which with its PEP reports before the different Race Relations Acts can also be placed under the heading of policy-oriented NGOs, but the report of the IRR was far more extensive – with 41 research projects instead of one – and covering a much wider field than any of the PEP reports.

The Survey of Race Relations indicates a third category of non-governmental organisations: the policy-oriented NGO. In the Survey, the Institute of Race Relations did maintain its approach to race relations through the production of knowledge. However, the knowledge produced was strictly practical and not theoretical, thereby parting company with the so-called "race professionals" whose race relations research was to be strictly theoretical. Also, universities were the only institutions that could "afford" the strictly theoretical research of the "race professionals". Thus, any a scholar wanting to research in order to make policy suggestions had to turn to the research of non-governmental organisation, such as the Survey of Race Relations.

4.2.3 The IRR as an activist and politicised body – *Race Today*

In 1969 Sheila Patterson, the editor of *News Letter* for the first nine years of the pamphlet's history, wrote: "It was part of the initial conception that the subject [race relations - CV] should be studied, in so far as possible, objectively and that the Institute should not become a pressure group."[256] However, at the time this was written, the Institute had already turned into a more politicised organisation, and from within the

[255] Rose et al. 1969: 34.
[256] Patterson 1969: 287.

Institute came the wish for an activist IRR that would act as a pressure group. Indeed, Patterson's own *News Letter* was to be the forum where these feelings were first expressed. Here, the staff had built up its own voice and kept closest to the current events and issues related to the general population. In many ways, it was natural that the activist period of the Institute came from this forum.

The first comment in the *News Letter*, for instance, was on the lack of media coverage when the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act was passed.[257] Before this comment, the pamphlet had been a pure summary of press cuttings from British and foreign newspapers. In 1964, "legislation" was mentioned together with "anti-discriminatory" for the first time. In comparison, the same issue appeared in *Race* one year later, and the 1962 CIA was mentioned three years after it received a mention in the *News Letter*. The same year, 1964, the pamphlet also started to include articles, of which about half were written by outside contributors. In the beginning, these writers were academics and post-graduates, but by and by community workers, health workers and members of other organisations contributed comments or articles. In 1965 articles with vague suggestions for policy-making started to appear in the *News Letter*, and some of these were written by unnamed staff members. Whereas CARD was never mentioned in *Race*, its meetings were among the announcements on the last page of the *News Letter*.

The Survey of Race Relations had been well funded, and the IRR set up new research bodies in collaboration with the universities during this period,[258] but the IRR had little funding after the Survey was published. The publication of the report had marked a transition for the IRR. Mason had retired after his pride, the Survey, had been completed, the *News Letter* was changing into a new format, and new researchers were hired for the new projects. What path was the Institute to take now?

People within the Institute felt a growing need to be able to express ideological standpoints in their work. This was made evident first with the removal of the

[257] *News Letter*, July 1962 (the pamphlet was not published in editions and volumes before January 1967).
[258] The Joint Unit for Minority and Policy Research (JUMPR) and the International Race Studies Programme (IRSP), as described in chapter 3.

contributors' anonymity in articles in 1966 and with the rise of articles that included the opinions of the author throughout 1967. As already mentioned, a change was also evident in *Race* where the "Quarterly Forum" was introduced. The year after, the Race Relations Act and the Commonwealth Immigrants Act were passed, Powell made his infamous "Rivers of Blood" speech and the Kenyan Asians crisis took place.[259] The *News Letter* included articles on these events along with articles on the Race Relations Bill in the United States. At the end of this year, Sheila Patterson was replaced by Peter Watson. Watson's first task was to change the name and layout of the pamphlet and it became *Race Today*. The new pamphlet took a line – a politicised one – and thus was the first part of the Institute to represent what was to be the new stance of the IRR. Again, it is important to repeat that most members of the IRR Council did not share this stance at this point. However, the opinions expressed in *Race Today* represented what was to become the message of the Institute in the 1970s. In the pamphlet, the staff of the Institute was made more visible by giving the library its own section.

Small changes were evident with the politicised articles in the *News Letter* from 1967 and the inclusion of many items on domestic and controversial issues in 1968, and the new editor and new format in 1969 was further evidence of this politicisation. This short period between a policy-oriented body and an activist body, between 1969 and the first months of 1970, was characterised by the expression of clear opinions in the articles. The transition, from a policy advisor to the government to a critic of government policy with a clear opinion of its own, is evident in the final issue of *News Letter* in 1968. Here, Anthony Dickey, who was not a member of the IRR staff, compared the 1965 Race Relations Act to the new Act of 1968. The article was in the November/December issue and described a law that had come into force on November 26 of that year. This focus on current legislation and policy was to be typical for the politicised *News Letter*. In the article, Dickey examined the judicial complexities of the two acts, studying the different ways they had been passed through the legislative system as well as the legal differences embodied within them. What was new was that he denounced the new act for not taking into account criticism of the former act:

[259] For all these events, see chapter 2.

> None of the suggested new provisions was incorporated into the final Act, and as a result the powers of the Race Relations Board and their conciliating committees may be insufficient to enable them to perform their duties effectively.[260]

This first obvious criticism of policy, almost before the 1968 Act had come into force, marked what became more and more visible from 1969: *Race Today* was now functioning as a watchdog as far as government policies were concerned. The message of the Institute's staff in this period differed from the policy-oriented one in that they made few concrete recommendations for policy, but rather expressed only disapproval of current policy. This transition was first visible in the *News Letter* was because of the changes that were made to the pamphlet in 1964. Then, the *News Letter* had started to follow the progress of the Survey along with the activities of government bodies such as the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI). This, together with the longer articles, including some by authors from outside the Institute, created the basis for a critique of the government and the expression of personal opinions. While the Survey of Race relations had a visible connection to the policy of the Labour government, the personal opinions of *Race Today* cannot be summarised into one collective voice. Common to most of the criticisms of the government's policy was that it was too weak on preventing racism and too strict on immigration control. The former Director, Phillip Mason, claimed that Watson did manage to avoid "the emotional line".[261] By this he referred to the rising popularity of *Race Today* and the fact that a popular pamphlet had to take a line.

Towards the end of 1969 members of staff at the Institute were beginning to express their frustration with the government. They felt that they could not give advice to policy-makers when they considered them to be a part of the problem.[262] In March 1970 Sandy Kirby took over the editorship and *Race Today* quickly went from a politicised position to one reflecting the activist aims of the staff. This was made evident in controversial headlines, columns set aside for various governmental and non-governmental

[260] *News Letter*, vol. 2, no. 9, November/December 1968.
[261] Mason 1984: 183.
[262] *Race and Class*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1980.

organisations, and direct criticism of the government. Before the 1971 Immigration Act, the staff of the Institute accused the government of being openly "racist".[263]

A new set of terms, and old terms used in a different meaning, characterised the articles of *Race Today* during Kirby's editorship. An article entitled "Huey Newton and the Black Renascence"[264] by librarian Ambalavaner Sivanandan in 1970 illustrated a use of politicised race expressions along with Marxist terms. Sivanandan used the term "black" to refer to a political colour, more than a non-white skin colour.[265] The article praised the Black Panther Party for Self-Defence for applying Marxist theory in an understandable and practical fashion to the American ghettoes: "[…] they educated and politicised their people. And that is revolution." White people were not mentioned, but wealthy non-whites were labelled "black capitalists" and their businesses accused of "exploiting of the black community".[266] In this article, the political label "black" was used to divide into races, but within the label, people were also divided into classes – here, the capitalists against "their people". Four months later, the same writer included white people in a tribute to Muhammad Ali entitled "The Passing of the King".[267] He polarised the world by dividing it into black and white, where Muhammad Ali was an inspiration for the black part of the world and an irritation for the white: "The white world had willed that the king should die." Here too, Sivanandan included Marxism and the struggle between the classes, but this time with a clear black/white division.

> Heavyweight boxing had, until the advent of Muhammad Ali, come to be associated with brute force. If it once had been the province of elegant gladiators […], it was the sport of white men. But as the black man began to claim the game more consistently, the game itself became tainted with the stereotype image of the 'nigger'. It was a thing for brutes – hefty, slow-moving, slow-thinking sub-humans – a blood sport from which the white man would gather profit and pleasure at no great cost to himself.[268]

[263] Interview with Jenny Bourne, 17 April 2008.
[264] *Race Today*, vol. 2, no. 12, 1970.
[265] Nydal 2007: 284.
[266] All quotes: *Race Today*, vol. 2, no. 12, 1970.
[267] *Race Today*, vol. 3, no. 4, 1971.
[268] Ibid.

Especially the latter sentence illustrated the view of "the white world" as the class suppressing "the black man", as the sides were labelled in the article. The radicalisation of the language in *Race Today* was evident in the last part of the article when the writer described Ali as "the very blackness, which white society decrees as evil".[269] Sivanandan's use of Marxism to contextualise 'race' relative to class,[270] corresponded with the stance of Marxism in the United Kingdom in the 1970s, as described in chapter 2. It is important to note, however, that this type of language did not exist in *Race Today* before Sandy Kirby's editorship from 1970. It is examined here in order to describe the transition to the 1970s, as well as the ideologies that had been growing among the IRR staff at the end of the 1960s.

The staff of the institute expressed their need to act as an activist pressure group through the pamphlet and controversial issues were put forward in what could no longer be characterised as a pamphlet for the Institute, but an activist journal. The development could be compared to what happened to the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination,[271] but as this organisation struggled between activism and lobbying, *Race Today* was merely a forum in which activists could express their position and debate. Still, *Race Today* differed from the *News Letter* in exploring controversial issues, taking a stand on these, and from 1970, according to Philip Mason, backing "the underdog every time".[272]

Housing and education had been the major issues in research on domestic race relations during the second half of the 1960s and this was reflected in both *Race* articles and in the Survey. The *News Letter*, however, reflecting press coverage and the activism of organisations, included very little on these issues. This could perhaps indicate that academia, here represented by the Survey and *Race*, did not reflect the reality for most people – that housing and education were not major issues for the common citizen. Also, in the *News Letter* and later *Race Today*, the writers were closer to the lives of ordinary people and, most importantly, the lives of the non-white community. The symbolic act of

[269] Ibid.
[270] Miles 1993: 43.
[271] As described in chapter 2.
[272] Mason 1984: 182.

moving to Pentonville, near the non-white community, and away from Jermyn Street, where the Institute had been close to Members of Parliament and senior Civil Servants, showed how the focus shifted from trying to influence policy-makers to trying to help the immigrant community directly. The move was probably also about securing a lower rent for an underfunded Institute, but symbolically it was more significant. All this could indicate that the position of the Institute at the end of the 1960s was not only at odds with that of its staff, but also at odds with the needs of the general population.

None of the works on the Institute have identified this politicisation within the IRR as emerging as early as 1967. In my view, the changes in the *News Letter* partly reflected a position the Institute of Race Relations had gained after the publication of the results of the Survey, and partly reflected the new researchers who had joined the Institute in 1967 and 1968. The conflict in 1972 made it clear that the Council's opinion did not necessarily reflect the position of the staff of the IRR or how the Institute was perceived.[273] Even if the Council was to map out the direction of the Institute, it met only four times a year and had no direct impact on the research chosen or what the publications should include. An examination of the activities and publications of the Institute is therefore important to accompany the official standpoint of the Institute of Race Relations – that it was there to carry out objective research and hold no corporate view.

4.3 Summary

During Roy Jenkins's period in office as Home Secretary, and in close contact with Labour policy, the Institute turned from a theoretical research-oriented organisation into a more policy-oriented body. Before this, the IRR had focused on providing a forum for theoretical knowledge on race relations. Now, the Institute focused on the production of practical knowledge and direct suggestions for future legislation. The IRR had produced research itself before, but its main object had been to provide a forum for other publications. After seven years as an independent and growing organisation, the Institute had started publishing its own research. *Colour and Citizenship* was published at the end

[273] See chapter 3 for the 1972 conflict.

of what was known as "the liberal hour"[274] and the Survey is a good representative, not only of the Institute, but also of the standpoint of the policy-makers during this time. During this period, it became clear that the Institute was only in theory precluded from expressing a corporate view. After, and perhaps as a reaction to, this policy-oriented period, the Institute became more politicised. By the turn of the decade, IRR was turning into an activist organisation. The two last positions indicate that the changes of 1972 had been "fuming" for a while before the conflict broke out. This confirms some of the previous research that claimed the conflict started in the *News Letter*, but indicates that it started earlier than has been believed. As the new Director from 1969, Hugh Tinker allowed the views held by the staff of the IRR for at least a year or two to become visible in the work of the Institute.

This chapter suggests that non-governmental organisations of the 1960s could not be divided into the three categories so easily, with two of them being a) research NGOs concerned with educating the population and producing theoretical knowledge, and b) activist NGOs using lobbying and pressure to influence legislation. In addition to the immigrant welfare NGOs, this chapter introduced a fourth group of non-governmental organisations in the 1960s: d) the policy-oriented NGO, which was concerned with producing practical knowledge that could be used by the legislative bodies. Political and Economic Planning could be placed under this new group, as could the Institute of Race Relations from 1965 to 1968.

The three different profiles give evidence of the conflict between politics and research within the Institute of Race Relations throughout the decade. After six years as a colonialist professional body under Chatham House, the focus of the independent Institute from 1958 had been on providing research in order to ensure a smooth assimilation of the non-white immigrants into British society. From the mid-1960s, the IRR continued its academic approach, but now with the agenda to play a role in the political decisions around race relations. The turn of focus in the mid-1960s also depicts a shift within academia: there was no longer a division between academic knowledge and

[274] See chapter 2.

academic ideology. By the end of the 1960s and at the beginning of the next decade, the IRR staff, and later the whole Institute turned against the legislative bodies, now aiming to play a role in the community and oppose governments by providing information in the name of anti-racism. Research at the Institute of Race Relations was now conducted for the purpose of criticising politics.

5. The impact of the IRR's work

"As a country we have time to act
but insufficient knowledge to determine in what way we should act"[275]

In the 1960s, the members of the Institute of Race Relations held numerous positions outside the organisation. These positions gave them influence on political matters as well as on the policies of other non-governmental organisations. For the Institute as a whole, however, the Survey of Race Relations encapsulated its influence on the anti-racist response of the 1960s.

The impact of the Institute of Race Relations depended on its credibility; its status or reputation; its visibility; and its position in the public sphere. All of these points were, of course, connected to one another. This could be measured in terms of media coverage, the numbers of IRR staff or Council members in public positions, positive mentions of the Institute in Parliament and so on. The actual impact the Institute had, on the other hand, is hard to measure. Here the question would be: what impact could it have? This would mean a comparison between the Institute and similar organisations with the same status and position. However, there were few organisations comparable to the Institute of Race Relations in the 1960s, and the IRR was by far the biggest of these types of non-governmental organisations. This chapter therefore seeks to provide an analysis of the impact of the IRR's work based on an examination of the factors on which impact depends. The main questions are whether or not the Institute was accepted as an expert on race relations, and whether or not the IRR was used to legitimise political decisions.

5.1 The IRR's representation in public positions

In 1964, before the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI) became a governmental organisation, IRR Director Philip Mason was the chairman of the Committee. He stepped down from the Chairmanship when the NCCI became governmental in 1965, but, along with the Survey of Race Relations Director E.J.B. Rose,

[275] Professor Cullingworth, Parliamentary Debates (Lords) December 1969, vol. 306.

remained a member of the Committee. Mason, in his capacity not only as the Director of the IRR but also as a individual actor and Council member of various governmental organisations, was asked by the Undersecretary in the Home Office, Maurice Foley, to draft the White Paper entitled *Immigration from the Commonwealth*. This White Paper, which came out in August 1965, was the reason for changing the NCCI to a governmental organisation. In short, the paper stated that immigration should be limited further, but that local communities and organisations should be helped in their efforts to integrate those already in the country.[276] This twofold strategy towards New Commonwealth immigrants was known as the "Package Deal"[277]. Although Mason claimed the Home Office altered his text so that the final draft was unrecognisable,[278] the White Paper was consistent with the suggestions from Mason's original draft.

After the 1968 Race Relations Act, the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants was turned into the Community Relations Commission and no IRR members were represented in the Commission. Two former Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD) representatives, however, were members, indicating that the latter organisation had become very important before its collapse.[279] It also suggests that the Institute of Race Relations might have lost some of its influential position. Still, as Members of Parliament and figures from other NGOs continued to form the larger part of the Council of the Institute, I would conclude that the lack of IRR people in the new Community Relations Commission was nothing more than a coincidence and a natural consequence of the transition from the Committee to the Commission. As described in chapters 3 and 4, the Runnymede Trust was founded by two Institute of Race Relations members and two CARD members. This fellowship between the non-governmental and governmental organisations created an elite of experts to advise the government in matters of race relations and made NGOs, such as the Institute of Race Relations, powerful organisations.

[276] Bleich 2003: 66.
[277] Hansen 2000: 140.
[278] Mason 1984: 133.
[279] For the collapse of CARD, see chapter 2.

The reputation of the Institute was more international than national: it was funded by trusts and foundations that were only partly British. Only in the early 1960s did IRR start to focus on domestic issues. Before this, only smaller projects on domestic race relations had been conducted. The Survey of Race Relations became the embodiment of this new focus on domestic race relations. In this field, the Institute was a pioneer in Britain, but still with an established international reputation. The international connections came partly from the business networks of some of the IRR's Council members who held numerous company directorships, particularly in former colonies such as South Africa and in South East Asia, and in the United States.[280] It is important to include this international reputation in order to understand why the Institute could receive funding for such a large and long-term project as the Survey of Race Relations.

However, the above-mentioned activities were conducted by individual actors, and not by the IRR. Even if their activities could say something about the influence of the Institute, it is hard to say when the Institute's influence ended and that of the private actors began. Their activities outside the IRR cannot therefore be measured as part of the Institute's impact. The Survey of Race Relations, on the other hand, was, as argued in chapter 4, a representation of the profile of the Institute itself. In order to study the impact the Institute of Race Relations had in the 1960s, the reception of the Survey is examined here.

5.2 A landmark study – the impact of the Survey of Race Relations

There has been little exploration of how the Survey of Race Relations (SRR) influenced the United Kingdom after its results were published in 1969. In 1987 Director E.J.B. Rose wrote a six-page article entitled "A Myrdal for Britain: A Personal Memoir"[281] in which he described the enormous attention paid to the publication of the Survey. Except for these six pages, examining the impact of the Survey requires groundwork. The organisation of the SRR is examined in chapter 3. The focus of this chapter is the publication of the report in 1969 entitled *Colour and Citizenship* with 33 "Findings and

[280] Mullard 1985: 55.
[281] *New Community*, vol. 14, no. 12, 1987.

Recommendations" as a conclusion. The recommendations were very clear and several of them aimed directly at policy-making.

This chapter does not mean to show the stages or the history of the IRR's influence, but presents an example where the Institute's influence covered many sides of the anti-racist response in the 1960s. The following discussion on the Survey's influence is therefore not chronological, but divided systematically into influence on academia, influence on the public and influence on legislation and politics. First, however, is a closer examination of the connection between the Institute through the Survey and Home Secretary Roy Jenkins, as presented in chapter 4.

5.2.1 The Survey and Roy Jenkins

When Roy Jenkins became Home Secretary in the Labour government in December 1965, those who lobbied for liberal race legislation saw him as "their man in government".[282] As described in chapter 4, the staff of the Survey had a close connection to Jenkins and the report of the Survey included a 40-page analysis of his time in office. The co-operation with Jenkins during his two years as Home Secretary, during the production of the Survey, was an important time to influence the Home Office.

In a speech delivered to the Institute of Race Relations in October 1966, Jenkins pointed out the problems of integration. He stated that he saw tackling integration as well as immigration controls as the right and the task of the Home Office. He also emphasised the future co-operation with the Institute by concluding: "we are united in the basic principles which should govern our policies".[283] In 1965, of a £25,000 government grant, £10,000 was earmarked for the Survey. This was the first and only grant from the government to the IRR, indicating a wish from the government's side for more research and perhaps a closer connection with the Institute. The Survey was to reflect liberal-democratic ideals, according to Chris Mullard.[284] In the end, the recommendations in

[282] Bleich 2003: 72.
[283] *Race*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1967,
[284] Mullard 1985: 80.

Colour and Citizenship, which was published in 1969, mostly agreed with the ideals of Labour's "Package deal" presented to Parliament in 1965. This was formulated in the White Paper of 1965, which had been drafted by IRR's Director, Philip Mason. One might conclude from this that the very process of producing the Survey had had an impact on legislation.

Interestingly, in Roy Jenkins's own memoir, *A Life at the Centre*, the impact of the close connection with the Institute was not mentioned at all. This could signify either that the IRR had no impact or, what seems more likely to me, that Jenkins disassociated himself from the Institute after its new form in 1972. However, no other non-governmental organisations or individual actors were mentioned as influential during Jenkins's first term as Home Secretary from 1965 to 1967. Also, in an interview, the assistant director of the Survey, Nicholas Deakin, stated that he saw the role of the Institute before the 1968 Race Relations Act as being a meeting place and a briefing source.[285] When Jenkins made his speech at the Institute in 1966, it was clear that he thought he could find the best audience for his message on policy on race relations here. He also invited co-operation between the Home Office and the IRR staff members and other researchers present at the meeting. This confirms Deakin's perception of the role of the Institute during Jenkins's Secretaryship as a forum for meetings and source of knowledge. As described in chapter 4, it was the Survey and its staff that turned towards the more policy-oriented and recommendation-making Institute, to some degree against the wishes of Director Philip Mason. In the interview, Deakin emphasised that the IRR was turned to for advice on approaches to combating racism during this period, and not for advice on immigration.[286] The latter became a matter for policy suggestions first in 1967 or 1968. Both issues were in the end included in the recommendations part of *Colour and Citizenship*.

Jenkins entered his second term as Home Secretary in 1974. A year into his second term, he asked a committee of prominent academics for advice on what the government should prioritise when it came to research "likely to be relevant to the formulation of policy in

[285] Interview with Nicholas Deakin, by correspondence, autumn 2008.
[286] Interview with Nicholas Deakin, by correspondence, spring 2009.

race relations."[287] Again Jenkins turned to academic research for policy suggestions and one year later the 1976 Race Relations Act was passed. In my view, had it not been for its new politicised form, the IRR would also this time have functioned as a close advisor to Jenkins.

5.2.2 Influence on academia

In the second half of the 1960s, there was a division among social scientists between those who saw the field of race relations as a field for posing policy problems, and those who saw it as a field for intellectual problems.[288] As described in chapter 4, most of the academics behind the Survey of Race Relations can be placed in the first category.

The initial grant from the Nuffield foundation was not large enough for the Survey to conduct its own research and so it had to turn to scholars outside the Institute.[289] Among the researchers collected for the Survey were John Rex, Robert Moore and Anthony Richmond, all distinguished researchers in the field of race relations. Ambalavaner Sivanandan described the Survey as the "corner stone of the race industry",[290] making the field respectable in university departments.

In 1950 Thomas Humphrey Marshall had published his groundbreaking essay "Citizenship and Social Class", in which he examined the development of citizenship in the United Kingdom from the 18th to the 20th century. He argued that civil rights had been introduced as a part of citizenship in the 18th century; political rights in the 19th; and in the 20th, a person had to possess social rights to be a full citizen.[291] The latter concept, social rights, was introduced by Marshall and embodied fighting social inequality and a universal right to real income.[292] E.J.B. Rose met Marshall when he visited the universities to commission research for the Survey of Race Relations, and was greatly

[287] Goulbourne 1998: 124.
[288] Banton 2008: 6.
[289] Rose et al 1969: 757.
[290] Sivanandan 1974: 11.
[291] Marshall and Bottomore 1992: 17.
[292] Marshall and Bottomore 1992: 28.

influenced by his ideas on citizenship.[293] In the report Marshall's ideas were examined and citizenship was defined as "the unfettered employment of social rights and the opportunity for full participation in public affairs",[294] agreeing with Marshall's definition. The use of the term citizenship in the very title of the publication, *Colour and Citizenship*, makes the importance of Marshall's definition evident. This is one of the few theoretical discussions in the Survey. According to another of the Survey's mentors, Michael Banton, the SRR was one of the very first places where Marshall's ideas on citizenship were used.[295]

It must be pointed out that even if *Colour and Citizenship* did not include much theory and methodology on race relations, the separate research projects that formed the background to the report were all of university standard, being conducted by academics with all the theory and methodology necessary for academic projects. On the other hand, when it came to introducing new theory, the use of Marshall's theories on citizenship was the only example.

With 41 research projects in one survey, the Survey of Race Relations was the biggest sociology project in Britain since the Second World War (footnote). After the publication of its report, it was supposed to continue with the collaboration between the IRR and the University of Sussex, in the Joint Unit for Minority Research (JUMPR). Here, the findings of the Survey were to function as the framework for future research on race relations in the United Kingdom.[296] However, with the initial difficulties in finding funding and the conflict within the Institute at the beginning of the 1970s, as described in chapter 3, the JUMPR never became what its creators had envisaged.

The Survey had echoes within academia well into the 1970s and was used frequently when referring to the 1960s. Even today, in research describing racism or immigration in the 1960s, the numbers and other findings of *Colour and Citizenship* are used in

[293] *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* vol. 26, no. 4, 2000.
[294] Rose et al. 1969: 15.
[295] Interview with Michael Banton, 6 November 2008.
[296] Mullard 1985: 81.

academic publications. However, the insufficient innovativeness when it came to theory made the Survey a report of the 1960s, and irrelevant when examining race relations in United Kingdom after 1970.

5.2.3 Reception on publication day – the media and the public

Media coverage on the day of the publication is a good indicator of the public reception and reach of the Survey of Race Relations. When *Colour and Citizenship* was published on 10 July 1969, it received massive press coverage. The staff of the Survey had prepared a 60-page summary of the report as well as a shorter press release.[297] This ensured that the essence of the almost 800-page report could be conveyed to the journalists, who could in turn summarise this and pass on the findings of the Survey to the public. In addition, the staff of the SRR was invited to appear on various news programmes on television and radio to recount the five years of the Survey and its findings. This made certain that the report reached an even wider audience.

The newspapers gave the publication of the report of the Survey considerable space. I have looked at six of the highest-circulation British newspapers of the time: the conservative *Daily Telegraph*; the socialist *Morning Star*; the populist *Sun* and the centre newspapers *Guardian*, *Observer* and *The Times*. They provide a wide selection of the media response to the publication of *Colour and Citizenship*. They all expressed how important the Survey and its findings and recommendations were. The *Daily Telegraph* described the Survey as "the most searching investigation ever into the problems of race in Britain" and also how "its recommendations could form the basis for a complete redrafting of the race and immigration laws".[298] With different audiences, the newspapers focused on different issues when summarising the Survey. As a socialist newspaper, the *Morning Star* focused over half a page on how the report revealed that immigrants enhanced Britain's economy and concluded that the borders should not be closed to immigrants. It was the only newspaper with this angle to the report; most of the newspapers presented here focused on the suggestions concerning integration. Both *The*

[297] *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2000.
[298] *Daily Telegraph*, 10 July 1969.

Times and the *Daily Telegraph* debated the Survey's suggestion to move the responsibility for integration from the Home Office to the Department of Social Affairs, as they saw urban poverty and race relations as connected.[299] While the *Daily Telegraph* had no objections to the suggestion, *The Times* rejected it in the leading article because the immigrants "have a citizen's right to find their own level in society".[300] Here, interestingly, they used the term "citizen's right", but obviously not as it had been defined by Marshall or by the Survey of Race Relations – as the right to social equality.

In the *Observer*, this definition of citizenship was the focal point. Unlike the other newspapers studied here, the *Observer* contributed an academic analysis, written by a Professor of Politics, Bernard Crick, and focused on the use of terms in the report. Crick discussed the use of the terms assimilation and integration, and the meaning of the term tolerance.[301] With this article as the only written account of *Colour and Citizenship*, the newspaper implied that the Survey was intended for scholars. Michael Banton described how the report addressed itself to readers who already possessed some knowledge of public policy.[302] Through the media coverage of the publication, the Survey's actual range of audience, however, became much larger than this. In the *Sun*, *Colour and Citizenship* was summarised in a myth-and-fact section of seven myths about non-white immigrants and the report's negations of these.[303] This reflected a simplification of the report in order to make it more easily understandable for the readers of the *Sun* at the same time as it ensured a broader audience for the findings of the Survey.

[299] Rose et al. 1969: 684.
[300] *The Times*, 10 July 1969.
[301] *Observer*, 13 July 1969.
[302] *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2000.
[303] *Sun*, 10 July 1969.

Caricature in the *Observer*, 13 July 1969

In addition to the academic article, the *Observer* included a caricature of politician Enoch Powell falling down stairs after being hit by a copy of a book entitled *Race and Citizenship*, while saying: "Lies, damn lies and statistics".[304] The book was clearly meant to depict *Colour and Citizenship*, but with the term *race* instead of *colour* to relate it to Powell's rhetoric.[305] With the image of Powell falling after being hit by the Survey, the newspaper stated that the report proved Powell wrong. In addition, using Powell to illustrate the findings of the Survey made its interpretation comprehensible to all readers of the newspaper, even those who had no knowledge of public policy but had seen or heard Enoch Powell speak. There was also a hint of irony in the caricature with the very learned classical scholar Powell being "brought down" by knowledge.

The significance and emotional impact of Powell's ideas and infamous speeches at the end of the 1960s was evident in how two of the newspapers portrayed the report as a rebuttal of Powell's prophesies. Powell had foreseen a United Kingdom swamped by non-white immigrants and struck by violent conflicts if immigration were not restricted. This was famously put into words in his "rivers of blood" speech of 20 April 1968. The

[304] *Observer*, 13 July 1969.
[305] For Enoch Powell, see chapter 2.

Morning Star introduced the publication of the report with the headline: "Nine-man team issues report: Powell myths take a knock"[306] and the *Observer* carried the above-mentioned caricature of Powell. The *Sun*, however, focused on how Britain could become "an explosive society" if the suggestions of the Survey were not followed under the headline "Ten years to avert race disaster".[307] Here, the interpretation of the report reflected Powell's alarmist rhetoric.

When the Parekh Report[308] was published by the Runnymede Trust on 11 October 2000, it received massive press coverage not only in the United Kingdom, but also in the Commonwealth countries. The report recommended, among other things, that Britain should formally declare itself a multicultural society, that the nation should be built on shared values such as equal rights and tolerance, and that gender and race legislation should be seen as the same. What received most press coverage, however, was a suggestion to re-think British history in order to include all citizens, and the statement that "British" had racial connotations of colonialism. The *Daily Telegraph* called it "Sub-Marxist gibberish" and the *Daily Mail* saw it as "an insult to history and our intelligence".[309] This influenced how the readers of the newspapers understood the report. For instance, one reader labelled it "extraordinarily offensive to the vast majority of the British people"[310] while conservative MPs, such as Gerald Howarth of Aldershot, criticised the rethinking of British history as insulting to the "native British".[311] As a response, the sponsor of the report, Home Secretary Jack Straw, stated that: "Unlike the Runnymede Trust, I firmly believe there is a future for Britain and for Britishness."[312] He did not appear to study the report himself, but was criticising it on the basis of the media's interpretation of the report. This was an example of massive press coverage that was not positive for the producers of the report. Also, the reception of the report indicates the state of controversy of the concept of "multiculturalism" in Britain today.

---

[306] *Morning Star*, 10 July 1969.
[307] *Sun*, 10 July 1969.
[308] The Runnymede Trust's report *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain.* See chapter 2 and 3 for the Runnymede Trust.
[309] Both quotes from the *Guardian*, 12 October 2000.
[310] *Daily Telegraph*, 11 October 2000.
[311] *Guardian*, 11 October 2000.
[312] *Guardian*, 12 October 2000.

By contrast, the press coverage of the Survey of Race Relation's report did not lead to massive debate and controversy, and still ensured a publishing success with the edition sold two months after the publication. The Institute's publisher, Oxford University Press, had to arrange for a reprint the same day as the report came out.[313] As a result, according to Michael Banton, the findings of the Survey were accepted as a national consensus.[314] While the Parekh Report caused controversy and political debate, the publication of *Colour and Citizenship* did not lead to political controversy. This is explored further in the next part of the chapter.

5.2.4 Influence on the political debate and legislation

While the Institute if Race Relations was only to be a forum for academic interest, the Survey of Race Relations was able to make suggestions for future policy. It is therefore a good starting point for looking at the political influence of the IRR. Surprisingly, no examination of the effect of the Survey's recommendations on policy has been conducted. Here, the political impact of the Survey is examined in three parts:

1. The impact on the immediate political debate
2. The impact on the 1971 Immigration Act
3. The impact on the 1976 Race Relations Act

The 1971 Immigration Act is not a part of the anti-racist response, but as the Survey concluded with recommendations also for future immigration policy, it is interesting to explore if any of the suggestions were taken into account only two years after the publication of the Survey. The 1976 Race Relations Act is studied for the same reasons, but also because the Act was, in many ways, a result of the anti-racist responses of the preceding decade. Both Acts were prominent until they were amended in 1981 (for the Immigration Act) and 2000 (for the Race Relations Act).

After the publication of the Survey of Race Relations in July 1969, the Institute of Race Relations received a grant from the Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust for a six month-

[313] *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2000.
[314] Interview with Michael Banton, 6 November 2008.

lobby on the findings of the Survey. SRR Director Rose, accompanied by the relevant researcher, visited the departments affected by the suggestions in the report. Each department's ministers and officials made comments on the recommendations that concerned them and discussed the findings with the Survey's representatives.[315] In December the same year, the Institute's Chairman, Lord Walston, called attention to *Colour and Citizenship* in the House of Lords and the Lords devoted a whole debate to the report. This was very unusual, according to Rose, unprecedented for a non-official publication.[316] Again, individuals within the Institute of Race Relations holding powerful positions elsewhere ensured greater significance for the work of the Institute. In the House of Lords debate, the report was praised as a pioneering work, but criticised for its length of over 800 pages, which would not appeal to most people. Most of all, more knowledge on the subject was requested as Parliament was considering new legislation concerning race relations. Lord Walston's statement summarised the debate:

> In our debate on November 25, the noble Lord, Lord Brooke of Cumnor, said one thing at least with which I was in profound agreement, as I think I mentioned at the time. He emphasised, and so rightly emphasised, the need for more knowledge of the real facts about immigration and about colour, and reminded us that this subject should be discussed in light of knowledge rather than of emotion. *Colour and Citizenship* is a contribution, and a very important contribution, to our knowledge, but it is far from the last word.[317]

Already in the 1960s, the House of Lords had only delaying power when it came to passing bills, while the actual power was in the House of Commons. It was significant for the IRR to have its Survey debated in the House of Lords, but this portrayed only a symbolic significance and no direct impact on legislation. The latter was affirmed by the report not being mentioned in the House of Commons.

In a comment on the publication of the Survey, journalist Claire Hollingworth stated: "The authors' objective, 'to put into circulation information which might serve as a basis

[315] *New Community*, vol. 14, no. 12, 1987.
[316] Ibid.
[317] Parliamentary Debates (Lords) December 1969, vol. 306.

for policy-making,' has, after five years of intensive work, been fulfilled."[318] With this she agreed with the report's conclusion that the recommendations were meant as a realistic programme for action. The recommendations included a more consistent immigration policy, but no numerical limit on immigrants. The most important policy suggestion concerning immigration was that Commonwealth citizens and alien immigrants should be treated equally. Citizenship should largely be based on birth in the UK, and the system of a combined United Kingdom and Colonies citizenship should be abandoned.[319] This citizenship had already been undermined by the British Nationality Acts and Commonwealth Immigrant Acts of the 1960s. The separate UK citizenship was to guarantee free entry and departure, unlike the confusion and inconsistency during the Kenyan Asians crisis after the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act.[320]

In the parliamentary debates on the 1971 Immigration Bill, the suggestions from the report of the Survey of Race Relations were not mentioned. In the House of Lords, which traditionally had a strong link with the Institute of Race Relations, reports from the Bow Group and Political and Economic Planning[321] were quoted and discussed, but not the Survey. Even Lord Walston, Chairman of the Institute at the time, who had initiated the debate after the publication of the report, did not mention *Colour and Citizenship* or the IRR in his long speech on the 1971 Bill.[322] With the efforts of the staff of the Survey in mind, it is curious that, only two years after the publication, the recommendations of the report were not explicitly taken into consideration when the Immigration Bill was discussed. One year after *Colour and Citizenship* came out, the Conservatives came to power. As the Survey was strongly connected to the Labour party and its policy,[323] this change of government could explain why the Survey now received so little regard. However, the composition of the House of Lords was not affected by the new government. As this is where the Institute had its strongest connections, the conclusion

[318] *Daily Telegraph*, 10 July 1969.
[319] Rose et al. 1969: 751.
[320] See chapter 2.
[321] For the Bow Group and Political and Economic Planning, see chapter 2.
[322] Parliamentary Debates (Lords) June 1971, vol. 320.
[323] As examined in chapter 4.

must be that the suggestions of the Survey had little impact on the political debate around immigration legislation.[324]

When the Immigration Act was passed on 28 October 1971, it adopted the Survey's suggestion to guarantee unrestricted right of entry to the United Kingdom for UK passport holders by introducing the *right of abode*.[325] It also followed the recommendations of a right to citizenship based on birth by requiring a strong link to the British Isles – in most cases this meant being born in the UK. However, the Survey's suggestion to abandon the combined United Kingdom and Colonies citizenship was not taken into account at this time. Only with the 1981 British Nationality Act ten years later did this category of citizenship cease to exist.

The report suggested that legislation should encourage integration, but few of the suggestions concerned fighting racism. The ideal of the report was that the positive findings of the Survey should be disseminated in the right way in order to allow changes in public attitudes.[326] What generated most press coverage and critical leading articles in the newspapers when the report was published was the suggestion to move the responsibility for integration from the Home Office to the Department of Social Affairs. Here, the Community Relations Commission would make the same move. Interestingly, this went against the statement made by Roy Jenkins in his speech to the IRR in 1966: that integration was the right and the task of the Home Office. With the 1976 Race Relations Act, the Community Relations Commission and the Race Relations Board were replaced with the Commission for Racial Equality. The latter was a non-departmental public body – meaning that it was public, but not connected to a specific ministry. This did move the Community Relations Commission's successor away from the Home Office, as the Findings and Recommendations had suggested, but not to the Department of Social Affairs. The responsibility for integration remained, to a large part, with the Home Office.

[324] Interestingly, only one month after this debate, Lord Walston was due for re-election to the Council of the Institute of Race Relations. This was to be a formality (Mason 1984: 182). However, he was not re-elected because of the new members who had been recruited by the IRR staff (see chapter 3).
[325] See chapter 2.
[326] Rose et al. 1969: 737.

The media paid little attention to the Survey's recommendation to repeal Section 6 of the 1968 Race Relations Act, which had remained unchanged from the 1965 Race Relations Act. Section 6 made it unlawful to incite others to racial hatred by speech or writing. As we have seen, the Survey saw this as coming close to invading freedom of expression and, because of this, a possible cause for sympathy and publicity for racialist views.[327] If not repealed, the report recommended that the Section should at least be incorporated into a statute such as the 1936 Public Order Act. In the 1976 Race Relations Bill, Section 6 was replaced with a less restrictive clause in which incitement to racial hatred was a criminal offence if there was the intent of racial hatred. Before the Race Relations Bill, a Freedom of Speech Restoration Bill[328] was presented to repeal Section 6 of the former Race Relations Act, but this was rejected. At the second reading of the 1976 Race Relations Bill in the House of Lords, incitement to racial hatred was the controversial matter. All speakers on the reading agreed that that the proposed clause was confusing. Many agreed that intent to spread racial hatred was too subjective and the speaker pointed out that the clause could be misused and applied to any case.[329] Unlike the Freedom of Speech Restoration Bill, the clause was not repealed because of its encroachment on the freedom of speech. In the end, when the Race Relations Act was passed on 22 November 1976, incitement to racial hatred was, in accordance with the Survey's recommendations, incorporated in the 1936 Public Order Act.

5.3 Summary

When it became clear during the 1960s that the consequences of immigration effected British society, politicians turned to experts for advice on policy-making. Legislation was to be based on knowledge, and in providing such knowledge the Institute of Race Relations was much needed. The Institute was accepted as an expert on race relations, and this was signified through the Survey of Race Relations. For the impact of the Survey, the Institute could not be measured with other non-governmental organisations of

[327] Rose et al. 1969: 687.
[328] Parliamentary papers (Commons) February 1976, vol. 4.
[329] Parliamentary debates (Lords) 20 July 1976, vol. 373.

the time because its position was unique. For instance, statistic and analysis provider Political and Economic Planning provided knowledge, but did not aim to influence legislation such as the IRR during the second half of the 1960s. The Institute members in public positions are proof of this aim of influencing law-making. It also shows how members of the Institute of Race Relations were perceived and used as experts on race relations. The financial support received from the government during the production of the Survey also signifies the expert status of the Institute, embodied in the Survey of Race Relations. Moreover, the debate on *Colour and Citizenship* in the House of Lords in 1969 shows that the Survey could be used to legitimise legislation.

Even so, few of the Survey's policy recommendations were used directly to legitimise political suggestions for legislation. The question remains whether the findings of the Survey were published too late. The publication of *Colour and Citizenship* caused little controversy, and even if politicians praised the work of the IRR, it had little impact on the subsequent Acts of the 1970s. The time of debate on racism had past when the Survey's findings were published. The subject had simply fizzled out after Powell's speeches, the 1968 Race Relations Act and the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act. Because of these events, racism as a political topic was well known and received media coverage and interest in Parliament. However, only two years after its publication, the Survey proved to have little impact on legislation and no impact on the debate leading up to the legislation. This may have been caused by the change in governments where the IRR's former associate, the Labour party, was no longer in power.

Also, in influencing legislation, the IRR did not adopt the pressure group approach of, for instance, CARD before the 1965 Race Relations Act, but rather served as a source of information for the government, providing recommendations and criticisms. This way, it may not have given the impression of direct impact at the time.

Still, the important period for the influence of the Survey was not when it was published, even if it received massive attention, but during the years it was being produced; in particular from 1965, when the staff of the Survey chose a more policy-oriented

approach, as described in chapter 4. During the production of the Survey of Race Relations, both the message of the IRR and of the government changed, and after the termination of the production of the Survey the Institute had to find a new role.

6. Conclusion – the IRR and the "liberal hour"

> For race relations in Britain the liberal hour has already passed. It lasted at most two years. 1968, the year in which it ended, was what the French call *année zero* for those who believe that there are solutions to be found to problems arising from inter-racial contact and that the way to achieve them is through the traditional devices of discussion, bargaining, and legislation.[330]

This was written as a part of the introduction to the report of the Survey of Race Relations, *Colour and Citizenship*. The report embodied the role of the Institute of Race Relations in formulating liberal politics from the mid-1960s; racism was to become a criminal offence and the government was to put "gentle pressure" on organisations, businesses and private persons to ensure integration in housing and employment.

The Institute of Race Relations served as a forum for research at the beginning of the 1960s. In contrast with previous research on the Institute, this thesis has not confirmed that the ideological conflict in 1972 was the turning point in the history of the IRR; the change came as early as the mid-1960s when the staff of the Survey of Race Relations decided to try to influence legislation instead of sticking to pure academia. This meant that the Institute went from an ideology of fighting racism through educating the public, to fighting racism by making recommendations directly to the legislative power. The former placed the Institute under the heading of the so-called "race professionals" who focused on academic theory and objectivity, while the latter moved the IRR towards the activist branch of the anti-racist response and created a conflict of roles for the Institute.

The Institute of Race Relations was a pioneer both in developing the academic field of race relations and in placing race relations on the political agenda. When the Institute started to focus on domestic race relations at the beginning of the 1960s, it had already built an international reputation during its first eight years for its works on international race relations. The journal *Race* collected the most important international and national research regarding race and race relations, and gathered different academic disciplines

[330] Rose et al 1969: 10.

into one field. At the same time, the Survey of Race Relations employed researchers from different disciplines and from a number of universities inside and outside the United Kingdom for over five years. Together, these two factors helped to make race relations a field within academia and to create research centres for ethnic or minority studies at a growing number of universities during the 1970s.

Throughout the 1960s, race relations policy was to a larger and larger degree based on expert advice. When Labour came into power in 1964 most politicians agreed that racism could no longer be legitimised or tolerated and sought legislation against it. They wanted policy based on science and sense, not prejudice and emotions. For this, they needed research, and therefore they provided considerable space and opportunities for knowledge providers; this was a new and unprecedented approach to policy-making. In this system, there was a need and a role for the Institute of Race Relations. Ambalavaner Sivanandan has argued that the Survey changed its direction "with every wind the Government blew"[331], indicating that the IRR was misused by the legislative power to legitimise restrictions against immigration. Testing this claim is too extensive for this thesis as it employs an analysis of the primary intentions of both the government and the Institute compared with the legislative results. Moreover, it might not prove relevant to study who had the upper hand over whom when looking at the role of the Institute in the 1960s. The most important factor in studying the impact of the IRR is that the Institute helped place race relations on the political agenda.

The change for the scholarly and political message of the Institute between 1964 and 1965 coincided with Roy Jenkins's assumption of office as Home Secretary in 1965. Before this, IRR members had been acting as individual representatives in various organisations, and, most importantly, the Director of the Institute, Philip Mason, had drafted what was to be the 1965 White Paper, the "package deal": to integrate those already in the country and restrict further immigration from the New Commonwealth. The Home Secretaryship of Roy Jenkins, however, provided the first pronounced co-operation between the Institute and the government. At the Institute's Annual Race

[331] Sivanandan 1974: 9.

Conference, which was held each September from 1966, politicians and activists outside the academic field of race relations were invited. This demonstrates that the Institute now had embodied the political side of race relations. With Jenkins's speech at the first of these Conferences, the joint effort of the Institute and the government against racism was set.

This political consensus of fighting racism came into being through the production of knowledge on racism produced by the Institute and other experts in the field. Political consensus resulted in the anti-discriminatory laws of the 1965, and the 1965 and the 1968 Race Relations Acts. In the report of the Survey, *Colour and Citizenship*, these three steps, the production of knowledge to create a consensus that in turn led to anti-discriminatory legislation, were described as the "liberal hour", during the years from 1966 to 1968 – Jenkins's period as Home Secretary. This focus on anti-discriminatory legislation embodied the first part of the "package deal", while the second part, restricting immigration, was not an element of the focus of the liberal hour, but became a political target from 1968. The Institute of Race Relations was one of the most important actors in shaping the liberal hour, not only as the producer of knowledge on domestic race relations, but also through the Institute's close link with the Home Secretary.

The IRR's initial object was to educate and form opinion, but in his 1986 book *Race and Empire in British Politics*, Paul B. Rich described the IRR's influence as "limited"[332] beyond government circles. In contrast to this, my thesis has pointed out how the Institute did have an impact on the formulation of liberal anti-racist politics in the United Kingdom. Still it is important to remember that the laws from this period did shape the public opinion, even if not directly. For instance, a law against discrimination in housing could "force" a landlord to rent to a non-white person. Without the law, the landlord could have feared the reaction of his other tenants, or the neighbourhood could have feared lower standards with non-white neighbours. Because of the anti-discriminatory law, these prejudices could be laid to rest and a multi-cultural neighbourhood could be seen as something positive. This was in accordance with the IRR's major mission: that

[332] Rich 1986: 200.

fear could be conquered with education and information. Thus, the Institute did have an impact also on public opinion.

By stating that the Home Secretaryship of Roy Jenkins had been the closest the country had come to a decent race relations policy,[333] the Institute of Race Relations also showed where it stood politically. Director Philip Mason, even if he had a clear political view as an individual actor, insisted that the Institute should retain its neutrality and continue to abstain from holding a corporate view in order to provide credible knowledge. At the same time, as early as 1964, forces within the IRR wished for the Institute to take a line and influence anti-racism this way. The latter group's frustration with the Director's ideology of official political non-partisanship became evident in the formation of the Runnymede Trust, which was undertaken by a group of IRR and former Campaign Against Racial Discrimination members in 1967.

The same dilemma emerged in academia at the end of the 1960s, to a large degree as a result of the 1968 student movement. In the academic field of race relations, academics either insisted on producing theoretical knowledge or producing utilitarian science for political purposes. The latter often departed from politically neutral scholarship. It might be argued that research that loses its objectivity can no longer be called analytical scholarship, but this division between academic knowledge and academic ideology was hardly seen at the end of the 1960s. This meant that it became more accepted for scholars to be committed to societal change, and that incorporating activism into research was not seen as damaging the quality of their work. Still, to produce knowledge that had a social-reformist or even revolutionary agenda or to conduct research with the purpose of solving intellectual problems remained a dilemma that divided scholars at the end of the 1960s.

The transition from the theory- and research-oriented to the policy-oriented Institute of Race Relations created a similar dilemma as in academia: should the IRR remain "objective" and insist upon neutrality or should it conduct research and make recommendations for policy in order to ensure that legislation was rooted in informed

[333] Rose et al. 1969: 549. See also chapter 4.

decisions. As Philip Mason himself claimed, “theoretical studies are only of value when they do contribute to the making of policy and the betterment of human life.”[334] Still, he insisted on official objectivity and that the Institute should not hold a corporate view or take a political stand.

With the direct co-operation with both academia and the Home Office, the Institute received greater funding and more attention, and grew in size as well as in reputation. This gave it an important role in the anti-racist response, but also led to the above-mentioned dilemma, which led, I believe, to the inevitable polarisation culminating in the conflict and the “re-founding” of the Institute in 1972. To be sure, the political commitment of the 1960s and the more radical Marxist views after 1972 cannot be seen as identical, but, unlike the theoretical academic approach, both ideologies involved a social responsibility and a form of political activism. The activists behind the 1972 conflict, however, did not believe that influencing the government with liberal politics, as the Institute had done during the liberal hour, would solve the problem of racism. The IRR was indeed important when the politicians needed it from the mid-1960s, but this new role also meant the decline of its scientific role and indicated a transition from scholarship to activism. In 1972 the political conflict within the IRR culminated in a re-establishment of the Institute, but the basis of this conflict was laid before.

Today, the Institute of Race Relations considers itself “an anti-racist 'thinktank'”[335] serving as a voice for the minority in the United Kingdom; both in terms of skin colour and religion. The Institute conducts research on racism inside and outside Britain and points out injustices carried out by the government. *Race* has continued to be published as *Race and Class* since 1975 and the Institute still publishes academic works: both geared to academia, but with a clear ideological stand on the political left. In 2000 Randall Hansen described the position of the IRR then as being on “the Marxist periphery”.[336] The Institute today is focused towards social change but, unlike the IRR

[334] *Race*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1968.
[335] As stated on their website http://www.irr.org.uk/about/index.html.
[336] Hansen 2000: 36.

during the liberal hour, the IRR does not act as an advisor for the government nor is it aimed at influencing policy.

This thesis is a contribution to the historiography of the multicultural experience in Europe. Because of its colonial history and open-door policy after the Second World War, the United Kingdom had an early experience with post-war migration and racism compared with the rest of the European nations. Fifty years after the Notting Hill and Nottingham riots and the subsequent debate in the UK, the same questions are raised all over Europe. Firstly: how can racism be prevented? Here the same issues as in the UK in the 1950s and 1960s are significant, namely discrimination in housing, education and employment. As a consequence, a second question that was significant in the 1960s occurs: what role should a scholar in this field have in the public debate? The 1960s introduced the acceptance of incorporating activism into research, but raised the problem of the politicisation of knowledge. Still, the production of knowledge from bodies such as the IRR contributed to reducing the effect of racist influence such as Powell's alarmist rhetoric. The experience of the IRR in the 1960s has shown that academia has the opportunity to play an important part in policymaking, but that this can also come at the price of losing one's neutrality as a scholar.

7. Bibliography and sources

Banton, Michael. “Problem Finding in Ethnic and Racial Studies”. Ed. Eade, John et al. *Advancing Multiculturalism*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle: 2008.

Banton, Michael. *Race Relations.* Tavistock Publications, London 1967.

Banton, Michael. *Racial Minorities.* Fontana/Collins, London: 1972.

Banton, Michael. *The Coloured Quarter. Negro Immigrants in an English City.* Jonathan Cape Thirty Bedford Square, London: 1955.

Bleich, Erik. *Race Politics in Britain and France. Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s*. Cambridge University press, Cambridge: 2003.

Cashmore, Ellis et al. Dictionary of Race and ethnic relations. 4th ed. Routledge, London: 1996.

Goulborne, Harry. *Race Relations in Britain Since 1945*. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills: 1998.

Griffith, J.A.G. et al. *Coloured Immigrants in Britain*. Oxford University Press, London: 1960.

Hansen, Randall. *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-war Britain. The institutional origins of a Multicultural Nation*. Oxford University Press, New York: 2000.

Heinemann jr, Benjamin W. *The Politics of the Powerless. A study of the Campaign against Racial Discrimination.* Published for the Institute of Race Relations, Oxford University Press, London: 1972.

Jenkins, Roy. *A Life at the Centre*. Macmillan, London, 1991.

Lal, Barbara Ballis. “The ‘Chicago School’ of American sociology, symbolic interactionism, and race relations theory” Ed. John Rex and David Mason. *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1986.

Layton-Henry, Zig. *The Politics of Immigration. Immigration, ‘Race’ and ‘Race’ relations in Post-war Britain.* Blackwell, Oxford: 1992.

Little, Kenneth. *Negroes in Britain. A study of racial relations in English society.* Kegan Paul, London: 1948.

Lester, Anthony and Bindman, Geoffrey. *Race and Law in Great Britain.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1972.

Macdonald, Ian M. *Race Relations. The new law*. Butterworth, London: 1977.

Marshall, T. H. and Bottomore, Tom. *Citizenship and Social Class*. Pluto Press, London: 1992.

Mason, Philip. *A Thread of Silk. Further Memories of a Varied Life*. Michael Russel, Wiltshire: 1984.

Miles, Robert. *Racism After 'Race Relations'*. Routledge, London: 1993.

Mullard, Chris. *Race, Power and Resistance*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London: 1985.

Nydal, Knut. *Sosialmoralsk engasjement og politisk aktivisme. Framveksten av en antirasistisk bevegelse i Norge 1975 – 1988.* Universitetet i Oslo: 2007.

Park, Robert Ezra. "Race and Culture". Hughes, Everett Cherrington et al. *The Collected Papers of Robert Ezra Park.* Vol. 1. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois: 1950.

Patterson, Sheila. *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain 1960-1967*. Published for the Institute of Race Relations by Oxford University Press, London: 1969.

Paul, Kathleen. *Whitewashing Britain. Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era.* Cornell University Press, Ithaca: 1997.

Rex, John and Mason, David. *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1986.

Rich, Paul B. *Race and Empire in British Politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1986.

Richmond, Anthony H. *The Colour Problem. A Study of Racial Relations.* Penguin Books, Middlesex: 1955.

Rose, E. J. B. et al. *Colour and Citizenship A report on British Race Relations*. Published for the Institute of Race Relations, London, Oxford University Press, London: 1969.

Sivanandan, A. *A different hunger. Writings on Black Resistance.* Pluto Press, London: 1982.

Sivanandan. A. *Race and Resistance: the IRR story.* A Race Today Publication, London: 1974.

Tabili, Laura. *"We ask for British Justice" Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain.* Cornell University Press, Ithaca: 1994.

Internet sources

Institute of Race Relations – Educating for Racial Justice
http://www.irr.org.uk
(25 February 2009)

Unesco publication 791
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001282/128291eo.pdf
(10 October 2008)

At the turning of the tide "Thirty years on" Anthony Lester
http://83.137.212.42/sitearchive/cre/anthology_04.html
(12 February 2009)

Last witness to the Raj
http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/1999/feb/03/guardianobituaries1
(10 April 2009)

BBC News – Race
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/uk/2002/race/survey.stm
(17 April 2009)

Journals

The Institute of Race Relations News Letter (1960), continued as *Race Today* (1969) Published by the Institute of Race relations until 1974. Published by Race Today Collective after 1974.

International Affairs (1931) Published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

New Community (1971), continued as *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (1998) Published by the European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations.

Race (1959), continued as *Race and Class* (1975) Published by the Institute of Race Relations.

Newspapers

Morgenbladet
Guardian
Morning Post
Observer
Sun
Daily Telegraph
Times

Parliamentary papers

House of Commons and Command 1975-76

Parliamentary debates

House of Lords 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1975-76

Acts of Parliament

Race Relations Act 1968
Immigration Act 1971
Race Relations Act 1976

Reports

Reports by Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council July1963, February 1964, and September 1964
Political and Economic Planning (PEP) report 1967
Numbers in Britain (Institutes of Race Relations paper) 1968
Race Relations Board reports 1966-67, 1968-69, 1970-71, and 1971-72

Interviews

Jenny Bourne (Company Secretary, IRR), 17 April, 2008
Michael Banton (Professor Emeriti of sociology), 6 November, 2008
Nicholas Deakin (Professor Emeriti of social policy and administration), by correspondence, autumn 2008 and spring 2009
Jessica Mai Sims (research and policy analyst, Runnymede Trust), by correspondence, autumn 2008 and spring 2009
Rosie Wild (Worker Black History Project, IRR), 17 April, 2008

For details on journals, newspapers and parliamentary sources, see individual footnotes.

Appendix 1

List of abbreviations

CARD	Campaign Against Racial Discrimination
CRC	Community Relations Commission
CUKC	Citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies
CON	Commonwealth of Nations
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
IRR	Institute of Race Relations
IRSP	International Race Studies Programme (IRR programme)
JUMPR	Joint Unit for Minority and Policy Research (IRR programme)
NCCI	National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
PEP	Political and Economical Planning
RAAS	Racial Action Adjustment Society
RIIA	Royal Institute of International Affairs
RRB	Race Relations Board
SRR	Survey of Race Relations in Britain (IRR programme)

1948 BNA	British Nationality Act, 1948
1958 BNA	British Nationality Act, 1958
1962 CIA	Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1962
1964 BNA	British Nationality Act, 1964
1965 BNA	British Nationality Act, 1965
1965 RRA	Race Relations Act, 1965
1968 RRA	Race Relations Act, 1968
1968 CIA	Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1968
1971 IA	Immigration Act, 1971
1976 RRA	Race Relations Act, 1976

Appendix 2

Net immigration from the New Commonwealth, 1953-62

	West Indies	India	Pakistan	Others	Total
1953	2000				**2000**
1954	11000				**11000**
1955	27500	5800	1850	7500	**42650**
1956	29800	5600	2050	9350	**46800**
1957	23000	6600	5200	7600	**42400**
1958	15000	6200	4700	3950	**29850**
1959	164000	2950	850	1400	**21600**
1960	49650	5900	2500	-350	**57700**
1961	66300	23750	25100	21250	**136400**
1962a	31800	19050	15080	18970	**94900**

a Until introduction of CIA 1962 in July.

The table is taken from Layton-Henry, Zig. *The Politics of Immigration. Immigration, 'Race' and 'Race' relations in Post-war Britain.* Blackwell, Oxford: 1992. The layout has been slightly modified, but the numbers are the same.

Appendix 3

Net immigration from India, Pakistan and the West Indies, 1955-66

	West Indies	India	Pakistan	Total
1955	27550	5800	1850	**35200**
1956	29800	5600	2050	**37450**
1957	23000	6600	5200	**34800**
1958	15000	6200	4700	**25900**
1959	16400	2950	850	**20200**
1960	49650	5900	2500	**58050**
1961	66300	23750	25100	**115150**
1962[337]	35041	22100	24943	**82084**
1963	7928	17498	16336	**41762**
1964	14848	15513	10980	**41341**
1965	13400	18815	7427	**39642**
1966	9620	18402	8008	**36030**

The table is taken from Patterson, Sheila. *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain 1960-1967*. For the Institute of Race Relations by Oxford University Press, London: 1969. The layout has been slightly modified, but the numbers are the same.

[337] The numbers have been added together to the total number of 1962. In the original table they are divided into before and after the 1962 CIA in July. The total number is 75930 before July and 6154 from July to December 1962.

Appendix 4

Timeline, 1945-1976