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Abstract

This study reveals the often overlooked but highly significant role of the Leeds multiple tailors in the history of British men’s clothing and fashion from the 1940s to 1980. Focusing on these particular companies, their mass production of men’s tailoring, and the ways these garments were consumed, makes an important contribution to a more complex understanding of men’s fashion and dress as well as the history of the Leeds tailoring industry in the post-war period. This thesis takes a dress historical approach which combines object study, oral history and personal accounts, company archives and trade literature to look at the design, production and consumption of the men’s tailoring made by the Leeds multiples. The use of object study and oral history has revealed details and meanings of suits that illuminate the richness and diversity of men’s experiences and relationships with mass produced and everyday clothing which is rare in the history of men’s dress. Four main themes are analysed by this thesis: the role of design and fashion within the Leeds multiple tailoring firms; masculinity and identity and the suit; masculine consumption; and mass produced and everyday men’s dress. These are explored through four chapters focusing on mass production, made-to-measure and design; visual identity, design and display in retail; men’s consumption of suits and tailoring through their lives; and the partnership between Hepworths and fashion designer Hardy Amies from the early 1960s. These themes are contextualised within the wider changes in men’s fashion in this period and demonstrate the variety of approaches taken by the Leeds multiple tailors to make and sell men’s suits for British high streets in the four decades after the Second World War.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Illustrations</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Abbreviations</td>
<td>xvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 1.</strong> The Cut Must Suit the Making: Mass Production and Design</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Demob Suits</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Made-to-Measure</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Cloth</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 2.</strong> A Presence on Every High Street: Retailing and Display</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 London</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Location and Visual Identity on the High Street</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Window Displays and Retail Interiors</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Mannequins</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3.</strong> I Am an Ordinary Man: Getting and Wearing Suits</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 First Suit</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Young Men</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Weddings</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Older Men</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 4.</strong> The Fashion Business: Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Fashion is our Business: Hepworths 1961-1985</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Fashion Shows and Male Models</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Illustrations

#### Introduction
1. Coverlet made of clothing labels by Winifred Dodge, 1960s to early 1970s, 150cm x 212cm. Details of Leeds multiple tailor labels used in the coverlet.
2. Detail of map of the shopping district of central Leeds, 1967, showing nine branches of Leeds multiple tailors.

#### Chapter 1.
1.1 Hepworths style guide advertising their made-to-measure service, mid-1950s.
1.2 Burton's staff looking at tailoring fitting and figure types.
1.3 Three-piece man’s Utility suit made under the Civilian Clothing (Restrictions) Orders.
1.4 ‘I should like to order an austerity suit, please’. Men’s Wear cartoon.
1.5 ‘Thank heavens – I won’t have to wear a ghastly austerity suit!’
1.6 Ministry of Information photographs of a demobilisation centre following one man as he gets his civilian clothing.
1.7 Three stills from a film showing the demob process of an RAF serviceman, Uxbridge, West London, 1945.
1.8 Drawing of scenes from the demobilisation centre at Olympia, Kensington, London, 1945.
1.9 Advertisements for Sydmor tailoring.
1.10 Burton's double breasted suit, ‘Style No. 9’.
1.11 Harry Page in his pinstripe double breasted demob suit in Whitehawk, Brighton.
1.12 Navy worsted stripe two-piece demob suit with six buttons showing and jetted hip pockets with flaps.
1.13 Demob suit with fine white and blue striped wool, it has flapped hip pockets but without jetting.
1.14 Jacket and detail of cloth. Grey herringbone tweed two-piece demob suit and braces.
1.15 Light brown Glen-check tweed three-piece demob suit.
1.16 Ted Bradley in his (ill-fitting) demob suit, outside All Saints’ Church in Sedgley, the West Midlands, 1946.
1.17 Ron Goldstein in his demob suit with two family members on his way to a wedding reception in 1947.
1.18 George Hedges in his demob suit with his sister Winnie on her wedding day in 1946.

1.19 Burtons pattern cutter with the order slip on the table in front of him, 1976.


1.21 Burtons photograph illustrating measuring techniques, c. 1950s.

1.22 Burtons Figure Description Chart, 1940.

1.23 Types of Male Figure: A. Average; B. Square Shouldered; C. Sloping Shouldered; D. Head Forward; E. Stooping; F. Tall and Slim; G. Uneven Shoulders; H. Well-Built; I. Semi-Corpulent.

1.24 Burtons navy blue serge three-piece suit and order slip.

1.25 Burtons Hudson Road factory cutting room, c. 1940s-1950s.

1.26 Burtons head designer ‘on whom the onus for creating new designs largely rests, checking on his models’.

1.27 Arthur Chappell (standing), Hepworths chief designer, draping cloth on a mannequin, Leeds, 13 December 1967.

1.28 ‘A class working on the practical side of the design of garments’ at the Clothing Trades Department of Leeds College of Technology.

1.29 ‘Students are taught how to cut stock patterns, then to modify them to individual measurements and adapt them to abnormalities.’

1.30 Pattern draft exercise for a ‘Modern SB Lounge Jacket’ by Melville Hopwood when he was training at John Barran, 1962.

1.31 Illingworth Morris PLC, ‘Cloth from Great Britain’ promotional booklet, early-1970s.

1.32 British Colour Council colour trend fold-out supplement ‘Brown’ in Style for Men.

1.33 The influence of fabric design on the look of tailored garments was illustrated with these two similarly cut sports coats.

1.34 Cloth selection area with cloth lengths (‘pieces’) on the shelves and bunches (cloth sample books) on the table, Burtons Preston branch, 1953.

1.35 Wool worsted cloths pulled from Burtons bunches, from left, blue diagonal twill, grey check and brown ‘fancy’ birds eye, c.1953.

1.36 Front cover of Weaver to Wearer style guide featuring ‘Mr Weaver’ and cloth styles.

1.37 Front cover of Burtons style guide, mid-1950s.

1.38 Burtons cloth designer, who ‘has a range of designs woven into one length of cloth, upon which the Buying Committee then pass judgement.’

1.39 Model Tony Armstrong-Barnes wearing a double breasted suit, style 805 in a ‘Cognac Terylene/worsted/mohair mixture’.
Chapter 2.

2.1 ‘1964. The Hepworths tailoring organisation embraces four production centres and nearly three hundred retail branches throughout the country…’.

2.2 Multiple tailors frequently had stores near to each other on high streets across Britain; Burtons branch, Slough, with Weaver to Wearer store next door, 1962.

2.3 Birmingham branches of Burtons in the late 1930s.

2.4 Erdington, Birmingham, Burtons building in 2009 with Erdington Snooker Club above.

2.5 Burtons store, St Helens, featuring the distinctive green glass fascia with ‘Montague Burton The Tailor of Taste’ in white lettering over transom lights with the words ‘Elegance’, ‘Taste’ and ‘Economy’.

2.6 Burtons suit label sewn inside the jacket over the inside breast pocket, from a double-breasted jacket, part of a two-piece Utility evening suit, c.1944-1952.

2.7 Burton House, corner of New Oxford Street, in London’s West End with what was then ‘London’s largest neon sign’ in red and blue.

2.8 Hepworths advertisement with illustration of Horse Guards on Whitehall, London, 1956.

2.9 Illustration of Burtons branch, Old Town Street, Plymouth.

2.10 The Park Ballroom over Jackson the Tailor, Southampton.

2.11 Illustration of the old Burton shop front name comparing it to the new style below. Also note Boots on the top left and John Collier top right. John Collier was the new name adopted by Henry Price – The Fifty Shilling Tailor.

2.12 Burtons new visual identity as seen on their suit labels after 1954. Dark grey two-piece single breasted suit, wool blended with Acrilan, 1958.
2.13 Label inside a Burtons navy worsted double breasted two-piece suit, 1962.
2.14 Burtons branch, Duncan Street, Leeds, c. 1920s.
2.15 Burtons branch, corner of Duncan Street and Briggate, Leeds, c. 1960s.
2.16 Brighton North Street branch of Burtons with original 1930s fascia, 1959.
2.17 Brighton North Street branch of Burtons after refurbishment, 1959. Note the Regent Ballroom above with entrance next door.
2.18 Exterior of Burtons and Peter Robinson Dunstable branch, 1966.
2.20 Exterior photograph of unidentified Burtons superstore branch, 1972.
2.21 Hepworths shopfront from the South East of England, repaired after war damage, 1944.
2.23 Davies Shopfitters featuring the modern shopfront of Hepworths Swansea branch, designed by H. W. Burton, Staff Architect to Hepworths.
2.26 Label inside a suit bought by a man to wear as best man at a wedding, Hardy Amies for Hepworths, 1972.
2.27 Artist’s impression of the modernisation of Hepworths Darlington branch.
2.28 ‘Difference in style of the new shops is stunning and typified by the branch recently opened in the heart of Telford New Town in Shropshire.’
2.29 Hepworths new visual identity, 1980.
2.30 Front cover of FST (Fifty Shilling Tailor) pamphlet, 1953.
2.31 Fascia being installed on John Collier’s Tooting branch in London, 1954.
2.32 John Collier store with Castle Billiard Hall above, High Street West, Sunderland, 1960s.
2.33 John Collier store, High Street, Slough, Berkshire, 1982.
2.34 Advertisement for Davies Shopfitters featuring the new Alexandre branch on the Strand, London.
2.35 Advertisement for Davies Shopfitters featuring an unidentified Alexandre branch.
2.36 Window shopping at Hepworths Plymouth branch, 1951.
2.37 Montague Burton stock-filled window display with large price tickets and show cards, 1920s-1930s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Simpson Piccadilly, interior of outfitting department, 8 May 1936.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>Interior of Preston, Lancashire, branch of Burtons, 1953. Note the female cashier in her booth to the right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Night view of ‘Charcoal Greys’ window display at one of Burtons Leeds branches, 1955.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>Interior and exterior of Hepworths Altrincham branch in Greater Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>Ground floor and first floor of one of Hepworths Leeds branches, 1955.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Hepworths branches, 1956.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>‘…the suspended ceiling in which the lights are fitted is black leather. The lights over the mural are Swedish.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>Burtons window display design and set up with full-figure mannequins, 1964.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>Interior of the Grimsby branch of Burtons, 1966. The entire shop can be seen through the window display which features full-figure mannequins while the interior design conforms to the contemporary style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>Hepworths spring 1960 bespoke window display designed by Eric Lucking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>‘New look Coventry branch uses aluminium sculptures and concealed lighting to set off new style in men’s shops.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Interior of made-to-measure area in the Hepworths Kensington High Street store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>Upstairs ready-to-wear section of Hepworths Rotherham, South Yorkshire, store, 1960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Interior of Leeds Burtons branch, c.mid-1960s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>‘The largest shop experiment in the Arndale Centre, Manchester is a success’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>Male display torso from Levine &amp; Son Ltd, 23s. 1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Male mannequins from Adel Rootstein and Gems, 1965.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>Burtons male mannequin legs dressed in slim cut narrow trousers with notched detail over the foot allowing the trouser to sit over footwear, 1965.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Burtons male mannequin with sculpted features, window display mock-up photograph, 1966.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Window of Hepworths High Street Kensington branch, showing full-figure mannequins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Window display for Hepworths featuring the ‘Hardy Amies Co-ordinated Look’ including shirts and ties on full-figure metallic-look mannequins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Burtons mannequin heads being groomed and prepared for display, 25 August 1970.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.61 Burtons window display design 1970.

Chapter 3.

3.1 Two suits in ‘Golden Talisman’ wool made by Hepworths from their Hardy Amies range bought by Raymond Fox.

3.2 Burtons ‘average man’ of the late-1940s-early 1950s.


3.4 Details of Stephen Collins first suit, made-to-measure by Burtons, 1975.

3.5 Two pages from Burtons made-to-measure style guide. The guide features the same curlicue brown and yellow logo as on the suit label.

3.6 Detail of 1963 boy’s first suit by Burtons.


3.8 Purported teenage earnings and spending power, 1958.

3.9 Richard Blake in a light-weight double-breasted suit by Leeds tailor Sumrie and a more informal sporty suit in a window-pane check cloth, the jacket featuring patch pockets by J & J Brightbart which he chose for business wear.


3.12 Burtons 1950s style guide using American fashion illustrations.

3.13 Alexandre ‘Manhattan’ drape.

3.14 Teddy Boy Jacket, Alexandre, 1964. V&A catalogue image; label; jacket reverse with velvet half-belt; jacket front showing missing button.

3.15 Teddy Boy Jacket, Alexandre, 1965. V&A catalogue image showing two half-moon jetted pockets at hips; label and fancy lining; coat reverse with velvet covered button half-belt and two deep 11 inch long vents; damage to button at front; one button half-turn back cuff.

3.16 Teddy Boy Jacket, Burtons 1966 [1973]. V&A catalogue image showing front of jacket with four flapped pockets and self-covered buttons; Burtons factory label inside lining breast pocket with date stamp: 26.9.73; back of coat cut in one piece – whole back; turn back sleeve cuff with three covered buttons.

3.17 Front cover and inside page of Alexandre style guide, 1962.

3.18 John Collier style guide, possibly from a cutter. The handwritten ‘y.m’ (young man?) may refer to the pattern blocks. The Mersey-Beat style is a loose page inserted into the booklet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Burtons Beatles Jacket Style 98 and Burtons Style 21 CS with 'Continental lapel and collar', withdrawn 1967-1968.</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td><em>The Saturday Night Suit</em>, Johnny Johnson Orchestra, John Collier.</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td><em>Get Hep with Hepworths</em>, Johnny Johnston and the Keynotes, Hepworths.</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>Photographs of Del Evans in his Hepworths made-to-measure Mod suits.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Exterior of Mr Burt and Top Shop stores, Leicester, 1974.</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Interior of Mr Burt, Leicester, 1974 featuring cloth bunches for made-to-measure suits.</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Screenshots from 1973 Mr Burt cinema advertisement.</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>Mr Burt of Burton suit on display and label on inside lining.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>Detail of Mr Burt suit: Front of jacket, left pocket flap detail, reverse of trousers, trouser legs, waistcoat.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>Burtons green cotton denim jacket, c. 1972.</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>Burtons selling branded garments and casualwear in the 1970s which contributed to the lack of focus of their stores.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>Redesigned Burtons, Top Shop and Top Man, exteriors 1978 and Top Man interiors with young male and female sales staff.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Burtons acrylic jumper, c. 1978-1980.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Burton Group Annual Report, 1979.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Hepworths advertisement for their Golden Talisman wool cloth suits.</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>Burtons Harris tweed jacket, factory label date 21 January 1967.</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>Burtons style guide, style 114 Norfolk Jacket.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Harris Tweed from Hepworths styled in a Hardy Amies designed sports jacket, 1968.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>David Gillett’s wedding suit, 1973.</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>Roger Burges wedding suit and tie.</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>Suit sales at 50 Burtons branches by age 7 February-14 March 1953.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>Undated Burtons cartoon advertising their made-to-measure tailoring.</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>Cover of John Collier style guide, c. 1950s.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>Burtons advertisement, 1969.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>William Howarth’s Hardy Amies for Hepworths suit. One button missing on left cuff, wear to edge of trouser pocket and jacket lining.</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>William Howarth’s Hardy Amies for Hepworths Sports jacket with patch pockets.</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.46 Details of John Collier suit bought by Mr M. A. Harber in Norwich, 1964: lapel and breast pocket with pocket square and button fly in trousers. 224

3.47 Suit bought by Mr D. Upham in 1936 and worn by him (and also his son) until 1970. 225

**Chapter 4.**

4.1 Location of Joseph Hepworth’s first business in Leeds on Briggate, 1864 as represented in the Hepworths centenary booklet, 1964. 229

4.2 Hardy Amies ladies suit made of striped worsted wool, 1947. 231

4.3 Amies in 1947 photographed in his Savile Row office. 231

4.4 Advertisement for Radiac shirts designed by ‘Consultant designer’ Hardy Amies. 233

4.5 Red and black satin tie designed by Hardy Amies in the 1950s. 233

4.6 Norman Shuttleworth and Hardy Amies. 234

4.7 ‘Main British Men’s Wear Trends, 1956’. 236

4.8 Alexandre advertisement for American *Gentleman’s Quarterly* featuring the American designer Petrocelli, 1959. 238

4.9 Headrow Clothes Ltd advertisement for Saxon Hawk-branded ready-to-wear suits designed by Savile Row tailor Huntsman. 239

4.10 Saxon Hawk promotional campaign advertisement. 239

4.11 Hepworths and Hardy Amies collection for Autumn 1961 – one of the press advertisements and pieces from the collection. 242

4.12 ‘The suit was “built on” to a model in best Savile Row fashion, under the critical eye of Hardy Amies.’ 244

4.13 George Rutland photographed in a Hardy Amies for Hepworths dinner suit made for the Hepworths show 2 September 1966 and the surviving suit showing his name and the garment model number (105) inside the jacket. 246

4.14 Tony Armstrong-Barnes holding one of his modelling photographs from the 1960s. 247

4.15 Armstrong-Barnes in a 1963 Hepworths advertisement which ran in the *Daily Mirror*, 7 March and *Sunday Mirror*, 15 March. 247

4.16 Rare menswear sketch of suit for Hepworths with comments by Hardy Amies from the Hardy Amies Archive, c. 1966. 248

4.17 ‘Hardy Amies, men’s wear designer for Hepworths, Robin Darwin, CBE, the Principal of the RCA; Mrs. Janey Ironside, Professor of the School of Fashion Design, RCA; Mr. Norman Shuttleworth, Managing Director of J. Hepworth and Son Ltd, February 1964’. 252

4.18 Pierre Cardin blazer for Neville Reed. Illustration by Robb. 253
4.19 John Collier suit ‘styled by design circle’, late 1960s. 254
4.20 Advertisement for Jackson the Tailor, ‘I told my designers…’. 254
4.21 ‘The Rogue Male Look Goes Romantic’, illustration by Robb. 256
4.22 Suit by John Collier, £14 19s. 6d. left, and Hardy Amies for Hepworths £17 5s., right. Models Alan Wright and Steve Gray, photograph by Larry Ellis. 256
4.24 Burtons John Weitz International Designer store display, February 1977. 258
4.25 Hepworths poster campaign, Spring 1975. 260
4.26 Colour image from poster photoshoot in Hepworths sales career booklet, c. 1975. 260
4.27 Hardy Amies for Hepworths suit, tie and shirt, the ‘Hardy Amies Coordinated Look’ launched in 1976. 261
4.28 Hepworths re-design by McCann Design Associates. 261
4.29 Label for Hardy Amies for Hepworths black jacket, 1982. 261
4.31 Hepworths sample jacket, double breasted in hopsack wool, 4 February 1983. 263
4.32 Hepworths and Hardy Amies fashion show, Savoy Hotel, London, 8 September 1965. 265
4.33 ‘Models in the Birmingham parades’. 270
4.34 Tony Armstrong-Barnes’ colour newspaper advertisement for Burtons, 1962, and ‘composite’ – model card – for Michael Whittaker, 1969. 271
4.35 Screenshot of unused clip of Hepworths and Hardy Amies first Savoy fashion show, 11 September 1961. 273
4.36 Hepworths fashion show at Southport Floral Gardens, on the coast of north west England in 1965 where it was watched by an estimated 5,000 people. 275
4.37 Hepworths and Hardy Amies Savoy fashion show programme, 8 September 1965, designed by Edward Burrett. 276
4.38 Screenshot of Kenneth Partridge and Ken Fleetwood watching the rehearsal of the 1964 fashion show, Savoy Hotel, London, 8 September 1964. 276
4.39 George Rutland modelling a coat in 1967 from the Hardy Amies for Hepworths 1968 collection. 277
4.40 Photograph of the live Savoy fashion show, 9 September 1964. 279
4.41 Screenshot of rehearsal of Amies for Hepworths fashion show, featuring George Rutland in a 1880s style outfit with a penny farthing, Reuters, 8 September 1964. 279
4.42 The 1965 Amies for Hepworths fashion show at the Savoy, London featuring the ‘Ad Lib’ collection with the models dancing to pop music.

4.43 Split photograph of pieces from the Amies for Hepworths centenary collection, 1964.

4.44 Two garments from the ‘future’ collection of the 1964 centenary show.

4.45 Collarless suit made of Bernat Klein-designed space-dyed Scottish tweed in a basket-weave pattern.

4.46 ‘Past Historic’ 1860s styles shown at the Hepworths centenary fashion show which influenced Amies contemporary and future designs with high-buttoning jackets and narrow trousers.

4.47 Detail of trousers with elastic loops and ‘95 Buck’ label in the back of the jacket. The multicoloured space-dyed yarns making up the weave of the cloth are also visible.


4.49 The same suit being modelled by Tony Armstrong-Barnes on the cover of Hardy Amies *ABC of Men’s Fashion*, 1964.

4.50 Suit details – model label and sleeve vent.


4.53 Final Hardy Amies for Hepworths fashion show at the Savoy Hotel, London, September 1967.

4.54 Hardy Amies watching the Autumn 1971 collection fashion show at the Queens Hotel, Leeds.

**Conclusion**

1 Menswear fashion column with illustrations by Martin Welch featuring an outfit by Hepworths consisting of a grey padded cotton blouson jacket worn with a soft cotton shirt, wool and acrylic sweater, and blue corduroy trousers.

2 Designs for blouson jackets and casual styles at Top Man and Burtons in 1984.
List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>Montague Burton Ltd until 1969, then Burton Group Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST</td>
<td>Fifty Shilling Tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAA</td>
<td>Hardy Amies Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT</td>
<td>History of Advertising Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>Joseph Hepworth &amp; Son Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>Imperial War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Leicestershire Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMG</td>
<td>Leeds Museums and Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Manchester Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>Museum of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAS</td>
<td>Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Royal College of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMAG</td>
<td>Worthing Museum and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYAS</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Archive Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS</td>
<td>United Drapery Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&amp;A</td>
<td>Victoria and Albert Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VADS</td>
<td>Visual Arts Data Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1 Coverlet made of clothing labels by Winifred Dodge, 1960s to early 1970s, 150cm x 212cm. Details of Leeds multiple tailor labels used in the coverlet.

At some point in the 1960s Winifred Dodge began collecting the labels out of garments which she patched and sewed together to make up into a coverlet. She was notorious for cutting off labels she liked from people’s clothes; as a friend said ‘she would have it off in no time – no waiting for the owner to remove it at a later date – out with the scissors there and then’! Over 2,000 labels ended up in the coverlet she made and the finished piece offers a unique insight into the mass produced British clothing industry of this period due to the extraordinary variety of types of garment, manufacturers, retailers and clothing brands represented. Included in the coverlet are a significant number of labels from Leeds-based companies and from the Leeds multiple tailors, the vertically integrated companies making and selling men’s tailoring which are the subject of this study. These names include Burton, John Collier, Hepworths and Alexandre, companies which made millions of garments and clothed significant proportions of British men in the post-war period with mass produced made-to-measure and ready-to-wear suits.

This study reveals the often overlooked but highly significant role of the Leeds multiple tailors in the history of British men’s clothing and fashion from the 1940s to 1980. These companies had developed a distinctive approach to making and selling men’s suits and tailoring from the nineteenth century with manufacturing primarily based in Leeds and hundreds of retail branches each on high streets across the whole of the British Isles: Scotland, Wales, England and both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Leeds became the British centre of men’s tailored outerwear, both ready-to-wear and factory made-to-measure (what was called ‘wholesale bespoke’); a position which was expanded and consolidated through the 1920s and 1930s. These companies designed and made suits and sold them through their own chains of retail branches, most of them as made-to-measure, a process which involved a customer being measured for his suit in a branch which was then cut and tailored in the Leeds factory. The manufacture of tailoring in Leeds also encompassed other producers such as wholesale firms that supplied men’s outfitters, independent tailors and department stores, cut-make-trim companies who would make on behalf of outside firms, and ready-to-wear tailors who sold their own branded suits. However, the focus of the research for this project is mostly on the largest of the Leeds multiples: Burtons (and its affiliate Jackson the Tailor), Hepworths, Price’s (originally called the Fifty Shilling Tailor and then renamed John Collier) and Alexandre. This emphasis on these companies is for two main reasons. First is their domination. It is estimated that from the 1930s to the 1960s, after which all suit sales and British manufacture declined, Leeds multiple tailors produced around half of all suits bought by British men. They were ubiquitous on British high streets; for example a 1967 map of central Leeds shows nine

---

branches of six of the multiples in remarkably close proximity (see below). Second is the surviving source material which favours the large Leeds multiple tailors, in particular Burtons and Hepworths. Focusing on these particular companies, their mass production of men’s tailoring, and the ways these garments were consumed, makes a significant contribution to a more nuanced understanding of men’s fashion and dress in the post-war period.

---

4 The Burtons company archive was given to the West Yorkshire Archive Service which holds a number of company archives from the Leeds tailoring industry. Leeds Museums and Galleries (hereafter LMG) hold large collections of Burtons objects and materials (including the company’s photographic archive) and Hepworths items as well as objects from other companies from the Leeds tailoring industry. The Hardy Amies archive also has material related to the designer’s collaboration with Hepworths.
The period from the 1940s to the 1970s saw remarkable changes in men’s clothing and men’s fashion became the subject of popular comment and attention, most conspicuously in the 1960s. As Jonathan Aitkin commented in 1967:

…the most telling symbol of the social changes in the last few years is not the continual chatter about class, but the new clothes. Virtually everyone has been affected in some degree or another by the sartorial revolution. We are all dandies now.5

Just as Aitkin does, there has been a tendency to utilise references to men’s style and clothing as a way of summing up broader social and cultural differences and developments of the period, in particular youth culture. However, by using clothing and fashion as a shorthand in this way, the significance of the role of the Leeds multiples in supplying men’s fashion and tailoring to British men, as well as the continuing importance of the role of the suit in many men’s lives is lost. In order to counter this problem this thesis takes a dress historical approach which combines object study, oral history and personal accounts, company archives and trade literature to look at the design, production and consumption of the men’s tailoring made by the Leeds multiples. The strength of this approach, as Geraldine Howell has argued, is that it includes all aspects of the clothing they made and sold and that men bought and wore, whether it was considered fashionable or not:

Popular clothing of often limited longevity, created by a range of both predictable and less predictable cultural forces, is regarded as fashion and gives rise to the fashionable. Dress encompasses a much wider remit and includes all the clothing worn at a particular time. Fashion is part of dress history while dress history is not necessarily part of fashion.\(^6\)

The framework established by dress history enables four main themes to be explored and analysed by this thesis: the role of design and fashion within the Leeds multiple tailoring firms; masculinity and identity and the suit; masculine consumption; and mass produced and everyday men’s dress.

I

By exploring the participation of the Leeds multiple tailors in men’s consumption of fashion and the making and design of menswear in the post-war period, this study makes an important contribution to the history of the Leeds tailoring industry. Much of the early work on the industry was concerned with histories of individual companies.\(^7\) Other research has been dominated by economic and business history within the industries of clothing and retailing.\(^8\) More recent work, including that of Katrina Honeyman, Laura Ugolini, Paul Jobling and Frank Mort has considered the Leeds tailoring industry within the
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context of gender and consumption. Honeyman has written extensively and excellently on the Leeds clothing industry, putting gender and labour at the centre of her analysis and successfully bringing together the production and consumption of men’s tailoring and suits in twentieth century Britain in her investigations. However, the majority of Honeyman’s writing focused on the pre-Second World War period of the Leeds tailoring business, the years when the industry grew rapidly and established a significant market for their made-to-measure and ready-to-wear suits sold from their network of retail outlets across Great Britain. Ugolini and Jobling’s works integrated examples from Leeds tailoring companies into broader studies focused on masculinity and menswear consumption, as well as advertising, demonstrating a greater recognition of the diversity within menswear and of men’s experiences. Ugolini, like Honeyman, has looked at the decades before the 1940s. Her work has effectively utilised personal accounts to illuminate the variability of men’s clothing consumption, as well as the ways the industry retailed tailoring and suits to men. In his books on menswear advertising in the twentieth century, Jobling included examples from the Leeds tailoring industry within the context of the menswear business, uncovering the complexity and innovations in the selling of men’s clothing and masculine consumption. For his study Mort (initially with Peter Thompson) focused on the largest of the Leeds multiples, Burtons, to explore men’s consumption and constructions of masculinity in the 1950s, showing that these companies offer a useful means to understand these themes in post-war Britain. By concentrating on the most significant of the Leeds multiple tailoring companies over a period of forty years, this thesis provides a new perspective on the role of these companies in the clothing of British men, male fashion consumption, and the history of the industry. First by concentrating on how they made and designed men’s suits in the post-war period and second, how they were successful in an active engagement with fashion.


This thesis also contributes to the burgeoning academic literature on the history of men’s fashion and dress.\(^\text{13}\) This is a relatively recent development, as the establishment of fashion and dress as a subject worthy of study has required considerable effort by a range of scholars to counter the gendered marginalisation and trivialisation of the history of clothing within museums and academia.\(^\text{14}\) An exception was the history of textiles, on the one hand due to its close connection to industrialisation and attention from economic historians and on the other its association with design and the decorative arts.\(^\text{15}\) The historic study of dress and fashion is a broad discipline and encompasses a wide range of approaches from those based in object study and material culture to work which draws upon theoretical concerns, particularly those of gender.\(^\text{16}\) In terms of men’s appearance, studies of contemporary masculinity and masculine consumption have also been influential, particularly with the advent of what was termed the ‘new man’ of the 1980s.\(^\text{17}\) Historical studies drawing on gender were effective in the development of research into the history of men’s clothed appearance as they revealed the often hidden ubiquity of men’s fashion consumption.\(^\text{18}\) Since the early 2000s there has been a dramatic increase in historical studies of menswear, exemplified by the 2009 collection The Men’s Fashion Reader which brought together over 30 texts with the history, culture and identity of men’s fashion as their subject.\(^\text{19}\) Some dominant narratives have emerged from both the older and more recent work: the history and status of the tailored suit in menswear; an interest in the spectacular, subversive and the subcultural in men’s dressing and fashion; and in Britain, the privileging of London as
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\(^{15}\) For example the journal Textile History was set up in 1968 to look at the history and technological development of textiles. Taylor discusses the prioritising of the collection of textiles by the V&A rather than dress and fashion. Taylor, Establishing Dress History, pp. 107-117.

\(^{16}\) There has been debate within the discipline about these different approaches, as well as the theoretical differences between ‘dress’ and ‘fashion’. See papers by Lou Taylor, Christopher Breward, Valerie Steele and John Styles in Fashion Theory, 2:4 (1998); Christopher Breward, ‘Between the Museum and the Academy: Fashion Research and Its Constituencies’, Fashion Theory, 12:1 (2008), 83-94.; Peter McNeil, ‘“We’re Not in the Fashion Business”: Fashion in the Museum and the Academy’, Fashion Theory, 12:1 (2008), 65-82.


\(^{19}\) The Men’s Fashion Reader, ed. by Peter McNeil and Vicki Karaminas (Oxford: Berg, 2009).
the centre for men’s fashion change. The research in this project extends these narratives by concentrating on the Leeds multiple tailors. It shows that the national reach across British high streets of these companies from their base in Leeds allowed them to cater to large proportions of the male population with suits, designs, and fashions that could satisfy regional sensibilities as well as the differing demands of men’s ages and life stage, including youth-led and subcultural styles.

The modern men’s tailored suit traces its origins back to the late seventeenth century and through its subsequent evolutions it has become both an emblem of menswear and shorthand for masculinity. Anne Hollander has argued that suits have an ‘intrinsically abstract formal character’ and this along with ‘their abiding evolutionary character – their look of looking like themselves, even while their style keeps slightly changing’ has given the form endurance and power. However, it is this conception of the suit, and by extension men’s clothing in general, as the perfect modernist coverall that has helped to play into the denial of men’s engagement in their appearance. David Kuchta has interrogated this seemingly ‘unnoticed, unquestioned, second nature’ embodiment of masculinity inherent in the tailored suit which he argues has allowed ‘men’s fashion to remain as an unmarked category, inconspicuous and unexamined. And it is as an unmarked category that this ideology of masculinity has escaped critical analysis, and thus retained its power to reproduce elite male status.’ Honeyman has explored the way that although in the pre-1940s period the Leeds multiple tailors’ production and retailing of men’s suits was dominated by ‘a standard, unchanging product’ it also allowed for ‘variety, quality and even “fashion”’. This study extends this work by illuminating the role of the tailoring of the Leeds multiples as a site of identity formation for many men in Britain in the post-war period and providing a more complex understanding of this garment that was experienced by a majority of men. This study shows that the inherent duality recognised by Honeyman in the suits made by the multiples continued after the Second World War, especially through the Leeds companies’ adherence to the made-to-measure model of production which positioned the masculine consumer as an active participant in suit design.

While suits have been studied for their close associations with masculinity and as representative of men’s dress, another strand of writing on the history of men’s clothing has been dominated by interest in the exceptional, men wearing clothing that has not


21 Hollander, *Sex and Suits*, p. 4.


conformed to cultural and societal conventions or has been overtly fashionable. One notable example is the dandy, both as an historical reality and an ideal of masculine style (which has also been adopted by women). The extravagant style identified with the dandy has also made it an appealing subject for exhibitions of menswear, the visual impact of the garments acting as a material argument for men’s historic and contemporary explicit engagement with fashion. Other forms of men’s dress which have a crossover with dandy styles and have attracted attention are those that are subversive or subcultural. Academic concerns with working-class identities and resistance in the 1960s and 1970s opened up new areas of research and interests which as a consequence provided another view of men’s clothing. Resulting research has primarily focused on the second half of the twentieth century and on dress styles worn by young men such as the 1950s Teddy Boys; the zoot suit worn by young African American and Mexican American men from the 1930s through the 1940s; black British style, and 1960s Mods. Shaun Cole’s work on gay men’s dress practices has looked at the range of styles from conformist to distinctive also highlighting those that were pre-cursors of subcultural styles (such as Mods) and others that were influential on mainstream men’s fashion. These studies have added to understandings of the diversity of men’s dress practices and the essential part that clothing can play in masculine identity and constructions of masculinity. The findings of this study definitively show that the Leeds multiple tailors facilitated men’s participation in these

subversive dress forms through their affordable made-to-measure tailoring, in particular young men who sought to wear the distinctive Teddy Boy and Mod styles of the 1950s and 1960s. However, it also shows this consumption within the context of the majority of men who bought and wore suits in ways that were more nuanced than simply conforming or not conforming.

Another recurrent theme in the British historiography of men’s fashion has been the study of particular geographical locations, especially the city spaces of London and in this regard the work of Christopher Breward has been particularly influential. In some respects this follows the trends seen in fashion history and its preoccupation with key metropolitan cities as drivers of fashion change, but also recognises that London has been Britain’s fashionable centre for hundreds of years. It reflects the importance given to the establishment and survival of the tradition of bespoke tailoring seen in the firms which are located around the street of Savile Row in London’s West End. These establishments represent what has been described as the male equivalent of Parisian haute couture; making individualised garments and emphasising quality in cloth, cutting and craftsmanship including multiple fittings and hand-finishing. London’s role in post-war men’s and women’s fashion has also been considered particularly significant. The rise of independent designers and boutiques from the 1950s onwards, together with the collisions and mixtures of classes and cultures intrinsic to city spaces, are regularly cited as being major contributors to the possibilities of different kinds of male style. A problem with this concentration on London is the possibility of crowding out (or even devaluing) the


experiences and developments outside of the city. The positioning of the multiple tailors in the north of England and their national spread of hundreds of branches means that the findings of this study contribute to a more nuanced understanding of men’s fashion that stretches beyond London’s borders. This does not ignore London; the Leeds multiples made use of the status of London as a menswear fashion centre, for example they established flagship stores in London’s West End, put the name ‘London’ on their tailoring labels, and Hepworths collaborated with Savile Row-based couturier Hardy Amies. However, London did not eclipse Leeds and the north, which remained the site of their head offices, most of their manufacturing, the source of much of their wool cloth, and the location for the design centres for their retail branches, cloth and tailoring. The multiple tailors had to negotiate and balance majority tastes across the whole country and could not be restricted to fashions popular in one location, even if it was London.

By taking the Leeds multiple tailors as its focus, this study also builds on the diversity of literature within dress history interested in the design, production and consumption of ordinary and everyday clothing and fashion. As Cheryl Buckley and Hazel Clark have recently argued, ‘scholarship in fashion studies and fashion history has tended to focus on the avant-garde, the extraordinary, and the unusual, especially regarding its origination and design’ and been preoccupied with the attire of the elite. One approach to ordinary dress has looked at the development of ready-to-wear and the mass production of clothing and fashion, which is still relatively neglected. Designer Ian Griffiths even described himself as ‘The Invisible Man’ due to the lack of attention given to designers like him who worked for large companies making ready-to-wear fashion. Men’s tailoring has attracted particular historical attention in this respect as it was influential in the development of factory garment making, notably in the United States. Other scholars have revealed the value of
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34 For example, see Styles, Dress of the People, which looks at clothing across England as well as London and Alison Toplis, The Clothing Trade in Provincial England (London and New York: Routledge, 2016, first published 2011). See also Helen Smith’s work on same-sex experiences of northern working-class men which provides a different perspective on the of history masculinity and sexuality which has largely focused on male experience in London and larger metropolitan areas. Helen Smith, Masculinity, Class and Same-Sex Desire in Industrial England, 1895-1957 (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

looking at home dressmaking to explore the complexities of people’s clothed experiences as well as the diversity of how clothing has been made and acquired.\(^{39}\) Geraldine Howell’s study of dress during the Second World War also exemplifies the worth of taking a more inclusive view of fashion to better understand its role in people’s lives, across the social spectrum.\(^{40}\) The work in this thesis demonstrates the significance of studying the ‘common and everyday character’ of the suits and tailoring designed, made and sold by the Leeds multiples, and acquired and worn by men in post-war Britain.\(^{41}\)

II

Within history the recognition of seeing objects as valid and useful sources is a relatively recent and notable development, so much so that the discipline has been described as having taken a ‘material turn’.\(^{42}\) However, as Lou Taylor has aptly shown, object-based research has a long and rich legacy in dress history with a close relationship to curatorial practice – the caring for, understanding of, and interpreting costume and textile collections.\(^{43}\) Object study remains a significant part of dress history, with scholars taking ‘a focus on the material and cultural characteristics of the object and/or its wearer, either as their central concern or a touchstone for wider inquiry.’\(^{44}\) The methods adopted to analyse dress objects have built on the skills of curators working with collections as well as techniques used by material culture scholars.\(^{45}\) In their recent guide to using object-based research in fashion, Ingrid Mida and Alexandra Kim have neatly summarised these methodologies and put forward a useful practice-based approach to the close study of clothing, to enable researchers to unlock the ‘narrative embedded within the garment’.\(^{46}\) Object-based research is central to this project and the garments analysed have been drawn from museum and archive collections.\(^{47}\) However, there have been limitations to this, as


\(^{40}\) Howell, *Wartime Fashion*.


\(^{47}\) Suits made by the Leeds multiple tailors in the post-war period can be regularly found for sale second-hand in shops and online. However I limited the objects I studied to museum collections due to concern for provenance.
there are with any historical source, but some of these are directly related to the fact they are items of dress. The first is one of survival. As costume collector Doris Langley Moore noted: ‘Masculine fashion takes a less conspicuous place in the Museum of Costume than feminine only because men’s clothes are harder to come by in quantities adequate to dress whole figures.’ Her explanation centred on men not keeping hold of their clothing over time, while Breward ascribed this phenomenon to men’s clothing tending to ‘end its life in the second-hand market or exhausted in the rag-bin’. The history of museum collecting has also demonstrated biases in what has been acquired, with costume disparaged within institutions, considered purely feminine (men’s clothing discounted as not being of interest), or dominated by pristine examples of the clothing of the elite and the cutting edge of fashion. With the interest in history from below, other types of dress began to be collected as examples of social or industrial history; for example, the majority of the suits made by the Leeds tailors in the collections of LMG were acquired by the Leeds Industrial Museum at Armley Mills. Langley Moore made her comment in the 1950s and Breward in the late 1990s, and museums continue to face these issues with most dress and textile collections containing far fewer male than female clothes.

However, while there may be fewer, the research for this thesis revealed over 90 suits and garments made by the Leeds multiple tailors in the post-war period held by museums across Britain, while LMG has over 70 alone. I was not able to look at all of these garments, largely due to practical considerations of travel and access. The suits are in collections spread across Britain and during the last five years curatorial and other staffing cuts to museums have made accessing collections more difficult, with some collections closed to researchers entirely. The research involved the detailed examination of suits and clothing based on my experience of years of buying twentieth century second-hand clothing, object-based study during my MA in the History of Design and from having worked as a costume and textile curator. The approach taken was broadly that outlined by Mida and Kim, which they break down into three phases: observation – looking closely and recording the information from the object; reflection – considering ‘embodied experience and contextual information’; interpretation – bringing together the findings from the first
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49 Breward, Hidden Consumer, p. 11.
51 This has also been my experience as a curator of the Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service (CIMS) collection, visiting costume and textile collections professionally, and in undertaking this research. Most of these garments were discovered after responses to an appeal to the Dress and Textile Specialists and Social History Curators email groups, some from personal requests to curators and also from consulting online collection catalogues where these exist.
52 MA (RCA) in History of Design. I curated a collection of over 10,000 items of dress and textiles held by CIMS.
two phases with theory. The value and strength of these garment studies is that they have revealed details and meanings of the suits and clothing that cannot be discovered in any other way, from fabric wear and staining, to types of fly fastenings in trousers and the factory labels hidden within the inside breast pocket of jackets. Significantly they also help to illuminate the richness and diversity of men’s experiences and relationships with mass produced and everyday clothing, an approach that has not previously been used in relation to the Leeds multiple tailors and is also rare in the history of men’s dress.

Another important source for this study was oral history interviews. Much has been written about oral history; its usefulness, problems, technique, challenges, methodologies and potential. Paul Thompson has strongly argued for the significance of oral history believing that its use ‘can be a means for transforming both the content and the purpose of history. It can be used to change the focus of history itself, and open up new areas of inquiry…and in the writing of history…it can give back to the people who made and experienced history, through their own words, a central place.’ Geraldine Biddle-Perry, Lou Taylor and Clare Lomas have all recognised the parallels between many of the aims of oral history and those of the history of dress in uncovering and untangling people’s lives and the society they lived in: ‘Fashion and dress form a fundamental part of everyone’s everyday experience and its memorial. Oral history…can clearly provide new perspectives, which challenge and contradict previous historical and cultural assumptions.’ The cultural conflation of fashion and dress with femininity has been an issue for some researchers when conducting oral history interviews with men on this subject. Clare Lomas confronted the issue of the gendered meaning of clothing memory when researching the experiences of the ‘new’ male consumer of the 1980s. She struggled to get men to respond to a questionnaire and to believe that they had anything to offer as interviewees: ‘Comments such as “I know nothing about fashion. There’s no point in interviewing me!” were frequent.’ However, Lou Taylor cites the work of Nicola Smallbone who looked at Mod subculture on the south coast of England who found that while there were gendered responses to the interview process, men did discuss what they had worn:

Men seemed to be quite reserved about talking about the past, but as soon as they were prompted [with period photographs] they began to pick out images and go into details about their machines [scooters], who did and did not wear the right

---

54 Mida and Kim, *Dress Detective*, p. 27.
clothes…They seemed to be much more strongly opinionated than the women about exact details.  

The utilization of oral history interviews has allowed scholars such as Mort and Ugolini to explore the diversity of men’s clothing consumption practices and Cole and Lomas have demonstrated the advantages of using oral history when looking at the experience of gay men in relation to fashion and the construction of identity.

The decision to use oral history was taken as a means to explore the experiences of ordinary people working in the design and sales area of the tailoring industry in order to understand how and why suits were designed and marketed, and to consider the experiences of men who bought and wore suits. The process of undertaking oral history interviews was supported by LMG through training (they organised two training sessions from the Oral History Society for LMG staff and myself), use of recording equipment, initial contacts, transcribing, and the accessioning and cataloguing of the interviews.  

LMG curators already had contacts for potential interviewees from the tailoring industry within the Leeds Jewish community and LMG Community History Manager Gabrielle Hamilton organised a meeting with Malcolm Berwin of Leeds tailoring company Berwin & Berwin and myself. As a result of this meeting I decided to recruit participants by the snowball sampling method of asking interviewees or research contacts to recommend others for interview. Ethics approval for the interviews was obtained from the University of Leeds PVAR Faculty Research Ethics Committee (reference PVAR 12-058). All participants were given an information sheet outlining the research project, a research consent form and a LMG consent form giving permission for the recordings to be accessioned into their collections and to be available for future research and display. Six men were interviewed for the PhD project.

Malcolm Berwin was interviewed by myself and LMG Costume and Textiles Curator Natalie Raw. He gave us the name of Brian Rayner who Natalie and I also interviewed and who gave me the contact for Brian Hill. These three men had all worked in the Leeds tailoring industry. The curator of the Hardy Amies Archive, Austin Mutti-Mewse gave me the contact details for Tony Armstrong-Barnes and George Rutland who had both modelled for Hardy Amies and Hepworths in the 1960s. The final interviewee, Robert Entwistle, was a personal contact who I had previously worked with.

As an interviewer I was aware of what I brought to the interviews: as a white, academic, younger New Zealand woman, interviewing older British men with an experience of an

---


60 Ugolini, Men and Men’s Wear; Mort, Cultures of Consumption; Cole, Don We Now Our Gay Apparel; Lomas, ‘Men Don’t Wear Velvet You Know!’.

61 This support was part of the Collaborative Doctoral Award partnership of the research project. Transcribing of most of the interviews was undertaken by a LMG volunteer intern, Katherine Young.

industrial and manufacturing past, I was an outsider. While being an insider (such as interviewing within the family or community) means that you may have privileged access and unspoken understandings of custom and culture, being an outsider can allow questioning of things taken for granted or assumed knowledge, the shared myths and understandings. This outsider status meant that I did not have the production knowledge of an industry insider and asked questions about design and fashion within the Leeds tailoring industry. As all but one of the men I interviewed had been involved with the Leeds tailoring industry through their work, this overcame some of the potential problems with gendered associations of fashion with femininity. The men’s oral history interviews were analysed as sources providing first-person accounts of events such as the Hepworths Centenary fashion show or the importance of cloth buying within the industry. They were also used to understand the construction of men’s stories about their history, within the context of gendered notions of fashion and dress. What powerfully emerged from the interviews was the emotional and subjective responses that some men expressed about their clothing histories and how these related to their lives. These emotional resonances and meanings were found in other personal accounts from men that were drawn on for this study, some connected to objects but many others found online, often related to photographs or discussions of the Leeds multiples.

The combination and diversity of sources used for this project is one of its strengths and follows the methodology advocated by dress historians such as Lou Taylor by looking at traditional written and printed archival materials alongside oral history and personal accounts; visual sources including photographs, film and illustrations; and object study of surviving suits. The extensive use of visual material in this PhD provides a more complex picture of the design approaches of the Leeds multiple tailors. For example, the photographic evidence from Burtons and Hepworths of their stores shed light on their investment in developing their interior and exterior retail architecture which was transformed over the thirty year period. Studies of garments provided valuable insights into broad changes in fashion but also more particularly into how the provision of made-to-measure suits by the Leeds multiple tailors gave men the opportunity to individualise their suits through choices in cloth and tailoring details. The survival of particular suits and their donation to museum collections also revealed emotional connections men had to their clothing, especially those garments which were accompanied by personal narratives. Taken together these different sources enable this research to demonstrate the significance of the place of the Leeds multiple tailors in men’s fashion and men’s lives in Britain in the post-war period.

This thesis examines the Leeds multiple tailors from the end of the Second World War to the end of the 1970s through four chapters. The chapters are thematic in scope and while all draw on a wide range of source material – detailed object-based research, oral history interviews, company archives including photographs and advertising ephemera, trade literature and journals, newspapers, films, as well as web-based materials – there is some variation in emphasis on particular companies due to the strengths (and absences) of sources. For example, the Burtons and Hepworths companies dominate, partly as they were the largest companies but also because more of their archives have survived, and even these are not comprehensive and are in different locations. This was not the case for most of the others, such as Weaver to Wearer or Alexandre and Price’s (John Collier). The first chapter focuses on mass production and design, contrasting the ready-to-wear provision of demob suits after the war with made-to-measure production. The second considers the network of retail branches and their design and display. The third chapter explores men’s consumption of suits and tailoring through their lives and the significance of meaning and identity in these garments. The last chapter concentrates on the partnership between Hepworths and fashion designer Hardy Amies from the early 1960s within the context of the wider changes in men’s fashion in this period and how the multiples utilised fashion and design.

Several key themes are explored through the thesis. First, this study reveals the extent and variety of the utilisation of design by the Leeds multiple tailors. These companies invested heavily in design throughout the post-war period but also deployed gendered definitions and constructions of design. They ensured that their suit designs were ‘productionised’ effectively to enable the most efficient use of their factories and emphasised the masculinity of the technical skill and craft of this design, especially in their adherence to made-to-measure making. This wholesale bespoke service also allowed ordinary men to participate in the design process by choosing the details of their suit including the cloth and cut to create a unique and individual garment. Within their retail stores and company identities they also made extensive use of design to create displays and interiors that would appeal to the post-war male consumer and respond to men’s changing desires. Hepworths in particular also brought the concept of a named fashion designer to British high street tailoring for men for the first time through their long-term collaboration with Hardy Amies. Second, the project explores the close connections between masculine identity and the tailored suit, as well as the meanings ascribed to this form of attire, in these four decades. From the mass produced ready-to-wear suit given to every demobilised man from the armed services at the end of the war, men’s memories of their first suit, to the carefully detailed Mod suit, and the suits bought by men to wear to their weddings, this garment played a significant role in the lives of most men and contributed to men’s sense of masculinity. A third theme is men’s consumption of dress and fashion as the great majority of the consumers of the suits made and sold by the Leeds multiples were men. Their model
of business was based on a high volume of production and sales to a broad male market, men of all ages and from all parts of Britain. They were purchasing suits for a diversity of reasons and with a variety of constraints and concerns including conformity, social expectation, pleasure, necessity and fashion. A final key theme is the significance of studying mass produced and everyday dress to facilitate a more complete picture of the different ways that men bought and wore clothing and fashion in the post-war period. The thesis begins with the first chapter focusing on men’s experiences of off-the-peg demob suits which underscores the significance given by the Leeds multiple tailors to the craft and skill of made-to-measure production between the 1940s and the 1960s.
Chapter 1.
The Cut Must Suit the Making: Mass Production and Design

In the mid-1950s Hepworths advertised their made-to-measure suits in a style guide (see above). It stressed that ‘Hepworths Made-to-Measure is genuinely individual. Each and every garment is separately hand-cut to your own measurements and requirements, perfectly tailored, correctly shaped, and carefully passed by experts, and in addition, hand-sewing and hand-pressing play their important parts’; the style guide was illustrated with photographs of cutters and tailors in their Leeds factory.1 Burtons took a similar approach, boasting that ‘Burton’s are responsible for clothing over 2 million men a year and they have to satisfy each and every one of them on every detail of cut, style, finish and fit.’2 In 1960 Sydney Jacobson of Burtons argued that the ‘skill of the individual tailor’ was paramount to
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1 LMG, LEEAG.2010.0336, Hepworths style catalogue.
the industry and enabled them to 'put the emphasis on individuality, which meant selling bespoke tailoring rather than ready-to-wear. "If you sell ready-to-wear clothing anybody can pick it off the peg and they can do the same in half-a-dozen other shops", he said. “Bespoke means selling to the individual and he regards you as his tailor.”3 This bespoke ethos was also profoundly gendered. This chapter sheds light on the continuity in made-to-measure suits within the industry from the 1940s to the 1960s, revealing the gendering of this form of production as particularly masculine. The industry promoted their made-to-measure design and production as being pre-eminent, publicising the craft and skill of their cutters and tailors and their ability to create quality fitted suits by mass production for the male consumer. This will be explored through three sections: a case study of the ready-to-wear suits given to servicemen on their demobilization at the end of the Second World War; the way that made-to-measure was designed and produced by the industry; and the importance of wool cloth to the gendered construction of made-to-measure tailoring. In order to contextualise these discussions, made-to-measure tailoring will first be explained as well a brief discussion of how design was seen within the clothing industry in the 1940s.

In the bespoke (and made-to-measure) tradition the personal relationship between the customer and his tailor dictated design decisions, from the choice of cloth to the intricacies of where a ticket pocket should be, particular to the individual. The process of making then reinforced this by accentuating craft and skill in production, especially those of the cutter, a process proclaimed as masculine.4 As George Dines, Managing Director of the Savile Row tailors Gieves, made clear in his introduction to the 1949 edition of tailoring bible The Modern Tailor, Outfitter and Clothier: ‘Tailoring carried out by the bespoke specialist is in an entirely different category. Clothes are produced having regard to the customer’s particular taste. His personal foibles are carefully considered’.5 While in another chapter, A. A. White asserted that a ‘good cutter will not only take careful note of his customers’ figures, he will also observe something of their personalities. And when he is cutting and fitting their clothes he will bear in mind the fact that he is dressing a personality as well as a person’.6 Bespoke tailoring also supposed quality cloths, technical prowess, hand craftsmanship and skill, and was ruled by a sense of proportion and balance. Made-to-measure tailoring also involved a recognition of the occasion of buying a suit as it was an expensive item of clothing, as Burtons sales staff were advised: ‘Although you may be dealing in hundreds of

---

4 The nineteenth century saw cut and fit become essential for good tailoring and developments such as the adoption of the measuring tape, attention to male anatomy and scientific approaches to measuring the body and establishing figure types were applied to men’s tailoring. These principles continued into the twentieth century. Norah Waugh, The Cut of Men’s Clothes 1600-1900 (London: Faber and Faber, 1964); Christopher Breward, The Suit: Form, Function and Style (London: Reaktion Books, 2016). On the tailor and customer relationship see for example, Laura Ugolini, Men and Menswear: Sartorial Consumption in Britain 1880-1939 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 234-245.
6 In bespoke tailoring the cutter is responsible for measuring the customer, making the pattern, cutting the suit and the subsequent suit fittings. A. A. White, ‘Types of Male Figure’, The Modern Tailor, Outfitter and Clothier, ed. by A. A. White, 4th edn 3 vols (London: Caxton, 1949) Vol. I, pp. 30-33 (p. 33).
suits a week, most of your customers buy one, or, at the most, two suits a year. The purchase of a suit, therefore, is an event. These concepts infused the mass manufacture of men’s made-to-measure tailored clothing and the Leeds multiples continually stressed the ‘bespoke’ nature of their made-to-measure suits. The ability to apply fit, cut and quality of tailoring to a mass production process was crucial and required the designer’s technical skill and analysis of figure types and pattern cutting (see below).

1.2 Burtons staff looking at tailoring fitting and figure types.
LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.4084.

The definition of design within the tailoring industry emphasised production. This was evident from the initial meetings of the Leeds Association of British Clothing Designers in 1935 where the role of the men’s tailoring designer was considered to be a display of technical skill:

A designer shall be a man who can produce from a plain piece of paper a draft of a good-fitting garment and from it be able to produce various styles and grades…and generally superintend the various stages of the making.

---

8 The Association was made up largely of those in the men’s tailoring trade. They joined the London Association of Clothing Designers in 1950. WYAS, Federation of Clothing Designers, WYL2031/1/1 Minute Book 1935-1950: Minutes 26 April 1935, p. 255.
At another meeting it was also declared: ‘that a Designer was a man who had supreme control of production’. The definition of design outlined by this group was both explicitly technical and gendered, emphasising the role of the designer as a man who was responsible for overseeing the entire production process rather than as someone who established stylistic innovation or set trends as in the tradition of women’s high-end fashion. The designer created a model for mass production in which ‘the cut must suit the making’.

The Leeds multiple tailors had built up their business during the inter-war period based on this gendered model of made-to-measure and tailoring design which continued after the war and remained crucial until the late 1960s despite the rise of ready-to-wear.

The setting up of the Leeds Association of British Clothing Designers reflected general concern about design for industry which intensified after the Second World War. A report into the heavy clothing industry (including men’s and boys’ outerwear, women’s and girls’ tailoring and coats, rainwear and industrial overalls) epitomised these anxieties.

Good design in the manufacture of clothing is extremely important; and we wish to stress this fact because it is not always sufficiently appreciated…The general level of design in British industry, however, is considerably below that achieved by the leading firms; and many firms are unable to find designers who could bring about the improvements which they desire.

This was an approach that had been applauded by trade journal Men’s Wear in 1945: ‘We agree with the President of the Board of Trade that Britain’s aim in production must be perfection. Not necessarily high-priced goods nor luxury garments but a standard of high quality and design both in material and make’. It also echoed the findings of a report into the place of design in women’s clothing which had been conducted in 1939 but because of the war was published in 1945. Although the Heavy Clothing report looked at both men’s and women’s clothing, it asserted that ‘it is in the women’s trade that questions of design are especially important.’ The close association of women’s clothing with ideas of fashion change and variety and men’s outerwear and tailoring with more gradual shifts in style meant that design was seen differently depending on who the garments were made for.
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11 This included a number of measures from setting up the Council of Industrial Design in 1944 to exhibitions such as ‘Britain Can Make It’ at the Victoria and Albert Museum (hereafter V&A) in 1946 and industry reports. Cheryl Buckley, Designing Modern Britain (London: Reaktion, 2007); Design and Cultural Politics in Post-war Britain: The Britain Can Make It exhibition of 1946, ed. by Patrick J. Maguire and Jonathan M. Woodham (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1997); Did Britain make it? British Design in Context 1946-86, ed. by Penny Sparke (London: The Design Council, 1986).
15 Board of Trade, Heavy Clothing, p. 39.
(men or women as well as high end or high street), and their production process.\textsuperscript{16} Katrina Honeyman has shown the nature of the gendered labour split within the Leeds tailoring industry (men in technical, skilled and more senior roles such as cutting and tailoring, women restricted to working as machinists and in relatively unskilled positions) while she and Laura Ugolini have also demonstrated the importance of the construction of masculinity in the retail side of the business.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1945 a panel of menswear industry insiders were asked if it would be of benefit for ‘definite and regular changes to be made in the style of men’s clothing’.\textsuperscript{18} The responses were mixed, with one commenting, ‘I shudder at the thought of men’s wear shops becoming fashion houses’ and another remarking ‘I am not keen on too great a multiplicity of styles or such rapid fashion changes that one would run the risk of being left with out-of-date stock. Remember the awful example of women’s hats in normal times!’\textsuperscript{19} Rapid fashion change was deemed as inextricably linked with women’s clothing and femininity and through the inter-war period had also come to be more closely associated with the concept of the ‘fashion designer’ or ‘dress designer’ based on Paris couturier practice ‘to describe work based on an original sketch, made up into a garment, pattern cut, sized and graded for production’.\textsuperscript{20} The 1950s and 1960s had also seen women’s fashion production shift towards ready-to-wear with companies such as Marks & Spencer investing in making fashionable women’s wear available at cheaper prices on British high streets.\textsuperscript{21} Much of this type of production relied on copying and adapting ‘models’ or sketches (often from the bi-annual shows in Paris which had the authority as the capital of women’s fashion) rather than creating original designs in order to generate the variety required for the faster turnover of styles – a practice which continued well into the 1960s, as fashion journalist Alison Settle described:

\begin{quote}
…when dress firms advertise for a designer, a vast number of them really mean a stylist, who is also a pattern cutter and grader; preferably one who, on being shown an illustration on a magazine page, can cut out something tolerably akin and then grade it correctly into sizes. The number of really original designers is very, very small indeed.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} In 2000 MaxMara designer Ian Griffiths made the point that designers such as himself working in volume production and high street fashion were invisible in most of the writing about fashion, demonstrating a lack of understanding of the industry. Ian Griffiths, ‘The Invisible Man’, The Fashion Business: Theory, Practice, Image, ed. by Nicola White and Ian Griffiths (Oxford: Berg, 2000), pp. 69-90.


\textsuperscript{18} ‘Brains Trust: Would it not be an advantage post-war for definite and regular changes to be made in the style of men’s clothing?’, Men’s Wear, 3 March 1945, p. 14.


However, while they were small in number, the cachet of named fashion designers remained and was consolidated by institutions such as the Royal College of Art whose fashion design course aimed to ‘equip designers with the skills needed to enter industry, while at the same time developing their creative talents’. Therefore, while design for women’s wear was gendered as fashion and feminine, design within the Leeds multiple tailors (primarily until the 1960s) was gendered as productive and masculine. This chapter will examine how the multiples implemented this gendered definition of design through making by mass producing men’s tailored suits. The main focus is on the decades between the 1940s and the 1960s as this was the period when the Leeds multiples were at their height in the production and selling of tailored suits in the post-war period. The first section explores the ready-to-wear ‘demob’ suit of the 1940s as the provision of these suits provides a stark contrast to made-to-measure as well as an insight into many of the reasons why the Leeds multiples’ version of bespoke remained so popular. Looking at men’s experiences of their demob suits as well as surviving tailoring within the context of the public debates concerning these suits, reveals the significance for many men of made-to-measure tailoring and the importance of fit and quality in their suits. The second section expands on the efforts made by the Leeds multiples to ensure variety and choice in their tailoring through their dedication to made-to-measure design and production rather than rapid fashion change and ready-to-wear. Third, the importance of wool cloth to the multiple tailoring industry will be addressed. Cloth is central to an understanding of the importance given to design by the industry as it was where innovations and trends emerged in colour, pattern, weights and fibres. Choices in cloth could also provide male tailoring consumers self-expression, especially through made-to-measure suits.

1.1 Demob Suits

Three young men in new suits came in. The suits were blue, grey and brown; but were alike in being severely, even skimpily, cut, and in being very new. The young men who wore them – and wore them newly too – were not alike, for one was tallish, fair, good-looking, and another was of similar height but dark and beaky, and the third was burly and battered. In his fictionalised account of the experiences of three men as they returned home after demobilisation from the armed services in the mid-1940s novelist J. B. Priestly used the exchange of clothes from uniform to new ‘demob’ suit to indicate the other changes these men were soon to undergo. From 1944 until the early 1950s the millions of men leaving the armed services in Britain after the war and later after National Service, were supplied with a demob suit and associated accessories by the government. A substantial proportion

of these suits were made by Leeds multiple tailors with probably around a third made by Burtons alone.\textsuperscript{25} The Leeds multiples had established themselves as important producers and retailers of men’s suits in the period before the war and were expert in the mass production of men’s tailoring; they had also manufactured millions of uniforms during the war, all of which made them perfectly placed to take up the challenge of manufacturing demob suits.\textsuperscript{26} This section will showcase the role of the Leeds multiple tailors in the design and production of demob suits within the context of their reception by the men who wore them and the wider public. This period saw an environment created where men’s clothing was up for public discussion; the usually private discourse of masculine fashion (normally characterised as being limited to that between men and their tailors) became subject to government orders, national attention and debate in parliament. Commentary and responses to the demob suit scheme, and the suits themselves, were largely framed in acceptably masculine terms with an emphasis on practicality and craftsmanship. By exploring both the production and the consumption of demob suits this case study reveals the variety of men’s expectations of their tailoring in the 1940s – men wanted quality cloth and cut, garments that fitted well and were individual – expressing frustration when the demob suits they received did not match these desires. Many of the problems stemmed from the fact that demob suits were ready-to-wear when significant numbers of men were used to having a suit made for them, largely due to the success of the Leeds multiple made-to-measure model of tailoring. It also highlights many men’s anxieties about having the right tailoring in order to express the correct masculine appearance in this immediate post-war period.

In order to understand the reasoning behind the provision of demob suits, and the wider clothing restrictions it is necessary to first look at the context of clothing policy during the Second World War and after. The war saw unprecedented government involvement and regulation of the entire clothing industry in Britain from the introduction of clothes rationing in 1941 until its end in 1949. Alongside rationing were associated ‘Utility’ and ‘austerity’ regulations and controls concerned with pricing, standards of cloth and clothing manufacture, sizing, and garment design which affected men’s, women’s and children’s clothing.\textsuperscript{27} The style and design of clothing also came under scrutiny by the government.

\textsuperscript{25} It is difficult to assess exactly how many demob suits were made by the Leeds multiple tailors in total. Eric Sigsworth states that Burtons made around a third of all demob suits, which was also the figure given in a 1946 report from the Manchester Daily Dispatch reprinted in the Burtons company history. The Yorkshire Evening News claimed in 1946 that clothing manufacturers in Leeds were making between a third and half of the country’s weekly production of 97,000 demobilisation suits. Eric M. Sigsworth, Montague Burton: The Tailor of Taste (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), p. 112; George Tansey, ‘Stanley and the General’, Daily Dispatch, 29 March 1946 in Ronald Redmayne, Ideas in industry: being the story of Montague Burton Ltd., 1900-1950, (Leeds: Petty & Sons, 1951), p. 195; WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/36 Private Cuttings Book No. 12, 1945-1946: ‘Leeds Doing Big Demob Suits Job’, Yorkshire Evening News, 2 February 1946.

\textsuperscript{26} Burtons made 13,524,634 garments for the army, navy and air force, around a quarter of all uniforms produced. Redmayne, Ideas in Industry, p. 155.

\textsuperscript{27} The administration of the government clothing restrictions was done by the Board of Trade. There have been a number of studies of the regulation of clothing in Britain during the war beginning with the official history in 1952. See E.L. Hargreaves and Margaret Gowing, Civil Industry and Trade (London: HMSO, 1952), pp. 424-483; Peter McNeil, “Put Your Best Face Forward”: The Impact of the Second World War on
with the introduction of what became known as the ‘austerity’ regulations. These consisted of controls on style by limiting the amount of material and trimmings commercial manufacturers (who made nearly all men’s outerwear including tailored suits) could use. For men’s clothing this meant amongst other things, shortening shirt lengths, reducing the number of pockets and buttons on suits, and outlawing double-breasted suits, double cuffs on shirts, and turn-ups on trousers (see suit from the Museum of London below). The large-scale design and manufacturing processes of the Leeds multiple tailors put them at an advantage. Their form of factory mass-production was viewed as the most efficient and attractive form of clothing production by the Board of Trade — the body appointed by the wartime government to oversee these regulations — and Leeds tailoring firms such as Burtons were rewarded by being given designated status which guaranteed supplies of cloth and labour, and a market to sell to.

28 The Making-up of Civilian Clothing (Restrictions) Orders of 1942 and 1943.

29 Hargreaves and Gowing, *Civil Industry and Trade*, p. 437. The detailed restrictions on men’s suits included: Jackets and Blazers were to not be double breasted, have more than three pockets or buttons, patch pockets, or fancy backs; Waistcoats were not to be double breasted, have more than two pockets, five buttons, or a chain hole; Trousers were to have a maximum width at the bottoms of 19”, with no pocket flaps, pleats, or permanent-turn-ups. ‘The Making of Civilian Clothing (Restrictions) Orders. 1942 No. 514’, *Statutory Rules and Orders: Other than those of a Local, Personal or Temporary Character for the year 1942* (London: HMSO, 1943), p. 503. There are a number of men’s Utility suits (i.e. suits made with Utility cloth but that do not conform to the austerity regulations) in collections: see for example Leeds, Leeds Museums and Galleries (hereafter LMG), LEEAG.2011.0537, grey pinstriped Utility suit; London, Victoria and Albert Museum (hereafter V&A), T.304&A-1982, Selfridges Utility suit and T.242&A-1981, brown wool double breasted Utility suit; Manchester, Manchester Art Gallery (hereafter MAG), 2003.30, Burtons navy blue pinstripe Utility suit.

It was taken for granted that women would find these style restrictions difficult to come to terms with, as Pat Kirkham has argued: ‘Being “fashionable” and taking a pride and interest in what you wore was an important part of “women’s culture” which did not suddenly cease because Britain was at war.’\textsuperscript{31} When introducing rationing the President of the Board of Trade, Oliver Lyttleton stated: ‘I know all the women will look smart but we men may look shabby. If we do, we must not be ashamed. In war the term “battle stained” is an honourable one’.\textsuperscript{32} However some of the reactions belied this supposed lack of interest by men in what they wore, as the design of men’s clothing became subject to the sort of scrutiny which was usually consigned to the realm of fashionable femininity. The changes in the design of men’s suits under the austerity regulations were the subject of parliamentary debate. Many of the comments were negative, such as those expressed by David Robertson, the Conservative Member of Parliament (MP) for Streatham:

The only man who would buy one of those suits was the man who was obliged to have a suit. Anyone who was used to having four pockets in his waistcoat to hold his pen, watch-chain and diary found it very difficult to get used to two pockets, he would have to carry his fountain pen horizontally in a jacket side pocket and probably find it leaking.\textsuperscript{33}


\textsuperscript{32} Sladen, The Conscription of Fashion, p. 20.

These anxieties were framed as pragmatic concerns with functionality, rather than an admittance of men’s engagement with style change. This representation of masculinity tallied with the usual discourse around men’s tailoring, that it was about craftsmanship and technical design detailing rather than fashion. In a later review of the wartime restrictions, the tailoring trade journal *Men’s Wear* argued the regulations had aroused much discontent:

> Austerity consisted chiefly in denying people a lot of quite small style points like pockets, ptu’s [permanent turn-ups], pleats, buttons, and so on, to which they suddenly found they had become much attached… There arose a storm of protest from the trade and public alike which will not be forgotten by anyone who shared it and its results.  

The article went on to describe the rigours and dangers of war that both men in the armed services and male civilians had endured without protest. ‘But make him wear plain bottoms on his trousers by an official Order, and he’ll commit mayhem in his tailor’s front shop.’ *Men’s Wear* considered that for men being forced to forgo details such as a chain hole or to wear single breasted suits when they wanted to wear double breasted were more than enough grounds for trouble. The article concluded that the reason for protest was that men did not agree with government interference in their private affairs. While the piece took a semi-humorous tone, it made clear the discomfort that was felt when the expectations of privacy around men’s clothing became public, thereby challenging the constructions of masculinity that denied men’s concern with dress. Significantly (and unusually in discourse relating to men’s clothing), in their official history Hargreaves and Gowing also recognise the important influence of fashion in menswear with regard to the austerity regulations:

> They were most valuable when they introduced minimum standards into the industry and least valuable when they tried to control fashion…In men’s wear the influence of fashion meant resistance to any changes involving economies. Definite savings were achieved by restrictions on shirts and suits, but evasion was fairly common.

Just as Pat Kirkham has argued in regard to women’s continuing engagement with fashion during the restrictions of the war, it is clear that for men fashion still existed in the seemingly minor details of a trouser turn-up and waistcoat pocket. In fact, the austerity regulations for men’s suits only lasted two years. It was announced by the Board of Trade in February 1944 that the design restrictions would be lifted for all men’s outerwear as it was decided ‘that the demobilised soldiers could not be offered civilian clothing in austerity styles.’ This had substantial implications for clothing manufacturers and retailers. To deal with the problems raised for the clothing trade as they were potentially left with unsaleable
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37 For example, trouser legs could be made longer than necessary by tailors and then turned up at home. Hargreaves and Gowing, *Civil Industry and Trade*, p. 439.
stock, the number of coupons required to purchase them was down-pointed to 20 from 26. Burtons attempted to make the austerity tailoring appealing by advertising them as ‘simplified’ suits. The attitude of much of the tailoring trade to these suits can be seen in cartoons from Men’s Wear in 1944, one of which depicted two salesmen falling over in shock that anyone would be interested in purchasing one of these suits, even with the discounted number of coupons required, the other highlighting a particularly flashy and exaggerated style which was associated with the dodgy dealings of the ‘spiv’ (see below). Tellingly, all three men in the first cartoon were conspicuously wearing fashionable double breasted suits with generously cut trousers featuring wide legs and turn-ups, all design elements missing from austerity suits, and the spiv in the second flaunts an even greater excess of cloth in his suit.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.4 ‘I should like to order an austerity suit, please’. Men’s Wear cartoon. Men’s Wear, 29 January 1944, p. 5

1.5 ‘Thank heavens – I won’t have to wear a ghastly austerity suit!’ Cartoon reprinted from the Sunday Dispatch. Men’s Wear, 1 February 1944, p. 7.

The design elements that had been excised by the austerity rules were considered to be of such importance by the government that they were not to be denied men returning from war service. Despite this acknowledgement of the significance of the style details of men’s tailoring, the provision of demob suits proved to be just as controversial as the suits that conformed to the austerity regulations. The debate again thrust the design and fashion of
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39 WYAS Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/36 Newscuttings June 1944 to January 1946, The Outfitter, 8 July 1944.

men’s clothing into the public domain – the severe restrictions highlighted anxieties about masculinity as men underwent the visual transformation from active service into civilians through their new suit of clothes. The number of demob suits required was huge: on Victory in Europe day in 1945 there were over five million Britons serving in the armed forces, and nine out of ten of these were men. The immense demob programme involved ‘the outfitting of some five million officers and other ranks with civilian clothes of good quality’. In order to cope with the required numbers the vast majority of demob suits produced were ready-to-wear and were made by the wholesale men’s outerwear industry which was dominated by the Leeds manufacturers. The combination of suits made by mass production and the restricted choices offered to demobilising men proved contentious particularly due to the perceptions – and reality for some men – of the inadequacies of ready-to-wear tailoring. There were also indications that men’s tastes were changing, with casual styles and different cuts becoming popular. The dramatic shift from military uniform to civilian clothing by millions of men created a very public recognition of the status of men’s clothed bodies and the expectations and assumptions of how they should look.

When it came to demobilisation of men from the armed forces the government was determined to improve upon the demob process of the First World War. As GOC Northern Command, Lieut-General Sir Philip Christison (KBE, CB, DSO, MC) commented after visiting the Burtons Hudson Road factory in 1946:

I wanted to see this for myself, after my experience at the end of the Great War of houses fit for heroes to live in, and clothes fit for heroes to wear. They were shocking things. But this time I am most impressed. The quality and workmanship amaze me.

There was no question that the civilian clothing supplied would not consist of a tailored suit, as Mass Observation asserted in 1939, for ‘all classes it is the emblem of that universal class-attribute, respectability’. It was agreed that the demob suit from 1944 would also improve on the austerity suits that men demobbed earlier in the war had been given. It

42 Board of Trade, Heavy Clothing, p. 9. Women who were demobbed from the armed services were given clothing coupons, see for example: Mary Blood, ‘A WAAF Gets Demobilised’, WW2 People’s War: An Archive of World War Two memories - written by the public, gathered by the BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/stories/38/a2754038.shtml> [accessed 25 November 2014].
45 House of Commons Hansard. Written answers (Commons) of Wednesday, 8th December, 1943. Demobilised Men (Austerity Suits), Fifth Series, Volume 395, Column 980, <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rfr_id=xri:hcp&ft_dat=xri:hcp:hansard:CASSCV0395P0-0007> [accessed 23 August 2012]. Men who were demobbed from the navy before 1944 had been given a cash amount of £2 19s. 4d. or a voucher for an austerity suit from Montague Burton which caused some controversy. The 2010 relative value of this amount would be £104.10. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/36 Newscuttings June 1944 to January 1946: ‘Monopoly in Sailor’s Civvy Suits Ended’, Daily Mirror, 12 October 1944; Lawrence H. Officer and
was felt this would ensure that ‘when the soldier steps into “civvy street” and becomes John Citizen from now on he is assured of a good suit, and he will feel a dignified citizen’. The idealised version of these suits was designed to conform to the expected style of 1940s tailoring, to be made of good quality wool cloth, two- or three-piece with options of single or double breasted jackets (or a more informal sports jacket and flannel trousers) and trousers with turn-ups if they were desired.

1.6 Ministry of Information photographs of a demobilisation centre following one man as he gets his civilian clothing.


However the demobilisation outfit itself comprised more than just a suit, and most of the publicity and press about the scheme emphasised the variety and choice on offer to men coming out of uniform. The outfit was described as including a ‘felt hat (wide choice of shape and colours), a shirt (over 100 designs) with two collars to match, tie (over 50

---


designs), two pairs of socks, a pair of shoes (black or brown), and a self-lined raincoat. Labour MP Evelyn Walkden on being shown samples of the ensemble at a special parliamentary display thought the clothes were exceptional: ‘I valued the outfit – suit, hat, shirt, shoes and underwear – shown at £17 17s. The suits were better than most MPs are wearing today’, his estimate being more than £600 in 2010 terms. Ministry of Information colour photographs of a demobilisation centre demonstrate the way the demob process was promoted, with the emphasis on individual selection and an attempt to recreate the kind of clothing consumption that men would have been familiar with (see above). A British Pathé newsreel film from 1945 followed an unnamed Royal Air Force (RAF) serviceman as he demobbed through a centre in Uxbridge, West London: admiring the mocked-up tailor’s window with an elegant display of the outfits on offer and feeling the quality of the cloth; perusing the style-sketches; being assisted into a ‘quieter’ patterned jacket by the civilian tailor (after rejecting the suggested ‘nice, smart check’ with the exclamation ‘blimey!’) and admiring his reflection in a full-length mirror (see below).

1.7 Three stills from a film showing the demob process of an RAF serviceman, Uxbridge, West London, 1945.

Guidance on styles from a civilian tailor.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

47 “Civies” for the Demobilised: A Wide Choice’, The Manchester Guardian, 14 March 1944, p. 5. The whole outfit was worth 56 coupons and men were also given a supplementary 90 coupons. ‘Restocking the Shops’, Economist, 7 July 1945.
Of course, these were idealised representations of the demob centres and there are other images which show that due to the huge numbers of men being dealt with it was likely to have been rather more chaotic. A pencil sketch of the process at Olympia in London’s Kensington for the Illustrated London News gives a more realistic indication of what the experience may have been like with the long Empire Hall filled with servicemen trying on suits and dealing with bundles of clothes (see below). However, after some initial concerns, the menswear trade appeared to be largely supportive with trade journal Style for Men approving of the way ‘the submerged style interest of the new-fledged civilian was pleasantly stimulated, by allowing him a fair degree of shopping choice, and by a number of “Hints on selection”, displayed on showcards.’

Ken Rawlinson, who had served as a driver in the Royal Tank Regiment, remembered taking advantage of these options on his demob, choosing the more relaxed style of ‘a sports coat and flannel slacks instead of the familiar “chalk stripe” demob suit.’

---

50 ‘Clothes Sense’, Style for Men, April 1944, p. 247.
This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.8 Drawing of scenes from the demobilisation centre at Olympia, Kensington, London, 1945.

The demob outfits on offer also conformed to an egalitarian ethos as both officers and privates were given the same choice of clothing. Field-Marshall Sir Bernard Montgomery was reported to have chosen ‘a nice dark brown herring-bone tweed suit with a thin and not too obtrusive red stripe’ for his return to civvy street.\(^{52}\) This was quite different from the situation within the armed services where both male and female officers, who usually came from wealthier backgrounds, routinely had their uniforms individually made by bespoke and made-to-measure tailors – Burtons, for example, offered made-to-measure officers’ uniforms during the war.\(^{53}\) As George Isaacs, the Minister of Labour, admiringly commented to Burtons workers in 1946:

> In these disposal centres there is no difference in rank. There is no difference between Commissioned Officer or Non-Commissioned Officer; they all come in and take their tunic off and you don’t know whether he is a Sergeant or a Major; when he puts the suit on, it is a tribute to the garment you have supplied when you realise that it was good enough for the Colonel and the same time good enough for the Private.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{52}\) ‘Monty picks demob suit’, Daily Mail, 15 November 1945, p. 3.  
Isaacs strongly approved of the way the demob suit had the potential to remove the class and status differentiation normally expressed by a clothed body. This chimed with much of the rhetoric of the Leeds multiple tailors throughout their history, particularly that of Burtons. Superficially this could be considered the case, but just as with the disparaging comments austerity suits attracted, it was in the subtle details of cut, fit and cloth that the quality and style of a man’s suit was measured. Men’s awareness of these differences with demob suits was played on in cartoons advertising the Sydmor brand of Leeds tailor S. Morris & Company in *Men’s Wear* (see below). One depicted a high-ranking officer flipping a coin with an ordinary serviceman for a Sydmor suit, another showed a burly naked serviceman (his modesty covered by his discarded uniform on a chair) being told that all of the Sydmor suits had gone, their superior quality giving them particular desirability. There were rumours that suits made by the London store Simpsons (renowned for their high quality ready-to-wear tailoring), which could be identified by their code, would be put under the counter and ‘could only be obtained by asking the Quartermaster Sergeant very nicely’ while the *Daily Mirror* reported that civilian workers in some demob centres had been sacked for taking tips from servicemen for exactly that practice. Officers and men of the lower ranks were given the same choices of demob suits, but it is clear that there were identifiable grades of quality in demob tailoring. This was dependent on who they were made by and despite the fact that the manufacturer’s name did not appear on the garments, some servicemen were aware of these quality differences and took advantage of them if they could.

---

The vast majority of the production was for ready-to-wear suits (a small number of made-to-measure suits were offered to men who were considered outsize) and there were restrictions on styles and colours laid down by the Ministry of Supply. The options were single breasted suits with either single breasted (notched) or double breasted (pointed) lapels or double breasted suits (with double breasted lapels); the suits were ‘to be manufactured in various shades of Blue, Brown and Grey’. These colours covered the most popular hues for men’s suits; however, given the infinite mixtures possible in woven wools, especially tweeds, these were not as limiting as might first appear. Just as in peacetime the quality of cloth was considered one of the most important elements of a suit.

57 Tom Hellawell had his Royal Navy uniform made-to-measure because of his height. Hellawell, ‘Yorkshire Lad: Some Folk Take Some Suiting’; Wing Commander St Loe Strachey who at over six foot was photographed being measured for his specially made demob suit. ‘Britain’s Under Secretary for Air measured up for suit – 9 October 1945’, Planet News Archive, Getty Images http://www.gettyimages.co.uk/detail/news-photo/wing-commander-st-loe-strachey-member-of-parliament-for-news-photo/138582745, [accessed 3 October 2012].

58 WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/100 – Major Milner (MP): Copy of Tender No. 819448 Supply of Civilian Suits for Demobilised Servicemen, 8 March 1947, pp. 1, 3.
The weights and types of cloth for a demob suit were also specified: ‘Worsted mixture, 15 ounces; Various woollen materials from 14 to 17 ½ ounces; Tweeds, 16 and 17 ounces.’

Positive coverage of Burtons demob production at the beginning of the scheme in 1944 highlighted the diversity of cloths used and emphasised the quality and high standard of the materials available for the new civilian suits:

In this one factory’s range, the ‘demobbed’ man will have the choice of no fewer than 47 different patterns – pin stripes, herringbone, silk stripes, twills, over-checks – the designs run the whole gamut of men’s tailoring. Serges, worsteds, tweeds – they will all be there for the asking – each and all lined with an artificial silk twill of excellent quality.

The publicity given to the scheme emphasised variety and aimed to conform to what had become accepted as important in men’s clothing consumption. This was firmly located within the safety of men’s tailoring where choice, style and quality cloth were deemed appropriately masculine.


60 ‘Demobilisation Suits of Pre-War Serge’, The Maker-up, November 1944, in Redmayne, Ideals in industry, p. 173.
1.10 Burtons double breasted suit, ‘Style No. 9’.


1.11 Harry Page in his pinstripe double breasted demob suit in Whitehawk, Brighton – this was the style which came to epitomise the image of a demob suit.


Some of this variety is clearly visible in a number of surviving demob suits held in museum collections. LMG have four suits, a tweed overcoat and a raincoat in their collections that have been classified as being part of the demob scheme. Two of the suits conform to what subsequently entered into the popular imagination as typical of a 1940s demob suit, double breasted and made of navy blue striped wool. The first belonged to Mr F. Jordan; he was given it on demobilisation in 1946 after serving in the forces for five years. Made of navy worsted with a muted chalk stripe, the jacket is double breasted with a subtle curve to the collar, the two hip pockets are top jetted with flaps and it is lined in black twilled fabric.

These are suits that have been catalogued as demob suits, usually through provenance. Some also have surviving labelling that indicate they were made as part of the demob scheme (normal manufacturers’ labels were not allowed).


Two other similar suits are: Norwich, Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service (hereafter NMAS), NWHCM: 1970.567; IWM, UNI 13767-9, demob suit.

rayon. In the museum documentation it is identified as ‘Style 9’ – referring to a Burtons double breasted suit style, which appeared in Burtons style guides in the 1940s and earlier, though with only four buttons showing rather than the six of the demob suits (see above along with photograph of Harry Page).\textsuperscript{64} The second, which was donated by R. G. Steggles, is similarly made of navy wool, the jacket double breasted (also Style 9) with the same number of buttons and three pockets (though the hip pockets while having flaps have not been jetted).\textsuperscript{66} The suit is three-piece with a matching waistcoat and has a very different impact due to the variance in the stripes in the wool. Rather than one white stripe as Mr Jordan’s suit has, a combination of three fine white stripes close together have been complimented with a fine bright blue stripe in the weave creating a bolder and brasher effect (see below).

As evidenced by the Burtons style guide of 1940, these suits demonstrated continuance in a silhouette from before the war with its high defined waist, square shoulders and straight trousers. Alan Allport has pointed out that the ethos of the demob suit was that it would make returning soldiers inconspicuous, which ostensibly a double breasted navy blue suit would do.\textsuperscript{67} However, he found many comments that clearly demonstrated the men’s distaste for the uniformity and lack of fashionable styles on offer through the demobilisation centres, including this one: ‘obviously a pre-war seventy-five-bob effort. Not any sort of suit I would buy…foul’.\textsuperscript{68} Some men observed the homogeneity of the suits the demobilising soldiers chose; a regularity that can be seen in the design of the navy blue stripe double breasted suits just described, despite the understated variations in the

\textsuperscript{67} Allport, Demobbed, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{68} Union Jack, 6 September 1945, p. 2, cited in Allport, Demobbed, p. 120.
weave of the cloth: ‘You looked like bookends – everyone looked the same’, recalled Tony Cameron, while Tom Hellawell reflected later that for the majority ‘a demob suit was simply one uniform received in exchange for another. Khaki, Air Force Blue or Navy Blue, all were replaced with grey or brown chalk stripe’.  

Clearly there was no way mass production on the scale required and standardised ready-to-wear tailoring could satisfy every man’s individual tastes. But the comments also demonstrated the desire for men to differentiate themselves from each other by what they wore, even if these differences were subtle such as cloth quality or more drape in the cut of a jacket.

Other surviving demob suits show that variation in cloth could have a noticeable influence on a suit (the significance of cloth to the multiple tailors will be discussed further in the final section of this chapter). Two of these are tweed suits, both single breasted, one held by NMAS made of dark grey herringbone tweed with a blue stripe and the other example from LMG. The NMAS suit is constructed of a very heavy-weight wool cloth, perhaps chosen for its durability, and shows little evidence of wear to the tweed. The weight of the cloth can only be ascertained through handling the garment and shows the quality of wools that were used in the making of some demob suits. The second suit, which is also in a three button single breasted style, is particularly striking because of its fawn-coloured Glen-check tweed. Suits in tweeds such as these may not have been considered suitable for all types of situations because of the historic association of tweed with the country and leisure pursuits rather than as a fabric that could be worn for office or town wear. These distinctions were recognised in the demob process as can be seen in the 1945 newsreel Demob by British Pathé where the fabric patterns on offer were divided into town wear, country wear and leisure wear. The combination of colour and check in the weave of the Glen-check suit make it a bold pattern to carry off, challenging any notion of being unobtrusive; it could be one of the demob suits which were described as ‘gaudy’. Whether it was deliberately chosen by a man who had the confidence to wear such a loud suit or it just happened to fit him, is impossible to know.

---

69 Tony Cameron, Imperial War Museum: S #12918, cited in Allport, Demobbed, p. 119; Hellawell, ‘Yorkshire Lad: Some Folk Take Some Suiting’.
71 Demob (British Pathé, 1945).
72 Daily Express, 27 August 1945, p. 3; Soldier, 13 October 1945, p. 2 cited in Allport, Demobbed, p. 120.
1.14 Jacket and detail of cloth. Grey herringbone tweed demob two-piece demob suit and braces.  

1.15 Light brown Glen-check tweed three-piece demob suit.  

Fit was another aspect that was very important to men. For those used to made-to-measure suits, having to wear a suit off-the-peg was an affront to their idea of what a tailoring should be, how it should look, and how it should feel to wear. Mass Observation found in 1939 that of their sample of 170 Observers ‘only 14 bought ready-made suits for every 86 who bought tailor-made, and in the section which paid less than £4 for its suits, the proportion was 73 tailor-made to 27 ready-made. The tailor was, in the majority of these cases, one of the big multiple firms, like Montagu [sic] Burton and the fifty [sic] Shilling Tailors’. Sir Montague Burton estimated in 1942 that 75 per cent of men’s suits sold were made-to-measure. A tailor in Style for Men described a young RAF serviceman’s demob suit brought to him in 1944, the ‘quality and make was appalling, the fitting impossible;

---

73 The 2010 relative value of £4 would be £193.40. Officer and Williamson, MeasuringWorth, 2016; Mass Observation, ‘Clothes’, p. 1
very inferior cloth, ill made, ill fitting. Even after extensive alteration he only considered it worthy of being worn for his work in a factory: ‘If he had appeared in this suit with a red handkerchief around his neck he could have appeared as characteristic of the “underdog” of the early Victorian period.’ A Lancashire tailor reported that he had seen more than 20 ex-servicemen for alterations to their suits as they attempted to get a better fit, and when Malcolm Berwin (whose family owned Leeds tailoring company Berwin & Berwin) came home wearing his demob suit, his father was so dismayed by it he insisted their factory make him up a new suit to be ready the next day. Ted Bradley wore his demob suit to his wedding to Alice in 1946 and while there is no record of what he thought of his suit, their wedding photograph shows that the jacket was clearly too small (see below). Sir Harry Secombe remembered his suit ‘didn’t look too bad’ after his mother and sister had helped adjust it and he was happy to wear it to meet his mates and go to a dance, and fashion designer Hardy Amies, who had been an intelligence officer and had his suits made by a bespoke tailor, admired the quality of the demob clothing he was given but found most of it ‘rather unbecoming, except a cavalry mackintosh of excellent cut.’ Despite the egalitarian ethos of the demob suit, the tailoring and cut of a suit could still be a marker of status, an ill-fitting suit the cause of self-consciousness. All of these elements were crucial to the quality and design of men’s tailoring with its emphasis on fit and correctness, the cloth and cut combining to create an idealised image of tailored masculinity.

---

While there were many complaints about demob suits, the cloths, the styles, the fit and cut, there were men who were satisfied with their new civilian tailoring. A Mass Observation file report on Clothes Buying and Wearing from 1947 noted that men’s attitude to demob suits was mostly positive: 26 percent liked and wore their suit and only 12 percent disliked them.  

A Normandy veteran, Jim, remembered his demob suit with pleasure: ‘it was my first ever suit and I was very pleased with it indeed. It was a grey pinstripe suit and with it I received lovely suede shoes.’ Soon after his demobilisation, Mr James Towns was reported by the *Daily Mirror* to be so proud of his demob suit that after wearing it he always put it in a press and refused to wear it in the rain. Ron Goldstein and George Hedges were photographed in their demob suits, Ron on his way to a wedding reception, George proudly giving his sister Winnie away at her wedding in the only suit he had ever owned (see below). Men also continued to wear their demob suits well after the end of the war, some because they liked them, others because they had little choice – a problem faced by Gerard Crosby who had been amazed by the clothes on offer at the demob centre but had

---


81 ‘Mr Towns Was So Proud of His Demob Suit’, *Daily Mirror*, 4 February 1946, p. 4.
been forced to continue wearing his suit for several years because of the post-war difficulties in obtaining clothing. In 1958 the Daily Mirror featured several stories relating the durability of demob suits: Mrs R. Wood’s husband had worn his for twelve years as a lounge suit and continued to wear the jacket to work, while the quality of cloth meant she had been able to cut down the now too tight trousers to make shorts for her sons. The diversity of opinions expressed by men about their demob suits demonstrates the difficulties in supplying ready-to-wear tailoring to male consumers largely used to acquiring their suits by made-to-measure and the importance men put on fit and quality for their tailoring in the 1940s. The domination of the Leeds multiples made-to-measure model had developed to cater to individual choice giving men options in design and cloth styles, furthering established masculine tailoring consumption practices. However, the ready-to-wear tailored demob suit removed most of these choices, much to many men’s frustration. The next section explores the importance of design for production in men’s tailoring as the Leeds multiples adhered to made-to-measure tailoring and how this was influenced by constructions of masculinity.

1.17 Ron Goldstein in his demob suit with two family members on his way to a wedding reception in 1947.


1.18 George Hedges in his demob suit with his sister Winnie on her wedding day in 1946.

Jane Pook, ‘Dad’s On About the War Again!’, WW2 People’s War: An Archive of World War Two memories - written by the public, gathered by the BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/stories/03/a2706103.shtml>, [accessed 22 January 2015].

---


83 ‘Demob Suit Records!’, Daily Mirror, 8 May 1958, p.18.
1.2 Made-to-Measure

One way of understanding made-to-measure from the 1940s to the 1960s is to look at how it remained significant to the Leeds multiple tailors in the 1980s. The Leeds multiple tailors built their businesses on a range of different types of garment production, including ready-to-wear, but it was the making and sale of wholesale bespoke or made-to-measure tailoring that the industry, especially the largest multiple Montague Burton, became known for. Laura Ugolini has concluded that before the Second World War British men seemed to prefer to purchase made-to-measure and bespoke tailoring over ready-to-wear due to the belief that off-the-peg suits were cheaper and of poorer quality but also that:

the process of choosing cloth and pattern, being measured and fitted by tailoring ‘experts’, and being able to imprint the garment with one’s own individuality, although not always a conflict-free process, all served to add value to a suit, and ultimately to enhance its wearer’s sense of masculine self-worth.\(^8^5\)

This belief in the superiority of made-to-measure also dominated the approach the Leeds multiple tailors took to their tailoring in the post-war period, with for example both Burtons and Hepworths continuing to offer made-to-measure suits into the early 1980s.\(^8^6\) Burtons produced a comprehensive made-to-measure folder in the mid-1970s promoting their ‘Tailor Shop’, offering ‘the traditionally skilled personal tailoring service, which Burton is renowned for’ and stating that ‘each Burton made-to-measure suit will continue to be hand cut and carefully made’; one of their cutters was photographed cutting a made-to-measure suit by hand in 1976 (see below).\(^8^7\) Hill remembers that at Hepworths:

I mean the the bespoke business never really, never quite went away, um but it got smaller and smaller and smaller um… And of course in order to do that you had to have the manufacturing base. Well we ended up just with one factory um and they did the− What bit of made-to-measure there still was, I mean they made ready-to-wear too.\(^8^8\)

Even Burtons kept a small made-to-measure offer in their stores and launched an advertising campaign in 1982 highlighting the craftsmanship and technology in their bespoke tailoring production.\(^8^9\) In business terms, for the Leeds multiples Hepworths and Burtons to continue to hang on to made-to-measure suit production seemed to make no sense, especially as they shifted to retailing and away from production, to ready-to-wear and

\(^{8^4}\) Honeyman, *Well Suited*, pp. 74-75.


\(^{8^6}\) Honeyman discusses the introduction of computerised cutting technology by Hepworths in the late 1970s and Burtons in the early 1980s both designed to improve the production of bespoke suits. Honeyman, *Well Suited*, pp. 126-127.


\(^{8^8}\) Brian Hill worked at Alexandre from age 16 in around 1962 and then Hepworths from 1970. Interview with Brian Hill, 8 July 2013, LEEAG.2013.0165.

more casual clothing. However, the ethos of made-to-measure was clearly so deeply entrenched in what these companies considered tailoring to be – the assertion of a particular form of masculinity through the combination of craft, skill and technology in the production with the input of the male customer in the design and detailing – that making suits in this way was the last of the manufacturing they maintained.

Establishing the proportions of measures and ready-mades manufactured by the Leeds multiples is difficult but they appeared to remain high until a rapid decline in the 1970s. A 1952 survey of 260 men by the International Wool Secretariat found that 63 per cent of men bought made-to-measure suits and felt that fit was the most important consideration when buying a suit. Brian Hill who trained at Alexandre in the 1960s and then went to work at Hepworths in 1970 felt that:

…at the time it was still very much a made-to-measure business. They used to do ready-to-wear, but it was a very limited range… ready-to-wear clothing was looked upon as something—Well if you had you know if you had a ready-made suit it was really because you couldn’t afford a bespoke one.

91 Brian Hill.
Figures found for Burtons vary. In 1953 when briefing their new advertising agency, Dorlands, Burtons informed them that approximately 50 per cent of their suits sold were ready-to-wear, the rest made-to-measure; in 1963 it was reported that 80 per cent of their output was measures; in the early 1970s it was said that measures still made up over half of their production. A 1961 report into the men’s suit business found that two thirds of garments sold by multiple tailors were made-to-measure, while ‘for suits alone that share is higher’. This was definitely the case for Leeds multiple Alexandre; about 90 per cent of their business was made-to-measure in the 1960s. After moving to Hepworths Hill remembered being surprised, but also pleased, that Burtons was beginning to shift away from measures (under the direction of their new joint chairman Ladislas Rice who was appointed in 1969):

And I can remember you know having discussions about how stupid Burtons were and you know why were they moving away from the market that they dominated and so on and so forth, um but the truth was that he was right and we were wrong, but we couldn’t see it…Hepworths was a very very strong business and we… should’ve changed more quickly than we did but if you like the difficulty with that was that the dominant business, i.e. Burtons, was running away from a market that we were already strong in, um UDS was having their problems so we ended up uh kind of on top of the heap, which was great for a while, but the clever trick would’ve been to say, ‘Right, ok, we’ve got this, now let’s start developing that.’ But of course, you know, we were slow.

Rice was correct; during the 1970s the proportion of made-to-measure suits sold fell dramatically while ready-to-wear suit sales rose. John Beasley obtained figures that showed a drop from 4.7 million bespoke suits sold in 1970, a million higher than ready-to-wear, to only 1.2 million by 1980 (see graph below).
In order to understand the complexity of this process, and how it influenced design, some of the main components of made-to-measure tailoring as operated by the Leeds multiples will be outlined. This will be discussed with a focus on the 1940s to the 1960s when many aspects of made-to-measure had hardly changed since the Leeds companies first developed wholesale bespoke.  

Brian Hill described the procedure:

BH: Well yeah you know you would go in as the customer, ‘I want this suit.’ Um right ok um what, ‘Oh I want you know whatever this that other’ next thing and then you would be given a series of pattern books, usually something about this thick with uh cloths in which would be various price points…so you would pick the fabric that you want and then you’d be given um a style book, which had lots and lots of different silhouettes in it, uh with description of what that, what it was…and then somebody would actually write all that down and would measure you….then two copies went with the order. They all went in a big packet on a Saturday evening, went to the off—you know the order office on a Monday morning…they would calculate how much cloth was needed, it would go to the length-cutting department, that cloth would then be cut, it would go to the cutting room, blah blah blah. Until it emerged at the other end as a, you know a two-piece suit, a three-piece suit, a jacket and trouser, whatever it was.

DS: And it would be sent back to the shop and?

BH: Yeah, and that took about depending, when things were quiet, it would take a month, four weeks. When we were busy sometimes six weeks.

---

97 David Little was probably the first to offer this special measure type of tailoring in around 1903. Honeyman, *Well Suited*, p. 47.
sometimes two months. [pause] So there was no instant gratification. You had to wait.\textsuperscript{98}

One important element, which Hill skipped over, was the measuring. Ugolini has discussed how significant this was to ensure the correct fit as well as for the customer and tailor relationship, especially considering the intimate nature of some of the measurements required.\textsuperscript{99} It was also essential for suit production – the multiples’ made-to-measure economic and production model relied on there being only one, final fitting of the suit once it was delivered; any remaking was an additional expense to be covered by the company not the customer. Internal publications and documents from Burtons show the constant battle the company had to ensure that measurements were taken correctly so that any subsequent (costly) alterations would be reduced. A circular to retail branches in 1946 commented that: ‘It is disturbing to learn that alterations are increasing. This evil nullifies our endeavours and destroys the Company’s most valuable asset – goodwill.’\textsuperscript{100} The anxiety over the amount of alterations was still evident in 1953 with a section of the Burtons Managers Guide devoted to the problem, as it was felt alterations ‘lead to serious trouble and usually result in a loss, instead of a profit, on the order. In some cases, a new garment can be made in the time it takes to do an alteration.’\textsuperscript{101} The company also produced a measuring guide which was given to all branch managers on the understanding they would use it to train their staff and keep it confidential; its aim was ‘to emphasise the value and importance of correct measuring and careful figure description to the man who is to cut the suit.’\textsuperscript{102} A Burtons company photograph showed just some of the parts of the body that needed to be measured for a suit, such as waist, hip, chest, over the shoulder and gorge, illustrated with measuring tapes secured around a male model – possibly Stanley Burton (see below). And in 1963 Burtons produced a detailed guide to measuring trousers as part of their managers course, making it clear that correct measurements were essential, so ‘the cutter then knows what he is doing’ and concluded with the assertion that a ‘little extra care with these measurements will be more than repaid by freedom from worrying alteration problems.’\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{98} Brian Hill.
\textsuperscript{99} Ugolini, \textit{Men and Menswear}, pp. 240-245.
\textsuperscript{103} WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/121 Managers Courses Hudson Road File: Be Careful with These Trouser Measurements, 20th September 1963.
Part of measuring was understanding different figure types, which was also crucial for the subsequent suit production and had a long history in the development of tailoring as a means of creating an idealised and balanced suit which would disguise bodies that were anything but.104 Tailoring guides attempted to describe the ‘normal’ and average figure alongside those that were unbalanced or disproportionate and also often had sections on male anatomy.105 This was particularly significant because in made-to-measure production (unlike bespoke) the cutter did not see the man for whom he was cutting a suit; he had to rely on the information provided by the sales staff to choose an appropriate pattern to work and cut from. This could be problematic when, as one guide put it, measurements were ‘more often than not, taken loosely and not infrequently over an inflated chest.’106 Two figure charts show how ideal masculine body (and tailoring) silhouettes could change. The first from Burtons, was dated 1940 but portrayed a 1930s shape, while the second demonstrated the looser and square shouldered look of the later 1940s. The Burtons figure chart from their staff style guide highlighted the different types of male bodies that the

106 British Factory Production of Men’s Clothes, p. 103.
cutter might have had to accommodate to make sure of a correct fit. The Modern Tailor described the standard or average figure as a man with, ‘upright carriage, moderately square shoulders, seat in the usually accepted proportion to the chest, and a general build not showing any excessive development’, illustrated along with his non-conforming counterparts, all wearing suits of the contemporary 1940s silhouette (below). The Leeds multiple tailors used made-to-measure production to provide their male customers with suits that allowed for their different body types, but they relied heavily on accurate measuring and understanding of the masculine figure by their retail staff.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.22 Burtons Figure Description Chart, 1940. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WY1951/136 Style books: The Trend of Fashion Exclusive Designs by Burton, 1940s, p. 60.

1.23 Types of Male Figure: A. Average; B. Square Shouldered; C. Sloping Shouldered; D. Head Forward; E. Stooping; F. Tall and Slim; G. Uneven Shoulders; H. Well-Built; I. Semi-Corpulent.


107 WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WY1951/136 Style books: The Trend of Fashion Exclusive Designs by Burton, 1940s, p. 60.
There were other elements of the male body that the multiples considered important when they were attempting to manage the process of making individualised suits by mass production. Burtons included instructions on noting their customers’ occupations which would have an influence on men’s body types, while age was also considered significant because men’s bodies changed as they got older. The Burtons measuring guide noted: ‘If your customer appears to be a manual labourer, this should be stated on the order form: the cutter would then use a larger sized pattern than he would for a sedentary worker.’ A surviving Burtons made-to-measure suit order slip from 1956 gives a space for occupation along with the option to specify ‘Muscular’ or ‘Normal’ and three different fitting types: ‘Close’, ‘Medium’ or ‘Easy’, all giving the cutter and tailor essential information about the figure of the man it was being made for, in this case a navy blue serge double breasted three-piece suit (below). In terms of age, in the 1950s Hepworths declared in a style pamphlet that ‘Hepworths experts also streamline suits for middle aged men. It’s quite an art and appreciated by so many who need a little special attention.’ The introduction in the 1950s of new suit styles and cuts designed for younger men caused problems for Burtons because ‘it appeared that an elderly man requiring a particular type of suit would get a suit cut from the Young Man’s pattern’. Sales staff were reminded that, while every style should be available to customers, ‘the proper adjustment should be made according to age and requirements.’ It was the skill of the cutter and tailor that transformed these written instructions into an individual suit, based on patterns and cuts that had been devised by the designers.

---

1.24 Burtons navy blue serge three-piece suit and order slip. The order includes instructions such as customer measurements, coat style number, cloth choice as well as fitting type (Close, Medium or Easy), figure description (Muscular or Normal) and the option to specify occupation.


The measurements and figure type of the customer determined which pattern block the cutter used to hand-cut and the tailor to baste (hand-sew) together the customer’s suit in the factory. A photograph of Burtons cutting room at their Hudson Road factory shows the scale of this process – each cutter had his own table and the thousands of patterns were hung down the centre of the room – in the 1950s Burtons publicity boasted they had over 30,000 different patterns available for made-to-measure tailoring (see below).  

Experienced cutters were incredibly skilled. Brian Hill greatly admired the ability of some of the older men he worked with when he started: ‘uh this guy Frank Loftman I sort of told you about who was who was a cutter, and I mean this guy, he could draft a pattern on a piece of cloth with a yardstick and a cutter’s square. He didn’t need a pattern, he could just do it out of his head…I mean these guys were in their 60s when I worked with them, they were they were you know close to retirement and uh they knew their stuff.’ Hill said of another, Walter Prince, who was a master tailor: ‘You know he could, he could put a suit of clothes together um without… He he didn’t need to refer to anything, he just knew.’  

Burtons described their tailors in the 1950s as having the eye that:

…ensures the final fit and hang of the garment….The information on the order form is wide enough to give the tailor a clear mental picture of the customer; not only the measurements, but also his posture and the things

---

115 Brian Hill.
116 Brian Hill.
which make him an individual. ‘An individual never quite fits a blue print’ says the Tailor.\(^\text{117}\)

These skills became an important part of the Leeds multiples’ gendered representation of their tailoring as being masculine, crafted, individual and made-to-measure; images of male cutters using shears, and male tailors sitting cross-legged on tables, were often part of their publicity. For example, Hepworths built their major advertising campaign and company redesign in 1960 on the ‘twin themes of craftsmanship and personal service’, the emphasis on ‘hand-cut tailoring’ reinforced by its use as their slogan, as well as by featuring a close-up photograph of a cutter’s hands and a second of a tailor hand-sewing.\(^\text{118}\)

By emphasising made-to-measure tailoring and production, the Leeds multiples were committed to a very technical approach to design where most of the skill was concentrated in creating a garment that was both bespoke and mass-produced. Brian Hill and Brian

\(^{117}\) This was one of a series of photographs of suit production given as part of a briefing to their new advertising agency. WYL1951/120 folder: 2. General Advertising: Letter to A. R. Merchant, Dorland Advertising, 2 February 1953, Photograph L. The Tailor at work.

Rayner who both worked for Leeds multiple companies from the early 1960s did not recognise the term ‘designer’ as applicable (apart from Hardy Amies at Hepworths) because the pre-eminence of made-to-measure. As Rayner put it, ‘there was tremendous amount of options so almost the customer in them days was his own designer. Yeah very much so.’

Both men, however, discussed the importance of cloth to tailoring, which will be discussed in the next section. During the period when their output was dominated by made-to-measure (and when even in women’s wear the role of the designer as a creative originator of style change was still being developed) the designers in menswear remained anonymous outside of the industry, some also complaining that they were not given enough credit for their work. At a meeting of the London Association of Clothing Designers and Production Managers the president declared that ‘many employers still did not recognise that it comprised the technical brains of the local clothing industry.’

Men’s Wear lamented in 1959, that ‘it cannot be said that our trade is without the talent. The regrettable fact is that all too often our designers are backroom boys at the factories.’ Again it was the production element of the designer that the industry valued and the designers defined themselves by. Even in 1974 the Hepworths company newspaper, the Hepworth Mercury described their design team as being a ‘busy backroom department’, where garments were ‘made up as a one-off to prove a design’, after which ‘alterations may have to be made to achieve an easier assembled garment, or to produce one that is more economical in cloth and make-up time.’

Though what had changed by this point for the designer within Hepworths was that ‘fashion trends need to be spotted and next year’s designs identified’ as a starting point for the process. These factors have also meant that sources discussing the designers’ role and the process of design within the made-to-measure industry are scarce.

The technical and behind-the-scenes elements were emphasised by Burtons in the script of their publicity film, *Ideals in Industry* describing the process from when the cutter received the order slip and chose his pattern from the rack:

> For a pattern to get on that rack there has been quite a large amount of backroom work. The man who produces the prototype for each style and size of garment we make is the Chief Designer…It is in this department that the alteration of 1/8” or 1/16” to the length of lapel, length of sleeve, width of collar is made…an error on the part of the Designer will eventually be reproduced into many thousands of garments with consequent disappointment to customers.

---

119 Interview with Brian Rayner, 6 November 2012, LEEAG.2012.0589.
123 ‘More scope for design’, p. 2.
As the script makes clear, decisions by the designer on even small changes to the cut and the block patterns could have an enormous impact on the resulting suits. Another publicity effort by Burtons for a BBC educational series ‘Looking at Things’ contained a rare detailed description of the responsibility of the designer, which involved creating the design ‘models’ (in this case a tweed sports jacket of ‘the very latest design…cut with the latest “American drape”’), ensuring these could be manufactured, and checking the production process for quality: ‘Before any model is placed on the production lines in the Workrooms, every detail in connection with the cut and design of the garment has to be worked out by the Chief Designer and from his blue-print.’ A Burtons (unnamed) head designer was also photographed checking a jacket model in their commemorative publication *Ideals in Industry* and described as the man ‘on whom the onus for creating new designs largely rests’, while Hepworths chief designer Arthur Chappell’s role in the 1960s was described as ‘productionising’ the designs of Hardy Amies (see below).

---

1.26 Burtons head designer ‘on whom the onus for creating new designs largely rests, checking on his models’.

1.27 Arthur Chappell (standing), Hepworths chief designer, draping cloth on a mannequin, Leeds, 13 December 1967.
Alamy, EKXN99

---

The need for new design models was put into practice in earnest by the Jacobson brothers at Burtons in the early 1950s as they decided to update the Burtons suit cut to be based on two main styles: ‘The Normal Conservative Fitting’ and ‘The Semi-Drape’. The new drape model aimed to appeal to younger men. Designer Mr F. C. Vernon was tasked with preparing new patterns, models and ‘making methods’ to conform to the new cuts required. However, this was not straightforward, as evidenced by the Jacobsons’ concerns about the suits being made over a year later, with worries that the ‘alteration of the cut has not solved all our problems and we are working at present on the making methods’. It appeared that the size of the Burtons enterprise created an impediment to changes in the design and production process. This issue would prove increasingly challenging for the Leeds multiples by the late 1960s and into the 1970s as male consumers changed their clothing buying habits.

The weight given by the Leeds multiples to made-to-measure, as well as the gendered view of menswear as not requiring the same level of design and fashion as women’s wear, also dictated the training and place of design within the industry. Angela McRobbie has looked at the gendered nature of fashion design education throughout the twentieth century in Britain, as well as the influence of class (working-class girls were trained through trade schools for industry – the rag trade – and their middle-class peers went to art schools where they tended to study fine art, textiles or in the post-war period fashion design). In a similar vein to the historiography of dress and fashion history, McRobbie argues that fashion design, and more particularly its place in the teaching of art and design, was stigmatised by connotations of femininity. Reports and reviews on art and design education and their relationship to industry also tended to ignore menswear and tailoring, even as concerns about the standards of British design compared to those of Europe or the United States continued to be expressed throughout the post-war period. The 1945 report *Design and Designer in the Dress Trade*, directly addressed issues of design and the role of the designer. Their terms of reference were restricted to the (women’s) fashion dress trade with a concentration on London but their conclusions could be applied across many parts of the clothing industry, especially in terms of the status and training of designers. They found that the role of the designer was not clearly defined, covering a variety of tasks from creating innovative designs to those who merely adapted or copied models and that

---

128 Vernon appears to have come with the Jacobson’s from their business Jackson the Tailor when they merged with Burtons in 1953. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/180 Folder Jackson the Tailor, 1953: Letter to Sydney Jacobson from S. H. Burton re Proposed arrangements for Manufacture - Discussion 10.8.53, 11 August 1953.
131 Dress Committee of the Council for Art and Industry, *Design and the Designer*. 
designers were not catering to the developing taste of consumers which was being met by imports. It also appeared that remuneration rates for designers were very low, which they argued was ‘a measure of the lack of esteem in which the commercial community holds the designer our present system is producing.’\textsuperscript{132}

McRobbie’s focus was on the women’s wear industry but education in design in men’s multiple tailoring was similarly gendered, falling squarely in the low-status working-class trade and technical category, closely allied with industry. It was also almost exclusively aimed at men. As Katrina Honeyman has shown, Leeds developed technical education to serve the industry from the 1900s through institutions such as the Leeds Clothing College (part of the Leeds College of Technology) and by 1945 Leeds had an international reputation for its provision of clothing and tailoring education and training, which ‘was structured around the requirements of the male clothing worker.’\textsuperscript{133} A 1946 article in trade journal \textit{Men’s Clothes} highlighted the close relationship between the industry and the college in Leeds where about 700 of the 900 students also worked in clothing factories, attending classes in the evenings and one or two days a week.\textsuperscript{134} Male students on the men’s design courses were photographed working on pattern cutting and design (such as adapting patterns to accommodate ‘corpulent figures’) and the craft and technical aspects were emphasised in the article with no mention of sketching or fashion trends (see below).

Burtons records show the type of subjects studied by some of their mostly male employees under this system: Pattern Drafting (both practical and lectures); Practical Tailoring; Factory Methods; Measure Cutting; Cloth Analysis and Testing; Knowledge of Fabrics; Garment Design; Craft Tailoring; and Management and Costing.\textsuperscript{135} There were 33 Burtons employees enrolled in one or two of these subjects each; only two were women. While garment design was included, it is unclear how creative or fashion-led it was.

\textsuperscript{133} Honeyman, \textit{Well Suited}, pp. 196-197.
\textsuperscript{134} ‘Clothing Craftsmen and Women for the Future’, \textit{Men’s Clothes}, November 1946, pp. 42-45.
1.28 ‘A class working on the practical side of the design of garments’ at the Clothing Trades Department of Leeds College of Technology.
‘Clothing Craftsmen and Women for the Future’, *Men’s Clothes*, November 1946, p. 43.

1.29 ‘Students are taught how to cut stock patterns, then to modify them to individual measurements and adapt them to abnormalities. Here the men’s design class is being shown how to allow for corpulent figures.’
‘Clothing Craftsmen and Women for the Future’, p. 44.
Brian Rayner, who trained at Burtons and the Leeds College of Technology in the 1960s, remembered they did some design but commented most about the aspects of his training that concentrated on pattern design, cutting and methods of manufacture, concluding that ‘there wasn’t quite the distinction in those days between between uh creative and um and technical,’ an emphasis also evident in the training work books of Melville Hopwood who worked as a cutter for John Barran (see below). Brian Hill’s experience was similar, he did some technical pattern cutting but his focus was on clothing technology and textiles.

The production and craft emphasis of the training contributed to the industry’s view of (particularly made-to-measure) tailoring as a masculine concern in which an understanding of fashion change was deemed unnecessary.

However, despite these efforts, as Honeyman stressed in her history of the industry, training and skills remained a problem for the Leeds multiples. A 1963 study of training requirements in the clothing industry found that two-thirds of the tailoring firms surveyed expressed a preference for boys (girls were only considered as suitable to be machinists) to be trained on the job, working up from the bottom rather than any college training.

The authors felt there was a ‘mystique’ around the craft skills of cutting and tailoring by the industry, that they were ‘not skills to which principles of scientific analysis and training can be applied’, with one respondent commenting: ‘It’s impossible to say how you do it. You acquire a mental image of your work, and it takes some fifteen years to acquire this.’ In

136 Hopwood’s work books include pattern drafts, cloth identification, stitch types, point papers (weave designs) and hand drawn pictures of production machinery. Brian Rayner; LMG, LEEAG.2010.0350.0001-8, Melville Hopwood tailoring documents.

137 Brian Hill.

138 The study included visits to 112 companies and questionnaires sent to 984 firms, with a 30 per cent return rate. Eunice Belbin and Robert Sergean, Training in the Clothing Industry: A Study of Recruitment, Training, and Education (London: Twentieth Century Press, 1963), p. 64.

139 Belbin and Sergean, Training in the Clothing Industry, p. 64.
terms of design, the study authors focused on the women’s trade and felt that the ‘design of garments is one of the few skills in the industry which is not – and probably could not be – learned by sitting alongside a more experienced person’, with management more enthusiastic about formal education for design, though unclear about what it should entail.\textsuperscript{140} The only comment conveyed in the report regarding fashion within the tailoring industry was from a manager who said that boys in his own firm ‘considered the inclusion of fashion drawing and textiles in the course they were attending to be out of place’, but he felt that they were worthwhile as they were ‘topics which provoked thought in a student’.\textsuperscript{141} The most significant shift in the training of menswear designers was in 1964 when the Royal College of Art offered its first course in men’s fashion. The influential and inspirational head of fashion Janey Ironside noted that:

> Although there are colleges of tailors, and mass-production firms run their own trainee systems, men’s wear design had never been taught before, at least not in the UK, so that everything Denis [Hayes, editor of magazine \textit{Sir}] and I did was for the first time.\textsuperscript{142}

The new course was established with sponsorship by Hepworths and signalled the firm’s active attempts to integrate some of the accoutrements of ‘feminine’ fashion into the Leeds multiple tailoring business, which is the focus of Chapter 4.

1.3 Cloth

The stress on made-to-measure tailoring by the Leeds multiples made the fabric the suits were made from the focus of both production and consumption. In 1947 the \textit{Yorkshire Evening Post} reported that a party of French editors had visited the Burtons Hudson Road factory in Leeds and all were eager to obtain a suit made of West Riding worsted. However, with no clothing coupons and it being illegal to buy them they left empty handed. ‘So fine, so good, so English’ was the wistful comment by M. Maurice Catelos of Amiens on feeling the texture of a Utility navy pinstripe cloth he couldn’t have.\textsuperscript{143} The international renown of the British tradition in tailoring went hand in hand with that of the cloth used, particularly that of worsted, woollen and tweeds. In his comment Monsieur Catelos revealed not just the reputation of British and particularly Yorkshire wool cloth and tailoring, but also the sensory nature of the fabric which was a major part of the appeal of a tailored suit. As Brian Rayner answered to the question of what makes a good suit, ‘fabric is the biggest part of it. Obviously it’s got to be cut nice and made nice …you’d say it’s the fabric that was pulling you towards it mainly.’\textsuperscript{144} It is the intrinsic qualities of wool which enable many of

\textsuperscript{140} Belbin and Sergeant, \textit{Training in the Clothing Industry}, p. 69.
\textsuperscript{141} Belbin and Sergeant, \textit{Training in the Clothing Industry}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{142} The course was run in conjunction with industry and she acknowledged the assistance from companies such as Burtons. Janey Ironside, \textit{Janey: An Autobiography} (London: Michael Joseph Ltd, 1973), p. 146.
\textsuperscript{144} Brian Rayner.
the technical elements of tailoring to work, its elasticity and ability to be moulded and formed by stitching and heat allowing the almost sculptural craft of the tailor to transform a flat piece of cloth into a three-dimensional, fitted garment. Assessing quality and determining the type of cloth is also a sensory experience relying on sight and touch, understanding the feel and ‘handle’, weight and texture of the fabric. These sensory aspects became an important part of the made-to-measure process and contributed to the gendered nature of wool fabrics as certain types of cloth became associated with masculine or feminine clothing; the city or the country; day or evening; work or leisure activities.\textsuperscript{145} Strong conventions had developed from the nineteenth century in menswear as to the types of cloth of tailored garments to be worn for particular activities or in different spaces and geographies; these also had connotations of class and status.\textsuperscript{146}

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.31 Illingworth Morris PLC, ‘Cloth from Great Britain’ promotional booklet, early-1970s including Salts (Saltaire) worsted manufacturers and Pepper Lee who specialised in mohairs. Bradford, West Yorkshire Archive Service (hereafter WYAS), Illingworth Morris PLC, 41D96/1 Cloth from Great Britain, front cover.


Cloth was central to the business of the Leeds multiple and wholesale tailors. The sheer volume that they manufactured meant that the design, buying and selling of cloth was a key element in the process – in 1953 Burtons declared that they used 12 million yards of cloth per year and a report on the wool textile trade in 1969 found that multiple tailors took 25 per cent of the British wool industry’s total menswear output.\footnote{147} In 1964-1965 West Yorkshire worsted weavers Salts (Saltaire) owned by the Illingworth Morris group sold 20,871 pieces to Burtons and in 1967 recorded that 36.5 per cent of their fabrics went to multiple tailors.\footnote{148} In the post-war period changes in types of cloth, including lighter weights and the advent of synthetics, also became significant for the Leeds multiples. The made-to-measure suit exemplified this as the choice of cloth could have a significant impact on the final look and feel of the garment in terms of weight, colour, texture and pattern. Even more importantly, it was in the variety and diversity of the cloths offered by the multiple tailors and their changing designs and colour where trends emerged in the made-to-measure business. Hepworths described the significance of this in one of their style guides in 1965:

> The type of cloth – its colour, pattern, weight and texture...is part and parcel of the designer’s thinking from the start. His design and its variants depend, for their ultimate effect, on a skilful marriage of line and cloth. Given these basic ingredients of fashion, the ultimate choice in both belongs to the customer.\footnote{149}

This was also significant as the British menswear industry had no defined process of trend forecasting despite the efforts of organisations such as the British Colour Council (they reportedly released their first ‘colour types’ for men’s suitings in 1946 including shades ‘storm’, ‘smoke haze’ and Norse gold’, see one of their trend forecasts from 1953 below), the various trade fairs established after the war and the menswear trade press.\footnote{150} Textiles tended to lead trends due to the time frame of their production which meant that ‘patterns for each season are presented rather more than a year before the season.’\footnote{151} These elements

\begin{footnotes}


\footnotetext{151} *The Strategic Future of the Wool Textile Industry*, p. 43.
\end{footnotes}
were intrinsic to the Leeds multiples’ construction of a masculine tailoring tradition expressed through their perseverance with made-to-measure production and its associations with quality, craft and skill.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.


Just as tailoring was presented as a technical craft rather than being subject to whims of fashion change, so was the design and production of wool cloths. The production of woollen and worsted comprises a series of intensive and technical processes from the raising of the sheep to the spinning of the yarn, dyeing, weaving and finishing. The making of worsted involves removing all the short fibres from the wool and aligning the remaining long fibres in parallel. In woollen yarns and cloth the short fibres are left so some of the fibres lie in parallel and some randomly. These processes result in cloth with different textures and handle; worsteds are known for their smoothness and fine quality while woollens tend to have a ‘hairy’ texture, and are, for example commonly used to make tweeds. Wool cloth design was closely allied to the methods of production. One designer commented that when they entered the wool weaving industry around 1960 the older generation had ‘always concentrated on the technical and practical side of cloth making rather than the aesthetic’. 152

Most writing about the wool textile industry has looked at the manufacturing and economic significance of the industry with little concern for the finished garments. 153 Issues of design and fashion are sometimes not addressed directly,

even when these have been shown to be influential within the industry.\textsuperscript{154} The Scottish tweed industry is one exception where the variety and diversity of its product has been cited as one of the reasons for its success; another is tartan.\textsuperscript{155} In contrast, cloths designed for the menswear industry (particularly worsteds) were sometimes criticised because the ‘scope of the designer is in general terms limited to rather subdued colourings, obtained by choice of weave and the type and thickness of yarns used.’\textsuperscript{156} Another writer noted that ‘worsted fabrics appear on the whole to be more standardised than woollen fabrics, partly owing to their more standardised construction and (in the writer’s view) limited range of shades, all tending towards black, brown or grey.’\textsuperscript{157} The more subtle nature of much menswear cloth design meant that in 1949 the editor of \textit{Man and His Clothes} argued that: ‘Popular design and colourings for suits and coats are so subdued that they are nothing more than a background’, acting to distinguish the quality of tailoring.\textsuperscript{158} He also argued that tweeds and cloths for sportswear offered men more variety and scope for the expression of individuality which was illustrated with two sports coats made up in different tweeds (see below).

\textsuperscript{154} Jenkins and Ponting discount discussion of fashion change while going on to argue that a contributing factor to the comparative success and failure of the Yorkshire, West of England and Scottish industries was to do with their response to consumer demand, quality of design and fashion. David Jenkins and Kenneth Ponting, \textit{The British Wool Textile Industry 1770-1914} (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1982) pp. 288-290.


\textsuperscript{157} Lynden Briscoe, \textit{The textile and clothing industries in Great Britain} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971), p. 59.

1.33 The influence of fabric design on the look of tailored garments was illustrated with these two similarly cut sports coats, on the left a ‘light fawn Shetland tweed’ and right ‘Harris tweed with brown and white houndstooth check’.

From the nineteenth century most of the cloth for the garment trade produced by the wool and worsted industry was for menswear. Fiona Anderson has clearly demonstrated how tweed was heavily gendered as a masculine cloth through its origins in working clothing worn by shepherds in the Borders and close association with new styles of menswear such as the lounge jacket and explicit links to the landscape of Scotland as well as country sporting and leisure pursuits.\(^{159}\) Lou Taylor has shown how the combination of fashion and social change stimulated the industry to make versions of this ‘masculine’ cloth for a female market.\(^{160}\) The gendered nature of wool cloth design and production continued into the post-war period. The Board of Trade working party report into wool noted that worsteds were used largely in men’s suits and woollens for tweed suits but the latter were also ‘used extensively in ladies’ wear since there is much greater scope for variety of structure and colour.’\(^{161}\) Couturier Hardy Amies at a lecture in 1954 displayed a woman’s suit made by a firm in Yorkshire of men’s suiting of which, he said ‘until we persuaded them to sell it to us, was one of the pillars of the men’s tailoring trade. It is a tweed for a hard wearing

---

\(^{159}\) See Anderson, ‘This Sporting Cloth’ and ‘Spinning the Ephemeral with the Sublime’. T. A. Stillie describes how nineteenth century woollen merchants were inspired to feed the demand for tweeds by commissioning designs that reflected the colours and textures of the Scottish landscape. T. A. Stillie, ‘The Evolution of Pattern Design in the Scottish Woollen Textile Industry in the Nineteenth Century’, *Textile History* 1:3 (1970), 303-331 (p. 321).

\(^{160}\) Taylor, ‘Wool Cloth and Gender’, pp. 30-47.

suit.\textsuperscript{162} And in 1969 a report into the British wool textile industry found a clear division between worsted for the menswear industry and woollen fabrics in women’s wear: the British menswear industry consumed 52 million pounds of woven worsted a year compared to just seven million in women’s wear, and for woven woollens the split was 29 million pounds and 82 million pounds respectively.\textsuperscript{163} Arguably it is this strongly gendered nature of wool cloths (worsteds and tweeds in particular) and their use by the tailoring industry which has also been a factor in its exclusion from discussions of fashion and design.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image1.jpg}
\caption{1.34 Cloth selection area with cloth lengths (‘pieces’) on the shelves and bunches (cloth sample books) on the table, Burtons Preston branch, 1953.}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{163} \textit{The Strategic Future of the Wool Textile Industry}, Table 3.3, p. 37.
1.35 Wool worsted cloths pulled from Burtons bunches, from left, blue diagonal twill, grey check and brown ‘fancy’ birds eye, c.1953.


The emphasis on made-to-measure tailoring by the Leeds multiples put cloth at the centre of the business and the process of consumption. Lengths of cloth and pattern ‘bunches’ (books of cut cloth samples) were a vital part of their retail branches from which men would choose the cloth they wanted for their suits (see the interior of a Burtons branch in Preston and cloths pulled from bunches above). This key process was carefully described by an anonymous branch inspector from Jackson the Tailor who at the end of 1953 compared a branch of Burtons to one of Jackson. Both of the visits were dominated by discussions of cloth prices, patterns and colours with the sales staff. After an encounter with an indifferent salesman, eventually at the Burtons branch the manager ‘started showing me rolls of cloth and made-up suits. He brought forward the main selling points of the suitings and generally went to a good deal of trouble’. However, he had a much more favourable impression of the Jackson branch where rolls of cloth were stacked neatly and at ‘inviting angles’ and the salesman:

…discussed weight, colour and wear of cloth. Had very definite ideas on helping choice. He went to some trouble producing rolls of cloth and getting made-up suits to show the effect of differing cloths.

Even more usefully, when the inspector asked if he could see the cloth colours in natural light, the salesman ‘was eager to show them in daylight. Bought several rolls of cloth out to me in the street. Discussed the shades helpfully.’ The process of made-to-measure tailoring meant that for the male consumer choosing the right cloth was crucial to the success of the final suit and the multiple tailors made every effort to stock a wide selection of cloth types and prices.

---

165 Branch inspections of Burtons and Jacksons, Montague Burton Ltd, 23 November 1953, p. 1. The Burtons branch was inspected again on 10 December 1953 to see if it had improved.
166 ‘Branch inspections of Burtons and Jacksons’, Jackson the Tailor, 23 November 1953, p. 2.
167 ‘Branch inspections of Burtons and Jacksons’, p. 2.
It was within the ranges of cloth styles and designs that the multiples could give their customers variety and choice; for example Hepworths paid over 68 different cloth companies in November 1949 with amounts ranging from £31.7.0 to John Walton & Son to £2,119.15.9 paid to Salts (Saltaire).\textsuperscript{168} Brian Hill worked and trained at Alexandre in the 1960s, specialising as a cloth buyer. Alexandre supported him to complete a course in textile design at Huddersfield Technical College as well as clothing technology at Leeds Technical College. He remembered the process of selecting cloths from the mills:

It used to take weeks to go through all the mills’ collections…we would look through their collections, make a selection of what we wanted, they would send patterns in and then we would you know you’d go from this to that. So probably of the, I don’t know twelve hundred maybe cloths that we had …um you would narrow it down to I don’t know a couple hundred, 300 or something, um because what what we were always doing, you were always deleting from the collection.\textsuperscript{169}

One Leeds multiple even put cloth production into its name: Weaver to Wearer was one of the cheapest of the Leeds multiples and promoted its business in the 1950s as also producing cloth, featuring the character ‘Mr Weaver’:

To design and weave all the cloth for your suit is quite an undertaking…we actually produce most of the very large selection of designs from which you can choose. We give you a quality cloth (the foundation of every garment) at the wholesale price, and needless to say, you still get the last word in style, fit and finish.\textsuperscript{170}

\textsuperscript{168} The 2010 relative values would be £863.90 and £58,410.00 respectively. Officer and Williamson, MeasuringWorth, 2016; WYAS, J. Hepworth & Son Ltd, WYL616/25 (32) Hepworths: Purchase Cash Book No 1 Nov 1949–May 1950.

\textsuperscript{169} Brian Hill.

\textsuperscript{170} WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/121 General Advertising File: Weaver to Wearer style guide c.1953.
This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.36 Front cover of Weaver to Wearer style guide featuring ‘Mr Weaver’ and cloth styles. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/121 General Advertising File: Weaver to Wearer style guide c.1953.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.37 Front cover of Burtons style guide, mid-1950s.
The colour photography of draped cloth on the front cover of their style guide provided a visual cue to the sensory nature of the wool cloths to be chosen from when men were deciding on the details of a made-to-measure suit. Burtons also used this technique in one of their guides from the mid-1950s (see above). While only using black and white photography, the soft draping of the cloth provided a tactile and appealing effect, which, as Paul Jobling has argued, became an important element in menswear advertising through the 1960s.171

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.38 Burtons cloth designer, who ‘has a range of designs woven into one length of cloth, upon which the Buying Committee then pass judgement.’

In 1953 Burtons asserted that the company had ‘to cater for men in every walk of life. Consequently they carry over 2,000 patterns of cloth to satisfy every personal preference for design and colour.’172 The volume that Burtons required meant that they had their own cloth designers (such as the one photographed above) who were described as preparing over 5,000 designs, from which they selected each season around 100 patterns that were then ‘distributed to mills in Yorkshire, the West of England, Scotland and Ireland, where the looms are set up and the new suitings woven.’173 Quality was also important to Burtons and they had their own textile research laboratory which conducted ‘rigorous tests for fading, strength, weight, wearing qualities, fastness of dye, shrinkage of cloth and water

Due to the number of different patterns they offered, cloths were regularly updated and it was this that provided the opportunity for shifts and trends to emerge in men’s tailoring, especially made-to-measure, when there was a slower pace of change in suit cuts and styles. At their annual sales conferences in Harrogate, Burtons quizzed their staff with detailed questionnaires on the cloth trends emerging from customers’ preferences. In 1963 they prompted respondents: ‘Your answers and observations to the following questions will be a great help to us to ascertain the trends in Cloths and Styles in the near future’. The questions included ones such as this on stripes: ‘Feeling for stripes has been widespread with a strong tendency to narrow cord affects and narrow stripes. Will this continue and what preference have you in shades? Charcoal, blue, medium grey mixtures.’ Burtons were obviously attempting to understand the changing desires of their customers and cloth was central to these different trends.

It was this aspect of the made-to-measure business that was stressed by Brian Hill: ‘Much more slowly than now but trends emerged over time um and either we would pursue those, um or you know the mills would do it.’ At Alexandre in particular, which was a made-to-measure firm with only a very small offering of ready-to-wear in the 1960s, Hill recalled some of the different cloth fashions:

I can remember there was a there was a sort of trend, trends would emerge but they would emerge in fabric rather than anything else. I mean there was a a big fashion for you know what we’d call gangster stripes, you know chalk stripes, really quite strong stripe patterns, and then that would shift and it would become checks, then that would shift and it would become plains you know what I mean.

In 1967 Alexandre advertised for a cloth buyer, which was the role Hill was doing. The requirements demonstrate the balance of creative and technical skills they looked for due to the significance of the role within the multiple tailoring industry: ‘Alexandre Limited, Require a cloth buyer with Flair for fabric design; Good colour appreciation; Sound commercial sense; Technical experience’, perhaps ‘a young man at present working in a cloth mill on design or fabric construction.” And in 1967 Hepworths appointed Mr R. T. S. Russell as a cloth buyer who had trained in textiles in Galashiels, Scotland at the college which was known for its excellence in cloth design with Scottish tweeds. Having an ‘eye for colour’ was a quality that Brian Rayner also identified as differentiating those in the tailoring industry who were considered creative rather than technical designers: ‘I think it’s an eye for colour a lot more than anything and being able to choose a fabric.”

---

175 WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/122 Folder Harrogate Conference 30 October 1963.
177 Brian Hill.
178 Brian Hill.
181 Brian Rayner.
necessity for qualities such as a sense of flair and colour appreciation as well as the
development of trends in the wools emphasise how in made-to-measure production
decisions about cloth were where variety and fashion change could be expressed in ways
that fitted within accepted masculinity.

Apart from the fashion changes in colours, patterns and weaves, two of the biggest and
influential trends in menswear fabrics in the post-war period were in the weight of cloth
and the introduction of synthetic mixes. In terms of lightweight cloths it was widely
recognised that American menswear styles in the 1940s and then ‘continental’ men’s
fashions were drivers of these shifts. American soldiers canvased by men’s trade magazines
in 1944 complained about the heaviness of British cloths, a problem faced by Scottish
tweed manufacturers who responded by developing new designs to fulfil ‘what the
American customers wanted – gay, attractive designs in light-weight cloths that also
combined the high quality of top grade Scottish manufacture.’182 Younger men in particular
were observed to prefer styles such as two-piece suits ‘usually in lightweight, delicately
toned cloth’ and at their 1959 annual sales conference Burtons asked their staff about their
preference for lightweight suitings, in particular worsteds at 12 or 13 ounces and mohair
and worsted at nine ounces.183 Men’s Wear noted that the multiples’ offering of ‘lightweights
in the lower price bracket’ had the potential to benefit the whole of the trade with their
promotional power behind the new trend.184 This change was remarked upon in a report on
the men’s suit market in 1961 which noted that the average weight of British suits had
dropped from 18 or 19 ounces to 15 or 16, while lighter weight cloths also drew comment
due to their tendency to ‘look a bit seedy’ after being worn as the cloth creased so much
more than the traditional heavier wools.185

One particular style of lightweight cloth that had a noticeable impact were mohairs, as
mentioned by Burtons in their staff questionnaire in 1959. Brian Hill remembered that
these were from the merchant collections which both Alexandre and Hepworths stocked:
‘you know Dormeuil, Wain Shiell, people like that um which were I mean…One of the
names I mean that was around then still around now was Dormeuil Tonik mohair and that
was really really uh trendy at one point, especially iridescent mohairs.’186 Dormeuil Tonik
was a French brand but the cloth was made in Huddersfield and it was marketed heavily in
the late 1960s and 1970s with innovative advertising campaigns.187 Hill recalled these cloths
were popular with Mods and that ‘one of the first suits I ever bought was, it was a a um

183 ‘Today’s Teenage Male’, Men’s Wear, 7 April 1951, p. 20; WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/121
Harrogate Conference 25 November 1959 - Questionnaire for the Annual Conference.
18; Robin Douglas-Home, ‘No woman will ever understand’, Daily Express, 22 September 1965, p. 16.
186 Brian Hill.
187 Jobling, Advertising Menswear, pp. 130-137; Paul Jobling, ‘‘Cloth for Men’; Masculine Identities and Haptic
silver grey, haliday [ph] mohair, kid mohair and it had bright red lining in it.\footnote{188}{Other wool textile companies made mohairs and Burtons sourced some of theirs from Yorkshire company Pepper Lee that had specialised in weaving with mohair from the 1920s and made high grade mohair cloths in wool or polyester blends.\footnote{189}{In the 1960s Hepworths had also included mohair blends as part of their made-to-measure range in collaboration with couturier Hardy Amies, with the lightweight fabric featuring particularly in the collection for 1969 which was launched in September 1968 with their colour trend ‘Cognac’ (see below). The ranges and numbers of cloths offered by the Leeds multiples as part of their made-to-measure production, including the new lightweight materials, meant they could keep abreast of style trends without committing to huge runs of ready-made suits that might not sell. They remained faithful to this form of tailoring because it maintained the masculinity of production as men chose their cloths which were then hand cut and tailored.}} In the 1960s Hepworths had also included mohair blends as part of their made-to-measure range in collaboration with couturier Hardy Amies, with the lightweight fabric featuring particularly in the collection for 1969 which was launched in September 1968 with their colour trend ‘Cognac’ (see below). The ranges and numbers of cloths offered by the Leeds multiples as part of their made-to-measure production, including the new lightweight materials, meant they could keep abreast of style trends without committing to huge runs of ready-made suits that might not sell. They remained faithful to this form of tailoring because it maintained the masculinity of production as men chose their cloths which were then hand cut and tailored.


1.39 Model Tony Armstrong-Barnes wearing a double breasted suit, style 805 in a ‘Cognac Terylene/worsted/mohair mixture’.


1.40 Hepworths press release with six cloth sample cards in the colourway ‘Cognac’, including a mohair and worsted and this Terylene, worsted and mohair blend.

HA Archive, File Box Hepworths 1, ‘Hepworths Hand Cut Tailoring Hardy Amies says Cognac for Autumn’, 9 September 1968.
The publicity campaign for Dormeuil Tonik and the advent of polyester blends highlighted the attention and money expended on different cloth and fibre types through the 1950s and 1960s as new synthetic fibres and fabrics were brought onto the market and wool producers replied with their own campaigns.\textsuperscript{190} Men’s Wear began mentioning Terylene (polyester) being used in men’s suiting in the 1950s and Hepworths showed a ‘new lightweight dinner jacket of Terylene and wool mixture fabric said to be crease-resistant’ at the 1957 Textile and Clothing Fair in London.\textsuperscript{191} Burtons textile centre tested the new cloths which did not necessarily respond as proclaimed – a photograph of a comparison test of an acrylic (branded Acrilan) wool blend with pure wool showed the wool performing significantly better; despite this they did produce suits in this type of cloth (see below).\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{190} Chemical company ICI owned the Terylene patent (polyester) while Courtaulds controlled 90 per cent of the production of cellulosics (rayon). Together they controlled British Nylon Spinners which produced nearly all nylon used in the United Kingdom. These two companies spent millions on advertising while the International Wool Secretariat marketed wool under the Woolmark label with a budget of £60 million (£700 million) over five years in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Relative worth in 2010, Officer and Williamson, MeasuringWorth, 2016; Briscoe, The textile and clothing industries, p. 31.


\textsuperscript{192} John Barran also advertised their use of a 50/50 blend of wool and Acrilan in 1959 but Terylene seemed to replace it as the polyester of choice through the 1960s. ‘Advertisement: Barran’s’, Men’s Wear, 26 September 1959, xix.


By 1961 the Economic Intelligence Unit concluded that though wool was ‘still the hallmark of a good English suit’, synthetics mixed with wool were being used in ‘approximately a third of all suits.’¹⁹³ This period was described as the ‘boom times’ for synthetics as the Leeds multiple tailoring industry (along with other high street clothing companies) responded to the public who ‘wanted Terylene/wool worsteds, and demand seemed fathomless.’¹⁹⁴ Brian Hill was rather more sceptical about the qualities of the polyesters and blends, remembering that:

> Yes I mean um polyester blends became quite important because of course they were less expensive and you know everyone was extolling the you know crease retention...And you know there was the sort of the blend of, which gave you the best of both worlds in theory you know. It didn’t, but

¹⁹³ Economist Intelligence Unit, ‘Men’s Suits’, p. 25.
¹⁹⁴ Mark Keighley, *A Fabric Huge: The Story of Lister* (London: James & James, 1989), p. 59. Of the suits made by the Leeds multiples held in museum collections that I have located, 12 are made of wool Terylene blend fabrics.
then um you know ICI came out with…something called Terylene Plus T which was a sort of high bolt polyester which actually handled a lot like wool. Um and they promoted that heavily and we did a campaign at Hepworths with it but it, as I recall it was never that successful. Hill felt that wool remained significant within the industry, pointing out that ‘at the same time um the the you know the the wool people were heavily promoting you know the Woolmark. Um so I wouldn’t— Yes synthetics were important but so was wool.’ The Leeds multiples marketed their suits in both the new blends and pure wool with Hepworths for example developing their own brand of wool cloth called ‘Golden Talisman’ which they used in their suits from the mid-1960s and also making suits with Terylene (see below).

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

1.43 Hepworths Golden Talisman wool advertisement, 1966.


195 Brian Hill.
196 Brian Hill.
197 LMG have recently acquired a large collection of hundreds of Hepworths cloth samples including Golden Talisman. LEEAG.2012.0240.0001-0681 and LEEAG.2013.0140.0160 Wool and Golden Talisman samples.
The choice of cloth for a suit remained a crucial element of the quality and style of a man’s tailoring. It was also essential to the production and consumption of made-to-measure tailoring in the period from the 1940s to the 1960s and the business of the Leeds multiples. When men were forced to have ready-to-wear tailoring for their demob suits, it was often the cloth that could provoke comment and dismay. The Leeds multiples put cloth at the centre of their business by employing designers and buyers to ensure that they were up-to-date with style trends as these often emerged first in cloth design. Innovations of design in weight and the introduction of synthetic fibres were also influential. Cloth styles were distinctive and making the wrong choice could be problematic, such as when the wools were too colourful or gaudy (with the possibility of vulgarity demonstrated by the two older gentlemen in their loudly patterned suits in the cartoon below), or were conversely too much the same or too subdued and boring. The uniformity of the design was one of the criticisms men had for the chalk- or pin-stripe navy blue wool that became identified with demob suits. When this particular design of navy stripe returned to fashion in the 1970s it was so closely associated with demob suits it could be lampooned (see below). Made-to-measure tailoring from the Leeds multiple tailors allowed men to select from hundreds of different patterns and designs in order to create an individual suit, a possibility that was not available to the same extent with off-the-peg tailoring, and created a masculine form of consumption which had a strong relationship to the making.
In their emphasis on made-to-measure tailoring and production in three decades after the Second World War the Leeds multiples were focused on a technical approach to design in which the skill was deployed in making suits that could be both bespoke and mass produced. The skills of the cutter and tailor were given precedence and their knowledge and experience of making and ability to create a three-dimensional garment out of a two-dimensional piece of wool were both admired and marketed by the multiples. Discussion of design for made-to-measure was often hidden behind a focus on production where the value was in designs that were easily ‘productionised’ rather than expressing the most up-to-date fashions. The rhetoric concerned with tailoring design also reflected the view that menswear did not require the same attention to design and fashion as women’s wear. These views dominated the training for design within the tailoring industry as young men entering the industry were expected to learn the craft and technical skills of bespoke tailoring as well as the technological processes of the factory. The continued adherence by the Leeds multiples to made-to-measure emphasised their belief in tailoring as a masculine craft. The importance of men’s expectations of having input into the production of their suit by choosing their cloth and tailoring details could be seen when these were denied them. The demob suits given to servicemen in the 1940s made by the Leeds multiples fell short of many men’s desires due to their lack of fit and sometimes of quality. Having a suit measured, even if it was mass produced, made it far more likely to fit correctly and
throughout this period fit remained significant in how men rated their tailoring. It was in the retail branches of the Leeds multiples that men were able to make their suit choices, made-to-measure or ready-to-wear, and that is the subject of the following chapter.
Chapter 2.
A Presence on Every High Street: Retailing and Display

‘Britain has one of the most monopolistic retail markets in the world...high-rent properties in malls and high streets are crowded with the eye-catching liveries of national multiples, which can be recognised in an instant.’

Kathryn Morrison’s characterisation of British retailing as being dominated by multiples and chain stores provides a picture of the Leeds multiple tailor’s place on the British high street. Through the twentieth century many of these multiples were those specialising in men’s clothing and included both outfitters and clothiers and wholesale bespoke tailors. The most dramatic growth in this sector occurred between the First and Second World Wars with the estimated number of multiple shop branches in men’s and boys’ wear growing from 1,426 in 1920 to 3,233 in 1939.

The Leeds multiples retained this strong presence on the high street after the war; for example, in 1967 there were nearly 600 Burtons and over 300 John Collier branches, 126 branches of Alexandre and 279 of Hepworths. In the post-war period masculine clothing consumption also underwent considerable change. Retail practices played an important role in these shifts which included developments in display and shop design, selling methods and changes in men’s expectations both of the clothing and suits they wanted to buy as well as their shopping experiences. Retailing was essential to the business model of the Leeds multiple tailors and throughout the post-war period they attempted to adapt to these changes with mixed results. However, while they did not lead retailing developments on British high streets, they did respond to them and were influential through their active use and deployment of new design. They updated their visual identities, they redesigned store layouts and decoration, streamlined window displays, and brought in full-bodied male mannequins, all in an effort to attract male consumers. By exploring the position of the Leeds multiple tailors as retailers, this chapter will shed light on the significant role they played in men’s consumption practices as they sold suits through their branches on high streets across the British Isles.

Out of all the Leeds multiple tailors, Burtons were particularly successful at developing the identity of the company through their design, though they all attempted to differentiate their retail stores and companies from each other. The period 1945-1980 saw significant change with many of the previously successful tailoring businesses disappearing completely; the introduction of new styles of design and retailing to the menswear sector; and the

---

2 It has been estimated that large multiple retailers in Britain increased their share of sales from approximately 36 per cent in 1950 to 56 per cent by 1971. John Christian Beasley, 'A Study of Corporate Objectives for the Retailing of Menswear in the United Kingdom since 1970', MPhil Thesis (Department of Textile Industries), University of Leeds, 1985, p. 45.
ongoing balancing of relationships between the Leeds multiples northern manufacturing base, their networks of branches across Britain, and the acknowledged style centre of London. With the increasing professionalisation of design there was a growing recognition of how it could be exploited to improve the customer’s experience from the shop front lettering and the window display to the interior layout and the overall look of the company. This process was defined by leading corporate identity designer Wally Olins in the late 1970s:

> Industrial organisations, as they get more complex, have to develop a culture that enables people working within them to understand one another. This culture is often best projected visually; it provides a signalling mechanism. The visual projection of a culture not only helps internal cohesion, but it plays a large part in showing the outside world what the company is like and how it can be expected to behave.\(^5\)

The first section of this chapter briefly contextualises the significance of London as a fashion centre to the Leeds multiples as retailers, especially as they had to balance their operation as national chains with regional differences. The ways that the multiples made use of the identification of London with fashion is a recurring theme through the discussion. The second section considers the importance of place to the Leeds multiple tailors as established national chains through their choices of location and the design of their visual identities. Retailing techniques that had been successful before the war and were continued by the multiples included investing in prominent sites and ensuring architectural homogeneity across their branches. The large chains still emphasised elements of tradition, especially with their made-to-measure suits, and their endeavours to keep up to date met with varying levels of success. However, the recognition of the importance of the retail and visual identities of these companies was demonstrated by the substantial resources poured into their architecture and redesigns and the methods they used to respond to shifts in design and consumption practices. The look of the different Leeds multiple tailors on the high street played a significant part in the ways they sold their suits and the ways they were perceived by consumers. The third section sheds light on the crucial developments in the design of the multiple tailors’ store window displays and interiors. This was increasingly significant within the context of post-war changes in men’s fashion, representations of masculinity and men’s consumption, all of which were also revealed in the retail display of male mannequins which is the subject of the final part of this chapter. The Leeds companies’ retail business will be analysed through photographs and illustrations of the architecture and design of their stores alongside the typography and graphics of their house styles. The study will primarily be based on the activities of Burtons and Hepworths as they were two of the most influential men’s retailing companies in the post-war period due to their size and the impact of their utilisation of design.

---

2.1 London

An important element of the Leeds multiple tailors’ projection of their identity was their relationship with London, particularly in the way they utilised its reputation as a centre for men’s fashion along with their national presence on British high streets, behind which was their manufacturing base in Leeds and the North of England. From at least the early modern period London ‘was the principal British site where fashion and taste were promulgated and contested’ with its large population, greater wealth, access to goods from across the globe, manufacturing and innovations in retailing. With the expansion and consolidation of bespoke tailoring around Savile Row in London’s West End from the early 1800s this part of London came to be widely regarded as a world leader for menswear style and tailoring. It also saw the appearance of the archetypal man of fashion, the dandy, whose various subsequent incarnations have provided alternative images of male appearance and men’s consumption of fashion. The strong connection between the bespoke tailoring industry and these particular streets in central London also created a city space of accepted masculine consumption, a shopping route that ran through Savile Row, the Burlington Arcade and Jermyn Street, which was distinguished from the ‘more feminized West End of Oxford Street and Regent Street.’ The tailoring traditions of these bespoke businesses also contributed to the creation of the expected atmosphere of a tailoring shop, one that had come to be viewed and experienced as an almost exclusively male space. Until at least the late 1930s props of tailoring craftsmanship such as bolts of wool cloth, pattern books, heavy wooden tables, shears and scissors were ‘set against an appropriately sober and masculine setting, characterised by the use of dark wood in all the fixtures and fittings’, making a predictable experience for the masculine consumer.

After the Second World War there were expressions of anxiety about London’s role in men’s fashion with increasing competition from Europe and North America and improvements in ready-to-wear tailoring. In 1948 a menswear manufacturer, Mr Leslie

---


8 The image of the dandy has been the subject of considerable attention as an overt example of men’s engagement with fashion and clothing consumption and is characterised as an expression of urban and metropolitan style. See for example: Christopher Breward, ‘The Dandy Laid Bare: Embodying practices and fashion for men’, *Fashion Cultures: Theories, explorations and analysis*, ed. by Stella Bruzzi and Pamela Church Gibson, (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 221-238; Olga Vainshtein, ‘Dandyism, Visual Games, and the Strategies of Representation’, *The Men’s Fashion Reader*, ed. by Peter McNeil and Vicki Karaminas (Oxford: Berg, 2009), pp. 84-107.


Jack, was reported bemoaning the problems caused by the war: ‘Rationing and exporting have all but killed the fashion leadership in men’s apparel for which England was famous in past years. To-day, a visit to London’s leading men’s shops will find no new styles or fabrics. England must look to America for style in men’s clothing’. Despite these criticisms, the bespoke trade of the West End of London still maintained that it epitomised the very best in men’s tailoring:

The West End of London has long been regarded as the centre of male style and fashion…The long history and fame of many leading West End houses, influencing people in every country where good clothes are recognised, have given London a unique position in the sartorial world…There is a subtle quality about the suit which emanates from the West End to-day, which sets its seal upon the place of its origin as the indisputable Mecca of good tailoring.

In an attempt to maintain their place as a leader in men’s tailoring and style, a group of ten of the leading West End tailors formed the Men’s Fashion Council which showcased high-end Savile Row tailoring in a number of fashion shows throughout the 1950s. While it is debatable how much influence the Men’s Fashion Council had as they represented the tradition of bespoke tailoring, London maintained its position through the post-war period as a trend-setter for menswear in new and subversive ways, with the influence of pop music and youth styles alongside retailing innovators in Soho and Chelsea who opened small boutiques around Carnaby Street and the Kings Road selling exciting men’s clothes.

For the Leeds multiple tailors, with their national chains of retail stores and factories across the north of England, London remained significant in the way that they constructed their image, due to its centrality in the narrative of men’s tailoring and style in Britain. London was perceived as the location of the most fashionably dressed – as Hardy Amies asserted in a lecture to the annual meeting of the Clothing Institute in 1955: “There were no leaders of fashion in Britain; you had the aggregate well-dressed mass – but only in London.” Amies’ dismissal of the rest of Britain as being provincial and behind the times was not uncommon, a negative response to the recognition of difference, which Helen Smith has argued in the case of England exists as ‘a very real divide, both in contemporary life and historically, between the north and south of England and between London and the provinces. This divide is emphasised by differences in language, dialect, culture, class and

---

historical experience. Regional identity existed for the Leeds multiple tailors through their use of quality Yorkshire cloths and their reputation for quality craftsmanship and making but the existence of national differences and divisions created further challenges for the Leeds multiples in their need to create and maintain a coherent and recognisable national identity. For example, the rhetoric of Montague Burton firmly emphasised a decline in regional difference as part of his project to provide men across the country with good quality and respectable tailoring: ‘The whole of Britain is practically like one city today. What sells in Penzance will also sell in Putney and Pontypidd. The changes date from the Great War when the miner, brick-layer and bank clerk were all thrown into one melting pot’. Despite the assertions of Montague Burton there is considerable evidence for continuing local variations across Britain’s high streets. In 1960 at the annual Burtons sales conference held in Harrogate a member of staff from a branch in Aberdeen, Mr G. McLeod, made the point that: ‘Current London styles usually become accepted in this district some 9 months to 1 year later’ and asked for an arrangement ‘to keep the Northern branches informed about styles and cloths which are selling well in the South.’ As this study will show, the Leeds multiple tailors also implemented particular strategic concerns to cope with these differences as well as being forced by pragmatism and economic factors into a hierarchy of location in their retail design and architecture – some branches, towns and cities were more important than others. And London remained a significant presence in the ways that these companies projected their image to their male consumers throughout the post-war period.

2.2 Location and Visual Identity on the High Street

The reasons for the retail success of the multiple tailors in the 1920s and 1930s have been clearly identified and location was one of the significant factors. James Jefferys, in his 1954 authoritative study of British retailing, made the point that for the wholesale bespoke tailors (such as Burtons) having stores ‘in the busiest thoroughfares was an essential part of this form of trading’ while the two largest companies ‘adopted a policy in the inter-war years of expanding only by way of sites in main shopping streets and of opening large, spacious and well fitted-out shops which in some cases had been specially designed and built.’ Katrina Honeyman’s extensive work on the Leeds tailoring industry demonstrates these developments particularly. By the late 1930s Leeds multiple tailors had hundreds of stores nationally with the most notable and largest firms such as Burtons with 595 branches, Hepworths with 313, Henry Price ‘The Fifty Shilling Tailor’ 260, and Weaver to

---

While slightly reduced from the 1930s, the distribution of Hepworths stores right across England, Scotland and Wales can be seen in the map they published as part of their centenary celebrations in 1964 (illustrated below), correlating with areas of larger populations including a significant number in greater London and the Home Counties.

2.1 ‘1964. The Hepworths tailoring organisation embraces four production centres and nearly three hundred retail branches throughout the country…’


2.2 Multiple tailors frequently had stores near to each other on high streets across Britain; Burtons branch, Slough, with Weaver to Wearer store next door, 1962.
LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.1.0047.

Burtons stores were similarly spread but also included branches in Ireland (both the Republic and Northern Ireland). The number of stores meant that nearly every town had a branch of at least one of the Leeds multiple tailors, while larger towns and cities often had several in close proximity of both the same and different firms. Honeyman’s close study of these stores in Leeds found an obvious strategy of duplication and concentration with Burtons, Hepworths, Alexandre, Prices and Weaver to Wearer all opening numerous branches in the central city streets of Duncan Street, Briggate and New Market Street in the
1920s and 1930s, often right next door to each other.\textsuperscript{21} A LMG photograph of a Burtons branch in Slough alongside one of Weaver to Wearer is an example of what was a common sight across the country (see above). This strategy could also be seen in Birmingham. Kathryn Morrison has mapped the distribution of Burtons branches with six in the city centre and another six in the surrounding districts (see below).

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.3 Birmingham branches of Burtons in the late 1930s.

\textsuperscript{21} Table 3: Presence of multiple tailors in Leeds high streets, Honeyman, \textquote{Tailor-Made}, p. 304. This was still the case in 1967 as illustrated in a map of central Leeds by Chas. E. Goad Ltd in which ten branches of Leeds multiple tailors were located (four of these were Burtons stores). Detail of the map is in the introduction. Leeds, Leeds Library and Information Service, Chas. E. Goad Ltd, fire insurance map of Leeds, April 1967.
Branches needed to be both convenient and recognisable in their purposeful positioning on the busy high streets of cities, suburbs and provincial towns. The need for convenience, to make it easy for men to find or pass by a branch (and possibly not even have to cross the road), epitomised an element of gendered thinking concerning the male consumer. A great deal of retailing rhetoric about male consumers argued that they would only buy if it was straightforward and undemanding and if they were provided with a suitably masculine environment. For example, menswear sections of department stores were routinely located on the ground floor, sometimes with separate entrances, to make them as easily accessible as possible so that men could speedily locate what they needed and then exit without having to interact with the rest of the store. Christopher Breward has argued that this type of placement of menswear departments could alternatively be read in a positive light ‘as an attempt to retain the integrity of a specific masculine mode of consumption within the broader sphere of consumer activity more usually defined as feminine.’ Brent Shannon has also argued that the deliberate creation of these distinctively masculine spaces in department stores helped to develop acceptable male consumption of clothing and accessories by asserting it as rational, focused and logical.

The tailor’s shop was constructed as one of the most masculine of male consumption spaces: ‘shops for men and almost entirely staffed by men.’ The Leeds multiple tailors and their made-to-measure service brought this reassuringly masculine form of consumption to high streets across Britain in the first decades of the twentieth century. The importance of location for the multiple tailors continued after the Second World War. Burtons actively exploited the prevalence of their branches and their convenience in their advertising campaign in 1950 which included the slogan ‘A Montague Burton Establishment is Within a Bus Ride of...

---

22 These conventions were well established by the 1910s for department stores and earlier studies of department stores have emphasised the way they created particularly feminine spaces of consumption. See Susan Porter Benson, Counter Cultures: Saleswomen, Managers and Customers in American Department Stores (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), p. 44.
25 Ugolini, Men and Menswear, p. 234.
Your Home’. Hepworths also emphasised this in their early 1950s advertising, declaring that ‘You’re never far from a Hepworths branch’. Moreover, the made-to-measure model that the Leeds multiple tailors developed meant that individual branches functioned more like order-points than stock-filled shops which meant that consistency and a strong visual identity became key to their style of retailing.

Sir Montague Burton actively facilitated this process throughout the company, recognising the importance of retail outlets as showcases because they acted as geographical points of publicity in towns and cities across the United Kingdom. Moreover, Burtons ‘tailor of taste’ slogan and ethos was expressed through the design and architecture of their stores and advertising. The architectural house style had been established by Leeds architect Harry Wilson from 1923 and largely maintained through to the 1950s. This coherence of vision could be seen in line drawings of over one hundred Burton branches in their golden jubilee publication *Ideals in Industry.* But it is likely that Sir Montague Burton himself was heavily involved as much of Burtons design was done in-house and internal memos demonstrate his attentiveness to the detail of the business. In 1932 the company formed its own architects’ department to work alongside the shopfitting department that was responsible for shopfronts and internal fittings; approval from Sir Montague was necessary for new schemes. As Katrina Honeyman has noted ‘the company’s exceptional success was at least partly founded on their distinctiveness from the competition.’ To this end Burtons stores were given exteriors of:

Portland or ‘Empire’ stone for the really prestigious shops, granite facings for the next order of shop in importance, such as the West End emporia…Oak panelling and thick carpet or polished parquet floors were standard for the shop interiors, enhancing the impression of dignity and solid worth conveyed outside.

An example of one of these stores was in Stratford-Upon-Avon, where in the late 1930s Burtons built a new building to house their branch in the centre of the town ‘occupying an important position at 8 and 9 Bridge-street…The structure is an important addition to the

---

28 This style of retailing would later cause the Leeds multiple tailors considerable problems as retailing and men’s consumption of clothing and fashion changed, as outlined later in this chapter.
The building, which is of two storeys, follows the architectural style adopted by the firm for its many establishments throughout Great Britain. It has an extensive frontage to Bridge-street, and its front elevation of granite is broken up by impressive-looking pilasters and steel windows. A massive pediment at the top bears the firm’s name.\footnote{Montague Burton Enterprise in Stratford-on-Avon, p. 4.}

Burtons branches also featured large display windows and store mottos such as ‘elegance’, ‘taste’, ‘economy’ and ‘courtesy’ or later the addresses of the main stores alongside phrases

such as ‘The Palace of Fashion’ and ‘Student of Harmony’.

These themes were reinforced by the garment labels, sewn inside each suit made by the company on the inside breast pocket featuring the company name and motto ‘Montague Burton The Tailor of Taste Ltd’ on an oval plaque flanked by two Doric columns and above and below the addresses of the flagship stores in London and Edinburgh. While including a garment label inside a suit jacket added to the development of a distinctive identity for Burtons and other multiple tailors, it went against the tradition of bespoke tailoring such as that practised on Savile Row, where the tailor’s label is hidden by being stitched inside the inside breast pocket. This overt identification ensured that the name of the company was known, though apparently for some men, ‘to be known to have a wholesale-bespoke tailor’s label inside their jacket would be a social embarrassment.’

It is unclear who developed the company identity, though the logo and label seem to have been used from the early 1920s. The elaborate script style font with its ribbon underscore used by Burtons is similar to the logo of Boots the chemist which dates from the 1880s and other script logos from the 1900s, but the use of capital letters gives an added sense of solidity and permanence. These material and architectural design elements combined to provide the primarily lower-middle class and working-class customers with an aspirational destination in which to purchase their suits and the confidence and reassurance that their cash deposits would be safe ‘by looking like a cross between a bank and a gentleman’s club.’

This investment in creating a distinctive visual identity clearly worked for Burtons in particular as Hepworths found to their cost in a survey of young men in Bexhill-on-Sea in 1936: ‘hardly any of them have ever heard of the [Hepworth] business or can tell me the address ... [but] they can tell me where to find Burton’s.’

---

38 Menswear blog Andrews & Pygott have a page dedicated to the labels of Burtons and include an image of a letterhead from 1916 where the company is called ‘Burton & Burton’ and surmise that the label design described above probably dates from the mid-1920s. Before the opening of 118-132 New Oxford Street, the same design had the address of the Burtons store at 87-89 Oxford Street. ‘Dating Montague Burton…’, Andrews & Pygott The Morning Dress Guide, 31 January 2011, <https://andrewsandpygott.wordpress.com/2011/01/31/dating-montague-burton-clothing/> [accessed 9 April 2014].
2.6 Burtons suit label sewn inside the jacket over the inside breast pocket, from a double breasted jacket, part of a two-piece Utility evening suit, c. 1944-1952.

Burton House at 118-132 New Oxford Street was opened in 1930. This design was used until 1954.

LMG, LEEAG.2012.0022.

The inclusion of the addresses of two particular Burtons stores on their labels until the complete revision of their house style in 1954, demonstrated the company’s recognition of the importance of London (and Edinburgh) to their status and image. It also referenced the common practise of dressmakers to include the address and location of their business on waist-tapes inside bodices before the advent of clothing labels.41 Burtons had opened the firm’s first London branch in 1916 and by 1921 it had stores in the West End on Oxford Street, the Strand and Holborn, with two in the City of London on Ludgate Hill and Cheapside.42 Suburban stores soon followed and by 1939 it had 74 branches throughout the capital.43 Oxford Street, along with Regent Street, had become one of the important shopping streets in the West End with its numerous department stores, catering to the middle market with an emphasis on ‘choice and value, with smartness and practicality valued above fashion.’44 While the area around Savile Row served the wealthy bespoke male customer, other streets in the West End were destinations for different types of male consumers. Rodney Bennett-England argued that before the 1960s ‘Tottenham Court Road and Shaftsbury Avenue catered for the style-conscious younger man; the large West End stores for the older male; Regent Street, Piccadilly and Harrods for the discerning executive’.45 Oxford Street and Regent Street were home to branches of a number of the Leeds multiples.46 Burtons had built the imposing Burton House on the corner of

41 The designer Charles Frederick Worth (1825-1895) was said to have been the first designer to use a label inside his clothing. The practice became more common in womenswear from the 1920s. Ingrid Mida and Alexandra Kim, The Dress Detective: A Practical Guide to Object-Based Research in Fashion (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), p. 55.
46 Alexandre opened their Oxford Street store in 1948. ‘Alexandre will develop ready-to-wear business’, Men’s Wear, 6 March 1948. They subsequently referred to themselves as ‘Alexandre’s of Oxford-Street’ in a 1953
Tottenham Court Road and New Oxford Street which was faced with Portland stone and cost over £330,000 (see 1949 photograph below).\(^{47}\) This monument to Sir Montague Burton’s success in selling men’s tailoring became the company’s principal branch, emphasising the continued necessity for the company to project their connection to London as a fashion centre compared to the Leeds and northern manufacturing parts of the company. The address of 118-132 New Oxford Street graced the company’s clothing labels from the 1930s until 1954 along with the Princes Street Edinburgh store.

2.7 Burton House, corner of New Oxford Street, in London’s West End with what was then ‘London’s largest neon sign’ in red and blue.


A 1952 comment viewed the multiple tailors Oxford Street proliferation with a mixture of disdain and resignation ‘Prices Tailors now has three branches in Oxford Street, and this thoroughfare can claim to be the poor man’s Savile Row. Truly, the lower income groups are ubiquitous in their shopping, but perhaps we are all potential customers of the multiple tailors.’\(^{48}\) Hepworths employed visual references to central London in their advertising before they opened a branch at 103 Oxford Street, between Oxford Circus and Tottenham

---


Court Road in 1958, with an illustration of a confident young man in his drape suit positioned in front of an image of the Horse Guards building on Whitehall. When Hepworths announced plans for a new store on Regent Street in 1964 it was described by their managing director Norman Shuttleworth as being their ‘showpiece’. However, sensitive to their status as a national chain, he added, ‘I should be just as excited about this branch if the site were in Birmingham or Glasgow. But, of course, Regent Street is a street on its own’. Having a prominent presence in London’s West End was clearly an important consideration for the national marketing of the Leeds tailors’ image and remained notable throughout the post-war period.

For a number of the Leeds tailors the period from the late 1940s saw design becoming increasingly significant, whether from within the companies themselves or in conjunction with advertising agencies. This was evident from the changes made to their retail outlets, their advertising campaigns and their label designs ushering in the beginning of periodic bursts of modernisation and re-styling by the large Leeds multiple tailors right up until the

---

1980s. It was also within a context of the post-war period in Britain which witnessed an increasing concern about the place of design in society as efforts were made by both government and sections of the design profession to advocate good design as a means to improve manufacturing and public taste. Many of the multiple tailors had suffered war damage to their stores across the country which led to reviews and assessments of their retail offer, but there was also an increasing awareness of the need to reassess other aspects of their retail design, visual identity and advertising approaches. Hepworths, which had operated as a men’s outfitter by combining the manufacturing and retailing of suits with the retailing of men’s shirts and accessories, re-focused their business to concentrate on bespoke suits from 1948 and closed around 100 stores in the early 1950s. Burtons began a programme of store renewal subject to the economic stringencies of austerity and comprising three different approaches: first, a ‘sub-austerity’ refit consisting largely of fixing new fascia and repainting the shop front; second, rebuilding with a standard Burtons shop front; and third, a full reconstruction of the store. The investment in their retail properties played a key role in their publicity and marketing and was closely linked to local newspaper advertising.

For Burtons this early 1950s phase was marked by a desire to improve on their pre-war success, but maintain continuity, especially as they celebrated their golden jubilee in 1950. The promotion of the new stores followed similar lines to the approach taken in the 1930s, with a local dignitary and a representative from Burtons head office opening the store, and advertorial text provided for the local newspapers. Coverage of a number of branch openings in 1953 demonstrated the company’s need to appeal to local pride alongside an assertion of national significance with almost identical language used in the evidence of press clippings from Ormskirk, West Lancashire to others in Surrey and Wales:

Moor Street now knows Montague Burton Limited as does almost every important street and thoroughfare in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales ...The new shop contains all the facilities and amenities which are to be found in the Montague Burton sartorial palaces throughout the country.

The company stressed the status-enhancing nature of their decision to invest in the high street of any given town or city. As Peter Scott has argued, Montague Burton was an ideal developer ‘as the prestige of his retailing chain raised property values in areas where he

---

54 The letter from Burtons architect N. Martin to the Whitehall Advertising Agency in 1951 also outlined the publicity approach that was to be taken in conjunction with the branch refurbishment programme.
55 WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYLI951/122 Folder of letters re branch openings 1953: ‘Editorial in Connection with the Opening of a new Montague Burton Establishment at 9-11 Moor Street, Ormskirk’, p. 1. The text used for this piece was repeated in coverage of those for two other openings documented in this file of branches in Godalming, Surrey and Ammanford, Wales.
located; by the very act of selecting a property for development he therefore increased the
profitability and reduced the risk.\textsuperscript{56} This careful assessment of place – choosing highly
visible often corner sites on the busiest and best shopping streets across Great Britain –
also contributed to the Burtons reputation for quality and consequence which would then
be replicated in any new location.

The re-built branches through the 1950s featured a streamlined and less fussy frontage
which was described in their publicity for the new Exeter store as being ‘massive and
masculine, the window lighting is of modern design and enables the public to obtain an
excellent view of the garments displayed.’\textsuperscript{57} This style can be seen in the illustration of the
Plymouth branch with its generous windows and ample display space, uncluttered fascia
and pared down Burton signage. The windows were designed to showcase the garments
with the suited mannequins clearly visible from across the street, giving potential customers
a comprehensive picture of the Burtons restrained masculine ideal.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{Illustration of Burtons branch, Old Town Street, Plymouth.}
\end{figure}

This image has been removed by the author of
this thesis for copyright reasons.

Just as the multiple tailors were careful about the placement of their stores on the high
street, they were also aware for the potential of the rest of their buildings to enhance the
appeal of their stores to male consumers. In the 1920s and 1930s Montague Burton was
especially successful at identifying these possibilities by wherever possible letting the
surplus floor space of a Burtons branch for ‘male recreational pursuits. Where possible, the
storeys above…were used for billiards, or less commonly for dancing lessons’ and in new


build branches even deliberately designing the upper floors as billiard saloons. These associations continued after the Second World War, for example in a site occupied by Leeds multiple John Collier in Sunderland which housed the Castle Billiard Hall above in the 1960s and one of Burtons branches in Brighton which had the Regent Ballroom above (see photographs later in this chapter). A survey of young people in Bury, Lancashire in the mid-1960s found that going to dance halls was one of the most popular leisure activities for both male and female teenagers, while the billiard hall was ‘still an exclusively male preserve finding its most regular support in the age band 17-22.’

Personal accounts indicate that situating the tailors below and the leisure spaces above resonated for many men: ‘My dad has told me, on a number of occasions, that he was taught the basics of dancing above one of the Birmingham branches of Burtons in the late 1940s, together with a horde of apprentices from the Birmingham School of Print.’ And another commentator also mentioned the role of his father in the choice of tailor and the influence of the snooker hall above: ‘My first made to measure suit was from Burtons in the 1960s and one of the reasons my father took me there was, apart from cost, there were a lot of Burton shops had a snooker table or two upstairs’. Moreover, Malc ‘Steve’ Dimmer, rhythm guitarist in rock-and-roll band The Hi-Lites from 1959 to 1963, remembers practising on Saturdays in a ballroom over a branch of Jackson the Tailor in Southampton:

The Park Ballroom was on the corner of Above Bar and Pound Tree Road, Southampton, above Jackson the tailor shop, with the letters, PARK BALLROOM spelt out in each of the windows. One Saturday morning when we were practicing in the ballroom, the manager of Jackson the tailor, came up and asked us to turn the volume down as it could be heard down in the shop. We didn’t think we were that loud! The site of the building was a prominent corner position in the centre of Southampton on the main shopping street. The upstairs ballroom was evidently known to a youthful clientele such as the members of the Hi-Lites, who despite the noise objected to by the Jackson manager, were the young male consumers increasingly sought after by the multiple tailors.

61 Comment by Stokerson below Jack, ‘The remarkable story of the immigrant’.
62 Until the merger with Burtons, Jackson the Tailor stores were largely confined to the north of England. The merger of the two companies led to a number of Burtons branches being converted into Jackson stores which was probably the case with this store in Southampton. Malc ‘Steve’ Dimmer, ‘The Hi-Lites: The Early Years’, April 2008, <http://www.davidstjohn.co.uk/hilitesearlyyears.html> [accessed 1 February 2016].
However, balancing local and national identities with a sense of place was not always straightforward for the Leeds multiple tailors. In the case of Burtons, Frank Mort and Peter Thompson have argued that until the early 1950s despite their ‘national image, their approach to the world of goods remained local and particular in the extreme.’

They emphasise Burtons’ use of local newspapers for advertising, local dignitaries to open new branches and the responsibility given to branch managers to maintain a certain standing within their communities. While this was the case, Mort and Thompson have given too much weight to the localism of the Burtons’ strategy before 1954 in order to provide more of a contrast to what came after this point. I would argue that Burtons relied on the construction of a coherent national retail design and visual identity for their success and status on British high streets. The design of the stores and the advertising (whether local or national) was all precisely directed by Burtons head office in Leeds through the architecture and shopfitting departments as well as advertising copy which appears to have been frequently personally vetted by Sir Montague himself. This national approach could sometimes clash with local concerns and the revamped shops were not without controversy. Burtons sometimes had problems gaining planning permission for their designs, with critics such as Mr Lionel Brett, chairman of the Oxfordshire branch of the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, objecting to the multiples’ ‘great monotony in the shopping streets of the country today’ with the ‘same fascia everywhere’ after

---

Burtons appealed a refusal for a new frontage on their branch in Henley-on-Thames.\textsuperscript{64} Hepworths too, saw themselves as a national chain with the launch of their first national advertising campaign in 1949 (the beginning of a long-term forward plan to redevelop their design, retailing and company look lasting right into the 1960s) along with centrally directed window display teams and their own architects’ department.\textsuperscript{65} For Burtons in particular, their overriding consideration was to preserve their reputation while also modernising the company’s carefully constructed national visual identity on high streets across the country, over and above local desires.

While Burtons had been making a number of changes to their architecture through the early 1950s the unexpected death of Sir Montague Burton in September 1952 ushered in a period of substantial development including a revision to the design and visual identity of the company. In 1953 the company merged with Jackson the Tailor, a smaller multiple tailor run by Sidney and Lionel Jacobson based in the north of England. The purpose of the acquisition of Jacksons was to bring the expertise of the Jacobson brothers, considered to be ‘two of the most successful men in the multiple clothing trade’ to strengthen Burtons management.\textsuperscript{66} Mort and Thompson and Jobling have provided an excellent assessment of the impact and content of the new advertising which was produced by agency W.S. Crawford under the direction of the Jacobsons for Burtons in 1954 and took the company in a completely new direction.\textsuperscript{67} The advertising was one part of a total revision of what at the time was called the house style of a company, which for Burtons transformed their external face. Later in this chapter the impact of the Jacobsons changes on other aspects of Burtons retailing including internal store design will be addressed further.

One of the most dramatic changes made by Burtons was the choice of a new typeface. They had already begun to move towards a more modern look in their shopfronts but the simplified lettering adopted for the 1954 advertising, labels and store redevelopments was a radical shift for the company. The complicated curlicues and ‘Tailor of Taste’ slogan were gone, replaced by Walbaum mono typeface simply spelling: BURTON tailoring.\textsuperscript{68} This choice clearly chimed with the design ethos of the time, winning a Layton Award in 1955 for its use in Burtons press advertisements and also being favourably commented on by Alec Davis in a review of contemporary trends in typography in Design, the journal of the Design Council.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{64} ‘Henley Town Planners Criticise Shop Design Burton’s Front An “Infliction”’, Men’s Wear, 5 August 1950, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{68} The font originated in Germany about 1800 and was introduced to Britain in 1925 by the Curwen Press. Jobling, Advertising Menswear, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{69} The Layton Awards were Britain’s first creative advertising awards, sponsored by printing-block makers C. & E. Layton. Art and Industry, July 1955, p. 33 cited in Jobling Advertising Menswear, p. 49.
An example of change from a bad to a good letter form can be seen in Burton’s new house style. Good lettering for the shopfronts of this widespread tailoring chain has two advantages: first, it ties up with the style of Burton’s press advertising and showcards; second, you can read it – to say nothing of the obvious advantage to all those town centres in which a Burton shop is one of the architectural features.⁷⁰

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.11 Illustration of the old Burton shop front name comparing it to the new style below. Also note Boots on the top left and John Collier top right. John Collier was the new name adopted by Henry Price – The Fifty Shilling Tailor.


2.12 Burtons new visual identity as seen on their suit labels after 1954.

Dark grey two-piece single breasted suit, wool blended with Acrilan, 1958.

LMG, LEEDM.S.1987.0011.3.

For Davis, the Burtons new lettering and streamlined design was deemed a success as it brought the Burtons look up to date and removed the overtones of outmoded design embodied in the swirls and loops of the old typography. Advertising executive E. J. Biggs of the London Press Exchange was equally impressed by the new designs, looking forward ‘to the time when the good taste of the Burton Press advertising was reflected in more of the company’s shop fronts.’ Both of these critics also acknowledged the importance of Burtons’ presence on Britain’s high streets and the impact of their design decisions. By 1956 nearly half of the stores had been refurbished with the new look. These visual changes to the country’s high streets which continued right through into the 1960s and 1970s can be traced through the extensive collection of photographs documenting Burtons branches which were donated to LMG. The change in the external face of the design can be seen in the images below of one of the Burtons Duncan Street branches in Leeds.

---

71 ‘The Tailor of (advertising) Taste’, *The Outfitter*, 16 April 1955, p. 52.
73 LMG hold thousands of photographs from the Burtons archive. The majority of them have been catalogued but only a small proportion have been scanned and most have not been fully documented due to a lack of contextual information and museum resource constraints.
This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.14 Burtons branch, Duncan Street, Leeds, c. 1920s.

2.15 Burtons branch, corner of Duncan Street and Briggate, Leeds, c. 1960s.
LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.1.0215.
While the architecture of the original mid-1920s Duncan Street building remains, the redesign led to the stripping back and covering up of many of the original features. The two large parapets have been removed and the transom windows have been covered up with a mosaic tile fascia. The new signage is easily readable as it sits on top of the tiled background while a plain dark stone frames the window displays. These more austere and pared back frontages matched contemporary design ideals as modernism became the prevailing model with a widespread rejection of Victorian and Edwardian styles. However, the huge number of stores meant that it took Burtons time to roll out the changes across the country which can be seen in an exterior photograph of one of Brighton’s branches. In 1959 the North Street Brighton branch (with Regent Ballroom above) still retained its 1930s frontage and signage with elaborate window transoms but showcased the more ‘open’ style of window display which will be discussed further in the next section of this chapter. While the refit gave the store the new simplified fascia and typography with the old Montague Burton identity completely removed, the old curved windows were retained, a reminder of the earlier design aesthetic of the company.

2.16 Brighton North Street branch of Burtons with original 1930s fascia, 1959.
LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.1.0182.
With the proliferation of new shopping centres and precincts throughout the United Kingdom in the 1950s and 1960s, Burtons had the opportunity to build completely new stores and to maintain the trends in retail design and the changing demands of male consumers. Photographs from the LMG collection demonstrate Burtons documentation of many of these new branches. One of these was a 1966 branch with a striking abstract concrete relief mural above and which also incorporated a Peter Robinson (Burtons had bought the London-based department store Peter Robinson in 1947 and it was within the Sheffield Peter Robinson in 1968 that an influential development for the company was to occur with the opening of a ‘Top Shop’ aimed at young women). While not identified as such, it is almost certain this Burtons store was in the Dunstable Quadrant shopping centre, opened in 1966 by Bob Monkhouse and featuring a concrete mural designed by artist William Mitchell. The store demonstrated the continuing refinement and paring down of the store front designs by the Burtons architects with extensive windows framed by pale grey granite stallrisers and pilasters. This simplicity is also evident in another precinct Burtons branch, its location unfortunately unidentified, from 1968.

---

75 Rita Swift, ‘Timeline’ Dunstable and District Local History Society, <http://www.dunstablehistory.co.uk/timeline.htm> [accessed 11 April 2016]. Mitchell designed a large number sculptures including this style of concrete reliefs for builings, public spaces and town centres in Britain from the 1950s.
2.18 Exterior of Burtons and Peter Robinson Dunstable branch, 1966.

By the early 1970s the Burtons architectural house style had evolved into what Kathryn Morrison has argued was ‘amongst the most recognisable of all post-war multiple architecture’. The new Burtons stores of this period featured strong rectangular shapes made up of bands of recessed windows and walls clad in white tiles. One such example is the unidentified superstore branch photographed in 1972 (see below). Burtons remained dominant as a retailer into the 1970s and as the Burton Group this part of the business became crucial to its survival as the multiple tailoring sector rapidly divested itself of manufacturing. Burtons continued to have a significant presence on British high streets, though after the appointment of Ladislas Rice as chairman in 1969 they reduced their reliance on the traditional mainstay of the multiple tailors – made-to-measure tailoring and suits – by introducing other forms of menswear. As the Burton Group the company also launched a number of other successful clothing chains most notably Top Shop and later Top Man in 1978. These developments will be discussed in Chapter 3 as they were largely driven by research into market differentiation by generation and age.

2.20 Exterior photograph of unidentified Burtons superstore branch, 1972.
LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.1.0272

---

76 Morrison, English Shops and Shopping, p. 228.
Burtons’ main rival Hepworths also built on their decision in the immediate post-war period to refocus their business as they shed their outfitting and concentrated on multiple tailoring. In 1949 they launched their first major advertising campaign and began a long-term policy of ‘modernisation, expansion and large-scale promotion’. They reassessed their shops as many were run down and ‘many too were uneconomic because the pattern of High Street trading had shifted as a result of post-war social conditions from the village to the town and from the smaller town to the city.’ As a result they closed around 100 stores, purchasing new and larger premises ‘on more imposing sites in towns or cities which were important trading centres’ where they were able to emphasise their shift to made-to-measure (what they called ‘personal’) tailoring.

This became visible in the early 1950s as a dramatic change in the typography of their name in their advertising and stores. This is perhaps unsurprising considering the changes in their retail model as they dropped outfitting merchandise to concentrate on men’s tailoring. The new lettering was a complete break from the previous Hepworths look which can be seen in two shopfronts, one from an unidentified English branch with its strong serif capital letters in 1944, the other the Kings Cross London branch from 1958 demonstrating how long it could take to change their image in every branch across the country.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.21 Hepworths shopfront from the South East of England, repaired after war damage, 1944.


80 Shuttleworth, ‘Chairman’s comments on the accounts’, p. 16.
In stark contrast the redesign used a spontaneous brush stroke style for the lettering which was prominently positioned on the new frontages of Hepworths branches. This follows the handwritten casual typography such as the American-designed Brush Script which had become popular in advertising through the 1940s and into the 1950s, described as being ‘peppy, informal and unabashedly confident’. Angled and casual, the brush stroke sans-serif letters projected a sense of vigorous movement and action, while the rounded forms of the letters and choice of lower case is deliberately approachable. This feeling was emphasised in the layout of their advertisements, such as the 1953 half-page advertisement illustrated below with its up-to-the-minute design trope of rounded trapezoid shapes, one of which encloses a glamorous lit up view of the new store (an advertisement which had been collected by Burtons and kept in its archive as part of its constant monitoring of competitors’ advertising and offers). This was a significantly different and more youthful look for the company, responding to the shifting market in men’s clothing styles and designs which had been coming to the fore since the end of the war.

---

In February 1960 Hepworths launched a new visual identity and slogan, a ‘new look’ as described by managing director Norman Shuttleworth and the result of ‘a year’s planning and re-thinking’ with the help of consultants’ ‘experts in display, design, production, public relations, and of course advertising’.82 This was a bold move by the company and firmly

established Hepworths as a company which cared about design. The use of Hardy Amies as a fashion consultant was only one element of their entire modernisation and design programme which continued throughout the 1960s. Crucial was the new house style featuring ‘a distinctive “lead-in” capital H’ in a sans-serif bold typeface but retaining the slanted lettering of the previous name style. This consolidated a move that they had already begun with the use of a plainer slanted typography in some Hepworths advertising in the late 1950s. House colours of black, azure and tangerine would also feature as well as the slogan ‘Hepworths Hand-Cut Tailoring’; it was all with the aim of achieving ‘a maximum concentrated effort in the “visual aspect” – the appearance of the Company – that this common styling has been devised’. Behind the revamp was typographer Edward Burrett, who, along with Hardy Amies and their window design consultant Eric Lucking, was a well-known and respected designer. This new house style was to serve them for the next twenty years.


‘Re-Styled Name is Eye-Catcher’, p. 3.

2.26 Label inside a suit bought by a man to wear as best man at a wedding, Hardy Amies for Hepworths, 1972.


Just as with Burtons, Hepworths’ aim was to extend their relevance, visibility and appeal on the high street with their new look. Hepworths argued that their:

…speed-up in modernization plans means that more and more shoppers in Britain’s prosperous High Streets will see the new “face” of the Company

---

83 ‘Re-Styled Name is Eye-Catcher. Hepworths Hand Cut Tailoring’, Hepworth Mercury, 2 February 1960, p. 3.
85 ‘Re-Styled Name is Eye-Catcher’, p. 3.
86 Burrett was known for his book design including the 1950 Penrose Annual and the official Souvenir Programme of the 1951 Festival of Britain. He was also responsible for designing the corporate image of shipping firm P&O in the 1950s and was a founder member of the British Typographers’ Guild (the Society of Typographical Designers). Jeremy Irwin, Edward Burrett and the Penmiel Press: A Founder Member and His Private Press (Pangbourne, Berkshire: Gaillet Press, 1995).
to its best advantage, and note Hepworths as being the most modern and progressive tailors in the country.

New distinctive fascias will incorporate the Hepworth name style and slogan and echo the common styling image projected wherever the Company’s name appears.\textsuperscript{87}

The ‘look of the future’ could be seen in a sketch of the plans for the modernisation of Hepworths Darlington branch (one of 40 to be updated in 1961) featuring a pared back and clean-lined exterior, uninterrupted stretches of glass for the window displays, all setting off the crisp new typography. The process required considerable investment and by the end of 1960 they were reported to have spent ‘well over £500,000 on acquiring and fitting new properties or modernising older branches’ alongside revising their advertising and display.\textsuperscript{88}

Their architects’ department was responsible for the ongoing modernisation programme which Hepworths believed was integral to the whole ethos of the company and the male consumer’s shopping experience, as was expressed in the internal staff magazine, the \textit{Hepworth Mercury} in 1967:

…the aim of Hepworths has always been to become not the biggest, but the best of the multiple tailors.

\textsuperscript{87} ‘Face-Lift for Branches’, \textit{Hepworth Mercury}, 2 February 1960, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{88} ‘Hepworths Spent £500,000 on Shops Last Year’, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 3 December 1960, p. 24.
That aim involves two factors – quality and appearance. Quality mainly concerns the product, the styling and finish of the suit. Appearance, to the customer, is first and foremost a matter of the look of the shop; a question of combining an up-to-dateness that bears out our leadership in fashion, with a quietness of taste that bears out the quality of our clothes and the personal touch of our salesmen.89

With the decision to work with Hardy Amies, Hepworths projected themselves as a company which overtly engaged with fashion in a way that was new for the multiple tailors. However, even in 1967 when men’s fashion was the focus of considerable attention, Hepworths maintained the necessity of what they term ‘quietness of taste’, an underlying moderation in masculine attire.

The necessity of remaining up to date with their suits was also essential for their stores as Hepworths more explicitly positioned themselves as fashion retailers rather than tailors. This meant that Hepworths continued with a programme of branch expansion and development into the 1970s and in 1971 reported on a programme of ‘face-lifts’ for their smaller shops which was to include interior modernisation and improvements to hanging systems and spaces.90 Three years later the Hepworth Mercury excitedly informed staff that by August 1975 thirty new stores were to open, fronted with polished stainless steel lettering on white marble fascia:

It’s a space age trail Hepworths are blazing in Britain’s High Streets with their new-look shop fronts… Plate glass windows run from the marble down to the floor, in the case of precinct premises, blending with the futuristic terratza flooring.91

Readers could judge for themselves whether this was space age from the photograph of the revamped Telford New Town store (see below). A further aspect of this ongoing process was to reverse architectural decisions of the 1950s with the removal and shortening of arcades of twenty-two of their key branches to create stores where customers could ‘see through the attractive open style window displays and can step directly from the pavement into the shop’ at a cost of three quarters of a million pounds.92 This process demonstrated the changing needs of retailers and consumer practices as the arcades had originally been introduced to provide large areas of window display space for suits, but by the 1970s this area was more useful as sales space for the wider range of menswear the company had also introduced. It was felt that the modern shopper ‘…wants to walk into a shop, feel free to look around unmolested if he so wishes or, equally to get some service if he wants it’.93 Hepworths’ aim was to ensure the least possible barrier between their menswear and their customers with the use of expanses of glass and sophisticated lighting at considerable cost,

89 ‘Fascias, face-lifts and “first-time evers”’, p. 2.
demonstrating the necessity of constant investment and responses to the continual changes in fashion retailing.

This constant reassessment of Hepworths’ design culminated in further changes into the 1980s. ‘A new year calls for new resolutions. A new decade calls for new thinking. But two decades call for a completely new approach. With 1980, we start a new decade. And it’s the start – after two decades – of a new “image” for Hepworths.’ Designed by London consultants McCann Design Associates utilising market research to study ‘the unconscious reactions of members of the public to all the elements of design’, the new Hepworths ‘H’ was a hand-written style in beige on dark brown. Just as in 1960 when they introduced the designs of Edward Burrett it was their high street presence that was a significant consideration, as the announcement insisted that ‘in the High Streets the shop fascia is the most important manifestation of a Company’s image…The Hepworth name and logo, however, will be instantly recognisable to the public.’ Unfortunately for Hepworths, this revision was only to last a couple of years before yet another redesign was attempted by Conran Associates. Then finally the Hepworths name was lost to British high streets as the stores were totally subsumed by the highly successful retailing project of Next.

---

95 ‘New Look for the 80’s’, pp. 2-3.
96 ‘New Look for the 80’s’, p. 3.
In the post-war period many of the other smaller Leeds multiples were just as interested in revamping their design. In 1952 the Fifty Shilling Tailor, which had been established in Leeds by Henry Price in the 1910s, began a process which would lead to a complete change of name, by abbreviating their title to FST.\textsuperscript{99} While this was largely driven by price – they had long been unable to sell a suit for their eponymous ‘fifty shillings’ – competition was clearly a motivating factor. These changes were accelerated the following year when FST was taken over by the large clothing conglomerate United Drapery Stores (UDS) and with substantial investment relaunched as the John Collier chain in March 1954, after managing director Joseph Collier.\textsuperscript{100} The name change was the result of research by advertising agents who advised that ‘men’s made-to-measure suits were a very personal purchase which called for a personalised trading name behind which it would be an advantage to have a real living person. The name of John Collier was recommended and adopted.\textsuperscript{101} The transformation from FST to John Collier was stark (see images below).

\textsuperscript{99} Fifty Shilling Tailors advertisement, \textit{Daily Express}, 15 March 1952, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{100} ‘FST to Become “John Collier”’, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 27 March 1954, p. 13.

The heavy square block lettering of FST had been completely transformed with the new John Collier name followed by the simple epithet ‘tailoring’ which was also used by Burtons. *Men’s Wear* described the new experimental fascia on view above the windows of the Tooting branch in London as a black and light grey checked background of vitrolite which ‘sets off the script, box-type lettering. Red neon lighting is set into the letters, which have Perspex faces. The lettering returns are finished in dark blue stove enamel, and the
edges and fascia frame are in stainless steel. The bold checkerboard effect, while eye-catching, seems to have remained an experiment as it does not appear in other images of redesigned John Collier stores, for example the Sunderland High Street West branch which had a dark plain fascia with white lettering. The typography chosen by UDS for the John Collier house style, while striking, is also awkward. The script style seems to have been based on a handwritten signature with its ungainly letters, all at slightly different angles. Alec Davis was particularly critical of the typography, stating ‘there is little excuse for bad lettering on a new sign such as that for John Collier’. Despite the lack of design elegance, by 1956 over 100 stores had been updated with the new fascia and it was reported that the first Price’s (FST) branch to have its name changed to John Collier had subsequently doubled its turnover. The new name also successfully entered into public consciousness through their television advertisements and associated jingle ‘John Collier, John Collier, The Window to Watch’. And UDS did persist with the John Collier typeface, maintaining the company’s consistent visual presence, as it was still evident on shop fronts into the 1980s such as the Slough store illustrated below.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.32 John Collier store with Castle Billiard Hall above, High Street West, Sunderland, 1960s.


102 ‘New Fascia for John Collier’, p. 17.
103 Davis, ‘House Style’, p. 47.
104 ‘Multiple Shop Doubled Turnover in 34 Weeks’, Men’s Wear, 14 January 1956, p. 10.
As the 1950s went on and into the 1960s the menswear sector in the United Kingdom continued to see upheavals and adjustments as competition remained intense. This could be witnessed on the high street as branches of the multiple tailors were opened, closed, refurbished and renamed. Two more of the Leeds firms which underwent development during this period were Alexandre and Weaver to Wearer. Inspired by the transformation of the Fifty Shilling Tailor, Joseph Collier of UDS negotiated a merger with another of the Leeds multiples, Alexandre, in 1954. In 1955 Alexandre announced it was expanding with a flagship store opening on the Strand in London’s West End followed by branches in two London suburbs, as well as Hull, Southampton, Portsmouth, Bedford and Sunderland. The clean lines and sans-serif capital lettering chosen by Alexandre for their shop fronts give a sense of authority while reinforcing the higher price point they sold their suits at. It was matched by the richly textured marble used for the 1956 fascia on the

---


108 Monopolies Commission, United Drapery Stores Ltd and Montague Burton Ltd, p. 15.
Strand branch in London which can be seen in the advertisement for Davies Shopfitters below.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.34 Advertisement for Davies Shopfitters featuring the new Alexandre branch on the Strand, London.


This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.35 Advertisement for Davies Shopfitters featuring an unidentified Alexandre branch.

*Men’s Wear*, 29 October 1960, p. i.
Weaver to Wearer produced some of the cheapest suits of the Leeds multiple tailors and in the mid-1950s was taken over by another conglomerate, Great Universal Stores (GUS). GUS also owned the menswear clothier Rego and converted many of those stores to Weaver to Wearer to the consternation of The Outfitter, who complained that ‘such a famous name as Rego in the men’s trade should be allowed apparently to pass into oblivion is obviously a matter of high policy at G.U.S headquarters’ while also acknowledging that ‘multiple tailoring is reckoned to be a more profitable venture than multiple outfitting in the lower and lower-medium price markets.’\(^{109}\) In 1964 it was announced that Weaver to Wearer was another of the Leeds multiples to disappear off the high street as its owner took the decision to discontinue the 200 strong chain and relaunch them as Neville Reed stores.\(^{110}\)

The end of the Second World War ushered in a period of substantial rebuilding, redesign and redevelopment by the Leeds multiple tailors on British high streets. The companies invested heavily in their physical architectural identities along with their visual styles as they competed for men’s attention and sales. To do this they were also forced to invest in the changing modes of contemporary design and men’s fashion and adapt them to appeal to their male customers. As national chains, the Leeds multiple tailors also had the ongoing challenge of creating and maintaining a nationally visible and coherent identity while recognising that regional and local differences continued to exist with men’s relationship to fashion. A key element of this process was the deliberate and strategic utilisation of London’s reputation as a fashion centre by the Leeds multiple tailors to promote themselves and their suits. The second section of this chapter will discuss how these themes were present in the window displays and the interior design of the stores of the Leeds multiple tailors.

---

2.3 Window Displays and Retail Interiors

The passers-by and window shoppers captured by an anonymous Hepworths photographer in the above image were interested enough in the Hepworths window to look at the displays; some have even stopped to study the garments – the company hoped that they would then be enticed inside to purchase. Burtons certainly recognised this as they reiterated in a company circular to all of their branches in 1951: ‘The Executive is of the opinion that the best form of publicity is a bold location and a well-dressed window that will attract passers-by to stop, and onlookers to go inside’.\(^\text{11}\) Throughout the post-war period window displays were a vital part of the selling strategy of the Leeds multiple tailors which along with the retail interiors is the focus of this section. As with their exterior designs, window displays and store interiors underwent considerable change from the

\(^{11}\) WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/122 Folder of memos, letters and branch circulars re sales, Branch circular No. 6254, 20 December 1951.
1940s to the 1970s. These developments reflected changes in retailing and consumer practices as well as in men’s fashion. The multiple tailors had long been concerned with the impact of the look of their stores on their selling success and firms such as Burtons and Hepworths had invested heavily through the inter-war period in improving their window displays and their store interiors. There was continuity in many of the messages from before the Second World War as these firms emphasised their modernity and worked on consistency and uniformity in their window displays with Burtons in particular centralising their display designs. Increasingly through the post-war period the design of the interior spaces of the stores became just as significant in the selling strategy. Inherent in the process of designing displays that appealed to men was the view of male consumers as being gendered in very particular ways. A noticeable development in the interior retail design was space and provision for ready-to-wear. The focus of this section will be on considering the ways that the Leeds multiple tailors responded to the gendered construction of consumers through the design of their stores and their window displays. They shifted from cluttered and crowded designs to those that conformed to ‘contemporary’ styles and emphasised comfort and leisure for male (and some female) consumers. The final section will look at an especially prominent change to the window displays of Hepworths and Burtons – the shift from torso to mannequin – which encapsulated many of the concerns of the multiples with satisfying masculine consumption.

Window dressing had seen a growing interest from the 1900s to the 1930s in Britain. Two main approaches to window displays dominated during this period: the ‘selling’ or ‘stocky’ window which showed as much of a shop’s stock as possible, which can be seen in the Montague Burton window display illustrated above; and the American ‘open’ method which with its simplified and streamlined look allowed more creative displays and became synonymous with ‘the professional, the skilled, the “artistic”, the “modern”, and “up-to-date”’. Lionel Jacobson bemoaned the standards of display by multiple tailors during this period with no professional training and when it ‘was nothing to see the entrance to a tailors shop cluttered up not only with lengths of cloth but with suits hanging like strings of sausages all round the doorway’ as the ‘prevailing theory was that if the customer did not see what he wanted in the window he would take it for granted you had not got it, and therefore the greatest ingenuity was exercised to pack the maximum amount of goods into the minimum amount of space.’ Laura Ugolini has argued that during the 1920s and 1930s for the menswear trade it was the new buildings, windows and interiors of the
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multiples and department stores that were generally associated ‘with an attractive and enticing image of modernity.’ This modernity was visible in all aspects of the store design, from the new facades with expanses of plate glass windows to the spacious interiors and was epitomised by two influential (and high-end) London menswear stores in particular: Austin Reed in Regent Street and Simpson Piccadilly (see image of interior below).

Simpson Piccadilly was far more avant-garde than Austin Reed’s flagship Regent Street store but they were both looked to as examples of excellence in menswear retailing. In particular, the design ethos exemplified by Simpson Piccadilly epitomised the pared back and clean-lined modernist approach which was continued after the war in examples such as Ashley Havinden’s designs for the menswear section of the ‘Britain Can Make It’ exhibition held at the V&A in 1946. These designs vividly demonstrated a sophisticated version of the modernist trend in menswear display and one that reflected a gendered view of appropriate masculine design that was minimal, restrained, and did not require decorative complications. It was the idealised design model which the Leeds multiple tailors went on to modify and adapt in their new and refurbished store windows and interiors.

There was increasing attention being paid to window displays and retail interiors in the post-war period. Architectural publication *Architectural Review* published a critical assessment

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.
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of the modern trends in shop design in 1957 where writer Herbert Tayler argued that it had made:

…the whole modern style in architecture real to the public…if
‘Contemporary’ has arrived in the suburbs, in the provinces, and in the
council houses, it is through the decor of shops, not the early modern
domestic interiors.\textsuperscript{118}

He went on to declare that because ‘everyone looks at shops’ it meant that their interiors
revealed ‘a popular free exhibition of modern design, and the public lapped it up, multi-
coloured walls, metal light shades, queer chairs, plants, the whole lot.’\textsuperscript{119}

Trade magazine \textit{Display} had noted the changes in the later 1940s and the significance of
American display trends in what has been described by Bethan Bide as a ‘a staggering pace
of change in visual merchandising on Oxford and Regent Streets’ and a recognition that
‘display was not simply about selling individual garments, but about selling the shopper a
desire for a new fashionable identity’.\textsuperscript{120} Arthur Sadler in his guide to menswear display also
saw that things had changed.

Modern men’s wear display is a technique which has developed during the
past twenty years. What was the mere placing of merchandise on view has
now become an art. The old crowded type of window display is outmoded
today. It showed merchandise certainly, but did not make it look attractive
enough, nor was it psychologically suited to the masculine mind.\textsuperscript{121}

The Leeds multiple tailors’ ongoing concern was with enacting this ethos and attempting to
redevelop their branches around the country so that they projected the appropriate kind of
masculinity through their displays to attract the large numbers of male consumers they
needed for their high volume business. A crucial part of this was their aim to remain safely
within the changing fashionable trends; while not necessarily leading fashion they did not
want to appear out of date.

Advice on window display design reiterated the necessity for menswear displays to reflect
the contemporary constructions of masculinity. The display manager for London
department store Peter Robinson in ‘Masculine Displays Please’ for trade journal \textit{Men’s
Wear} in 1947 explicitly connected ideas about masculinity to the design that he believed
men would best respond to:

\begin{quote}
The male makes up the generally accepted stronger sex, and, of course, this
is accentuated by the greater severity in his outward demeanour towards life
and the way he lives…So in the display of men’s wear it is quite correct to\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnoteref{119} Tayler, ‘Shops’, p. 101.
\footnoteref{120} \textit{Display}, March 1946, pp. 6-9 and \textit{Display}, October 1948, p. 12 cited in Bethan Bide, ‘Eric Lucking and
post-war window display at Liberty & Co.’, \textit{Costume Society}, 8 October 2015,
\texttt{<http://costumesociety.org.uk/blog/post/eric-lucking-and-post-war-window-display-at-liberty-co>}
[accessed 5 April 2016].
\footnoteref{121} Arthur Sadler, \textit{Men’s wear display: a basic manual in the theory and technique of window display for the men’s wear trade}
\end{footnotes}
be severe in the treatment of the merchandise, thereby creating the desired manly atmosphere.

A man’s outfitting display may be given a hard, ‘straight-line’ layout, which has a very clean, pleasing appearance and is so much more easy to look at than a display consisting of items placed here and there without any order or meaning.¹²²

This consensus of approach to modern display design was also articulated by Arthur Sadler in his 1954 guide to menswear display, as he reiterated the ideas first put forward decades earlier that cluttered and crowded displays were old-fashioned, lacked professionalism and did not appeal to the male consumer. Sadler outlined what he considered to be the important elements of masculine appeal:

Remember that men do respond to what might be called masculinity in a window. What is it? …It is not necessarily severe but certainly not fussy. Anything fussy is out of favour with the male temperament. There should be nothing tawdry about the display…Orderliness or clearness of effect is without doubt a great help in this quest for masculinity.¹²³

Sadler’s book was recommended for those designing menswear displays by a more general guide to window display, Harold Claude Murrills’ The Practical Display Instructor which was published in multiple editions. Murrills underlined Sadler’s themes and asserted that the ‘male shopper has a keen appreciation of style and quality and, for whichever clientele the display caters, handling of the merchandise must be impeccable.’¹²⁴ Order, clarity, quality and most importantly no hint of fussiness were the imperatives to create an appropriately masculine display.

By the late 1940s and into the 1950s when the Leeds multiple tailors were investing in and concentrating on their visual identities the majority were also actively attempting to enact these design principals. One of the Burtons branches that was completely refitted in the early 1950s was in Preston, Lancashire. Photographs of the new interior show the clean lines, smooth surfaces and lack of clutter which had become the accepted design aesthetic and had been showcased by Simpsons Piccadilly in the late 1930s. The dark wood which was used in Burtons stores before the war (which was associated with a masculinity of respectability, sobriety and authority) has been replaced by lighter surfaces of linoleum, brushed and powder coated metal light fittings, and pale figured-wood veneers. This modified and diluted version of modernism which was sometimes referred to as ‘contemporary’ as it was less puritan and severe, was much criticised by some commentators. Herbert Tayler in his 1957 review of trends in shop design was scathing of this form of design asking ‘what could be worse than this filtered modern – the style

¹²² P. F. Barrow, ‘Masculine Displays Please’, Men’s Wear, 8 February 1947, p. 16.
¹²³ Sadler, Men’s wear display, p. 18.
known as Contemporary? However, the modernist language of display design that was used by Sadler and adapted by the multiple tailors updated what was considered to be appropriately masculine in the post-war period and reflected other changes in men’s fashionable dress such as the desire for more colour and casual styles as well as the increasingly important impact of young men’s clothing choices on the menswear industry.

2.39 Interior of Preston, Lancashire, branch of Burtons, 1953. Note the female cashier in her booth to the right.

LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.5627.

The importance Burtons placed on their window displays can be seen in their 1953 Managers Guide. It included detailed guidelines on windows and displays which staff were instructed to read in conjunction with their internal publication ‘Window Displays’ which included ‘a series of practical suggestions and diagrams for differently designed types of windows. Plans are reproduced providing for a change of display every week of the year’. Windows were to be dressed weekly to ensure variety, as it was pointed out that ‘out of every one hundred customers 87 per cent buy by the attraction of sight’, while window display is ‘a greater selling force than newspaper and other forms of publicity combined. The ideal window dresser makes every garment look worth double. Ensure that the display

125 Tayler, ‘Shops’, p. 104.
looks as well in artificial light as it does in daylight."\textsuperscript{127} Individual store managers and display staff were responsible for maintaining the national standards of display, though later in 1953 the company began to introduce changes to these policies.

Lighting of window displays was significant for Burtons as they saw their windows as advertising at all times of the day and night. When in 1951, for example, the Ministry of Fuel and Power gave permission for electricity to be used for shop window lighting from 1pm on Christmas Eve, Burtons informed their retail managers to 'kindly arrange to take full advantage of the facility afforded, as window lighting and Neon Signs are the best form of publicity we have. There are no restrictions at all on the use of window lighting on Christmas Day, and Boxing Day, the 25th and 26th inst., consequently full advantage should be taken of this opportunity to illuminate your windows.'\textsuperscript{128} \textit{The Practical Display Instructor} by Murrills also included a long section on lighting, including detailed technical directions and arguing that 'display as one of the greatest visual selling agents, demands good lighting...In the shop window, lighting should reinforce the display design, strengthen the focal points and give emphasis to texture, to form, and to colour.'\textsuperscript{129} Moreover, many of the store window displays photographed by Burtons that are held in the LMG collection have been taken at night or under artificial lighting to demonstrate its effects on the designs (see for example, illustration 2.40 of a 1955 window display photographed at night).

In November 1953 newly appointed Burtons Display Manager Mr E. Pountney outlined his expectations in a letter to all Burtons branch managers:

> The policy of display must be [a] clean, plain, selective and honest presentation of the goods we wish to sell ...don't get a 'patter' complex – 'aids' to display such as vases, foliage, carpets etc won't entice the customers over the doorstep if he cannot plainly see in the window that which he wishes to buy.\textsuperscript{130}

The necessity of balancing selling and design was key for the 'display man' in the multiple tailoring business with the garments and cloth taking priority. The aim was to attract customers and not to alienate them which meant, as with the majority of design decisions by multiple tailors, they chose to take a middle path that referenced the current trends without necessarily leading them. As Pountney went on to reiterate in a number of points:

> We don’t want 'open' window displays but on the other hand a packed window only confuses the potential buyers...Remember that a properly dressed tailoring window will leave the potential customer with a good
impression of the resources of the firm…We like a clean window but
everything is subsidiary to turnover.\footnote{Letter from Mr. E. Pountney, pp. 1-2.}

Pountney’s directive was part of the overhaul of Burtons by the Jacobson brothers as a
result of the merger with Jackson the Tailor earlier in 1953. Updating and modernising
Burtons display was one of their priorities as Lionel Jacobson made clear at a series of
Burtons managers conferences in 1953 which demonstrated the difficulties in balancing the
company’s national aims with local differences. In July Jacobson showed his understanding
of variations across the hundreds of British high streets with a Burtons presence as he
stated that displays ‘must fit not only the shop but the locality and the class of trade for
which you are catering in that area. I do not expect to see a Regent Street display in
Rotherham or Barrow or an Ashington display in Leicester.’\footnote{WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/124 Jacksons: Memorandum September 1953 on Area Managers’ Conference July 30th, 1953 by Lionel Jacobson, p. 1.} Later that year in his
briefing regarding the upcoming 1954 advertising campaign and new visual identity which
was a fundamental change for the company, Jacobson discussed his longer-term intention
that display would be centralised under his personal direction. He emphasised its
importance by insisting that display ‘should have priority with regard to staff’ and that ‘a
first class man on display would undoubtedly have a much greater influence on turnover
when dressing the windows at a number of the branches.’\footnote{WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/124 Jacksons: Report on Conference of Area Managers Held on December 18th, 1953, p. 2.} The local and the national
again appear as company considerations in a 1957 article about Burtons for the in-house
magazine of W.H. Smith, the national chain of newsagents:

Local tastes vary less in their business than in ours, though obviously there
must be a greater emphasis on sports and country clothes in the small town
and seaside branches than in the cities. But subject to such variations, the
desire of the small town customer is to be able to buy locally a garment as
good, as fashionable and as cheap as he could in London or elsewhere.

To cater for this desire the company buys its cloth, sets its styles and adjusts
its manufacturing organisation for the whole country. It indicates to the
display department which lines are to be featured from time to time, and
the display department with its teams of travelling window dressers decide
how the displays are to be made.\footnote{WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/124 Public Relations: Newsbasket: The Journal of the Staff of W.H. Smith & Son, September 1957, p. 10.}

However, the overall ideal was for strong and coherent displays which could be seen on
every high street and which showcased contemporary design. These principals were to be
put into practise by the Burtons display staff and visible to the public in their branch
windows across British high streets. A 1955 window display at one of Burtons Leeds
branches demonstrated the updated company style. With a theme of ‘Charcoal Greys’ the
back wall of the window enclosure was covered in rough cut stone cladding which gave a
rugged and textured background to the four jackets and seven cloth lengths – folded flat with no complicated pleating and ruffling – simply arranged on narrow metal frames. Price tickets, while visible, were unobtrusive and the cloths and garments were arranged at a variety of heights and angles to provide visual interest. This window could not be accused of being fussy or cluttered while the grey theme echoed the contemporary popularity and colour trends for grey cloths in menswear.\textsuperscript{135}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.jpg}
\caption{2.40 Night view of ‘Charcoal Greys’ window display at one of Burtons Leeds branches, 1955. LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.7094.}
\end{figure}

The other Leeds multiple tailors were also attempting to modernise their displays. The \textit{Outfitter} reported in June 1955 on Alexandre’s expansion plans beginning with a new store on the Strand in London which included the following novelty for the shop’s main window: ‘a revolving display stage, 13 feet in diameter. This turns round every three minutes, so that two completely dressed displays can be shown alternately.’\textsuperscript{136} Throughout the 1950s Hepworths kept their staff updated in their in-house magazine the \textit{Happy Happy}

\textsuperscript{135} For example, the men’s trade journal \textit{Style for Men} featured grey as one of the main colours for menswear in 1953 as part of a colour supplement in association with the British Colour Council for their March 1953 issue and in 1956 \textit{Men’s Wear} considered that: ‘Medium and dark grey pinhead and pick-and-pick and mid-grey worsted flannel remain the “bread and butter” lines of the medium-class trade and, consequently, lead all other cloth styles in the season’s ordering.’ ‘Men’s Wear Review of The Season’s Merchandise, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 14 April 1956, p. 24.

\textsuperscript{136} ‘New Ideas at Alexandre. Revolving stage changes display every three minutes’, \textit{The Outfitter}, 4 June 1955, p. 12.
with images of the newly refitted stores. From the mid-1950s Hepworths added the tag 'the man’s shop' to many of their new store fascia, the authority of the statement slightly undermined by the choice of lower-case lettering for the phrase and by the 1960s they had replaced it with ‘Hand Cut Tailoring’. However, during this period as has been discussed, there was considerable upheaval in the multiple tailoring sector and the high-profile initiatives in advertising and display by Burtons from 1954 were likely to have provided an impetus for their competition, perhaps prompting Hepworths to accentuate the masculinity of their stores. Hepworths man’s shops followed a similar design aesthetic to Burtons with interiors of smooth surfaces, uniform utilitarian furniture, well-fitted and lit interior displays and clearly defined areas for cloth and garment display. But as can also be glimpsed from the following images, the window displays were fuller of stock than the Burtons 1955 window above, demonstrating the balance required between idealised design principals, attracting a wide range of male consumers, and the need to sell clothing faced by all of the Leeds multiple tailors. Hepworths had clearly taken the decision to be less adventurous in their window display designs, rejecting a very ‘open’ style of display to include a greater number of garments.

2.41 Interior and exterior of Hepworths Altrincham branch in Greater Manchester.


137 LMG hold the following Happy Heppy issues: Winter 1952, Spring Summer 1953, Christmas 1955, Spring Summer 1956, Spring Summer 1957.
2.42 Ground floor and first floor of one of Hepworths Leeds branches, 1955.

2.43 Hepworths branches, 1956.
Not all of the Leeds multiple tailors followed the visual style that was considered modern and up to date however. Weaver to Wearer appealed to the lower end of the menswear market and in 1960 their window displays attracted particular criticism by the trade journal *Men’s Wear*. Following on decades of design and display advice, the article equated windows filled with garments with old fashioned sales techniques but also went further by explicitly equating a garment-filled display as being working-class: ‘the more open the display, the higher the class of trade; and the denser, the more “working class” it is.’\(^{138}\) To illustrate the point, a stock-filled Weaver to Wearer window was pictured littered with price tickets. This condemnation summed up many of the longstanding prejudices against the multiple tailors which were regularly expressed by the menswear press (which largely represented the interests of independent tailors and outfitters who were facing increased pressure and competition during this period) as being too uniform in their appearance, dominating the high street with their numerous branches, and catering to undiscerning or gullible male consumers swayed by the advertised low prices.


‘How Dense Can You Get? In display it all depends on the class of trade you are after’, *Men’s Wear*, 13 August 1960, p. 12.

Through the later 1950s and into the 1960s the design of display and interiors of the multiple tailors became more centralised and was closely linked with advertising and

\(^{138}\) ‘How Dense Can You Get? In display it all depends on the class of trade you are after’, *Men’s Wear*, 13 August 1960, p. 12.
initiatives in sales and marketing as design gradually became more significant. Burtons directors demonstrated an appreciation for modern design in the luxury 1957 refurbishment of their Leeds directors’ dining room which was photographed for *Architectural Review*. The room interior and much of the furniture was designed by architect Derek Walker, highlighted by Swedish lighting, black leather on the ceiling, chairs by leading furniture designer Robin Day, and a large photographic landscape mural of a kind which were also a feature of Burtons store interiors. And by 1964 the Burtons display department had a staff of over 400 and a central advisory bureau at the company head office in Leeds. Brian Rayner who worked for Burtons in the 1960s as a cutter remembers that if the company

…decided to do the windows out in a different format there would be a team in in Leeds that would shape it all and then there was a team, a production team of 600 doing sets of that to take to the stores. So the team that would take the suits would also take the shop fittings.

Rayner also made the point that the Leeds location was advantageous to easily get to other parts of the country, which is why the Burtons Hudson Road factory site has been retained for warehousing and distribution by the current owner of the brand. The window displays were designed and arranged with lighting and props which can be seen in a number of photographs from the LMG collection, for example a display set up from 1964 (see below). These displays were then rolled out to all of the Burtons branches, such as the Grimsby branch from 1966 which featured window displays without backing boards – a design element that was an essential part of the clean and uncluttered aesthetic and had been used in more innovative shop design since the 1950s – allowing the entire interior to be viewed through the glass (see below). The images of the directors’ dining room and the shop interiors from the mid-1960s also demonstrated Burtons growing use of colour and decorative elements in the design while maintaining a restrained effect, particularly in the window displays. These shifts, especially the increasing use of colour, indicate the influence of fashion trends on design during this period as the impact of synthetic fabrics and materials with their unlimited colour possibilities fed into the use of bright and saturated shades and patterns.

---

141 Interview with Brian Rayner, 6 November 2012, LMG, LEEAG.2012.0589.
2.45 ‘...the suspended ceiling in which the lights are fitted is black leather. The lights over the mural are Swedish.’


This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

2.46 Burtons window display design and set up with full-figure mannequins, 1964.

LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.0644.
The 1960s saw Hepworths step up the design developments that they had begun from the late 1940s and colour was an important element of their new approach. In February 1960 they launched what they called their ‘Biggest Ever Sales Campaign’ and highlighted the changes in their new displays.\(^{142}\) This was a considerable investment and they spent £500,000 on their shops in the process of refurbishment and redesigns over the 1959-1960 year.\(^{143}\) Hepworths had decided to employ the experienced and inventive display designer Eric Lucking to work with their display team.\(^{144}\) This is another example of Hepworths taking innovative and creative design decisions as it coincided with their collaboration with Hardy Amies. For his first spring display Lucking used ‘strong vertical background pattern and liberal colour’ providing ‘a calm, clean-cut masculine setting’.\(^{145}\) Unfortunately the only image located of Lucking’s displays for Hepworths are in black and white, including the

---


\(^{143}\) ‘Hepworths Spent £500,000 on Shops Last Year’, *Men’s Wear*, 3 December 1960, p. 24.

\(^{144}\) Lucking was renowned for his work at the leading London department store, Liberty, where he was display manager and created exciting new displays in the 1940s which contributed to its change of image as an up-to-date fashion store. His work was very much in the ‘open’ style and utilised the full space of the window with few garments and props. Bide, ‘Eric Lucking and post-war window display’.

first designs which were shown in Spring 1960, meaning the ‘...felt-covered panels, in varying tones of green – sparked with brilliant chartreuse – are slightly off-set from bronze green rear walls’ can only be imagined.¹⁴⁶

Hepworths new and innovative approach to design was noticed by the menswear trade press later in 1960. *Men’s Wear* published a piece which praised the new window displays of the firm (after first listing all of the aspects they considered were problematic with multiple tailoring displays):

A window style deliberately linked to a sales pattern, with a common ‘handwriting’ for every branch shop, is a familiar feature of multiple trading…it cannot be denied that there is a ‘sameness’ about the multiple facade. In London’s Oxford-street, for instance, there are five tailors in a row and at first glance it is difficult to tell them apart. Through the years most of the multiples have tried a display break-through, but few with success.¹⁴⁷

In the opinion expressed by *Men’s Wear* it seems these developments had a dramatic and noticeable effect on the visual appearance of their stores:

The new Hepworths’ displays…which first brought their dominant colour note and lively composition on to the scene for the spring, were a genuine break with all previous multiple practice and set an incisive style which is all their own…These displays are part of a promotional plan which is one of

---

¹⁴⁶ ‘Displays Have New Look’, p. 3.
the most ambitious the trade has yet seen. It is designed to change the entire public image of the firm.\textsuperscript{148}

The article goes on to describe the key elements of Lucking’s uncluttered and crispness of approach with its use of strong colours (‘powerful reds, orange and yellow-colours which would frighten all but the expert’), simple structures and an overall design which could be installed complete to all of the many different sized windows the multiple had across its hundreds of branches.\textsuperscript{149} The \textit{Men’s Wear} writer was particularly impressed by what was viewed as evidence of the company’s decision to take a more up-market approach by emphasising tailoring craft (the introduction of the phrase ‘Hand Cut Tailoring’) and what it described as ‘prestige appeal’; the result it approvingly noted was a style that ‘is essentially masculine’ due to its associations with bespoke tailoring traditions.\textsuperscript{150}

The emphasis on window design and displays was effective. Brian Hill, who worked for Alexandre in the 1960s and then Hepworths from 1970, remembered how significant the window displays were:

BH: The big thing, the the big vehicle was the shop windows…there were a whole series of promotions. And they would make models to go in the windows and they’d be dressed and you know usually that that would be and then people would look at it and go, ‘Oh yeah, oh I like that, uh I want the suit in the window’. Ah ok. And you’d be surp— Amazed at how often that happened.

DS: Oh really? Ah right.

BH: ‘I want that one’. ‘Cause lots of people didn’t have much imagination so it was oh yeah, yeah that, exactly that, yeah exactly that.\textsuperscript{151}

Just as Burtons had through the 1960s Hepworths built up their centralised approach to their window display design. In 1968 the company established a display training centre in Ilford for their display cadets, one of whom was twenty-year-old Reg Martin who

…started as a junior salesman at the Sheffield branch of Hepworths. During the past year his duties included helping visiting display men as they dressed the windows. He watched attentively and listened hard. And it was not long before he came to a decision. He wanted to become a displayman.\textsuperscript{152}

Hepworths had previously worked with three regional centres for display training, at Ilford, Liverpool and Newport in Wales. This development demonstrated their commitment to ensuring that their staff experienced a set pattern and method of training to create the required company look. In 1971 they commissioned a complete review of their displays by

\textsuperscript{148} ‘Break-Through in Multiple Display’, p. vi.
\textsuperscript{149} ‘Break-Through in Multiple Display’, pp. vi-vii.
\textsuperscript{150} ‘Break-Through in Multiple Display’, p. vii.
\textsuperscript{151} Interview with Brian Hill, 8 July 2013, LEEAG.2013.0165.
\textsuperscript{152} ‘Twenty young, ambitious cadets take their first step towards a display career at Ilford’, \textit{Hepworth Mercury}, February 1969, p. 2.
an external consultant which also reviewed the displays of their competitors to assist their formation of a new display programme.\footnote{HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, ‘Display Recommendations for Hepworths Ltd October 1971’.} By the mid-1970s their process of designing displays was becoming increasingly sophisticated. In 1975 the company opened a ‘shop’ in their new Design Centre housed in their head office in Claypit Lane in central Leeds.\footnote{‘The shop that never sells a suit - but what an influence it has on a turnover of £28 million’, \textit{Hepworth Mercury}, July 1975, p. 4.} This was to be ‘the test bed for display ideas, the birth place of the next season’s theme for window displays, and the brain tank for forward thinking plans for future development in window and branch interior promotion.’\footnote{‘The shop that never sells a suit’, p. 4.} Once designs had been decided a seasonal ‘display bible’ was collated to communicate all of the technical and merchandise details, while the test shop with the finalised designs was then opened to the ‘150 strong field force of displaymen and supervisors under Display Manager Ken Hunton, who have the responsibility of re-creating the master plan in all the branch windows.’\footnote{‘Face-Lift for Branches’, p.4.} Hepworths window displays of 1960 were only part of the overhaul of the entire look of the company including redesigning the store interiors and unifying the signage with the new typography and logo. They hoped that the ‘modernized shop interiors with their open-style layouts and bright contemporary decor will entice and welcome new customers’ (an example of one of these stores is illustrated later in this section).\footnote{‘Face-Lift for Branches’, p.4.} The aim was to provide a comfortable atmosphere for their customers, and significantly, this was to include women:

Hand-painted wallpapers, the latest in decorative interior lighting, new display and hanging units, comfortable furniture and colourful rugs will all make the shop as attractive to the wife as the husband and create an ideal atmosphere for choosing clothes.\footnote{‘The Influence of the Woman Shopper’, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 12 May 1956, p. 18.}

The acknowledgement of the presence of women within the primarily masculine environment of the multiple tailors as participants in the buying of men’s suits, appeared to differ regionally with women being more influential in the north of England.\footnote{WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/124 Jacksons: …from one small shop, letter from Lionel Jacobson to R. Davidson, Hudson Road Mills, 24 September 1953, with booklet ‘…from one small shop’, Mass Observation, ‘Clothes’, File Report A17, 1939, p. 20, Mass Observation Online, <http://www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/FileReport-A17> [Accessed September 30, 2016].} Lionel Jacobson of Jackson the Tailor (most of their branches were in the north) had directed his salesmen to welcome the wives of their customers with courtesy and a cup of tea before the Second World War and a Burtons manager of ‘Worktown’ (Bolton Lancashire) was reported by Mass Observation in the late 1930s to have many women customers.\footnote{‘Face-Lift for Branches’, p.4.} Women had always purchased clothing for men, and particularly for male children, but the process of buying a bespoke or made-to-measure suit was largely regarded as a primarily
male practice. However, Jacobson’s influence led to Burtons experiments in 1958 to ‘break the male atmosphere of the store. Every Saturday while the husband was being fitted, a female employee served tea and biscuits to his wife, and sweets to the children.’

An accommodation for the presence of women was one indication of the changing nature of the Leeds multiple tailors’ retailing style which was reflected in the design of the store interiors. As described above, Hepworths 1960 launch of their new designs was a decisive step away from the dark wood fittings and utilitarian style of the traditional tailoring shop. What was considered acceptable for masculine consumption was changing. In 1967 Hepworths described the process of shopfitting by their architects’ department which included a number of decorative elements which would have probably not been considered appropriate previously and included ‘carpeting, wallpaper, armchairs, and any artistic touches like a piece of sculpture or glass-work, which might help the general atmosphere inside the shop.’ The aim was ‘to give the shop a pleasant, leisurely but smart atmosphere to put the customer at his ease…to give it the “modern look”…to make it recognisably a Hepworths shop, so that the Hepworths image holds good wherever you go.’ These elements were employed for all parts of the store, including bespoke and ready-to-wear and can be seen in the image of Hepworths Coventry and High Street Kensington branches below, the interiors decorated with features such as an aluminium sculpture and patterned carpet. Comfort, ease and leisure were all significant new additions to the language of the multiples’ retailing design, revealing broader changes in men’s fashion and clothing with the increasing importance of ready-to-wear and casual clothing.

2.49 ‘New look Coventry branch uses aluminium sculptures and concealed lighting to set off new style in men’s shops.’

*Ugolini, Men and Menswear, p. 211, p. 215.
*‘Fascias, face-lifts and “first-time evers”’, p. 2.
*‘Fascias, face-lifts and “first-time evers”’, p. 2.
As discussed in Chapter 1, the manufacture and sale of ready-to-wear suits had always been important for the Leeds multiple tailors as well as their made-to-measure tailoring, though this was not necessarily admitted to (for example, in 1953 Burtons briefed their new advertising agency that ready-to-wear made up around 50 per cent of their total sales, but with particular instruction that this figure was not to be published). The multiple tailors historically played up the differences between off-the-peg and made-to-measure suits. The latter was associated with fit, quality and prestige while ready-to-wear had connotations of cheapness and inferior choice, though there were some high-end ready-made brands, most notably Austin Reed. In a 1942 article Sir Montague Burton estimated that around 75 per cent of British men’s suits sold were made-to-measure, arguing that ‘the bespoke system provides the customer with a much wider choice in design, shade and style; each length in a tailor’s shop is a potential suit for almost any man. Selection becomes restricted in the ready-to-wear department.’

Despite Sir Montague’s reservations the 1940s saw increasing discussion of the possibilities of ready-to-wear. A 1944 report by Style for Men argued that it was the future of the menswear trade, with the resultant need for retailing to increase space and display to accommodate this evolution. A 1947 Men’s Wear article issued ready-made advice, pointing out that:

The art of merchandising ready-to-wear suits is quite as technical and important as the measuring for bespoke suits…To-day, more than ever, the man who asks for a ready-to-wear suit is most critical and demands that his

---

166 Austin Reed made a concerted move into ready-to-wear suits in 1926 and worked with Leeds tailor John Barran to develop a range of ‘fashionable, well-made garments that combined a wide choice of high-quality fabrics with over a hundred fittings’. Ehrman, ‘Broken Traditions: 1930-55’, p. 100.
168 Clem Attwood, ‘Deadlock in the Clothing Trade?’, Style for Men, August 1944, pp. 102-104.
suit is well cut, well made, and that the quality of the cloth used is of the
best pattern and colour procurable at the price charged.\textsuperscript{169}

The trade press also looked to America with its ‘extremely vigorous, dynamic, mass-
producing clothing industry’, 80 per cent of which was ready-to-wear.\textsuperscript{170} Despite the
bespoke snobbery, ready-made was to become increasingly significant for the Leeds
multiple tailors through the post-war period which became apparent through the design of
their retail stores. One of the companies to recognise this was Alexandre. In 1948 as part of
an expansion programme they added ready-to-wear departments to shops in Warrington
and Rotherham with others planned for Birmingham, Barnsley and a new store for
Sheffield which was to include ‘a section devoted to men’s sports slacks’.\textsuperscript{171} Alexandre’s
decision to make provision for sports clothes and ready-to-wear gives an indication of the
shifts in men’s fashion, as men adopted casual and leisure styles.

And by 1953, Burtons were also strongly in favour of the advantages of ready-made suits
with an exhortation in the Managers Guide to staff ‘that we are anxious to cultivate the sale
of Ready-Tailored Garments’.\textsuperscript{172} While outlining the economic reasons for the benefits of
ready-to-wear suits, it was also pointed out that:

\ldots not quite so much is expected of an R.M. [ready-made] in wear, fit,
exactness of shade or pattern, as of the ‘Special’. The R.M. is now generally
recognised as good enough for the ‘second best’ or business wear by men
who at one time would have scorned the idea of donning stock clothes. It is
great convenience for the man in a hurry, who has not time to wait for a
suit to be made for him.\textsuperscript{173}

Burtons emphasised the convenience and ease of purchase for men buying an off-the-peg
suit and in 1959 Burtons included ready-to-wear suits for their sales staff to inspect and
rate at their national sales conference along with a detailed questionnaire into the type of
suits and cloths (both ready-made and made-to-measure) their customers were asking
for.\textsuperscript{174} However, Burtons were clearly somewhat grudging in their appreciation for ready-
to-wear suits, which were still felt by many to be inferior to made-to-measure, no matter
the quality.\textsuperscript{175} In 1965 they introduced a high price point ready-made range (the ‘Director’)
but these were to be promoted as hand-cut just as with their made-to-measure tailoring.\textsuperscript{176}

Made-to-measure was still seen as essential to Burtons’ identity as a multiple tailor and this
attitude to the changing nature of men’s fashion and clothing during this period would see
Burtons face increasing difficulties as the 1960s ended.

\textsuperscript{171} ‘Alexandre will develop ready-to-wear business’, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 6 March 1948, p. 9. Though made-to-measure
 remained their most important product until the 1960s. Brian Hill.
\textsuperscript{174} WYL1951/121 Harrogate Conference 25 November 1959 - Questionnaire for the Annual Conference.
\textsuperscript{175} ‘Mr Sydney Jacobson Warns Against Too Much Concentration on Price’, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 9 April 1960, p. 10.
The 1960s saw a number of other changes in menswear retailing such as the advent of ready-to-wear fashion ‘shops-within-shops’ and boutiques. In 1959 Men’s Wear asserted that the first boutique for men had opened in London’s Knightsbridge and defined this new style of store as a ‘small shop essentially intimate in atmosphere with the purpose of selling advanced fashions for customers who have the taste and money to appreciate them.’ In fact the streets of London were already being graced with a number of boutiques in the 1950s that were subsequently recognised as being hugely influential; Mary Quant’s Bizarre, Bill Green’s Vince Man’s Shop and John Stephen’s first store His Clothes all heralded the significant changes for fashion retailing which reverberated through the 1960s. Boutiques appeared nationally and in 1966 the middle-market tabloid the Daily Express reported in their new ‘Manstyle’ men’s fashion column that the ‘multiples have been forced to put a premium on fashion by the large number of boutiques which have opened up all over the country.’ Hepworths had responded to this new retail style in 1964 by opening a Hardy Amies for Hepworths shop at Woollands in Knightsbridge and then consolidating the trend with the launch of similar outlets in Debenhams branches, the first in Sheffield in 1965. However, high turnover and small numbers sold by boutiques posed a challenge for the Leeds multiple tailors as they remained loyal to their historic dependence on made-to-measure tailoring while simultaneously recognising the need to introduce greater proportions of ready-to-wear.

The expectations and demands of tailoring customers also meant retailers had to make sure they stocked large volumes. The Leeds ready-to-wear suit manufacturer Sumrie mostly supplied other retailers but in the 1956 they opened a ‘shop-within-a-shop’ at department store Robinson and Cleaver’s on Regent Street in London’s West End. The description of the Sumrie shop gives an indication of the space requirements faced by retailers for ready-to-wear as the shop needed:

…visible hanging space for about 3,000 garments in forward stock…One end of the shop is taken by a battery of five fitting rooms, and there are further two at the other end. Inside, a large wall mirror placed in the right position in relation to another on the back of the entrance door enables the customer to get an unimpeded back view of the clothes being tried.

---

The manager noted that despite the number of sizes and fittings of garments stocked, they still had over 75 per cent of trousers requiring adjustments by their customers. This was, he felt, a problem that was ‘psychological rather than physical... The reason, it was finally decided, was not that the trousers were wrong, but that no two men liked their trousers the same length; nor, for that matter, did they agree on sleeve lengths. The prevalence of quality and relatively inexpensive made-to-measure tailoring on British high streets meant that many men were accustomed to garments that were fitted them individually, even if that was ready-to-wear.

Despite these attitudes the Leeds multiple tailors made space for ready-to-wear within their stores. Images from interiors of Burtons and Hepworths stores from the 1960s showcase the approach these companies took to designing spaces that would encourage men to purchase. In their 1960 Rotherham store (image below), Hepworths included a decorative suspended ceiling, a comfortably arranged seating area with carpet and a selection of chairs as well as changing rooms and discreet mirrors. The ready-to-wear section was upstairs, clearly signalling its relative importance to the company with the made-to-measure department given the prime ground floor sales space. The garments are on rails at two levels and while on open display, are not easily accessible to the customer as they have tables and chairs placed in front of them. A photograph of the interior of a Burtons branch in Leeds (probably from the mid-1960s) is very similar. As with the earlier Hepworths store, the Burtons interior pushes the garments to the edges of the room and are tightly packed on the rails which would have discouraged browsing. The photograph was aimed to be used for Burtons publicity as the customers and staff are posed in mid sales consultation but showcases the contemporary design details the company was installing as it updated its branch interiors throughout the country. These features included a patterned linoleum floor, mirrors and wooden chairs conforming to the current mid-century style.


2.52 Interior of Leeds Burtons branch, c.mid-1960s. LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.4857.
By the 1970s the interiors of Hepworths and Burtons stores were transformed into spaces that were dominated by ready-to-wear clothing and accessories, with suits and tailoring making up a much smaller proportion of their sales. The companies opened larger stores (such as Burtons with their superstores) with large expanses of shop floor and all stock available for customers to browse at their leisure as the expectations around men’s participation in consuming clothing and fashion had changed. These ‘bigger, better, brighter’ shops included Hepworths experimental large shop in the Arndale shopping centre in central Manchester providing a very different experience to that of the Burtons or Hepworths 1960s stores above. This focus on the changing design approaches taken by the Leeds multiples in the decades after the Second World War for their window displays and retail interiors reveals the continuing investment made by these companies in responding to the trends in menswear retailing. They were not leaders in retail design as they had to cater to a broad market in terms of taste, geography and age, but they actively employed new design styles to make their displays and retail spaces appealing and contemporary for male consumers.

2.4 Mannequins

‘Saturday night sees me standing with my hands shoved deep into my overcoat pockets looking in at the suits on the dummies in Montague Burton’s window.’ Victor Brown, the main character in Stan Barstow’s 1960 novel A Kind of Loving is a young man of twenty who notices men’s clothes (both his and others) as he comments on styles and suits throughout the book. His idle window gazing is just the effect that Burtons intended to create with their window display designs of cloth lengths and suited mannequins. To demonstrate the fit and style of tailored garments, the Leeds multiple tailors had always relied on displaying them in their store windows on mannequins or dummies. In 1947 Men’s Wear reported on...
developments in American retail design with an outline of the design of architect Paul László’s ideal menswear store. His aim was to create an ‘inviting place where merchandise is shown to the best advantage and a chance is given to complete a sale in the shortest possible time and with ease’, with an atmosphere ‘that has the informality and intimacy of the customer’s home’ but with no provision for the use of models or dummies ‘as Mr László feels that most available to-day are bad.’ What he meant by bad was unfortunately not recorded. However, these forms have often been viewed as problematic as substitutes for the living and moving human body garments are designed to clothe.

While mannequins are thought to have originated in the 1700s, they rapidly developed in the late-1800s in Europe and the United States with the expansion of retailing, and have been subject to constant attempts to create an effective body on which to display and sell clothing – whether this is fashionable and idealised, stylised or realistic. Most attention has been paid to female mannequins and although it is clear that figures with arms, legs and heads were available in male forms as well as female from the 1920s, these were not used by the multiple tailors. This seems to have been for a combination of reasons: mannequins were expensive and especially in the 1920s and 1930s were unwieldy and could be easily damaged (especially those made of wax); the Leeds multiple tailors had their own shopfitting departments and especially the larger companies such as Burtons and Hepworths endeavoured to control retail display in-house. It was not until the 1950s and 1960s that technical developments in mannequin design with the introduction of plastic and fibreglass made both their production and use easier.

There may have also been discomfort with the reality of a complete figure and its association with feminine fashionable shopping practices as opposed to the masculine nature of the male torso form with its strong connotations of bespoke tailoring traditions: ‘Without heads or discernible personalities, forms gave off an aura of good tailoring and respectability, and seemed more appropriately humble, tastefully indifferent to their appearance.’ These were all of the traditions that the Leeds multiples adhered to, although as they increasingly engaged with fashion and design change through the post-war period they also began to discard the tailoring bust. However, the gendered nature of the mannequin body continued to be problematic, as Michael Southgate of British mannequin firm Adel Rootstein described: ‘Even when you do get a male mannequin with the right look...you’ve got to reassure the

---

188 Burtons 1953 Managers Guide included a warning about wax figures, that they should be ‘kept from the rays of the sun either direct or through glass and from head of illuminated signs etc. as this is not only liable to melt the figures but to bleach them’. WYL1951/5 Managers Guide, Fifth Edition, p. 57.
189 Schneider, Vital Mummies, p. 87.
male customer with tweeds and natural wood and nice masculine elements all around the display.\textsuperscript{190}

Based on evidence of photographs of store windows, the multiple tailors appeared to have mostly used torso forms (in the style of dressmaker’s dummies) for their displays until the early-to-mid 1960s. In 1953, in his overall review of Burtons, Lionel Jacobson addressed some of the display problems facing the company, including the type of torsos they were using: ‘Whilst the Jackson bust was not entirely satisfactory it was agreed that it should be sent to Leeds with a view to cutting special window models. It was felt that the new Burton busts were not satisfactory but in view of the expense they could not be scrapped immediately.’\textsuperscript{191} Even comparatively simple display busts or torsos were complicated by the ongoing need to reflect the fashionable and idealised body, which could be seen in advertisements in \textit{Men’s Wear} for male display torsos in the late 1940s and early 1950s, including one from Levine & Son that boasted ‘Pronounced muscular detail’ and ‘Washable sun-tan finish’.\textsuperscript{192} The attention to detail of this idealised representation of the male unclothed body suggests that these forms were likely to be aimed at men’s outfitters displaying underwear or more casual clothing rather than tailored outerwear, supporting Jobling’s argument that in the post-war period advertising of men’s underwear presented a sense of pleasure for men in their bodies through conspicuous consumption.\textsuperscript{193}


\textsuperscript{191} WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/124 Jacksons: Memorandum September 1953 on Area Managers’ Conference July 30th, 1953 by Lionel Jacobson, Memorandum of Joint Conference of Area Managers and Display Men Held on Thursday July 30th, 1953, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{192} Levine & Son advertisement, \textit{Men’s Wear}, 9 June 1951, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{193} This is in respect of publicity for Lyle and Scott y-fronts in the 1950s. Jobling, \textit{Advertising Menswear}, pp. 66-67.
In 1965 a *Men’s Wear* article showed some of the new full-sized figures that were becoming available including examples from mannequin companies Adel Rootstein and Gems whose fibreglass model cost the significant sum of £55 (£830), though it did also feature flexibility and ‘a wide choice of heads’.\(^\text{194}\) Harold Claude Murrills in his 1967 guide to window display also mentioned the possibilities of display in the new male mannequins available, as the male ‘full figure has been revolutionised in recent years and, when shown in natural groups, will introduce atmosphere into the window and display the garments to advantage.’\(^\text{195}\) These trends were adopted by the Leeds multiples and could be seen in images of their window displays in the mid-1960s with full-bodied display mannequins with arms, legs and heads. The figures visible in Burtons display photographs from 1964 (see 2.46 window display design) and 1966 (see 2.47 interior of the Grimsby branch), for example, have white sculpted features including hair and faces but with no additions of wigs or skin detail. Getting the skin colouration correct on a male (or child) mannequin had caused problems for display designers since the 1920s, ‘because neither men nor children use makeup, any attempt to give even a natural blush to their cheeks ran the danger of creating an unnatural or disgusting effect.’\(^\text{196}\) By choosing an all-over chalk-white unnatural tone Burtons avoided this particular problem. The photographs below of Burtons window display mock-ups also show these mannequins in closer detail. The addition of arms and legs allowed full suits

---


\(^{195}\) Murrills, *The Practical Display Instructor*, p. 135.

\(^{196}\) Schneider, *Vital Mummies*, p. 94.
and outfits to be displayed, especially the more form-fitting styles which appeared from the late 1950s and were more mainstream by the 1960s.\textsuperscript{197} The mannequins show off the narrow legged, tight trousers, which had been described by Colin MacInnes as ‘skin-tight leg wear that both reveal and set off any natural physical graces that be available’, and cylinder style jackets, evidence of the more overt sexuality displayed by men’s fashions during this period.\textsuperscript{198}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{image1}
\includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{image2}
\caption{2.56 Burtons male mannequin legs dressed in slim cut narrow trousers with notched detail over the foot allowing the trouser to sit over footwear, 1965. LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.9645. 2.57 Burtons male mannequin with sculpted features, window display mock-up photograph, 1966. LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.7532.}
\end{figure}

Images of window displays from Hepworths until the mid-1960s show that they continued to avoid the feminine connotations of realist mannequins by continuing to use figures without heads. For their refurbished Brighton branch in 1964 the display figures had feet, legs, arms and hands but remain headless and others were more traditional torso forms.\textsuperscript{199}

\textsuperscript{197} These photographs were used in Burtons style guides in the 1960s. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/136 Style books: Styled for Men by Burton Tailoring Withdrawn Styles, Style 115 Sports Jacket [Withdrawn April 67].


Two years later, in 1966 some stores had new full-bodied mannequins with a metallic sheen to their surface – as with the Burtons choice of chalk-white, this design choice was abstracted rather than realistic. The new mannequin was also photographed being draped in cloth by Hepworths head of design, Arthur Chappell, at Hepworths Leeds factory in 1967 and a similar style of mannequin appears in photographs of Hepworths retail windows right through the 1970s (see below). By adopting these new mannequin display forms Hepworths were keeping up with the trends in selling men’s clothing and fashion by emphasising the whole male body which was replacing the limited display possibilities of the tailors dummy.

2.58 Window of Hepworths High Street Kensington branch, showing full-figure mannequins.

---

By the late 1960s and into the 1970s Burtons were attempting to take advantage of these developments in mannequin design and presentation by making their mannequins appear...
more realistic, styling them with eyebrows, wigs, fashionable facial hair such as sideburns
and painted eyes (see above). The longish cut of the wigs is uniform in style as are the
faces, though the hair is not as long as the young display men grooming them. Burtons had
increasing problems attracting young men from around this point. One of their in-house
window display design photographs from the same year demonstrates the difficulties with
realistic male mannequins and the perceptions of appropriate masculine skin – they appear
to have been ‘made up’ to accentuate their features with blusher on their cheeks and dark
colour around their eyes and with perfect shiny nylon wigs on their heads, all of which
could be read as effeminate. To attempt to provide the masculine edge one mannequin has
been given a moustache and they have all been positioned with wide stances, pose being
just as important in the maintenance of masculinity. The obvious use of make-up and the
features of the faces of these mannequins provide a completely different model of
masculinity to that displayed by the soberly suited torsos and lengths of cloth of the 1950s
(or even 1960s) multiple tailor display window, a transformation in the way the male body
was displayed and looked at. Their stances as well as the arrangement of the coats (one
draped like a cape, the other nonchalantly dragging on the floor) echo the styling and
movement of fashion shows which had become an important and established form of
menswear promotion by the early 1970s. They are clearly to be viewed within a context of
the flamboyance and extravagance which was part of the later 1960s expression of elements
of male fashions.
The shift from tailors dummy to full-figured, wigged and made-up mannequins of Burtons in the early 1970s demonstrates just one of the display and design methods that the Leeds multiple tailors utilised in their efforts to keep up to date with changing trends in retailing in the post-war period. In the decades after the Second World War they actively updated and modernised all aspects of their visual appearance and retail design, from the typography of their company names (and in the case of John Collier and Weaver to Wearer the appellations themselves) to the architectural facades of their buildings and the fit-outs of their branch interiors. Both Hepworths and Burtons in particular emphasised the importance of design as a means of demonstrating that they were fully conversant with ideas of modernity and new methods of selling as these changed through the period, most noticeably with developments in ready-to-wear suits. This also entailed a shift from the inter-war construction of masculine retail design dominated by grand stonework fascia and dark wooden panelling to re-vamped conceptions of menswear retailing with clean lines and minimalism and without fussiness or clutter. This was a different definition of masculine design which adapted some of the ideas of modernism to a contemporary style that was considered appropriate for their mass male market. As companies which had branches across the whole of the British Isles, Hepworths, Burtons and John Collier, especially, aimed to achieve consistency in the tailoring they sold and their overall company visual identities. This technique had been pioneered by Burtons before the war and...
remained significant for all of these companies’ retail recognition and their period of most success before the 1970s. The aim of all of these developments was to draw men into their stores and sell suits. The experience of the male consumer and how men acquired and wore their suits is the focus of the following chapter.
Chapter 3.

I Am an Ordinary Man: Getting and Wearing Suits


Wearing a suit was an experience common to most men in the post-war period in Britain. From the 1940s to the 1980s men had suits given to them, purchased for them and they bought them for themselves; with a large proportion of these garments having been made by the Leeds multiple tailors. The process of acquiring a suit, especially that of a made-to-measure, was a practice that many men participated in from their first suit (usually as a teenager) through their lives, for every day, for work, or for special occasions and life events such as a wedding, epitomised by the example of the two suits illustrated above. In 1964-1965 Raymond Fox bought his first suit from Hepworths for around £20.00, which was a large sum when he only earned about 30 shillings a week.¹ He bought this made-to-measure navy pinstripe three-piece suit because he had started at the Yorkshire Electricity Board as an apprentice after leaving school aged 15. In 2015 he donated his suit to Leeds Museums and Galleries along with his grey three-piece wedding suit (and grey and pink

¹ This equates to around £316.00 and £23.00 in 2010 relative worth. Lawrence H. Officer and Samuel H. Williamson, ‘Five Ways to Compute the Relative Value of a UK Pound Amount, 1270 to Present,’ MeasuringWorth, 2016, <www.measuringworth.com/ukcompare> [accessed 28 October 2016].
paisley tie) which he wore when he got married in May 1971. The two suits also show the combination of his personal taste (both jackets are single breasted with three buttons and the waistcoats are exactly the same style) along with his adherence to fashion with style details such as the lapels and pocket flaps (narrow for the mid-1960s and much wider for his 1971 wedding suit). Getting and wearing a suit and the memories associated with those experiences, alongside the garments themselves (when they survive), reveal aspects of men’s identities, their changing relationship with the suit as they age, and the many meanings that can be attached to particular forms of dress beyond whether they are fashionable. This chapter will examine these experiences within the context of the efforts of the Leeds multiple tailors to engage with and sell to their consumers, particularly younger men. This was also during a period of considerable change in men’s clothing as the menswear industry faced design influences from the United States, the Continent (especially Italian tailoring and styles) and popular culture and music, along with the increasing acceptability of informal dress styles and ready-to-wear.

The status and ubiquity of the suit as a garment worn by men, even as it declined in significance, means it has been an important site where men have been able to negotiate their identities – and sometimes independence – in relationship to a variety of authorities including the tailors selling the suits, parents, colleagues, friends, wives or girlfriends. The suit has operated as a marker of conformity but also of emotion, agency and choice, especially with made-to-measure tailoring which in the post-war period maintained continuity with the craft and skill of bespoke tailoring and required effort and time from the consumer. The garments themselves provide tangible links and additional insights into these experiences making them a significant focus to the analysis contained in this chapter. The objects, along with personal accounts and sources from the Leeds multiples, enable a richer more nuanced understanding of men’s ordinary dress. This aspect of the importance of dress within life narratives has been written about more commonly in terms of women’s experiences, that women ‘frequently describe their lives in terms of the clothes they wore’, but it is clear that it is important for men as well. Laura Ugolini has shown the usefulness of this approach in her study of men’s dress using autobiographies, which highlight ‘the consumer practices associated with particular “momen”ts in an individual’s life, particularly as he progressed from childhood to full masculine adulthood’ and ‘provide equally useful insights into particular themes of importance to the author’s life story’. Work by Shaun Cole and Clare Lomas on gay men’s experiences through their memories of dress using oral history, combined with other sources such as photographs and surviving garments, also demonstrates the value of this methodology, especially as it sheds light on experiences

---


that have typically been ignored or understated.\(^4\) John Potvin has argued it is important to consider how ‘the narratives of fashion extend beyond consumption to include the personal and public material, imagined, and visual experiences of the subject with its objects of desire’, and the men’s suits made and sold by the Leeds multiples provide an excellent focus to do this by exploring men’s personal narratives within the wider concerns of the industry.\(^5\)

As Paul Jobling has argued, the menswear industry including the Leeds multiples, had to pull off ‘a delicate balancing act: how to provide similar types of clothes for distinct age groups and how to build brand loyalty across the generations by respecting their different needs and desires, while turning neither sector off their products in the first place.’\(^6\) This was particularly important for the Leeds multiples as their business model was based on the idea, as Burtons put it to their advertising agency in 1953, that ‘generations of customers from Son to Grandfather had been regular customers in their shops.’\(^7\) One of the key ways the multiple tailors managed this was by their made-to-measure offer which allowed individual detailing and adaptation according to choice, desire and age-appropriateness while making and selling suits in their millions. As Burton Group commercial director Peter Gorb stated to journalist Nik Cohn: ‘When you bought a Burtons’ suit…you were saying, basically, I am an ordinary man and that’s what most Englishmen really wanted.’\(^8\) Even in the 1970s Burtons maintained their attempt to appeal across the generations despite the dramatic changes that had occurred in men’s clothing and fashion, as they stated in a mid-1970s made-to-measure style guide: ‘Burton shops are now offering customers of all age-groups an increasing range of clothes of all kinds…by catering for every individual taste, except the flamboyant and expensive.’\(^9\)

---


In the late 1940s and early 1950s Burtons had a very clear idea of who this ordinary man was – their ‘Average Man’ was five foot 9 inches tall, with a 38 inch chest, 35 inch waist, and 30 ¾ inch inside leg measurement (see above).\textsuperscript{10} Of course he was also suited, as a 1961 report into the market for men’s suits found – 19.2 million males in the United Kingdom aged 15 and over bought approximately 10 million suits in 1960 – about one suit every two years.\textsuperscript{11} And the multiple tailors, dominated by the Leeds companies, accounted for around 45 per cent of all suits sold.\textsuperscript{12} A 1965 customer survey by Burtons found that:

More than 80 per cent of all men have three or more suits, and almost three-quarters – 74 per cent – have between two and four suits in regular use. Some 15 per cent wear one suit ‘regularly’, while just over 8 per cent have four suits or more which they use regularly.\textsuperscript{13}

However, this was the peak of men’s suit owning and wearing which declined rapidly through the 1970s and along with it also went much of the Leeds multiples’ certainty about their customers. John Beasley collated a number of figures showing this slump in the market with a drop from 8.4 million suits sold in 1970 to 6.8 million in 1980.\textsuperscript{14}
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The following chart shows the percentage of respondents to a consumer survey who had purchased a suit either ‘within the last year’ or ‘about one year ago’ as well as the differences in suit purchasing by men of different age groups.¹⁵ It again shows the decline, as well as highlighting the long-term differences in consumption practices with older men buying significantly fewer suits than younger men.¹⁶

![Graph showing percent of men's suit purchases 1973-1982](image)


Nevertheless, men were still acquiring suits and these garments remained a significant part of many men’s wardrobes. This can sometimes be revealed through memory and reminiscences and the attachment and feelings about particular garments, and for men this was often a suit. In her study of menswear before the Second World War Laura Ugolini found that ‘dress played an important role in marking the different stages in a man’s life-course’ and while some of these markers changed after the war (for example there was no longer such importance placed on a boy’s first pair of long trousers) there were many that remained important to men’s experiences and identity.¹⁷ Julia Twigg in her work on contemporary age and ageing has argued that there is a ‘long established phenomenon of

age ordering in dress,’ which involves the ‘systematic patterning of cultural expectations according to an ordered and hierarchically arranged concept of age.’¹¹ This was the case with men’s suits in the post-war period, from the 1940s until the 1970s, as different styles of tailoring and clothing consumption were defined as age appropriate by the menswear industry, Leeds multiple tailors and men themselves. This began with getting a first suit, which often involved being dictated to by parents, even when a young man was spending his own money. The next stage concerned the period when men were teenagers and youths, when they tended to have greater disposable income and freedom in their choice of dress which often manifested itself in distinctive clothing styles and tailoring, from the American-style drape suits of the later-1940s to the wide lapels and flares of the mid-1970s. Young male consumers were recognised by the menswear industry as an increasingly important market and the Leeds multiples targeted them and catered to them with varying degrees of success through this period. Suits also played an important role for men when they married and the status and meaning of suits worn at engagements and weddings in men’s lives is made clear by the number that survive in museum collections. Finally, exploring the experiences of older men through their tailored garments has particular value to provide a fuller picture of men’s lives as they age. Older men were not considered to care as much about their clothing, to be less fashion conscious and more conservative, and not as active as consumers as younger men, making them of less interest to the menswear industry. This perception of older men’s dress has also meant that it tends to be dismissed as boring and less worthy of attention. However, older men’s narratives of dress can be just as illuminating as those of younger men. Therefore, exploring the ways that men acquired and wore their suits in the post-war period, as well as the suits that have survived in museum collections, will show how these tailored garments are important to providing a more complex understanding of men’s experiences through their lifetime and how clothing contributed to their identity. This chapter will highlight the role of the suit in men’s lives and how the Leeds multiple tailors attempted to cater to them from teenagers to old age in the following four sections: with their first suit, as young men, for weddings, and as older men.

3.1 First Suit

The acquisition of a first suit remained an event that was notable enough for it to be remembered by many men as denoting a change in their lives and their identity, often from school to work as with the suit bought by Raymond Fox which opened this chapter. As Ugolini has argued, for numbers of men ‘anecdotes relating to clothes consumption provided a key way of recalling and placing into a larger framework personal experiences and relationships’ and this was particularly the case with a new or special garment such as a

Many of these stories also include the role of their mother (or sometimes father or a sibling) in their clothing histories, particularly when it resulted in having a suit style or detail forced on them by their parent, a material reminder of parental authority and their sometime attempts at independence. For example, Brian Rayner remembers the fashion for narrow trousers in the 1950s meant that he would modify the ones his mother bought him:

Yeah I mean the trousers were so narrow. In fact I can remember as a kid um my mother’d buy me some trousers to go to school in and if they weren’t uh narrow enough we would take a needle and thread and we’d just make them a bit narrower.

These narratives often speak strongly of emotion and the resonance of memories associated with the acquisition of clothing which has been more accepted as part of women’s relationship with their clothes and fashion. However, a first tailored suit was an object that had meaning for many men for a number of reasons. It was strongly associated with adult masculinity, it was an expensive and one time purchase, and the process of acquiring it was often memorable.

Bob Entwistle, who grew up in Liverpool, well remembers his first suit which was bought for him by his older sister in Derby when he was 14 in the early 1970s:

Well I went—They said I needed one for some do we were going to. So I went to this—and it was quite nice actually, I remember that, it was grey with uh red, red, red—check line through it; that was quite, quite nice.

He didn’t feel that he knew what to wear so accepted the advice of the salesman and his sister despite being teased beforehand by his older brother: ‘he was very homophobic, my brother, for some reason and he’d say, “Yeah you watch yourself, goin’ to those place of droppers, watch yourself.”’

And I was—Yeah, they took me and I went into the shop again…went into this place and the bloke was very nice, he was obviously a bit camp but he was very nice and he said, ‘What we need with that, young man,’ he says, ‘is a nice pink shirt.’ I said, ‘Whoa! Pink shirt!’ And my sister said, ‘It would be nice a pink shirt with that,’ ‘cause she was with me, ‘It would go well.’ I said, ‘Would it?’ ‘Yeah. And a nice big, big kipper tie. Big, big, it would look really nice.’ And it did, you know, ‘cause— And that guy dressed me, really.

---

21 Brian Rayner interview, 6 November 2012, LEEAG.2012.0589.
23 Bob Entwistle.
He said, ‘This goes with you.’ And there’s a picture of me taken of meself when I was about 14, 13 in this and it really did look nice. The guy really had um a good idea about what, you know, what went well. But see then most, most blokes didn’t, you see, but he did.24

For Entwistle this experience was especially positive and memorable, despite the homophobic associations which his brother tried to taint it with. He respected the expertise and authority of the sales assistant in dressing and accessorising him in a way that ‘really did look nice’ as this was something that he found difficult to do for himself. Throughout the rest of his interview he commented on his lack of confidence in his appearance as well as how difficult he found it choosing and wearing clothes that he liked, felt comfortable in, and that fitted the fashionable norm of the 1970s.

Unsurprisingly, given Burtons’ ubiquity on British high streets, men such as Philip Burnard and David Roberton remember getting their first suits from this Leeds multiple. Burnard bought his for his first job as a junior clerk in Brighton Town Hall in the 1960s while Roberton’s was from the Burtons branch on Western Road, Brighton in 1953.25 Labour politician Roy Hattersley and Guardian journalist Ian Jack have also both written about the acquisition of their first suit from Burtons, and both noted the assistance of their mothers in the process. Jack remembered that in the 1960s ‘when the time came for me to be measured for my first suit, my mother and I naturally found ourselves among the measuring tapes and courteous assistants of Montague Burton’s shop on the high street.’26 For Hattersley, Burtons was the obvious choice as ‘at Burton’s taste had a new and special meaning…Quality, class, taste – they were all the attributes we needed when buying a new suit. For as well as a sign of respectability, suits – particularly new suits – were a mark of manhood. They were also one of the most expensive purchases that we, or our parents, ever made.’27 So in 1950, aged 17 and awaiting the results of his examinations, Hattersley bought his first suit at Burtons:

It was part of a package of purchases – dressing gown, cabin trunk, briefcase and single-breasted two-piece – in which I invested as a preparation for the great unknown – either university or National Service…I paid for the lot out of my own bank book. But…my mother behaved as if she had financed the whole transaction. She insisted on a blue

24 Bob Entwistle.
27 National Service was a policy of peacetime conscription from 1948 to 1963. It applied to all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 30 who if called up served between eighteen months and two years in the armed services. Roy Hattersley, ‘Gone for a Burton’, Independent, 8 April 1994, p. 19.
which was so serviceably dark that it looked like black. I matriculated dressed as an undertaker’s clerk.28

For Hattersley the purchase of this suit marked his leaving home and the beginnings of becoming independent, though his mother’s influence clearly curbed his efforts in freedom of expression, something he rectified when he bought his next suit, also from Burtons.

In 1975 Stephen Collins acquired his first suit which he subsequently gave to the Museum of London. Collins was 15 when after a year of saving from his Saturday job he went to a Burtons branch and bought a made-to-measure suit. Collins remembers exactly what had inspired him:

I was on a winter school museums’ trip in the west end of London and for some reason the class ended up in St. James’ Park. I remember it was the late afternoon and it was just beginning to get dark and the sun was going down. I was sat on a park bench with my mates, when this bloke walked past us. I don’t really think I’d ever seen a really smart City gent before, but his suit looked different to the ones I’d ever seen – it just had something very modern and different about it. He was wearing black highly polished low-ish platform shoes with it and carrying an umbrella. I do remember that it was blue pinstripe and the tie was wide and pale grey with a pattern. I have no idea why this image stuck with me or how I remember all the detail, but I suppose it made an impression on me as a youngster for some reason.29

Collins was also certain about what kind of suit he was going to order: ‘I was clear about what I wanted – slightly rounded big lapels and a high-ish waistband and trousers flared from the knee down with turn-ups. It had to be quite fitted, because that was the style at the time and I wanted something different – I had the memory of that suit in St James’.\(^{30}\)

This style of suit reflected the contemporary vogue for tailoring that harked back to styling of earlier in the twentieth century which had entered men’s fashion at the beginning of the

\(^{30}\) MOL, 2012.84/1-2.
1970s. However, he had not counted on his father insisting on accompanying him or on his father’s interference with his choices, ‘it turned out he had his own ideas of what I should get…in the 70s, some of the older generation were really still quite conservative with a small ‘c’ about what was acceptable for men to wear and look like – and they included my Dad.’ This conservatism meant that ‘Dad didn’t understand what I was doing – it makes me laugh to remember him getting more and more exasperated in that shop as he tried to enlist the support of the tailor who desperately tried to agree with both of us. In the end I gave up on the turn-ups!’ The survival of his suit means we can see the detailing so clearly remembered by Collins. The peaked lapels of the jacket (a detail usually found on double breasted styles) are definitely of a fashionable width, it is indeed fitted to the waist and features angled skirt (hip) pockets with wide flaps to balance the lapels, and two vents at the back. The trousers, while not having the turn-ups that he wanted, are high-waisted with an extra-wide waistband fastening with three buttons, a detail like the double breasted lapels that was definitely not conservative.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

3.5 Two pages from Burtons made-to-measure style guide. The guide features the same curlicue brown and yellow logo as on the suit label. It was designed by Pentagram and used by Burtons from around 1974-1978.

WYL1951/136 Style books: Burton Tailor Shop Folder.


32 MOL, 2012.84/1-2.
A Burtons style guide contemporary to the Collins suit and designed to be used in the made-to-measure ‘Tailor Shop’ section of revamped Burtons stores shows what Stephen and his father were likely to have been choosing from – the two pages illustrated above show what Burtons deemed as up-to-date styling for business wear. Unable to persuade his father to let him have all of the more exaggerated details which were on offer by ‘Cutting a dash – Mark II’ above, Stephen seems to have added instead his own individual touches to the flared trousers without turn-ups, angled pocket flaps on the jacket and wide (but not too wide) lapels featured in ‘Cutting a dash – city style’. Despite the compromises, Stephen was happy with his suit, ‘I felt the sharpest bloke on the Street when I first wore the suit – it felt as though I was wearing something that was really mine in every way for the first time’ and he even bought a pair of dark blue platform shoes to go with it. He went on to wear it when he went out to nightclubs and for a summer job he got in a bank a couple of years later – the wear is evident on the dirt and staining to the bottom of the trousers and a missing button from one of the jacket sleeve cuffs. For Stephen Collins this first tailored suit was clearly part of his entry into adulthood, it was a garment that evoked this period of his life and represented his attempts to express his individuality and independence from his parents. Even so, it is a lucky survival as he nearly threw it away several times only to be prevented by his mum and his wife who insisted he keep it.

The significance of boys’ and young men’s first suits can also be seen in the survival of some of these garments which have been donated to museum collections. At the end of 1963 a boy aged 12 to 13 was bought his first suit – a made-to-measure suit from Burtons which the donor said cost £11 (around £179.70 today). The suit was for him to wear to a family wedding and was said by the donor to be the smallest Burtons had ever made. Made for the donor’s son, it was given in 1980 to Manchester’s Gallery of Costume with only this brief information. The two-piece suit is made in a wool cloth woven with a diamond twill pattern, giving an overall dark grey and check appearance but enlivened with flecks of colour including bright blue and yellow. The three-button single-breasted jacket is cut in a boxy shape, short and square, with narrow lapels, the back cut in one piece (a whole back), and with straight fronts. The trousers feature tapering legs which narrow to 12 inch (33 cm) bottoms and a self-covered belt. The jacket has a company label ‘BURTON tailored LV’ of the design that was introduced in 1954 and also a factory production label, hidden within the inside breast pocket with the date of manufacture: 4 December 1963 (see below).

33 As part of their attempts to manage the substantial problems with their tailoring and menswear in the early 1970s the Burton Group (as it had become in 1969) commissioned design consultants Pentagram to revamp their visual identity along with investment continuing to redevelop their retail outlets. Robin Linklater, ‘Has Burton found the style for its retail comeback?’, Design, 361 (January 1979), pp. 36-41. WYL1951/136 Style books: Burton Tailor Shop Folder.
34 Collins, MOL, 2012.84/1-2.
35 Officer and Williamson, MeasuringWorth, 2016.
3.6 Details of 1963 boy's first suit by Burtons.

Unfortunately the donor did not reveal who made the choices in the decisions on style and cloth of the made-to-measure suit, what their son thought of it or how long it was worn for. However, examination of the suit shows very little evidence of wear and that all of its elements are intact, there is no fraying to the trouser hems, no missing buttons or stains to the lining. The condition of the suit along with the age of the boy and its size suggest that it was not worn many times, or for long – perhaps he grew out of it before he could get much use from it. The design also appears to be very close to Burtons jacket ‘Style 302’ and the Burtons ‘Italian B’ suit, both illustrated in Burtons style guides from the 1960s (see above) – single breasted, three-button, narrow lapels, boxy shape, straight fronts and whole back. The stylistic details, along with the narrow trousers, were features of the Continental or Italian influence in men’s fashion from the late 1950s. The two fashion drawings illustrating these Burtons suits portray aspirational masculinity with up-to-date and stylish backdrops of a glamorous sports car, clearly referencing the design of early 1960s British models such as the Jaguar E-type and Lotus Elite. The 1963 boy’s suit has plastic buttons, a more conservative choice than the self-covered option of the Italian style, though the discreet check effect and flecked wool cloth speak to the kind of weave designs that became popular throughout the 1960s. The trouser details are also those that were highly

37 WYL1951/136 Style books: Styled for Men by Burton Tailoring Withdrawn Styles.
contemporary, especially the tapered shape and self-covered belt with its metal buckle clip fastening, with an addition of a sewn-down seam on the outer-edge of the leg. We also do not know why the suit was kept or accepted into Manchester’s collections, but its status as a first suit, the obvious investment required for its purchase, and being made-to-measure, I would argue, are all contributory reasons. What can be said is that this boy’s suit shows the stylish and fashionable options Burtons made available through their stores, which this family chose to purchase in 1963 so that their son would be stylishly and appropriately dressed in his first tailored suit.

### 3.2 Young Men

Roy Hattersley’s first suit from Burtons was an important event in his life; his second was just as well remembered. Four years after being forced into a suit in a cloth picked out by his mother, Hattersley ordered a suit entirely of his own choosing. After finishing university in Hull he went to the local branch of Burtons for another made-to-measure, this time without any parental interference. For the cloth, he wanted ‘the sort of flannel to which I had long aspired – the light grey favoured by sporting persons and Oxford cricket Blues’. However the fitting revealed ‘that at the moment of purchase excitement had rendered me temporarily colour-blind. The suit was electric green. But I did not care. At last I was tailor-made.’ Hattersley’s experiences demonstrated the advantages and disadvantages of the Leeds multiple made-to-measure, the potential for creative personal style but also the possibility of being confronted with an unexpected and unwelcome result. They reveal the pleasure that could be enjoyed in the purchase of a suit, especially one that had been planned for and chosen independently. Young men in their teens and twenties made up an increasingly significant market for the menswear industry after the Second World War, including for the Leeds multiple tailors. In this section I will discuss some of the ways the Leeds multiples catered to the male youth market from drape suits of the 1940s to the introduction of completely new retail labels in the 1970s by Burtons. Within this context I will also look at men’s experiences and some of the made-to-measure suits they bought. Men’s memories of their suit getting and wearing as young men – and the suits themselves – provide valuable insights into masculine identity, emotion and agency. They also provide understanding of men’s points of view as consumers of the Leeds multiples, a view which is sometimes lost within the narrative of decline of the industry in the post-war period.

The teenagers and young people of the three decades after the Second World War, and the development of distinctive youth cultures during this time, have been the focus of

---

38 LMG have a suit made in 1966 which features the same style of trouser, belt and buckle: LEEDM.S.1987.0011.4, Burtons brown suit, 1966.
considerable historical study. While there is debate as to just how extensive (and how new) aspects of youth culture in the post-war period were, it is clear that economic and social conditions meant that, as Bill Osgerby has concluded, there was ‘an expansion of the commercial youth market and a heightening of young people’s profile as a distinct cultural group…the apparent affluence of many youngsters allowed representations of youth to become emblematic of economic growth and consumer prosperity.’

Demographically, young people also made up a larger proportion of the population, growing to 10 per cent by 1966. It was a demographic cohort that grew between 1970 and 1980, as the proportion of the population aged 15 to 29 increased from 22 per cent to 24 per cent. Predominantly single and with disposable income, young males had long been recognised as a group in society who would spend money on their appearance and who were also often considered style leaders who actively engaged with fashion change. It was this cohort of young men aged from their teens to mid-twenties who became increasingly important to the menswear industry after the war and who contributed to the considerable changes to the businesses of Leeds multiple tailors such as Burtons and Hepworths by 1980. These were young men who, despite their financial constraints, were described as considering clothing and personal appearance to be ‘extremely important and formed one of the leisure-time fillers which they pursued consistently and skilfully without any adult prodding, apart from the impersonal pressures of the commercial world. Some boys even listed “clothes” as their chief hobby.


41 Osgerby, *Youth in Britain since 1945*, p. 220.


period has demonstrated just why the industry was so enamoured with the youth market and how young men were represented in menswear advertising as companies increasingly focused on attempting to attract them.\textsuperscript{46} He focuses on the youth market and spending surveys that were undertaken from the late 1950s and 1960s, especially those by Mark Abrams and Stanley Orwell which highlighted the increasing spending power of teenagers and young people and in particular that of young single working-class men due to their higher wages.\textsuperscript{47} Frank Mort and Peter Thompson have also shown how Burtons in particular responded to the advent of the youth market in the 1950s by creating what they argued was a new youthful masculine identity – the casual man.\textsuperscript{48}

It is clear from the menswear industry trade press from the 1940s onwards, that there was an interest in what in March 1948 \textit{Style for Men} termed ‘the young man in his ‘teens’.\textsuperscript{49} Numerous articles presented statistics and surveys that showed how important the young male consumer could be to those designing, making and selling men’s clothing due to their increasing proportion of the population and their disposable income.\textsuperscript{50} As ‘Today’s Teenage Male’ put it in 1951: ‘He spends more because he is unmarried, pays no taxes worth mentioning and has no family responsibilities.’\textsuperscript{51} At the beginning of 1960, \textit{Men’s Wear} devoted a special section to the youth market, with the argument that ‘today the young-man market offers the greatest scope for expansion’ illustrating this assertion with a graphic to show the dramatic increase in spending power of young people since 1939 (see below) using figures based on Mark Abrams’s market survey \textit{The Teenage Consumer}.\textsuperscript{52} What was crucial, however, was the identification of this section of young men not just with spending but with spending on clothing. Abrams found that ‘at least 67 per cent of teenage

---

\textsuperscript{46} Paul Jobling, \textit{Advertising Menswear: Masculinity and Fashion in the British Media since 1945} (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), pp. 70-84.

\textsuperscript{47} For example Mark Abrams, ‘Selling to the Teenager’, \textit{Advertiser’s Weekly}, 23 January 1959 and 12 February 1960; Stanley Orwell, ‘Survey of the Youth Market’, \textit{Advertiser’s Weekly}, 21 February 1958 cited by Jobling, \textit{Advertising Menswear}, pp. 79-80. While Abrams’s figures in particular have been criticised as conflating wide variations in young people’s earnings and therefore creating an exaggerated picture of their affluence, it is acknowledged that his work did reveal the general trends. See Osgerby, \textit{Youth in Britain since 1945}, pp. 25-26.


\textsuperscript{49} Selling to the 16-20 Age Group’, pp. 212-213.


\textsuperscript{51} ‘Today’s Teenage Male’, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{52} Abrams actually classified ‘teenage’ as those aged 15-25 which meant he could include those earning higher wages into their twenties. Mark Abrams, \textit{The Teenage Consumer} (London: London Press Exchange, 1959), p. 5; ‘A New Year, A New Market’, p. ii.
spending is in male hands’ and that nearly a quarter of their uncommitted money went on clothing and footwear.\textsuperscript{53}

There was a recognition by many of these commentators that the clothing young men were purchasing and wearing was distinctive, with greater informality (demonstrated, for example, by the illustration of the young man and woman in jumpers and casual trousers in the 1960 \textit{Men's Wear} graphic above) and a desire for more rapid style change. As Mr H. G. Tayler, the president of the Federation of Clothing Designers and Production Managers acknowledged in 1949:

\begin{quote}
The story of the 16-year-old son of a wealthy family who delivered papers every morning until he had earned enough money to buy himself a drape style suit, because his father had refused to pay for one, is typical of the present-day trend. It emphasises that modern youth as a customer is very much his own master…it is the young man, rather than his father, who is becoming the style leader through the appreciation of clothes as something more than just covering for the body.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

A 1962 survey found that ‘the majority of young people do not worry whether a garment lasts or not. They do not particularly want it to outlive a change in fashion…Young people buy to be in fashion and to have something new.’\textsuperscript{55} This assertion of independence through


\textsuperscript{54} M H. G. Tayler, ‘Why are Boys so Badly Dressed?’, Boys' and Youths' Supplement', \textit{Men's Wear}, 25 June 1949, p. iv.

\textsuperscript{55} ‘Teen-Man Market Lacks Lead’, p. 20.
clothing was a key feature for young men, especially for those who chose to dress differently than the norm.

Owning at least one suit still remained important for young men, though this became decreasingly the case into the 1970s. Jobling quotes a survey undertaken in 1962 of 603 unmarried men between 15 and 24 which found that the majority shopped in the multiple tailors, with suits accounting for 30 per cent of their purchases, and topcoats and jackets making up 28 and 25 per cent respectively.\textsuperscript{56} Just as with young men buying their first suit, or the anecdote of the teenager saving to get a drape suit, due to their cost a suit was for the majority of young men still a considerable investment. In 1953 \textit{Style for Men} showcased some of the tastes and preferences of younger men by commissioning Richard Blake, a 17-year-old apprentice, to act as editor for their feature on the youth market. He was described as a youth, ‘extremely interested in his clothes, although at present he owns only one suit made by a multiple tailors – and this suit has seen him through technical school and his first year at work’.\textsuperscript{57} As editor, he chose a suit by Leeds tailor Sumrie:

\begin{quote}
…we told him it might prove expensive for his pocket; his answer was that he would be willing to save up for it. (We also mentioned it was too big for him, but he liked it this way!) He regarded it as an ideal leisure suit and selected the J & J Brightbart ‘Athletic style’ suit as being ideal for business wear. (We would have expected the reverse, but not evidently this young man!)\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{57} The Younger Man your target for ’54’, p. 17.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{58} ‘The Younger Man your target for ’54’, p. 19.
\end{flushright}
Richard Blake in a light-weight double-breasted suit by Leeds tailor Sumrie (left) and a more informal sporty suit in a window-pane check cloth, the jacket featuring patch pockets by J & J Brightbart which he chose for business wear.


Blake’s wages as an apprentice were only around £4 10s. (£98.00), meaning that even a Burtons suit – advertised at a starting price of £7 15s. (£168.80) for a two-piece in 1953 – was substantially more than his weekly pay packet and would require saving for. His choice of an over-size double breasted suit demonstrated the preference for a looser and more American fitting, showing the changing styles in tailoring that some young men adopted and that distinguished them from older men.

Many accounts of young men during the 1950s and 1960s also highlighted the way their tailoring could show off their comparative affluence. The working-class youth with numerous suits became a commonplace image in writing about teenagers and young men. In Alan Sillitoe’s 1958 novel of the travails of 22-year-old Arthur Seaton, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, Seaton’s extensive wardrobe gives him pleasure and gratification: ‘Up in his bedroom he surveyed his row of suits, trousers, sports jackets, shirts, all suspended in colourful drapes and designs, good-quality tailor-made, a couple of hundred quid’s worth, a fabulous wardrobe of which he was proud because it had cost him so much labour.’ T. R. Fyvel, in his 1961 book about young people, quoted an interview with a young man called Ron from Elephant and Castle in London as having six suits costing around £20 each

---

However, other reports show these stories were not a universal experience. In 1964 in his account of being in a gang in Liverpool and then a beat pop group, Colin Fletcher described how in 1959 some of the teenage boys broke away from the gang. Clothing was one of the reasons as they ‘were neither interested nor could they afford to keep up with the rapidly changing styles’ with the new beat groups wearing suits that were emulated by the gangs and he noted that the ‘present day trend of fashions has underlined the difficult position of the poorer boy to obtain status and acceptance.’

Mary Morse’s three-year study of young people published as *The Unattached* in 1965, found that there were definitely variations in their ability to spend. One of the researchers in ‘Lymport’ a dockside area of a region of heavy industry in the north of England, also discovered that for these youths money and clothing was a problem:

The pawnshop was frequented. The main gang of youths in particular seemed to use the pawnshop as a ‘paying wardrobe’, the only clothes they possessed outside it being the ones they wore. Clothes were almost communally owned by this group and they were for ever swopping around between themselves.

Whether young men were able to afford a number of suits or were restricted by a lack of resources, their presence in the menswear market became increasingly significant in the decades after the Second World War for the Leeds multiple tailors. The Leeds tailors had long been sensitive to age-related distinctions in dress but these were often subsumed by their overarching business of catering to every man, especially with their factory produced made-to-measure: ‘No wonder whole generations from grandfather to grandson are regular Burton customers!’ Burtons declared in 1953. Burtons did include a ‘young men’s drape’ suit (with both double and single breasted options) in one of their style guides (see Style 202 below), reflecting the increasing influence of the American looser fit of the drape which was particularly attractive to younger men. Style 202 was an explicit effort by Burtons to ‘cultivate the young men’s trade’ as public relations officer C. H. Hargreaves made clear in a 1953 answer to a proposal that the company make more effort ‘inviting the

---

61 Fyvel, *The Insecure Offenders*, p. 44.
63 The geographical areas of the study were anonymised. Morse, *The Unattached*, p. 117.
64 See Mort and Thompson for discussion of Burtons’ approach to the male youth market in the 1950s, ‘Retailing, Commercial Culture and Masculinity in 1950s Britain’; also ‘Beasley, ‘A Study of Corporate Objectives for the Retailing of Menswear’.
66 The drape was a suit in which the jacket was cut in a long length, with wide shoulders, fullness of cloth across the chest, a tapered waist, and paired with trousers that were full at the waist and thigh but narrower at the ankle, combining to give a loose fitting, sporty, and athletic effect. It became popular in America through the 1940s and 1950s as a conservative version of the zoot suit (a style popularised by black Americans in the 1940s and sometimes worn by black American servicemen in Britain and immigrants from the Caribbean).
youths trade’ from Kilburn branch manager T. H. Hemmings. And an internal Burton memo in 1952 reviewing their advertising in light of Sir Montague’s death, suggested that the company ‘announce in fact our intention of catering still further for the young man as well as continuing to provide for their fathers’. Alexandre too, sought to differentiate suit designs that would appeal to young men in the 1950s with what they asserted would be ‘A Coming Favourite of well-dressed young men’ in one of their style guides. The single breasted suit on offer would be preferred ‘because our designers have achieved a rare degree of distinctive smartness’, while they were keen to stress the ‘moderately broad shoulders’, trim hips and ‘an adequate suggestion of waist suppression’. The accompanying black and white illustration showed a remarkable similarity to the drape suit on offer from Burtons but with a fresher and more relaxed feeling to the drawing of the model (see below).


Other 1950s style guides from both Burtons and Alexandre demonstrate the adoption of American styling by the Leeds multiples which were favoured by younger men. Alexandre’s ‘Manhattan’ drape was just one suit model that they had in their style guide which they boasted were ‘Styled in New York’, though tailored by ‘English Master Craftsmen’.70 In 1954 under the new management of the Jacobson brothers and the merger with Jackson the Tailor, Burtons dramatically changed their visual identity, display and retailing as well as their advertising. Young men became a key target market. Their guide ‘Burton Tailoring! For men of fashion’ while undated, features the post-1954 Burtons visual identity and contains lithographic fashion illustrations copyrighted to ‘Graphic Fashions’ Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, bringing a touch of American glamour in presentation to the young men shopping in Britain’s high streets.71 The new management was alert to the fact that their

hoped for new customers would be well aware of what was in style and what they wanted, as one internal report noted:

The problem of the Drape suits and the young men that will be attracted by the advertising and the attitude of the managers particularly the elderly and old fashioned types was discussed. On no account is there to be any suggestion of dictation to the new type of customer. They are much more likely to dictate style to the branch and will resent interference.\textsuperscript{72}

This also revealed a reversal in the expectation of age-related deference as it is the young male consumer who is given authority to command the older male sales staff. Young men’s sense of certainty in their fashion choices is acknowledged as enough to transform the historic belief in the respect for the knowledge of age.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

3.12 Burtons 1950s style guide using American fashion illustrations. The suits were not drapes but could be ordered as such.


3.13 Alexandre ‘Manhattan’ drape.


In his 1963 review of the 1940s and 1950s Harry Hopkins exclaimed: ‘Never had “Youth” – with the capital “Y” – been so earnestly discussed, so frequently surveyed, so extensively

\textsuperscript{72} WYL1951/124 Jacksons: Report on Conference of Area Managers Held on December 18th, 1953, p. 1.
It was the distinguishing (and changing) looks of young men which exercised so much of this interest. Drape, Teddy Boy, ‘sharp’ Italian and Continental, beat, Mod and Rocker were all labels for the clothing of young people who deliberately dressed in distinctive ways, many with their own subtle group differences and identities. The young men who wore these styles were recognised by their distinctive visual expression; the clothing, hairstyles, stance and attitude, transportation, and use of public space together with new musical styles and consumerism. Many of these looks required suits tailored with particular details and cuts, making the Leeds multiple tailors with their relatively affordable made-to-measure offer an attractive option for young men seeking to achieve the appropriate style. Brian Rayner had a suit with an Italian short jacket and remembered discussing tailoring choices with twin brothers (one with red hair and one with black hair) he worked with at Burtons:

…so they were Ginner and Blackie and Ginner would say how many suits have you got Rayner? I said six, he said I’ve got nine. And he said I’m just having another one, I’m thinking of – and he’d describe I’m going to have these half-moon pockets or I’m going to do this way or that way and you’d think, Right.

The half-moon pocket was a feature of Teddy Boy-style suits which could be bought made-to-measure from the multiples. The Fifty Shilling Tailor had an ‘Edwardian Style’ suit model (the precursor to the Teddy suit and origin of the Ted name) on offer in 1953. Arnold Burton (one of Sir Montague’s sons) conceded that they didn’t mind making Teddy Boy suits, ‘as long as they bought the suits from us’ in an interview in 1992. London has been pinpointed as the origin of the Teddy Boy style where it emerged from a number of different influences into a visibly working-class style of male dress in the early 1950s. As the style disseminated in time and geography from its origins and as other styles were adopted, notably the short jackets, narrow lapels and tight trousers of Italian tailoring in the late 1950s, cultural observers felt it had lost its genuineness. Colin MacInnes was scathing in his 1959 assessment that ‘the style, in its authentic pure absurdity, is now only to be found in outlying holes and corners (I last saw it in a caff at Goring-on-Thames). Teds, of

---

74 While the cinema remained one of the most popular forms of leisure for young people after the war, it was the new milk bars, coffee bars and cafes they patronised which were particularly notable. See Horn, *Jake Box Britain and Kate Bradley, Rational Recreation in the Age of Affluence: The Cafe and Working-Class Youth in London, c.1939-1965*, in *Consuming Behaviours: Identity, Politics and Pleasure in Twentieth-century Britain*, ed. Erika D. Rappaport, Sandra Trudgen Dawson, Mark J. Crowley (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 71-85.
75 Brian Rayner interview, 6 November 2012, LEEAG.2012.0589.
78 Christopher Breward, ‘Style and Subversion: Postwar Poses and the Neo-Edwardian Suit in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain’, *Gender & History*, 14: 3 (2002), 560-583. The ‘Edwardian Teddy Boy’ website argues that the style appeared to emerge across the United Kingdom at a similar time. ‘History of the British Teddy Boy and Culture’. 
course, still exist – very much so: but are increasingly indistinguishable, sartorially, from other youngsters.\(^7^9\)

These customer requests were not necessarily embraced by the multiples who set themselves up as tailoring authorities – many of the narratives of young men who wanted alternative details mention having to go against the advice of a multiple salesman. Ray Gosling remembered his battle with a sales assistant in a Northampton Burtons when he ordered his suit in a Ted style in the mid-1950s, bought with money he earned from part-time work:

But the jacket was blue with a super silky, I think it was red, lining and black trousers, very tight around the bottom of the trouser leg, round the ankle. What a tussle I had with the assistant. I could only just get them on. You’d choose the cloth from a swatch and then came the measuring – lower, really, sir, you’ll look ridiculous. I said lower. Tighter – you won’t get them on, sir. And sometimes I did have to put Vaseline on my ankles to get them off. Or coconut grease…Burton’s were good to me. You had to fight to get what you wanted but my blue jacket was lovely. It came down to just above my fingertips…I had to send it back, the jacket, several times before it was right, but at the end of the day I was admired and afeared.\(^8^0\)

Gosling’s account demonstrated the concerted effort and time that young men could invest in their tailoring, taking advantage of the made-to-measure service that was offered by the Leeds multiples and which was at an accessible price. Gosling was able to express his agency by choosing the details of his suit, even if he still felt that he needed to moderate the style of his tailoring so that he wouldn’t offend his parents.\(^8^1\) Regional variations in youth style related to the ethos of Ted but significant differences also appeared. Fishermen in some coastal towns developed very distinct styles of made-to-measure tailoring. One Burtons salesman recounted how in the 1950s he worked at branches in the fishing ports of Fleetwood, Lancashire, and Lowestoft in Norfolk where he was astounded at what the fisher lads ordered, including pink suits. ‘They came with drawings and sketches of what they wanted, they had done the drawing while they were at sea…with half-moon pockets…all things like this.’\(^8^2\) Similarly in Hull, the young trawlermen of the 1960s became notorious in the city for their flamboyant made-to-measure suits.\(^8^3\)

---


\(^8^1\) Gosling, *Personal Copy*, p. 37.

\(^8^2\) ‘Taking the Measure to Sir Montague Burton’. Interviews by Amber Butchart with Lowestoft fishermen confirm that they had suits made at Burtons and Hepworths in the town, while the independent tailors used Leeds cut-make-trim tailoring firms to make the suits ordered from them. Personal correspondence, Amber Butchart, 14 July 2015.

Brian Hill remembers that ‘the Teddy Boy thing never really went away, you know. They kind of faded into the background, but they were always…We would take orders for you know sort of long coats.’ One such example was Dave Forrest who bought his first Teddy Boy suit from Leeds multiple Alexandre in Newcastle as a made-to-measure in 1964 when he was 17 – it cost him £16.00 (£252.90), four weeks of his apprentice wages. He went on to buy two more Ted suits, another from Alexandre and then one from Burtons, the jackets of which were acquired by the V&A for the exhibition ‘Streetstyle: From Sidewalk to Catwalk, 1940 to Tomorrow’ in 1994-1995. The trousers did not survive as they wore out. The garments reveal the variety of personalised details that Forrest specified which made each jacket completely unique, emphasising the thought and care which went into their design and the handwork required by the tailor to finish them (see below). Examination of the coats shows the amount of wear they received, with buttons missing and staining evident; it is unsurprising that Forrest wore out the accompanying trousers. On the inside of the Burtons jacket the factory order ticket indicates that it was made in 1973 rather than 1966 which is the attributed date, revealing loyalty to this style of suit and implying that Forrest must have been comfortable with a certain lack of conformity as the narrow lapels and trousers of Ted suits were distinctly different from mainstream men’s fashion at this date (see below).

---


3.14 Teddy Boy Jacket, Alexandre, 1964. Clockwise from top left: V&A catalogue image; label; jacket reverse with velvet half-belt; jacket front showing missing button.

3.15 Teddy Boy Jacket, Alexandre, 1965. Clockwise from top left: V&A catalogue image showing two half-moon jetted pockets at hips; label and fancy lining; coat reverse with velvet covered button half-belt and two deep 11 inch long vents; damage to button at front; one button half-turn back cuff.


This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.
In 1955, just as the Teddy Boy look was on its way to its peak, menswear trade journal *The Outfitter* noted the increasing influence of European manufacturers, particularly those from Italy and France. It was felt that ‘not only is “the Continental look” spreading its influence
throughout the world, but it is also gaining a firm hold in Britain itself." Two years later Man about Town heralded this style as the advent of the ‘Tony Boy’ as the ‘fashion trend among the lads at the end of the street is the Italianate influences of extremely short, top-heavy jackets, wide widely draped shoulders, very rounded jacket fronts, at least three buttons probably fastened on the top one, and a narrow turn-upless trouser’ all accessorised with sharply pointed shoes. Style guides from the Leeds multiple tailors demonstrate how this new tailored silhouette had infiltrated the mass market by the early 1960s and that it was a look the multiples seemed to actively embrace. The smart suits with their narrow trousers and short, boxy jackets were also adopted by the new pop groups breaking through, which were similarly reflected in the offerings of the Leeds multiples. Alexandre issued at least two style guides of continental tailoring featuring elegant line-drawing illustrations of suit models with exotic European names: ‘Antonio’, ‘Carlo’, ‘Marco’ and ‘Lorenzo’ in one (see below) updated to ‘Madrid’, ‘Oslo’, ‘Paris’, ‘Lisbon’ and ‘Geneva’ in another.  

3.17 Front cover and inside page of Alexandre style guide, 1962.

LMG, LEEAG.2010.0515.

---

If you went to John Collier instead, you could opt for the collarless, round-necked ‘Cardin’, or a double breasted ‘Italian Look’ (see below). In a slightly later booklet, the options included the less sophisticated but pop-music themed styles such as ‘Popster’, ‘Topspot’, and ‘Tempo 65’ (all with stepped hems on the narrow trousers) or even the ‘Mersey-Beat’ emulating the Liverpool pop bands; the illustration nattily accessorised with a transistor radio. This example has also been hand annotated with ‘y.m’ and then a number, which may refer to ‘young man’, the name of a pattern block for the cutter in the factory.

![Diagram of men's suits](image)

3.18 John Collier style guide, possibly from a cutter. The handwritten ‘y.m’ (young man?) may refer to the pattern blocks. The Mersey-Beat style is a loose page inserted into the booklet.


Brian Hill remembers the impact of rock music on the styles they sold when he worked at Alexandre:

…Pop fashion, you know that is what I recall as being a big driver… I mean the big thing that I can remember was the whole Beatles thing. And the Rolling Stones. I mean I, I mean you remember the Stones did a concert somewhere and Jagger was wearing a velvet suit and [clap] everybody wanted one…And that whole collarless deal you kn− With the um…

---

93 Brian Hill.
Brian Rayner made the point that these fads could also be problematic: ‘I mean like the Beatles came along and they have the collarless thing although it came and a lot of people lost money when it went and they still had stock left.’94 This illustrated the problems that the multiples had to manage, particularly with ready-to-wear, in terms of following the rapid turnover of fashionable styles which were more apparent by the mid-1960s. Their adherence to made-to-measure was an approach that allowed their customers to order the styles they desired without the companies being left with unsold and unfashionable garments.

Style guides from Burtons also show them deliberately targeting young male consumers with a wide variety of this Continental styled tailoring (see above). They also featured a ‘Beatle’ jacket, though it was not presented particularly appealingly – photographed on a headless mannequin torso rather than presented in the lively fashion sketches of Alexandre and John Collier.95 The awareness of the importance of the new pop stars on young men’s

94 Brian Rayner.
95 There are around 15 jacket models following this short and boxy style withdrawn between 1965 and 1967 in this folder. The collarless style which became known as a ‘Beatle’ jacket was copied by the Beatles tailor, Dougie Millings, from French fashion designer Pierre Cardin’s first menswear collection in 1960. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/136 Style books: Styled for Men by Burton Tailoring Withdrawn Style.
fashion by Burtons is clear; in 1963 the company specified ‘Beatles & Hollies styles’ as requiring extra care when measuring in a guide for Burtons retail managers.\footnote{WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/121 Managers Courses Hudson Road File - Be Careful with These Trouser Measurements, 20th September 1963.}

The multiples also utilised other mediums to promote their tailoring to young men. John Collier and Hepworths both commissioned pop songs which were issued as seven inch singles – for John Collier *The Saturday Night Suit*, while Hepworths went with *Get Hep with Hepworths*. The idea of the Saturday night suit also reflected the experiences of young men who had a ‘best suit’ which they wore to go out in. Having a suit for best, worn to go out in, that was distinguished from more workday tailoring became a marker of working-class male identity and feature of less affluent male dress in the twentieth century.\footnote{The Mass Observation Worktown study recorded these differences in men’s tailoring with most men having three suits: one for weekends, one for the week and a suit worn as working clothes. Mass Observation, *The Pub and the People: A Worktown Study* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1943), p. 143 and Mass Observation, ‘Clothes’, File Report A17, 1939, Mass Observation Online, <http://www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/FileReport-A17> [accessed September 30, 2016].}

As Brian Hill described:

> Everybody. You know, I mean you had your best suit, which is you know usually what you wore on a Saturday night when you went out. And then well I, I mean well because I was in the business I didn’t have a best suit as such because I had lots of them so I would know I would have two, three, four suits on the go. But I I would tend to sort of— I’d wear them and then gradually I’d start going to work in them. But dressing up you know Friday, Saturday night, there was always, usually the newest suit that you had that you wore you know to go out.\footnote{Brian Hill. Hill changed his suits every season and sometimes would be given suits as younger, less well paid staff at Alexandre would occasionally receive suits made up to test new fabrics or silhouettes.}

Brian Rayner who also worked in the tailoring industry, for Burtons, had similar memories:

> …most of the guys there would have two or three suits and one for best, so on a Saturday night you would be putting on your best suit on, going out to the Mecca.

DS: And would that be different like how would, would the details on them be different?

BR: Probably not. You would just you’d just, I mean it’s got a slightly better fabric. You might go to work in a blue suit and something a bit more jazzy you know for the uh Mecca when you were paying for these girls who were earning twice as much as you. Humf.\footnote{Brian Rayner. Rayner always wore Burtons suits and got them at a large discount. As he was a trainee he earned less than the women who did piecework in the factory. Mecca were a national chain of dance halls – in Leeds the Mecca Locarno in the County Arcade closed in 1969. ‘County Arcade, Mecca Locarno’, Leodis, <http://www.leodis.net/display.aspx?resourceIdentifier=20031028_83919925&DISPLAY=FULL> [accessed 18 August 2016].}
This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

3.20 *The Saturday Night Suit*, Johnny Johnson Orchestra, John Collier.


3.21 *Get Hep with Hepworths*, Johnny Johnston and the Keynotes, Hepworths.

LMG, LEAG.2016.006, 7-inch single, *Get Hep with Hepworths*.

Just as with the Teddy Boys, one of the appeals of the multiple tailors to young men wanting to dress to a specific look was their ability to offer a made-to-measure suit at a reasonable price. For the young male adherents of what became known as Mod, the hugely influential youth style of the 1960s, multiple tailors were often an option.\(^{100}\) In an iconic

1962 article which brought this style to a wider audience, a swaggering group of North London young men revelled in the intricacies of their tailored appearance with one, 15-year-old Mark Feld, boasting of his ten suits and eight sports jackets. Their preference was for bespoke tailor Bilgorri but they acknowledged that they ‘all had suits from Burton’s…We have, I admit it. You take a bit of a chance with Burton’s but if you tell them exactly what you want you can get a good suit.’

Chris Busby was a Mod in Leicester who described on an online forum how although he never really wore suits, preferring Levi jeans paired with desert boots and a Ben Sherman shirt, many others did:

On a Saturday, there was Jackson’s the Tailors, in Gallowtree Gate, and Burton’s, in Church Gate, which would have queues outside all day from the moment they opened, with people collecting clothes they had ordered, or being measured up for something. Jackson’s was seen as a cut above the others because the staff would offer advice to the customers.

John Angus also remembers going to Burtons to get his Mod suits because ‘there were a huge amount of permutations from which to specify an individual style…There would be four or five fabric pattern books on display, with forty to fifty fabrics in each one. A suit would cost around fourteen pounds. I worked night shifts in the bakery while I was at school to pay for my clothes.’ Del Evans and Gill Taylor were Mods in Birmingham who met in a coffee bar and got together as they were both interested in clothes and music. On the same forum as Busby, Taylor recounts how, inspired by an image in a French magazine in 1962, ‘Del started designing his own suits and having them made to measure at Hepworths in New Street Birmingham.’ He had several Hepworths suits, including one navy chalk-stripe two-piece, a black and white tweed, and a navy pinstripe with a Ghillie collar. Photographs of Evans wearing the suits were posted online (see below).

Unfortunately I have not been able to locate surviving examples of Leeds multiple tailors’ suits ordered or worn by Mods in the 1960s in museum collections, despite the numerous personal accounts about them.

103 Busby chose to be a Mod when he was still at school aged 14 in 1964. Mark Charlton, ‘the Lost Tribes of Leicestershire’, *Jack That Cat Was Clean: The Online Mod/ern/ist Archive* <http://jackthatcatwasclean.blogspot.co.uk/2011/10/lost-tribes-of-leicestershire-mods-by.html> [accessed 3 November 2014].
106 MAG has a John Barran suit ‘cut very avant guarde’ according to Christopher Ratcliffe who bought it in 1966 to wear at school, for ‘going out’ and then at university. Though not described as a Mod suit its description has features similar to those worn by Mods. Unfortunately it could not be located on my research visit. MAG, 1980.368, John Barran Suit, 1966.
The made-to-measure tailoring of the Leeds multiples gave young men who cared about the specifics of their look the opportunity to have a suit made to their exact requirements, though it may have required some assertiveness with the sales staff. This was the case from the late 1940s drape suits to the Mods of the 1960s, but also included young men such as Raymond Fox who bought his first suit (the suit with which I began this chapter) from Hepworths when he started at the Yorkshire Electricity Board. Evidence from young men
who bought these suits, company material and the surviving garments demonstrate how the Leeds multiples catered to those in the male youth market who were buying tailored suits and that suits remained important for men to establish and assert their identity and personal style. However, the late 1960s saw Burtons in particular begin to branch out into other forms of clothes retailing and to divest themselves of manufacturing. This was in response to the extensive adjustments happening in the menswear market as the shift towards ready-to-wear clothing accelerated away from tailoring, the suit market remained static and consumption growth concentrated mainly in the under-30 age group.¹⁰⁷

3.23 Exterior of Mr Burt and Top Shop stores, Leicester, 1974.
LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.3426.

As part of this process Burtons identified the need to address the young consumer as a separate market – first with Top Shop for young women and then launching Mr Burt, a chain for young fashion-conscious men in 1971.¹⁰⁸ Research into the menswear industry and the impact of fashion in the early 1970s confirmed the importance of young men as fashion leaders – these early adopters were ‘young, under 30 and usually around 24 years of age’, they tended to buy from smaller outlets and were often influenced by ‘someone wearing a style similar to their last purchase, and before they actually bought it’.¹⁰⁹ Burtons evidently still saw tailoring as important to the young men’s market, as suits were among the myriad of garments for sale in Mr Burt.

Despite the decline in tailoring, for some young men in the 1970s suits were still desirable rather than being obligatory as the suit retained its aura of masculinity and for a few years formal tailoring became fashionable. One such example was Stephen Collins, discussed earlier in this chapter, whose first suit from Burtons was inspired by seeing a stylish city

¹⁰⁸ Top Shop was begun as an experiment in 1968 on the top floor of Peter Robinson, Sheffield (the department store chain owned by Burtons since the late 1940s) aimed at young women aged 13-25. Its success led to the Burton Group opening a chain of Top Shops across the country. Lester, ‘The Retailoring of Burton’, pp. 47-48; Robin Linklater, ‘Has Burton found the style for its retail comeback?’, Design, January 1979, p. 37.

gent in London. Another was Bob Entwistle who saved up from his job in a pub in Liverpool collecting glasses and was given money by his father and brother to buy his second suit, a brown ready-to-wear three-piece that cost around £50.00 (£280.70): ‘We certainly wouldn’t have bought made-to-measure. We couldn’t afford. I didn’t know there was such a thing called made-to-measure.’\(^{110}\) He bought it on a shopping trip with friends when he was about 17 in 1976 or 1977:

\[\text{I went in with a couple of friends and we we all chose suits and you know you couldn’t choose the black one ‘cause Frank had the black one and he couldn’t have the blue one because um, because Tony had the blue one, so you had to have the brown one [laughs].}\]\(^{111}\)

These suits operated as markers of homosocial manhood; they felt they needed suits to fit in with their group and the current fashion. It also meant they could get in to nightclubs as they were underage. ‘Everybody bought suits and we’d all go out to Tiffany’s and try and chat up women… Tiffany’s was a nightclub in Liverpool, it was the uh the one that everybody used to go to. Uh, not everybody- Well there were quite a few other ones, but it’s the one we used to go to because we could get in there’.\(^{112}\) They all bought three-piece suits as it gave them more options in what they wore:

\[\text{And sometimes you’d just wear the waistcoat, shirt and a waistcoat. And we used to have the shirts with great big collars as well that you’d spread over your uh um, you know little- great big collars and penny round collars as well that you’d spread. And so I brought uh- Used to wear like that. And I did buy some nice jackets, we bought, we all went out and bought blue velvet jackets once.}\]\(^{113}\)

Entwistle’s tailoring purchases were strongly connected to his friendship group, his desire to fit in with them (‘everybody else was wearing it so you had to wear it’), and to establish a sense of masculine identity as a young man, despite finding the exaggerated proportions of 1970s tailoring difficult to wear: ‘Yeah, that and anything I bought, I’d say “Well that looks good,” but then I got home and it looks rubbish when I get home. I hated it. And you know A-line flares and all that sort of stuff, the fashions end, but they’re awful.’\(^{114}\) He was also discouraged by not being able to get exactly what he wanted off-the-peg:

\[\text{But I mean, I wanted- You’d see, see these things in shop windows and say ‘That looks great. I want that.’…But they’d never have it in your size and whenever you’d go to look at it, it wasn’t the same because obviously shop}\]

---

\(^{110}\) Bob Entwistle. Relative value for 2010 calculated using Oliver and Williamson, MeasuringWorth, 2016. He kept the suit and then donated it to Ipswich Museum, now Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service.

\(^{111}\) Bob Entwistle. The only other reference I have for men shopping together is from Burtons managers guide in 1953 which refers to the requirement to specify when suit orders are from friends: ‘Two friends, must be cut from the same cloth’ or ‘for two friends, taken from different cloths’. WYAS, Burton Group Ltd, WYL1951/5 Managers Guide, Fifth Edition, 1st January 1953, p. 14.

\(^{112}\) Bob Entwistle.

\(^{113}\) Bob Entwistle.

\(^{114}\) Bob Entwistle.
windows they pull them really tight on there, they put pins in, and they make sure like the the lapels curl slightly, which you - Which I wanted.
You could never buy stuff like that, it just wasn’t there.\footnote{Bob Entwistle.}

Throughout his interview Entwistle expressed his awareness of fashion trends and the potential of dress to be significant, particularly as a young man wanting to be accepted and conform to the style of his social group. He was eloquent when describing the different looks of his friends and why he felt they were cool: ‘they knew how to carry clothes off that they wore and they knew about fashion and they knew what suited them. And they were the right size and everything about it seemed to go well…They might have been no good at anything else, but they were good at that and when you’re about 16 or 15 or 14, that’s really really important, your image.’\footnote{Bob Entwistle.} However, this was mixed with a lack of confidence in his own appearance and frustration at not being able to dress in a way that he felt was flattering and stylish.

Memories of the distinctive silhouette of the 1970s also provoked a level of self-mockery in men’s descriptions of themselves. Brian Rayner recalls when flares and platforms came in:

I can remember one day I was stood in near Burtons window…Right, well when the window’s like this and you stand here like this, you can see yourself from one angle…and I thought who’s that idiot with the lapels that were here and the flares that were there and the hair that was there, and I thought it’s me.\footnote{Brian Rayner.}

Mr Burt stores were designed to appeal to young men like Entwistle and his friends in Liverpool. They were outfitted in a bright orange colour scheme and stocked with casual clothing alongside fashionably cut suits and jackets. Some Mr Burt stores were located within current Burtons branches, others were paired with a Top Shop – for example in Leicester (see 3.23 above) – in an effort to cater to the changing shopping habits of young people. Angus Stewart, Burtons styling director in the early 1970s predicted that:

Retailing will involve a development of a whole shopping environment, a part of leisure…Men and women will shop together, it will be a pleasurable business, an opportunity to dress, to have a passagiamo, you’ll buy clothes and makeup and jeans and jewelry and go to the sauna and the hairdressers all in the same area.\footnote{Mike Denley remembers working in the Brighton Mr Burt and thought that the store was ‘ahead of its time, they sold the top fashions in every way’ recalling the sound system that played ‘albums like “Dark Side of The Moon”…Lou Reed and his album “Walk On The Wild Side” and lots of other really cool music’\footnote{Prudence Glynn, ‘Serving You Right’, The Times, 7 August 1973, p. 8.} This atmosphere was promoted in a 1973

\footnote{Boutiques in London’s Carnaby Street became renowned for playing loud pop music earlier in the 1960s, especially the stores of entrepreneur John Stephen. Nik Cohn, Today There are No Gentlemen (London:}
raunchy cinema ad in which young men in Mr Burt suits and casual clothes were admired, undressed and caressed by glamorous young women (see screen shots below).

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

3.25 Screenshots from 1973 Mr Burt cinema advertisement.

‘Mr Burt’ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=87Z-M7Q_tjE> [accessed 18 September 2015].

A surviving Mr Burt suit, the only one I have located, provides tangible evidence of the tailoring Burtons made for this label and of Burtons ready-to-wear suits of this period. The three-piece suit made of dark grey wool with a blue windowpane check displays the fashionable detailing seen in the cinema advertisement. The single breasted jacket features lapels measuring over 4 ½ inches (12 cm), a defined waist with two back vents and deep flaps on the two skirt pockets. The waistcoat has pointed fronts while the wide flared trousers are designed to fit snugly to the body as they have flat fronts, no back pockets and no belt loops on the 32 inch (82 cm) waist. The windowpane checks have been matched well down the back of the jacket but some of the pattern cutting and the sewing betrays the lack of accuracy. The label is uneven and has been sewn without precision, the skirt pocket


120 ‘Mr Burt’ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=87Z-M7Q_tjE> [accessed 18 September 2015]. Thank you to Elizabeth Selby of the Jewish Museum London for this reference. The campaign was reported on in Adweek. J. King, ‘This Burton Experience is Quite Something’, Adweek, 23 March 1973, p. 16 in Jobling, Advertising Menswear, p. 108.
flaps on the jacket and waistcoat have not been cut from exactly the same part of the windowpane check and loose threads have not been clipped. The suit has no factory label but is likely to have been made in one of Burtons’ factories in England; by the mid-1970s the previous reputation of Leeds tailors as producing high quality suits was under threat, with some considering them to be increasingly inferior to imported tailoring.  

Unfortunately, unlike Top Shop, Mr Burt was not a success and the chain was eventually closed in 1976. It is unclear exactly why Mr Burt failed, but it has been suggested that Burtons’ lack of experienced and knowledgeable buyers for non-tailored garments, the type of production capacity, and lack of stock control were contributory factors as the clothes in the shops were obviously not attractive enough to the young male consumers they were aimed at.

3.26 Mr Burt of Burton suit on display and label on inside lining.

Winchester, Hampshire Cultural Trust, C2001.7.14, Mr Burt of Burton.

---

122 Lester, ‘The Retailoring of Burton’.
Mr Burt was an ambitious attempt by Burtons to explicitly segment their menswear by age with a completely separate label and retail offer. At around the same time they also introduced a huge new range of clothing to the Burtons stores explicitly aimed at the male youth market who were looking for casual and fashionable ready-to-wear, radically reversing Burtons’ long-standing principle of only selling tailored outerwear. One example of this new style of garment is a slim-fitting green cotton denim jacket held by Manchester Art Gallery. It is detailed with yellow zig-zag overstitching, has two press-stud fastenings,
very wide rounded lapels, patch pockets and a narrow waist (80 cm or 31 inches). Unlined, with imprecise stitching this jacket was far removed from Burtons’ traditional craft-based clothing production with its emphasis on quality, skill and made-to-measure making. By the 1970s jeans and other clothes made from cotton denim had become a mainstay of young men’s leisurewear, a shift which Burtons actively pursued, for example by selling Levi’s jeans and Adidas sportswear (see below).

3.28 Burtons green cotton denim jacket, c. 1972.


---

With the decision in 1976 to close Mr Burt, a large number of management changes and restructuring, in 1977 the Burton Group began the process of revamping and refocusing their menswear. The decision was taken to retain the Burton and Jackson names ‘to benefit from the affection and loyalty still attaching to them, but to adapt the stance to appeal to the younger market segments, which are where the money is’ while the lessons of Top Shop were applied to menswear by ‘setting up a “Top Man” chain specifically to appeal to the 15-to-25 age range, leaving the Burton shops to concentrate on the 25s-to-45s.’

Top Man was launched in 1978 and, as with Mr Burt, many were twinned with a Top Shop so that couples could shop together. Burton commissioned designers Fitch & Company to design Top Man and also a new Burtons look.

Sean Nixon argued that the design ‘evoked the feel of the disco or Top of the Pops’, drawing on the visual style of 1960s boutiques with a design-led approach to selling. Though in black and white, photographs (see below) of the Top Man interiors with feature lighting, chrome, mirrors, mannequins placed on the shop floor as well as the young male (and female) sales assistants, demonstrate the effectiveness of the attention to detail and market analysis which went into the new retail chain. Bob Entwistle and his friends shopped at Top Man in the late 1970s and early 1980s (which he interchanges with ‘Top Shop’ in the interview, the positive

---

126 Linklater, ‘Has Burton found the style’, pp. 37-40.
associations of the Top Shop label clearly having had an effect) in Liverpool, feeling that there ‘weren’t that many shops, good shops that had fashionable clothes in them’ but Top Man did. Also he had a friend who worked there who would shoplift clothes to order: ‘he could put them on under his clothes and he’d walk out like the Michelin man. [laughs] Meet you later on and uh give them to you in the pub.’

The differences in the segmented market for Burton and Top Man are evident in the illustration on the cover of the Burton Group 1979 annual report – two men are depicted toting Top Man carrier bags, one in casual clothing, and the other in an up-to-date slim-line pale blue suit, while the owner of the Burton bag is older and dressed in a more conservative business suit. However, casualwear remained significant for the Burton brand (see, for example, the lurid red acrylic jumper from the Manchester Art Gallery collection below) and with the redevelopment of the label, market research in 1983 found the Burton chain was successfully attracting men aged 18 to 25, with around 50 per cent of sales from this age group.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

3.30 Redesigned Burtons, Top Shop and Top Man, exteriors 1978 and Top Man interiors with young male and female sales staff.

Linklater, ‘Has Burton found the style’, p. 37, p. 39.

---

129 Bob Entwistle.

130 The green Burton logo is for the French Burton London division which was sold in 1981. LMG, LEEAG.2011.0183.

As Burtons belatedly discovered, the young male consumer had become essential to the menswear industry by the 1970s as a separate market, rather than as part of the continuum of every man whom Burtons had successfully clothed in suits for most of the twentieth century. Burtons were able to use design and market research to effectively refocus their retailing and appeal to these young men with Top Man, after the false start of Mr Burt, which many of the other Leeds multiple tailors were unable to do. Suits and tailoring were a far less important part of a young man’s wardrobe in the 1970s than they had been in the three decades prior. However, throughout the post-war period acquiring and wearing a suit remained significant for many young men. Buying a suit independently, especially a made-to-measure suit, gave young men the opportunity to express their identity through their clothing, a process which could evoke lasting memories and became intertwined in the narratives of their lives. The Leeds multiples saw young men as an important part of their business and made concerted efforts to cater to the changing suit styles dictated by
youthful consumption, but until the 1970s this was facilitated within their traditional model of tailoring retailing and production.

3.3 Weddings

‘I got my wedding suit made at weaver to wearer. the 30 shilling tailors 1950. My suit cost £4.10 shillings. one of the best suit’s I ever had made [sic].’\(^{132}\) Weaver to Wearer was one of the cheapest of the Leeds multiples, but Jack Kitchen, who made this comment on a photograph of a Weaver to Wearer branch in Leeds, was clearly satisfied with the quality of the suit he bought for this special event in his life. Marriage remained an important life stage and the formality of the occasion usually demanded the bridegroom (and male family and guests) wear a suit, deemed to be the appropriate masculine dress. The Leeds multiples recognised that special events such as weddings were considered worthy of expenditure and attempted to capitalise on this. For example, Brian Hill recalled that in the 1960s due to the tax law there was extra demand for weddings to be held in spring which the Leeds multiples took advantage of:

One of the um big promotions that we used to have both at Hepworths and at at Alexandres was ’cause lots, in those days lots of people used to get married in March because if you got married in March right you got all, you got all the the− ’cause when you were taxed in those days you were taxed, as a single person you were taxed more than a married person so if you got married in March right, before the end of the financial year which is, was still April the 6th you got a− You got a whole year’s tax back. So you know, so we used to have big promotions, the wedding suit.\(^{133}\)

A Hepworths advertisement from March 1967 shows off one of these promotions (see below) as part of their ‘This is living’ campaign featuring a conservatively cut two-button lounge suit which would be appropriate for both formal and semi-formal occasions.

---


\(^{133}\) Brian Hill.
Due to the meanings attached to marriage and the frequent investment in new clothing, men as well as women can usually recall what they wore while the garments themselves are often kept, though it is usually women’s clothing that dominates discussion. As Ingrid Mida and Alexandra Kim have pointed out in regard to wedding dresses, they can serve ‘as a material memory of a significant life event. The emotional poignancy attached to these garments is evidenced by their high survival rate in women’s wardrobes, as well as in museum and study collections.’ However, this is clearly also the case with men’s suits, particularly those of the groom, and many men went to the Leeds multiples to purchase a new suit for their engagement or wedding, evidenced by the twelve tailored garments with provenance I have located in museum collections. They span the period from around 1945 to 1976, and the museum catalogues record a variable amount of information, sometimes just the date and location of the wedding and sometimes the name of the couple, while a small number have been acquired with much more detail including stories or photographs

---


of the day. All of the pieces are made-to-measure and are single or double breasted lounge suits and show varying levels of fashionable detailing and cuts, and of wear. By undertaking a close study of three of these pieces (a Harris Tweed jacket and two navy blue pinstripe suits) within the context of the styles and choices offered by the Leeds multiples’ made-to-measure tailoring, the significance of these garments to the narrative of men’s experiences will be shown, revealing the importance of retaining a garment that has a connection to such an important life event.

In 1967 Mr J. Comie bought a made-to-measure Harris Tweed Norfolk jacket from Burtons for his engagement (see above). The choice of tweed and the style – popularised in the nineteenth century for sportswear – could be considered a surprising choice for an engagement event where formal tailoring might be expected, as both the style and the cloth of the jacket have a strong association with the countryside. Conventions about where certain types of men’s tailoring could and should be worn were relaxing by the 1960s and a man named Peter Miller remembered that he bought an off-the-peg Harris Tweed suit from Burtons ‘for 10 pound around 1964, just great for wearing to the hot and sticky

---

Regent dance hall on a Thursday evening.\textsuperscript{138} The contemporary Burtons style guide from which it may have been chosen presents the jacket in a lighter-weight cloth, streamlined, with tubular silhouette, giving the effect of a fashionable casual jacket for leisurewear. Mr Comie’s choice of the heavy and textured effect of the Harris Tweed, wider lapels and a lower gorge for his jacket gives a more sporting effect than the option in the guide, more in keeping with the heritage of the style. A Hardy Amies for Hepworths ready-to-wear sports jacket advertised in 1968 represents Harris Tweed in just such a setting, the male model accessorised with a shotgun and a dog (see above).\textsuperscript{139} The Burtons Norfolk jacket was withdrawn in November 1969 according to the handwritten note across the photograph of the page, presumably as its sales no longer justified its inclusion as an option for the high volume Burtons required. While it is impossible to tell how representative Mr Comie was as a Burtons customer, his jacket provides an insight into his personal style and design choices, which have been preserved because of their connection to a memorable event in his life through this garment.


\textsuperscript{139} However, the dog is a German shepherd, a breed which are not usually considered to be hunting dogs. LMG, LEEDMS.1988.0042.12, Hepworths display advertisement, Autumn 1968.
Two 1970s wedding suits, both in navy blue pinstripe and both three-piece, also demonstrate the differing responses men could make to their decisions about their wedding attire. The first dates from 1973 and features fashionable tailored detailing of the period (see below). Worn by David Gillett for his marriage to Lorna Woodhouse in Reddish on 21 July 1973, it cost £39 (£367.90) from Hepworths and was one of their Hardy Amies made-to-measure suits.\(^{140}\) The jacket has a rolled sleeve head and very wide curved lapels, the five-button waistcoat has pointed fronts and the trousers have a wide waistband fastening with two buttons and a curved opening (described as dropped welted cross pockets in a Burton\'s style guide).\(^ {141}\) Hepworths advertised suits at £29 (£298.40) in autumn 1972, and Hardy Amies for Hepworths made-to-measure started at £36 (£174.40) in 1977 so Gillett clearly invested a considerable amount in his suit to match the significance of the life event of his wedding.\(^ {142}\) The suit shows little evidence of wear; given that it was a formal three-piece as well as its fashionable detailing, this is perhaps understandable as Gillett may not have had many opportunities to wear his suit again before it would have been strikingly outmoded, the rounded wide lapels an immediately visible reminder of its original date.


The second 1970s wedding suit shows a much more pragmatic and low-key approach by the groom. Roger Burges and his fiancée Jenny married at Worthing Registry Office on Tuesday 15 March 1977 at 12.15 pm. Burges described the event as a ‘quiet affair’, his wife had made her own dress from a McCall’s dress pattern in a maroon cotton printed with floral sprigs, and it was attended by their parents, some relatives and ‘a few of my work
colleagues (during their lunch hour) from the Midland Bank, Broadstairs'. Burges wore the three-piece suit he had ordered the year before from Burtons in Bognor Regis (31 March 1976). Single breasted with two buttons, the jacket features wide lapels and deep slanted pocket flaps on the skirts, while the waistcoat has four pockets and the flared trousers include a cash pocket with flap and a wide waistband fastening with two buttons. He wore the suit with a navy, red and grey tie with a stripe and floral design. Burges doesn’t mention why he had originally bought this suit, but it appears that it may well have been an everyday work suit, which he then wore for his wedding. Working in a bank there would be an expectation of wearing a suit as a male employee and his suit exhibits a combination of details which fit with both fashionable norms (flared trousers, wide lapels) and conservative formality (three-piece, navy pinstripe). This would fit also with the lack of fuss he and his wife made of the event, while respecting the convention of the occasion. However, it was this suit rather than any of Burges’ other garments that were donated to Worthing Museum – being worn for his wedding gave the suit both personal and social significance and is likely to have been what ensured its preservation.

---

143 Roger Burges’ notes accompanying his suit. The suit, his wife’s wedding dress, the dress pattern and his tie were all donated. Worthing, Worthing Museum and Art Gallery (hereafter WMAG), 1998/194, Wedding Suit, Burtons, 1976.
3.38 Roger Burges wedding suit and tie.

3.4 Older Men

In a pub, I met a research chemist, thirty-one-years old, who was married and had two children and earned around £40 a week. He didn’t follow fashion but owned seven suits, all bought at Burtons, and chose them with care. He thought that they mattered, not as objects but symbolically, and each purchase was a major event. ‘When I buy a new suit,’ he said, ‘it’s almost like getting promotion.’  

The anonymous research chemist described in this anecdote at the end of Nik Cohn’s innovative 1971 book about men’s fashion was an example of the ordinary men whom the Leeds multiples saw as their customers. At 31, he was past the age of the youth market which has dominated the discourse about men’s fashion in the post-war period. Nevertheless his suits were an important part of his identity and an emblem of a particular form of masculine work. As Julia Twigg has pointed out with regard to dress history: ‘Mainstream, particularly middle aged or older styles, have received little attention in this literature, reflecting the wider neglect of age as a dimension of identity.’ However, his obvious excitement and emotional connection to the suits he bought from Burtons highlight the value in exploring men’s experiences of their clothing beyond the styles of the attention-grabbing teens and twenties. The suits worn by men like him and sold in their millions by the Leeds multiples were garments which could also attract opprobrium. For example, Colin MacInnes was scathing in his assessment of what he called ‘the “men’s wear” thing’ in the late 1950s:

This was, is, and doubtless long will be, the stable style of the great self-confidently tasteless mass of reliable English petty-bourgeois males. Three-piece of solid materials; but dung-coloured ‘lovat’ shades, total lack of chic or imagination in the floppy, flappy, shapeless ‘cut’.

MacInnes was not specific about the age of the men wearing this form of tailoring, but his description fits with the kinds of assumptions made about the clothes worn by older people (such as that they are out-of-date, unfashionable, boring, ill-fitting and conservative) and reflects the lack of attention paid to their dress. Drawing attention to these aspects of menswear (the unchanging or stagnated and lack of attention to fashion) also throws light on the way this has been used to support a particular definition of masculinity which as Martin Pumphrey has argued, claimed ‘its natural right to dominance on the basis of its permanence, unitary truth and resistance to change, its seriousness and no-nonsense rejection of the frivolous, superficial, ephemeral and trivial.’ This element of men’s clothing was observed by Michael Roper in his study of ‘organization man’ of post-war Britain, where he argued his interviewees’ business suits functioned as a means of creating

144 Nik Cohn, Today There are No Gentlemen (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), p. 172.  
neutrality, hiding the male body and deflecting attention from it. For the Leeds multiples, these features of men’s tailoring and the older male market posed problems due to their attempts to appeal to the young male consumer to stimulate greater demand, while catering to the widest age range possible and adhering to their made-to-measure mode of production. For the purposes of this discussion, men who were considered to be beyond the youth market – aged from their late twenties and over – by the Leeds multiples are the focus. Although this is a broad swathe of the male market, it was these men who were distinguished by the tailors from younger men, defined by their differing tastes and consumption practices. Exploration of the suits bought and worn by older men from the Leeds multiple tailors within the context of the industry, will provide greater insight into the diversity of men’s experiences of their clothing and the biographies of their suits.

The menswear industry and the Leeds multiples’ perceptions of older men’s dress styles and consumption were that they spent less, were conservative in their taste and that their aging bodies meant that fashionable styles were not appropriate: ‘Emphasised fashions are for the young and shapely; the middle-aged and elderly, and the disproportionate and ungainly, should be dressed with circumspection.’ These opinions were used as further reasons to focus on the younger male market. For example in 1953 Lionel Jacobson of Burtons informed his sales staff that:

There were certain branches that could sell Harris Tweed two-piece suits but in the main these sales were being made to men of fifty years of age and over. It was stressed that the future policy would be to cater for the young men who buy more frequently.

A 1954 article in Style for Men lamented that it was the ‘25s to 44s’ who ‘used to be the trade’s bread and butter’ but many were now ‘either bogged down by high rents, school fees and the appalling costs of housing, or they have broken into three-figure incomes and are hard hit by taxation and living up to their standards.’ A 1959 study reported that married men’s fall in spending on their clothing was ‘often the result of affection for their families, whom they insist upon dressing well – even at the expense of their wardrobes.’ In 1965 one industry insider told Men’s Wear that he felt there were ‘two distinct style groups…the younger man who is fairly adventurous and the older man who is most certainly not. For the latter we still have to make more conservative clothes’, and discussion of the clothing and tailoring of men who did not fit into the sought-after youth market could be negative for these reasons. 

---

However, while it is true that men did not tend to buy suits in the same numbers as they aged, older men were still important consumers. In 1953 Burtons conducted a sales survey of all the suits sold in 50 selected branches. The survey compiled results of sales over six weeks in February and March 1953 and was part of an experimental promotional push by the company to attempt to increase sales of ready-to-wear suits which had begun in 1952 (it actually resulted in higher sales of made-to-measure). Part of the data collected was a ‘Census of Customers’ Ages’ which revealed how many suits were bought by men aged between 15 and over 71 and whether they were made-to-measure or ready-made (see below).

The sales revealed that the number of suits bought by men did decrease as they aged but also how significant the older male customer was. Out of a total of 27,287 suits sold over the six-week period, the group who bought the highest number of suits were men aged between 36 and 40 (nearly 4,500 suits). Those aged under 25 made up 18 per cent of sales (4,940 suits) while men aged between 26 and 40 comprised around 41 per cent of sales (11,206 suits) as did men aged 41 and over (11,141 suits). Figures from survey research for the *Daily Herald* newspaper in 1961 reflected similar findings, with older men less likely

---

156 All figures collated from data in tables from WYL1951/127 Tables: Census of Customers’ Ages: Sales Promotion and Stock Distribution Scheme, 1952-1953.
to have bought a suit in the previous year than younger men but also demonstrating that
men in their thirties and older were still active consumers.\footnote{Daily Herald Readers and
the Market for Men’s Outerwear (London: Oldhams Press Ltd, 1961), Table 25, p. 41.}
A suit sales consumer survey by Mintel cited at the beginning of this chapter covering the 1970s
showed that the
weighting by age of suit sales remained relatively constant within the context of declining
sales over all (see below). In 1973 46 per cent of men aged 15-24 had bought a suit, by
1982 this had declined to 25 percent; for men aged 55 and over the drop was from 32 per
cent to 23 per cent.\footnote{Figures from Mintel Market Intelligence, February 1983, p. 68 in Beasley, ‘A Study
of Corporate Objectives for the Retailing of Menswear,’ Table 3.7, p. 77.} These figures reinforce the balancing act that the Leeds multiple
tailors had to continue to perform in regard to their broad customer base and the
significance to the multiples of men aged in their thirties and older as consumers of suits
even as they sought to appeal to the trend-setting younger male.

3.40 Mintel Market Intelligence, February 1983, p. 68. Based on a nationally representative sample of men
of Corporate Objectives for the Retailing of Menswear,’ Table 3.7, p. 77.

Older male consumers were often viewed by the Leeds multiples in terms of their role as
married and family men, a position where their consumption was mediated by women.
Women’s influence on men’s clothing was of continual interest to the menswear industry.
It was accepted that mothers bought their sons’ clothing and that for many young men
buying their own tailoring was a way of establishing their independence, but there was also
an awareness of the importance of wives’ and girlfriends' opinions to men's clothing
consumption. A Jackson the Tailor sales booklet which was circulated to Burtons staff was
explicit: ‘If your customer brings his wife with him, sell to her. This does not mean that you
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should treat him like a dummy, but it is invariably the case that you will have a satisfied customer provided you have a satisfied customer’s wife.” A 1956 article in Men’s Wear argued that women were a factor in the sale of menswear but that while women could influence men’s clothing habits ‘they cannot change them without their husband’s agreement’. Burtons undertook their own survey in 1965 of 12,000 women accompanying male customers to 600 of their stores. They found that 51 per cent of wives or girlfriends accompanied their husbands when they bought a suit and 63 per cent of them ‘said that their menfolk sought their advice about the choice of suit’. An undated Burtons cartoon, which may have been drawn in response to this survey, illustrated the positive potential of women’s engagement with men’s suit buying as a meek flat-capped balding husband is shepherded into a Burtons by his wife and transformed into a confident stylish man by his resulting made-to-measure (see below). One 1965 article approvingly commented that there had been some change from the past when after marriage a man would have “settled down” abruptly to wearing clothes almost like their fathers’ to a situation where married men ‘are retaining more of their style-consciousness as they grow older’. A research project in the early 1970s also found women’s role could be significant with 29 per cent of their male survey respondents stating they would discuss a potential purchase of clothing with a wife or girlfriend. Journalist Jean Rook’s book Dressing for Success summed up many of the perceptions of women’s role in shaping the wardrobes of men, particularly married white-collar middle-class men. In terms of suits, she considered three business suits a minimum; the multiple tailors were acceptable (her husband bought Hardy Amies from Hepworths at her instigation); while at a pinch she felt a man could ‘get away with a couple of from £12 Burton or John Collier suits until he gets his promotion.’ As for style, she recommended a ‘current-looking cut. Nothing flashy of course, but it isn’t necessary, these days, to stick to the old White Shirt and Single-Breasted Clerical Grey.’ Rook’s advice was concerned with a wife’s role to assist her husband to get ahead and to ensure that he was successful, which was an approach echoed by the Leeds multiples in most of their representations of the male consumer.

---


161 ‘Woman’s Influence, Burton’s Plot It,’ Men’s Wear, 9 January 1965, p. 7;


166 Rook Dressing for Success, p. 78. Relative worth in 2010 would be over £160.00, Officer and Williamson, Measuring Worth, 2016.

167 Rook Dressing for Success, p. 78.
The elevation of youthful styles and attention on the youth market in the post-war period meant that this is what the Leeds multiples also tended to emphasise in their advertising. However, as Mort and Thompson established in their analysis of Burtons’ approach to male consumption in the 1950s, they did not use images of youths or teenagers but of young adult men.\footnote{Mort and Thompson, ‘Retailing, Commercial Culture and Masculinity’, p. 117.} This became more apparent in the advertising by the Leeds multiples in the later 1950s to the 1970s where the illustrations and male models chosen were obviously youthful (and except very occasionally were not middle-aged or older), but were also not overly young. For example, the cover of a 1950s John Collier style guide was illustrated with a fashion drawing of two men – one in his twenties and the second clearly depicted as a man of at least middle-age as he has been drawn not only wearing a more subdued and darker coloured jacket than his companion, he also sports a moustache and a trilby, accessories strongly identified with older men at this time. In 1969 Burtons chose an older male model for one of their ‘Director Suit’ advertisements, his conservatively cut grey hair and sober suit matched with the essential trappings of an executive office, and the associated masculine power of the businessman (see both below).
This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.

3.42 Cover of John Collier style guide, c. 1950s.
LMG, LEEAG.2011.0259, Sportswear for the modern man.

3.43 Burtons advertisement, 1969.
Advertising Archive,
<http://www.advertisingarchives.co.uk/?service=asset&action=show_zoom_window_popup&language=en&asset=27205&location=grid&asset_list=28296,28295,28291,28287,28286,28285,27205,24274,19380,18136,14501,11240,4694> [accessed 2 February 2016].
The need to cater to different ages was also apparent in the suit cuts that the multiples offered. In 1960 when Hepworths launched their new image, advertising campaign and suit style, they emphasised that while the cut of the tailoring would incorporate ‘the latest fashion trends from America and the Continent’, they had been designed to ‘appeal to men in all age groups, for unlike the Continental Cut, it has not been designed exclusively for the younger generation.’

This sensitivity to the existence of age ordering in men’s dress, where particular suit cuts and styles were thought to be appropriate to men of different ages, was important. For example, one Scottish teenager commented that ‘fathers’ should wear suits that were not ‘bang up to date but they should have nice, well-cut suits. Shouldn’t wear suits for ten years. Got to help them out of conservative thinking’.

Partly it was due to the changes in men’s bodies as they aged, as a tailoring guide explained: ‘The problem of how a stout man can be clothed is the most common, because legions of respectable citizens tend to grow portly in the forties.’

The domination of youthful styles could be problematic for older consumers trying to find garments which were stylish but which they felt were age-appropriate. This was the case for Mr Cecil H. Robinson who questioned fashion designer Hardy Amies after a lecture he gave which included some of his suit designs for Hepworths: ‘Mr Amies has shown us some designs for young men. Has he thought of designing for the more conservative older man, to give him a suit which is elegant but which does not make him look like an overgrown teenage?’ Amies replied that he had but that: ‘I have not shown you any such clothes to-day because I thought that they would be rather dull to see by comparison with fashions for the young.’

Amies comment revealed the domination of the youthful ethos in fashion as it was deemed more exciting and interesting compared to the drabness of styles designed for older men.

There were also considerations of personal choices and preferences where men became comfortable with particular styles of tailoring or details which they adhered to even as fashions changed and they aged. This had the effect of creating an image of conservatism in older men’s clothing choices (for example continuing to choose heavier weight cloths for their made-to-measure suits when lighter weights became more common – a detail remembered by Brian Hill) and was often used to condemn men as having no interest in fashion. A survey undertaken by John Collier in 1964 highlighted these issues for the menswear industry and the Leeds multiple tailors. The survey involved observers standing on a selection of street corners in London noting the styles of tailoring worn by men as they passed and recorded that: ‘seven out of every ten men who passed had turn-ups on their trousers; six had baggy trousers “that hadn’t seen an iron in three months”; and only

three had slim-fitting trousers – and these were worn by men in their teens. They followed up the street survey with checks on their made-to-measure orders in some of their branches which confirmed that ‘eight out of every ten men chose turn-ups for their trousers, and of these only two chose trouser bottoms with widths under 17 inches’ and concluded that British men were not interested in high fashion. At this point in the post-war period the fashionable silhouette for men’s trousers was fitted at the waist, narrow and tapered legs, and without turn-ups, the cut markedly distinguished from the fuller baggier trouser of drape suits from ten years earlier. Brian Rayner remembered this difference particularly between the suits his father wore and his own: ‘His suits were the sort of big drape things. And that, I mean he’d look and he’d say, you know you look stupid in those little narrow trousers.’ The survey showed up the problems the Leeds multiples faced, put bluntly in the reaction by trade journal Men’s Wear that ‘it seems logical to assume that the fashion-conscious will spend more on their clothing than the non-fashion-conscious, either by paying more for a suit or buying more of them’ and noting that while high fashion was ‘not for the average man…its effects percolate to the average man in the shape of modified versions of what was initially high fashion.’ Men, particularly older men, who were satisfied with tailoring that was not considered fashionable were not going to purchase new suits.

However, by looking at and interpreting older men’s suits through object study, meanings other than simply a garment’s correspondence to fashionable modes can be understood, especially with ordinary clothing worn by ‘the average man’. Two items of tailoring which epitomise this type of garment and which could be dismissed as not being of particular interest due to their lack of high fashion styling and also because they were owned and worn by a London accountant, are a lounge suit and sports jacket from Hepworths. Both made-to-measure, the suit and jacket were bought by William Howarth (1919-2004) in 1975 when he would have been 56. His grey two-piece, single breasted suit appears appropriate to his profession, the width of the lapels and the check cloth the most obvious reference to current style trends, but is otherwise understated. His suit shows clear evidence of wear: slight fraying to the edges of one of the trouser pockets; loss of a cuff button; staining and possible cigarette burn marks to the trousers; damage to the jacket lining. Howarth’s choice of sports jacket shows quite a different look as it features distinctive patch pockets with rounded edges and inverted pleats, and is much less worn. The jacket fronts are angled away from the lapels, showing how they were cut to accommodate Howarth’s middle-aged stomach. It appears he wore these clothes until his early 60s, perhaps when he retired. These two garments give a small insight into Howarth’s personal taste within the

175 ‘Street-corner survey’, p. 18.
176 Brian Rayner.
conventions of male white collar work, the more casual sports jacket allowing greater freedom of expression but the well-worn tailored suit telling of everyday experience. They also are an example of clothing worn by older men, who by the 1970s were not the key concern of the multiple tailors as they actively attempted to attract younger men’s consumption.

3.44 William Howarth’s Hardy Amies for Hepworths suit. One button missing on left cuff, wear to edge of trouser pocket and jacket lining.

Howarth wore his Hepworths suit and jacket for around seven years but other men wore theirs for far longer, often for many years after they were first bought. These are the garments and wearing practice which fulfilled all of the anxieties of the menswear industry and exemplified the construction of masculinity as oblivious to style change. However, they also shed light on other significant aspects of the suits made by the multiples, including their quality of production. One example of this is a made-to-measure John Collier suit that was bought in 1964 by Mr M. A. Harber in Norwich. Made of wool and Terylene cloth, Mr Harber’s two-piece suit features up-to-date details such as the dark brown checked pattern of the cloth, narrow tapered trousers with 14 inch cuffs (38 cm) and no turn-ups (he was clearly an exception to the men observed in the John Collier survey of the same year), and a square cut and short jacket with narrow lapels (see below). There are no other details recorded about Mr Harber but he did combine the fashionable with the traditional in his suit by opting for a button-fly trouser fastening rather than a zip. He also continued to wear this suit until 1980 when it was donated to NMAS in Norwich with the green rayon pocket square he accessorised it with. Considering over how many years this suit was worn, it remained in remarkably good condition with evidence of wear limited to some soiling along the bottom edge of the jacket and a small ink stain on the inside lining.

---

(disintegration of the ‘stay-up’ band inside the waist is due to the nature of the material rather than wear). The lack of damage to the suit could indicate that Mr Harber may not have worn his suit frequently or he took very good care of it (or both) and it shows the quality of the cloth and of John Collier’s tailoring production. It also implies that his body did not change, that he could still fit this suit (it did not appear to have been altered), as well as demonstrating his acceptance with wearing this style of suit through the later 1960s and 1970s when this silhouette was completely out of fashion. This was a wearing practice which was an anathema to the Leeds multiple tailors who exerted themselves to try to convince men that they needed to update their garments as fashions changed.

Another example of this form of long-term relationship with a suit can be seen in a navy blue serge pinstripe suit which was originally bought from a Burtons branch in Norwich in 1936.\footnote{LMG, LEEDMS.1987.0011.6, Navy blue pinstripe double breasted suit.} Purchased by Mr D. Upham as his ‘Sunday Best Suit’ he said he always wore it for formal occasions including interviews, funerals, ‘school anniversaries, informal dances, firms informal “get togethers”’ and in 1949 he wore it when he got married.\footnote{LMG, LEEDMS.1987.0011.6, Mr D. Upham, note with suit donation.} He wrote that later on, ‘due to the TV series “Steptoe & Son” when “turn-ups” and 19” bottoms of the leg were outmoded and tapered legs were “in” my children always referred to it as “your Steptoe suit”.’\footnote{Mr D. Upham.} The suit also became the formal dress of his eldest son who wore it on several occasions for interviews. Unsurprisingly, considering the suit was worn for more
than 30 years, this can be read on the garment with fading and rubbing to the cloth at the back of the collar and the bottom of the cuffs on the jacket. It also has staining to the lapels and jacket front while the inside sleeve linings are coming away at the underarm and shoulder seam, and the trousers show dirt and marks, possibly splash marks from walking, on the turn-ups. The suit’s quality is also apparent as it is inherently sound. Mr Upham had expected to be buried in his suit, but instead it was donated it to LMG. As a suit representing men’s fashion, this garment would be interpreted by its date of purchase – the square shoulders, double-breasted cut, defined waist and wide lapels of the jacket paired with the wide-legged trousers and turned up cuffs – all fashionable details of 1930s tailoring. However, the way it was worn by Mr Upham (and also by his son) tells of the possibilities of alternative narratives of men’s clothing, representing experiences and life events, as well as being a repository of family meanings and resonances.


LMG, LEEDM.S.1987.0011.6, Navy blue pinstripe double breasted suit.

The tailoring choices of men such as Mr Upham and Mr Harber who were satisfied with one suit to last nearly a lifetime represented the type of male clothing consumption that the menswear industry and the Leeds multiple tailors hoped to overturn with their emphasis on
the youth market and greater fashion change. Both of these men’s suits and the way they continued to wear them long after fashions had moved on, typify the kinds of complaints about men’s tailoring generally and older men’s dress in particular. However, they also showcase everyday clothing consumption. Surveys of men’s suit buying and wearing as well as men’s personal narratives and surviving garments from the Leeds multiples, have shown that this was a commonly held experience. As Cheryl Buckley and Hazel Clark have argued:

The clothes worn by most people going about their daily lives have been typically a synthesis of new, old, bold, and mundane... By looking beyond fashion’s familiar terrain – the catwalk, the magazine, the boutique, the department store, the designer – we can trace a complementary, everyday fashion trajectory.\textsuperscript{184}

The status and ubiquity of the suit as a masculine form of attire, even as it declined in importance in the post-war period, provides an insight into some of the ways that men negotiated their sense of identity and relationships. Suits could operate as a marker of conformity but also of agency and choice, whether this was to follow the latest cuts and styles or to continue to wear a suit well after it had gone out of fashion. These styles were often shaped by popular culture, for example reflecting the influence of America and Continental fashions, pop music, or by a named designer such as Hardy Amies. The significant collaboration between Hepworths and Hardy Amies is the focus of the final chapter of this thesis. The made-to-measure tailoring offered by the Leeds multiples to such a large proportion of the male population facilitated the significance of the suit for many men as it involved emotional labour and an investment of time; to choose the cloth and design details; to negotiate the authority of a parent, wife or salesman; and to wait for the suit to be made. The process of getting and wearing a suit, especially those acquired from the Leeds multiple tailors, could create a space for young men to enter into adulthood and attempt to establish some independence, particularly if this was by choosing a style and cut that was highly fashionable or that was distinctive. The Leeds multiples were keen to attract these young male consumers and the personal narratives and surviving garments showed that they were successful to some extent in these efforts. Suits were also necessary attire for important events in men’s lives; one of the most meaningful of these could be a wedding and the survival of men’s wedding suits demonstrates this significance whether they were bought just for the marriage or were worn again. Despite the preoccupation of the Leeds multiples with younger styles of tailoring, older men remained valuable consumers throughout the post-war period and their experiences of suit buying and wearing, and their suits, contribute to a more complex understanding of men’s lives and identities.

Chapter 4.
The Fashion Business: Hepworts and Hardy Amies

Looking back over the twenty years of my association with Hepworts I can see various things. One is that I showed Hepworts and the manufacturers of shirts, ties, shoes and socks with whom I was later associated, that there is no need to be frightened of fashion.\(^1\)

In his second autobiography *Still Here*, the fashion designer and couturier Hardy Amies summed up his relationship with the Leeds multiple tailors Hepworts, putting himself in the role of fashion saviour. However, this chapter will demonstrate through an in-depth study of Hepworts and the company’s working relationship with Amies that this was a collaborative partnership which relied as much on Hepworts’ risk taking and experience as multiple tailors as Amies’ fashion credentials. Hepworts invested heavily in this venture with substantial marketing and advertising budgets and in the 1960s especially it was a considerable financial success with profits increasing year on year until the early 1970s.\(^2\) By drawing on Hepworts company sources, oral history interviews and media coverage of the Hepworts Amies collaboration, the crucial role played by Hepworts in the design, production and sales success of their suits will be illuminated. This is important as it facilitates a deeper understanding of the fashion industry, especially the processes of design and production for mass manufacture as well as the selling of fashion on the high street. This analysis will be framed within a broader discussion of the developments within the menswear and tailoring industries from the 1960s as they also began to utilise the reputations and design skills of fashion designers known, like Amies, for their backgrounds in women’s wear. As the previous chapters have shown, the Leeds multiple tailors deployed design and fashion in a variety of ways to appeal to male consumers with their suits in the decades after the Second World War. By employing Amies as their consultant designer from the early 1960s, Hepworts added a new and innovative approach to that array of established techniques. They pioneered the use of fashion designers by men’s tailoring companies in Britain, contributed to making a focus on this type of fashion mainstream for the Leeds multiples, and brought these designs to men on their local high streets. This case study also makes a significant addition to the history of men’s fashion of this period, the narrative of which is often dominated by the boutiques and extravagant styles of London’s Carnaby Street and Kings Road, or young men’s subcultural style.

In women’s fashion, Parisian haute couturiers had long been involved in allowing their designs to be copied for mass production internationally (especially by retailers and manufacturers in the United States) and after its establishment in 1946, Christian Dior


\(^2\) Reported year end profits increased by 21 per cent to £2.5 million in 1971 from £2.08 million in 1970 with turnover up 18 per cent to £18.3 million. Gross profits were £1.24 million in 1967, £1.52 million in 1968 and £1.73 million in 1969. ‘Hepworth Tailoring’, *The Times*, 23 November 1971, p. 24.
developed a model of licensing to widen the market for the products of the house.\(^3\) Menswear and men’s tailoring in particular had a completely different tradition of design and fashion with no equivalent to the publically renowned fashion designers of high-end women’s wear. Hardy Amies came from this sector of the clothing trade, which for many was the very definition of fashion – feminine, changeable and aspirational. For Leeds multiple tailor Hepworths to consider Amies was therefore a novel step. First I will briefly look at the differing histories of the two businesses and some possible influences on the partnership before moving on to discuss their collaboration in detail. A key element of the promotion of the collections created by Hardy Amies and Hepworths were the annual fashion shows put on by the company, making them an excellent case study to explore the ways that the Amies and Hepworths relationship operated, the impact on men’s fashion design, and fashion promotion within the menswear industry in Britain. While fashion shows and female models have a long history in the presentation of women’s clothing, particularly in the traditions of couture, the place of fashion shows in menswear and the role of the male model is far less well understood or documented historically.\(^4\) Amies and Hepworths’ use of male fashion shows during the 1960s was an essential part of the marketing of their collections. Along with the developing professionalisation of male modelling in this period, the fashion show provides the means to look at this neglected area of fashion history and to rethink these rituals of fashion performance. This is particularly significant, given the strongly gendered associations of modelling and fashion shows with femininity and women’s fashion.

---


4.1 Hepworths and Hardy Amies

Born in 1834, Joseph Hepworth started working aged ten in the Huddersfield woollen trade. In 1864 he and a partner opened a woollen drapers in central Leeds. The business also produced garments for the wholesale clothing trade and a year later Hepworth moved into clothing manufacture completely. By the early 1880s the company had a large factory and employed 500 people. At this point Hepworths became one of the first companies in Leeds to open retail outlets to sell their own manufactured clothing, a strategy which came to exemplify a significant element of the Leeds tailoring industry.

Hepworths opened their first shop in 1884; by 1926 they had 250 branches, increasing to 313 by 1945 and were second behind Burtons in the top ten of Leeds multiple tailors.

From the late 1940s, as outlined in Chapter 2, Hepworths refocused their business by dropping outfitting,

---

concentrating on tailoring and consolidating their retail outlets. This was the beginning of a ten-year plan to revamp the company which managing director Norman Shuttleworth described in 1963 as the company setting its sights on 'becoming tailors to the man-in-the-street, at providing him with the personal service and the craftsmanship that are the two essentials of good tailoring at prices he could easily afford.' This approach was evident, for example, in their 1950s style guides and advertisements in *Picture Post.* Unfortunately there are very few company records from the 1940s and 1950s for Hepworths so it is difficult to assess the impetus behind their new strategy. However, it appears that Norman Shuttleworth and his father Irvine Shuttleworth must have been instrumental in the development of the company. Both had long experience in the Leeds multiple tailoring industry as Irvine Shuttleworth had been managing director of Henry Price’s Fifty Shilling Tailors and Norman joined his father in 1926 aged 16 working for the retail side of Price’s. After his war service, Norman first worked for Jackson the Tailor (run by the Jacobson brothers who were to have such an impact on Burtons in the 1950s) reorganising their newly acquired Donegal Tweed Company. Crucially it was in 1948 that Irvine and Norman were appointed joint managing directors of Hepworths with Norman remaining as sole managing director when his father died in 1957. The 1950s was also a period of upheaval in the Leeds multiple tailoring industry with the Burtons and Jackson merger, Price’s and Alexandre both being taken over by United Drapery Stores and the subsequent re-branding of the Fifty Shilling Tailors to John Collier. It was in this context of change, along with a recognition of the need to innovate, that Hepworths approached the haute couturier Hardy Amies in 1959 or 1960.

---

13 Amies claimed it was as early as 1959 in *Still Here*, p. 67 but Michael Pick states that his diaries date it to 1960. Unfortunately I have not located any records of the beginnings of the partnership from Hepworths. Michael Pick, *Hardy Amies* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: ACC Editions, 2012), p. 278.
Amies had consolidated his place in the London fashion world on becoming royal dressmaker to Queen Elizabeth II in 1955 after first designing clothes for her in 1950. He had begun his career in fashion at the London dressmaker’s firm Lachasse in 1934, a company known for its women’s tailoring. “The clientele at Lachasse was truly “country”: ladies wanted suits (called by the gentry “coats and skirts”) for racing, but a good suit would have to be smart enough to wear in London for lunch. I loved working in tweed. My collections were successful and I began to become friends with fashion editresses and the fringes of the beau monde”.\(^{14}\) According to Michael Pick, wholesale manufacturers of women’s wear told Amies that they based their tailoring production on his suit designs while Lachasse was also popular with American buyers in the 1930s.\(^{15}\) He served in the Intelligence Corps during the war but also continued to design, becoming a member of the Incorporated Society of London Fashion Designers and contributing to a significant collection of garments of Utility prototype designs.\(^{16}\) As soon as he was demobilised he began the process of starting his own fashion house and seeing the potential in a building at 14 Savile Row – the centre of London’s tailoring district – where he launched his new


\(^{15}\) Pick, *Hardy Amies*, p. 36.

business in 1945. Aware of the potential in ready-to-wear and after a research trip to Paris where he visited a number of couture houses and their boutiques, with particular attention to Dior, Amies began a boutique line in 1950 which offered the same designs as couture but with less hand work and at half the price.\(^\text{17}\) Trade journal *Men's Wear* was always on the look-out for stylish male dressers and possible menswear fashion leaders and in 1948 an editorial comment approvingly observed the tailoring and accessorising of British couturiers Victor Stiebel and Hardy Amies: ‘Both carry the hall-mark of style artists. Wonder if they’d like a job in the men’s trade?’\(^\text{18}\) This proved to be prescient as in the 1950s Amies began designing men’s silk ties for Michelsons and men’s shirts for Radiac.\(^\text{19}\) In 1964 he said of his entry into designing men’s ties that he had followed the lead of ‘Monsieur Jacques Fath and closely afterwards Monsieur Dior’ who had begun before him.\(^\text{20}\) October 1958 saw his menswear featured in a Gaumont newsreel accompanied by his own commentary – in his handwritten notes he describes the shirts, pyjamas and a dressing gown being modelled and explains that:

> It seems a bit dotty that a woman’s dressmaker should suddenly start designing for men but I thought it was high time we showed those Italians that Britain, whose men are the smartest in the world, can still produce the best men’s wear.\(^\text{21}\)

Amies was clearly astute, as fashion historian Edwina Ehrman has argued, he was ‘primarily a businessman with the intelligence, vigour, and discipline to be alert to change and embrace new markets.’\(^\text{22}\) Amies’ initial ventures into the menswear trade demonstrated his business acumen which was combined with a flair for self-promotion and marketing, respect for tradition, and an evolutionary rather than revolutionary approach to fashion that was to be an excellent match for Hepworths.

\(^\text{17}\) Pick, *Hardy Amies*, p. 228.
According to Amies, Hepworths approached him in 1959 to discuss a potential collaboration. As the above brief history demonstrates and Ehrman has assessed: ‘Hardy Amies was a bold choice for Hepworths but his Savile Row address with its associations of men’s tailoring and his connection with the Queen would impress a more conservative customer, while his role as a woman’s dress designer clearly spelt fashion’. In his second autobiography Still Here, Amies detailed the Hepworths advance and the process of the resulting deal:

In 1959 I was telephoned by Prince Yurka Galitzine, who handled public relations for Hepworths. He said he had a business proposition to make and he asked me to lunch with him at Brooks’s in such a charming way that, although he was a stranger, I remember having no hesitation in

---

accepting. He wanted to interest me in the idea of designing men’s clothes for Hepworths which was at the time a powerful clothing business with retail outlets throughout the country. He felt that I could help them. If I was interested I was to go to Leeds to meet the directors to discuss the possibilities…We came to an agreement very quickly, a fact which at first surprised the directors. They were even more surprised when I told them that I could have a collection prepared for them within about two months. They seemed delighted and it was arranged that the collection, when ready, would be shown to their managers. A fee was arranged and we set to work at once.24

Amies never mentions any of the people he worked with at Hepworths but he does credit business associate (and Yorkshire-born) Eric Crabtree who came with him to Leeds for their initial meetings, negotiated the contract, and later became a member of the boards of both companies.25 However, to produce and promote the collections that were sold nationwide by Hepworths it is clear those in the company had considerable input.

Amies’ account of the events has tended to dominate the narrative around the collaboration. In 1964 Norman Shuttleworth was described as having ‘largely engineered the original Amies deal’ though he said that it wasn’t all his idea: ‘I certainly didn’t burst

24 Amies, Still Here, p. 67. Prince Yurka (Yuri) Galitzine had been a journalist and also worked as a press officer in Northern Rhodesia. He returned to London and worked in public relations, establishing the consultancy Galitzine, Chant, Russell & Partners. ‘Lives in Brief’, The Times, 12 March 2003, p. 36.
25 Amies, Still Here, p. 67; Pick, Hardy Amies, p. 282.
into a room with a kind of eureka'.

Although Shuttleworth appears to have downplayed his role, it is evident that Hepworths wanted to innovate and distinguish themselves from the other multiple tailors. In their 1963 annual report, Hepworths explained the reasoning for appointing Amies as their consultant designer by acknowledging the importance of fashion and design to the industry and what they called ‘style leadership’ as crucial to their long term business development.

Again with hindsight, in 1967 a Hepworths spokesman said that they had been thinking ‘of finding a designer who was a household name, already in the menswear field, something in Savile Row and an easily publicizable name’ when they decided on Amies. He was the only designer to fit that description in the late 1950s.

However, as I will go on to discuss, other developments in the menswear industry during this period are likely to have had an impact on their decision.

It is clear that the wider menswear industry was well aware of the need to adapt and change after the war. In 1953 the venerable men’s tailoring journal Tailor & Cutter responded to the increasing interest by the industry in men’s style by launching a supplement aimed at a wider audience called Man About Town which soon became a separate magazine. In 1960 it was taken over by Fame Magazine Publishers and re-launched with a larger and more ambitious format with fashion, politics and arts, and higher-scale production values, though it folded in 1968.

In the trade journal Men’s Wear, Sydney Barney argued in 1950 that men’s manufacturers should look to the women’s fashion trade as an example of success, particularly in the use of branded clothing.

Most women, if asked, could give the names of at least six branded costumes, coats, dresses, skirts, shoes, underwear, stockings etc. These names have been made known to them by consistent advertising, mannequin parades and window displays of the merchandise, organised, paid for and carried out by the manufacturers of the goods, in cooperation with the retailers.

Barney admired what he saw in women’s wear with organisations such as the London Model House Group acting as style leaders and advocated the men’s trade follow its example, especially as he saw younger men looking to America and the Continent for

---

29 Britain did not have a post-war equivalent to the American men’s lifestyle magazine *Esquire* which had launched in 1933, though British magazine *Men Only* which was formed in 1935, did follow its example until the 1940s. See Jill Greenfield, Sean O’Connell, Chris Reid, ‘Fashioning Masculinity: *Men Only*, Consumption and the Development of Marketing in the 1930s’, *Twentieth Century British History*, 10:4 (1999), 457-476. There were the short-lived *King* magazine (1964-1967) and *Club* (1970-1971) as well as a men’s supplement to British *Vogue* (1965-1967). Frank Mort argues that *Man About Town* (later known as *About Town and Town*) was unique, the failure of general interest magazines aimed at men was a particularly British issue considering the successful male consumer magazines in the US, France and Italy. Geoffrey Aquilina Ross cites the theories of publishers that such magazines would not appeal to men and that they would be unable to attract enough advertising. Frank Mort, *Cultures of Consumption: Masculinities and Social Space in Late Twentieth-Century Britain* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 18, p. 21; Geoffrey Aquilina Ross, *The Day of the Peacock: Style for Men 1963-1973* (London: V&A Publishing, 2011), p. 23.
‘novelty trends’.31 This approach of combining a number of elements (advertising, retailing and marketing using fashion shows) around a known name was just what Hepworths were going to go on to do far more successfully than any other menswear company.


A different initiative may have also had an influence on Hepworths. A group of London bespoke Savile Row tailors had formed the Men’s Fashion Council in around 1950. Trade journal The Outfitter, reporting on an early meeting of the council hoped that they would not ‘err too much on the side of conservatism, otherwise why Men’s Fashion Council?’32 Through the 1950s the trade press regularly reported on the promotions of the Men’s Fashion Council which appeared to mainly consist of yearly fashion shows or style parades that were often held at the Savoy Hotel in London.33 The reports were always within the context of continual anxieties about the place of British menswear and tailoring internationally, with the hope that they would provide style leadership and return British

32 I do not know the exact date of their formation, my earliest reference is this one. ‘Opinion: Liaison on Style’, The Outfitter, 27 May 1950, p. 16.
33 See for example a photograph of a Kilgour, French and Stanbury tailored suit shown at the Savoy Hotel on 19 April 1956 as part of a Men’s Fashion Council show. Woolmark and London College of Fashion, VADS <http://www.vads.ac.uk/large.php?uid=77968&sos=12> [accessed 24 August 2016].
tailoring to the centre of men’s fashion, countering the trends coming from America and Europe. For example, in 1952 the council teamed up with the International Wool Secretariat for a show at the Royal Festival Hall featuring ‘British sportsmen, BBC artistes and screen stars’ to promote wool cloth and clothing. The 40-minute show was televised on the BBC but attracted criticism afterwards for what one viewer called ‘atrocious fittings’ and Men’s Wear considered ‘a deplorable lack of attention to detail’. However, the main problem with the Men’s Fashion Council was that its bespoke members did not have the same relationship to the men’s fashion industry as couturiers did for women’s wear, with its seasonal rhythm and where copies were made and sold into the wholesale industry. In 1955 The Outfitter questioned how influential the council could be if no one had heard of it and argued that (as it had feared in 1950) ‘its inherent conservatism is such that its influence becomes almost bogged down before it starts.’ By 1959 there was frustration as wholesale clothing manufacturers’ reactions to the council’s annual show were reported to vary ‘between non-committal caution and outright condemnation’ as the look presented was thought to run ‘counter to modern conceptions of design – whether of clothes, household utilities or architecture – which is towards the straight line rather than curves.’ The point was also made that the show took place at the wrong time of year for the wholesale trade’s design and production process, while a clothing buyer thought that, ‘to get a style across to the masses, it would have to be taken up and promoted by the multiple clothing firms and retailers who were acknowledged leaders of the younger-man business.’ However influential or not the Men’s Fashion Council was, the idea of using an annual fashion show at the Savoy Hotel in London to launch a collection of menswear was to become a significant element in the marketing of the Hepworths and Hardy Amies collaboration.

36 Stewart, ‘Copying and Copyrighting Haute Couture’.
39 ‘Fashion Council’s New Style’, p. 11.
Other initiatives by the menswear industry saw tentative attempts by tailoring companies to utilise the idea of named designers in the late 1950s. For example the Leeds multiple Alexandre began using the name of Petrocelli, ‘the internationally famous designer’, in their advertisements, which prompted Men’s Wear to wonder ‘whether the technique of identifying the designer, which hitherto has been employed mainly in the sector where price is not a major consideration, is now going to be used in the medium-class trade. If so, it might help to speed the movement of fashion in men’s clothing.’\footnote{Design Buy-Line, p. 22. They used the name in their American advertisements as well – Alexandre was one of the few Leeds multiples to export. See LMG, LEEAG.2010.0535 Alexandre and Petrocelli advertisement from a 1959 edition of the US men’s magazine Gentleman’s Quarterly.} The article went on to note that this technique had already been used ‘to good advantage’ in women’s wear, ‘because in addition to the extra touch of artistry given to the garments, the publicity attached to it is of great value.’\footnote{Design Buy-Line, p. 22.} Names from Savile Row were thought to be most likely but ‘before the highly respected tailors in those parts shriek in protest at the mere thought of styling ready-to-wear, let it be said that such a thing could never happen – simply because it is impossible to find menswear designers or stylists whose names would mean anything to the public.’\footnote{Design Buy-Line, p. 22.} Just two weeks later Men’s Wear reported that a member of the Incorporated Society of London Fashion Designers, Ronald Paterson had designed a range of menswear for the first time which was to be shown at a parade organised by Courtaulds.
However, this appeared to be a one-off event. Far more substantial was the launch later in 1959 of a partnership between Leeds ready-to-wear tailors Headrow Clothes Ltd (with the label Saxon Hawk) and Savile Row tailors Huntsman, to the complete surprise of Men’s Wear.

The idea of a top flight tailor designing men’s ready-to-wear clothes has been a matter of speculation for a long time, but nobody in the trade really believed it would happen. West End tailors were sure that none of the big names would chance damaging a reputation by associating with a bulk manufacturer. What seemed impossible has now become a reality.

The editorial coverage was followed up by a fold-out colour advertisement promoting the range to menswear retailers and buyers for the National Association of Outfitters annual conference in Harrogate in the Autumn and then early in 1960 the announcement of a national newspaper campaign with the tag-line ‘Your Savile-row suit is ready-to-wear!’.

Hepworths approach to Amies was part of these changes but as will be demonstrated, was especially innovative and successful. The partnership with Amies showcased Hepworths understanding of the new directions being taken, not just in multiple tailoring but also in men’s fashion.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.
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4.9 Headrow Clothes Ltd advertisement for Saxon Hawk-branded ready-to-wear suits designed by Savile Row tailor Huntsman.

Men’s Wear, 19 September 1959, p. xii.

4.10 Saxon Hawk promotional campaign advertisement.

Men’s Wear, 26 March 1960, p. viii.

45 Men’s Wear, 19 September 1959, p. xii; Men’s Wear, 26 March 1960, p. viii.
A parallel development in Paris demonstrated how perceptive Hepworths actions were. French couturier Pierre Cardin had trained as a costume designer and in haute couture with designers such as Elsa Schiaparelli and Christian Dior. In the mid-1950s Cardin had opened a boutique for men, designing men’s accessories – shirts, ties and hats. The ties had been particularly successful; in a 1960 interview published in the men’s fashion magazine Man About Town, Cardin said that the year before they had made 90,000 of them. Cardin was also interested in the provision of fashion to a wider audience and had shown his first ready-to-wear women’s collection in 1959 at the Paris department store Printemps: ‘In 1959 I asked myself why should only the rich be able to afford exclusive fashion, why not the man and woman on the street as well? I can change that! And I did. Luxury should be affordable for millions of people.’ He showed his first haute couture menswear collection in Paris in 1960 after being asked by the president of the men’s clothing association of France to ‘prepare a collection of models with the aim of changing the style of the ready-to-wear trade.’ His early efforts in the menswear market showed how he began to fulfil those aims. Cardin had a clear design philosophy for men’s fashion, recognising the importance of the younger male market:

I am interested in designing for young men because they represent tomorrow…The modern man’s outlook on life is completely different to that of his father. He wants to feel free…He must go to the office in the morning, be able to go out of town at a moment’s notice and never look out of place. His clothes must be essentially practical and young.

The collection featured a very narrow silhouette, the ‘cylinder look’ with slim, fitted trousers, collarless and lapel-less jackets which were not stiffened or padded as traditional tailoring is, and made of unusual cloths such as corduroy. The presentation was just as significant as its design; Cardin wanted to put on a performance: ‘So I phoned all the Paris universities and colleges to choose a representative cross-section of French youth. The students I selected did not have model figures; some were quite short. But with their casual approach they put over the atmosphere of youth and novelty which I wanted.’ He also invited students to the event, placing them throughout the audience with the expectation that they would welcome the collection with much more enthusiasm than the press. Therefore, by securing the design services of Hardy Amies so early on, Hepworths were at the forefront of wider changes in the menswear industry in Europe as well as Britain, as women’s fashion designers entered the mass market for men’s tailoring. The perception of the Leeds multiples as staid and conservative made this innovative partnership a surprise to

51 Evans, ‘The Enchanted Spectacle’, p. 298.
some commentators but showed that they were prepared to take risks for success on British high streets.

4.2 Fashion is our Business: Hepworths 1961-1985

In 1961 Hepworths announced in their company newspaper the *Hepworth Mercury* that 11 September had marked what Norman Shuttleworth called ‘one of the greatest – if not the greatest – milestones in the long history of Hepworths’. The company had presented what they termed ‘the new British Line for Men’, designed by Hardy Amies, at the Savoy Hotel in London. In his address Shuttleworth alluded to the process of engaging Amies which he said had begun six months earlier, in the spring – well after Amies self-proclaimed date of 1959. For Hepworths the association with Hardy Amies was part of their long-term strategy, as Shuttleworth explained:

About ten years ago we set out similarly to bring craft tailoring to the man-in-the-street. Well, we have done that… Now our aim is to bring the hitherto exclusive world of Savile Row fashion to the man-in-the-street, to give him the lead in fashion that his increasing fashion-consciousness shows he wants and needs.

---

53 Shuttleworth, ‘This is a day to remember’, p. 1.
54 Shuttleworth, ‘This is a day to remember’, p. 1.
It particularly built on the developments they had already put in place from 1960 with the overhaul of their visual identity, advertising and retail outlets as discussed in Chapter 2. The sales director, G. H. Woodward put design at the centre of the company’s thinking behind their approach to Amies. ‘First and foremost of course, we were of the opinion that design is of paramount importance in this day and age, not only style design, but design as related to cloth, linings and so on in fact all the points of design that add up to fashion.’

He added that they wanted ‘not only good design, but to associate design with a well-known man, preferably himself associated in some way with top-class fashion and tailoring. This would mean nothing other than Savile Row’, making Amies ideal.

Shuttleworth and Woodward’s emphasis on Amies’ Savile Row and design credentials is unsurprising within the context of the *Hepworth Mercury* as they endeavoured to communicate the appropriateness of a women’s wear fashion designer to their business to the company’s thousands of staff. What was also crucial was the announcement of their integrated marketing campaign which was to accompany the new direction – newspaper advertising, cinema ‘filmlets’, retail and window displays, point of sale material, and garment packaging had all been conceived to push the collection. Alongside these elements were the annual

---

57 ‘Silhouette theme for campaign. All publicity to be linked’, *Hepworth Mercury*, 12 September 1961, p. 5.
fashion parades held at the Savoy in London, then shown across the country, which acted as a focus for the annual collection. This comprehensive approach (and money) was significant particularly through the 1960s to build the reputation and success of the collaboration.

This first collection had an immediate impact and it appears that it was beyond what even Hepworths had hoped for. ‘Success!’ shouted the headline for their February edition of the Hepworth Mercury with Shuttleworth explaining that the six months since the showing of the collection had exceeded their expectations. ‘We expected some interest and a gradual building up of sales as the new designs began to make themselves known. Instead we have met a flood of demand that shows no sign of subsiding.’ In response the company expanded its production with a new factory at Ashington in Northumberland and doubled the Leeds site to increase capacity. By the beginning of 1964 it was reported that the Hardy Amies collection accounted for around half of Hepworths’ 350,000 a year output (up to 95 per cent by 1967), and they were spending around £250,000 a year in advertising to promote it. There was some cynicism expressed within the menswear industry about the collaboration, for example one letter writer commented: ‘As for Hepworths’ success with Hardy Amies’ styles, I think it pertinent to refer to the amount they spend on advertising. They would have done just as well with any other name, if it were promoted to the same degree.’ However, the fashion shows in particular captured the imagination of the press and garnered extensive coverage which was a deliberate tactic by the company. As described by publicity manager Brian Bromwich in 1967, the ‘spectacular presentation’ of the shows was helped ‘with some gimmicky trend-setting garments included in order to attract the press publicity.’ This aspect of the collaboration will be explored in more depth in the following section.

As with the initial approach by Hepworths to Amies, there is only a little from the Leeds company point of view on the process of creating their collections. For the first collection, in Still Here, Amies described his excitement after the agreement had been reached with Hepworths, ‘I knew exactly what I wanted to do: I wanted to make about thirty outfits showing how I thought a man should be dressed.’ He went on to declare that he did not give much thought to the Hepworths customer or that ‘the greater part of their chain of over three hundred shops was situated out of London, mainly in the midlands and in the north. The style of their clothes could be described as more middle-of-the-road than

61 ‘Letters to the Editor: What have these gimmicks to do with good dressing?’, Men’s Wear, 19 December 1964, p. 20.
62 HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, Meeting Minutes, ‘Hardy Amies Collection’, memo from Brian Bromwich, 15 September 1967.
63 Amies, Still Here, p. 67.
fashionable.’ Instead he focused on the individual, arguing that the fashion of the time was to make men or women ‘look and feel richer and younger than they were, and more attractive.’ In order to achieve this first collection Amies sought the help of his personal tailor, Mr Wyser of Wyser & Bryant, who had made him his first ‘London suit’ in 1934 and who he credited with teaching him a great deal about the cut and fit of tailoring. Amies ordered twenty ‘suits and overcoats to be used as patterns’ which ‘incorporated details such as the drape over the chest from a wide shoulder, which was a typical Savile Row trademark, into a large coat, which I knew was up to date.’ Amies said he then presented the finished garments to the Hepworths directors. Amies again emphasised his role over that of Hepworths in his account and gave precedence to a bespoke London tailor in his new venture into men’s tailoring.

However, it is clear from other evidence that there was considerable negotiation over the designs of the Hardy Amies for Hepworths collection. Making a one-off bespoke suit for an individual client was vastly different from designing a garment that could be made on a factory production line – even one with the hand-cut tailoring boasted by Hepworths – or sold to the thousands of ‘middle-of-the-road’ Hepworths customers, even if they were becoming more fashion conscious. According to Hepworths, the presentation by Amies to their directors was in fact ‘the climax to many weeks of meetings and private discussions between Hepworths and their new consultant designer in an effort to establish a new

---

64 Amies, *Still Here*, p. 67.
65 Amies, *Still Here*, p. 68.
68 Rachel Worth has written about the significance of this more practical technological process to design for mass manufacture. Rachel Worth, “Fashioning” the Clothing Product: Technology and Design at Marks & Spencer’, *Textile History*, 30:2 (1999), 234-250.
British style that would be acceptable to the man-in-the-street.\footnote{Production Team Score New Styles. Savile Row-to-multiple gap is bridged', Hepworth Mercury, 12 September 1961, p. 6.} The design process between the two parties had involved consideration on how to transfer Amies’ bespoke (Savile Row) ideas into designs for the mass market as well as what the ‘line’ (the silhouette and cut) would be. Amies chose one of the Hepworths male models, William Buck, and ‘built’ his designs on to him as bespoke garments. After the collection was completed, Hepworths designer Arthur Chappell ‘went through the Hardy Amies collection item by item, in careful consultation with the Production Director and departmental heads, and estimated to what extent any, or all, could be faithfully reproduced under large-scale production methods.\footnote{‘Production Team Score New Styles’, p. 6.} This involved ‘weeks of hard work’ for the Leeds design and production unit as they cut production patterns, adapted production methods as necessary, trained cutting room and machine staff and transferred the final patterns to the factories in Leeds and Sunderland.\footnote{‘Production Team Score New Styles’, p. 6.} The Hepworth Mercury declared ‘acclamation’ by Amies at the final result but much later he wrote that ‘the machine-controlled construction gave the jacket a hard finish. The canvas linings were too rigid’, though he did concede that the 60 per cent of men who were dressed by the multiple tailors ‘were happy to have them and the cloth was always excellent.’\footnote{‘Production Team Score New Styles’, p. 6; Amies, The Englishman’s Suit, p. 32.} In public, Hepworths seemed content to give Amies much of the credit for the design, while they emphasised their ability to produce high quality tailoring and sell it on the high street.

Two models who worked for Amies and Hepworths recall the combination of Amies’ attention to detail alongside involvement from Hepworths staff. George Rutland (see photographs below of Rutland in 1966 and the original dinner suit he modelled) started modelling for the shows in 1963 and particularly remembered Amies’ care for the fit of the garments (just as in the posed photograph from the September 1961 Hepworth Mercury above):

Oh absolutely, with Hardy supervising everything, sitting there, watching meticulously, everything. As I say, they had to be absolutely right. The times I’d gone on thinking, ‘Oh, this is looking right now, really nice’, with the chalk marks and all the bits, you know, and everything, and he’d just tear it apart, he would, say, ‘No, that’s not fitting right, you know, this button is in the wrong place and, you know, and that’.\footnote{Rutland was born in Bermuda in 1938 and came to Britain in 1958 to train as an actor. After moving into modelling he also produced fashion and hair shows in Britain and internationally for companies including Marks & Spencer and Wella. Interview with George Rutland, 25 July 2013, LEEAG.2013.0166.}
Tony Armstrong-Barnes modelled for the Hepworths and Hardy Amies collaboration from the first collection in 1961 (see images of Armstrong-Barnes modelling, below), as well as occasionally for Amies separately. Both he and George Rutland recalled regularly going up to Leeds to Hepworths head office as well as seeing Hepworths people in London. Armstrong-Barnes remembered managing director Norman Shuttleworth, publicity manager Brian Bromwich, and Arthur Chappell (described as a fitter by Armstrong-Barnes) who was head of design for Hepworths in 1968.74

TB: I think it was Arthur Chappell. He came to every fitting, and we went up to Leeds and we were measured and chalked and uh everything that needed to be done. We always used to stay at the Queens Hotel, they looked after us.

DS: Right.

74 Both Bromwich and Chappell are present at all these meetings: Hepworths meeting minutes from 1967-1969. HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, Meeting Minutes. By 1968 Chappell is referred to as head of design at Hepworths: Anthony King-Deacon, ‘Business Habits’, The Times, 23 February 1968, p. 12.
TB:...They did a lot of fitting in London, I do know that, either at Hepworths, which is on the corner of one of the roads off Regents Street...There’s a road off there and Hepworths had their offices on the corner. There’d be Brian Bromwich and Judd— and Arthur Chappell would come down there. In fact they all the top people got very very involved in it. It was a big big thing.75

The clothes that Rutland and Armstrong-Barnes were wearing were fitted for the yearly fashion shows which meant that Amies paid particular attention. Given the high volume nature of the commercial collection and its production it is clear Hepworths had considerable input into the designs.

4.14 Tony Armstrong-Barnes holding one of his modelling photographs from the 1960s.
Tony Armstrong-Barnes collection.

4.15 Armstrong-Barnes in a 1963 Hepworths advertisement which ran in the Daily Mirror, 7 March and Sunday Mirror, 15 March.

75 Armstrong-Barnes used the name ‘Tony Barnes’ when he modelled. He was born in 1940 and grew up in Croydon where he had dancing lessons from the age of eight. He started modelling as a teenager in 1957 and appeared in the first Hardy Amies for Hepworths show in 1961. He has modelled professionally for his whole career and still models occasionally. Interview with Tony Armstrong-Barnes, 12 August 2013, LEEAG.2013.0167.
In an interview for Rodney Bennett-England’s book on British menswear in 1967, *Dress Optional* Amies demonstrated his awareness of the nature of designing for a multiple tailor:

> We begin planning a season’s range a year in advance. It requires an immense knowledge of public requirements. I don’t consciously alter styles just to produce something different. It is a question of evolution. Prototypes are being produced all the time.\(^7\)

As with his women’s wear, Amies relied on a team of assistants and his menswear design team was headed by Michael Bentley.\(^7\) In 1964 Amies described how his commercial designing contracts gave him ‘neat but firm artistic control over the products produced, and of course, in most cases, the actual designs emanate from me or from the staff I have

---


\(^7\) Bentley was a former model and he was mentioned as having been co-opted to help with menswear by Amies in a 1964 article for *Men’s Wear*. Patricia Lennard, ‘Cardin turns an eye to British menswear’, *Men’s Wear*, 11 July 1964, p. 18; this assistance is also noted by Pick, *Hardy Amies*, p. 288.
under my control.' A rare surviving working sketch of two suits for Hepworths from about 1966 gives some insight into the design process (see above). The silhouette has been decided and signed off by Amies but the sketch shows his concern with details such as positioning of buttons, gorge spacing and width of the collars. He also asks for ‘more waist emphasis and more flair’. On the smaller image a circle has been drawn on the lapel notch with the note: ‘has this been agreed by Leeds – increase to 2 ¼”, demonstrating the collaborative nature of the design process with Hepworths. In his 1994 book The Englishman’s Suit Amies admits that around this time he was also influenced by Pierre Cardin and tailor Tommy Nutter who had introduced jackets cut with this waisted and flared style.

By 1967 the design method seems to have been streamlined – the Hepworth Mercury described what happened behind the scenes to develop the collection each year after the Savoy show.

Within days he [Hardy Amies] is in discussions with Hepworth’s directors and executives, considering new cloths, patterns, colours and styles, and the shape of the next show. And within weeks the first ideas are being translated into prototype designs to be considered for ‘saleability’ by the sales director and his executives and to be ‘productionised’ by Arthur Chappell, Hepworths chief designer.

A few surviving memos and meeting minutes from between 1967 and 1969 also provide insight into the ongoing discussions between Amies and senior Hepworths executives about the collections. A September 1967 memo from Brian Bromwich outlined the future direction of the designs which was to involve a move from one to two collections a year (spring and autumn), ‘these collections being fully backed as a result of the closest possible collaboration between Mr Amies and Mr Woodward, Mr Beasley, Mr Chappell, and all others concerned with design and buying at Hepworths.’ At a design meeting in December 1967 attended by Amies, David Harvey and Michael Bentley from Hardy Amies along with W. S. Beasley, Arthur Chappell and Brian Bromwich from Hepworths, the committee viewed a jacket to be used in spring advertising and discussed ten design points ‘to be incorporated in the Autumn 1968 Collection proposals’ which included widening all trouser bottoms by half an inch, narrowing all the jacket sleeves and retaining the waistcoat

79 Amies and his companion and head women’s wear designer Ken Fleetwood apparently destroyed all of their design sketches not relating to their work for the Queen. Pick, Hardy Amies, p. 10, p. 276.
80 Amies, The Englishman’s Suit, p. 34.
82 This folder includes the 80th – 92nd minutes of the Hepworths Publicity Committee and two meetings of the Hardy Amies Design committee. HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, Meeting Minutes.
styling. Nik Cohn in his contemporary study of men’s fashion was not impressed by this process in which he assumed Amies’ ideas would be ‘mulled over by Hepworths, who may make revisions, and then again by Amies, who may make further revisions…until the final product emerges, totally hybrid.’ However, this was what made the designs commercially viable for Hepworths while retaining Amies’ overall sense of design direction.

Within the context of the enormous changes in men’s fashion during the 1960s some expected the Amies and Hepworths offer to be more adventurous. Cohn for one was disappointed ‘it wasn’t nearly as good as it might have been. Amies still played it safe, stuck mainly to greys and fawns and beiges…Clearly, he wasn’t a radical; just a tinkerer.’ Fashion journalist Antony King-Deacon, writing in 1968, thought that Hepworths ‘strangulate [Amies’] talents by refusing him a market for purism, as it were – and stultifying the designs he is allowed to produce’, and though he did admit that ‘in spite of everything I have said I will be joining the queue for a suit’ he vowed he would then remove the label. However, others, such as Bennett-England, saw the multiple tailors in a far more positive light, arguing that not only had they kept abreast of fashion changes, but they had also ‘done much to foster them’ which meant that the “average man” in Britain today has available to him at prices well within his reach some of the most progressively styled clothes in the world. He gave the example of Amies and Hepworths as well as another design consultancy between Neville Reed (the renamed Leeds multiple Weaver to Wearer) and Pierre Cardin to illustrate his point:

Who would have imagined only a few years ago that it would be possible to walk into a bar and find a humble clerk dressed by Hardy Amies or a delivery boy by Pierre Cardin? Yet thanks to the initiative of Hepworths and the Neville Reed / John Temple group, these two leading designers have been signed up to offer the mass market the best in design.

Rupert Lycett Green of influential London men’s fashion store Blades also expressed his respect, ‘I have terrific admiration for Hardy Amies. What he has done for Hepworth’s is terrific and gives the public excellent value for money’, adding that he would also like to try designing for a multiple and the mass market. The trade press also approved, with Men’s Wear concluding that the national reach of the multiples meant an ‘inevitable upsurge of consumer interest in male dress certain to help menswear as a whole. In helping themselves, Hepworths and others earn the unsought gratitude of the trade.’

---

85 Nik Cohn, Today There are No Gentlemen, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), pp. 73-74.
86 Cohn, Today There are No Gentlemen, p. 73.
89 Bennett-England, Dress Optional, p. 119.
90 Bennett-England, Dress Optional, p. 61.
To reinforce their new stance on design, and to start off the commemoration of their centenary, Hepworths made a £20,000 donation to the Royal College of Art (RCA) to establish a Department of Menswear Design at the beginning of 1964 (Amies, Hepworths managing director Norman Shuttleworth and Robin Darwin and Janey Ironside from the RCA were all in attendance – see photograph below). Making the announcement, Shuttleworth said they felt that ‘we should use the occasion of the Centenary to give a lead to our industry in providing for the men’s fashion designers of the future.’ Patricia Lennard, writing for the trade journal *Men’s Wear* gave a qualified welcome to the initiative, arguing that the ‘new menswear students will succeed because they are needed by an industry in a mood of receptive bewilderment at the progress of fashion. The trade needs authoritative designers badly.’ However, she went on to point out that in the high production part of the men’s trade, a designer:

…needs more and immediate practical business acumen and a working knowledge of his market in at least equal proportion to designing ability.

The ultimate test of a designer is, I am afraid, commercial success, and the means thereto can only be soaked up in the tough, raw, money-conscious, ruthlessly competitive boardrooms and backrooms.

---


95 Lennard, ‘Royal College of Art’, p. 25.
This ability to combine fashion design with high production figures and commercial success was exactly what Hepworths advocated in their Hardy Amies collections. Professor Janey Ironside who ran the fashion design department worked hard to ensure that the students had training in all aspects of the industry (as she had done with women’s wear), with teaching staff including Savile Row bespoke tailors, young designers such as Tom Gilbey as well as mass manufacturers Viyella and ICI, while ‘Raymond Burton of Burton’s men’s wear gave a great deal of help. I myself took two parties of students round their enormous factory in Leeds.’  

Hepworths plainly felt that this initiative would position them at the forefront of design for men’s clothing, and although the initial announcement that the department would be named the ‘Hepworths Department of Menswear Design’ did not come to pass, in 1967 Bennett-England saw the Hepworths gift as perhaps ‘a major turning point in the menswear industry’ as ‘large clothing and fibre manufacturers were quick to see the advantages of using tomorrow’s leading designers in pioneer work.’

In the early 1970s Burtons was one of these companies.

---

4.17 ‘Hardy Amies, men’s wear designer for Hepworths, Robin Darwin, CBE, the Principal of the RCA; Mrs. Janey Ironside, Professor of the School of Fashion Design, RCA; Mr. Norman Shuttleworth, Managing Director of J. Hepworth and Son Ltd, February 1964’. Alamy, ER6A3D <http://www.alamy.com/search.html?qt=ER6A3D%20&imgt=0> [accessed 25 February 2016].

Ironside, Janey, p. 147.

With Hardy Amies, Hepworths was able to bring the name of a fashion designer to Britain’s high street tailoring for the first time, contributing to the changing nature of the menswear industry so that in 1965 managing director Norman Shuttleworth could legitimately claim that ‘we are in the fashion business, and we intend to stay in it.’\textsuperscript{98} While it is difficult to quantify the influence of the collaboration the success of the venture did mean that the idea of working with a fashion designer was no longer such an unusual occurrence.\textsuperscript{99} One of the most notable of these was the partnership between Neville Reed and Pierre Cardin which was announced at the end of 1964, not long after the Leeds multiple had changed its name from Weaver to Wearer.\textsuperscript{100} Trade journal \textit{The Outfitter} slightly sceptically remarked that ‘the best selling merchandise to come from these basically women’s designers is not the avant garde, but the more conventional’ arguing that ‘almost any designer in the men’s trade could have produced these designs, indicating that perhaps

\textsuperscript{99} Bennett-England provides a comprehensive contemporary overview of the increasing importance of fashion designers to the British menswear industry, from small London boutiques to the multiple tailors in \textit{Dress Optional}.
\textsuperscript{100} ‘Money follows men’s fashion’, p. 9; ‘Outfitter Opinion: Designing for the Future’, \textit{The Outfitter}, 12 December 1964, p. 11.
a well-known name is a greater selling point than an actual design, however much publicity it may get.\textsuperscript{101} Of course it was the designer’s name that was becoming crucial as a means of marketing. The 1965 release of the Cardin collection for Neville Reed was filmed for a Reuters newsreel featuring his ‘Paris tubular line’ for those who ‘want to be with it’.\textsuperscript{102} Fashion journalist Prudence Glynn appeared to agree with the opinion of \textit{The Outfitter} as she wrote that ‘Neville Reed have acquired a considerable glamour and fashion image from their connexion with Pierre Cardin, as have Hepworths from their Hardy Amies tie-up’.\textsuperscript{103} Hepworths’ pioneering partnership with Amies had led this trend and gained the approval of the fashion press as well as many male consumers.

\begin{flushleft}
This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.
\end{flushleft}


Left: 4.20 Advertisement for Jackson the Tailor, ‘I told my designers...’.

\textsuperscript{101} ‘Outfitter Opinion: Designing for the Future’, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Long Lean Male Elegance in Made-To-Measure Clothing for Britons}, (Reuters, 14 April 1965) [16mm newsreel], ITN Source <http://www.itnsource.com/en/shortlist/RTV/1965/04/14/BGY505240242/?s=pierre%20cardin%201965 > [accessed 31 August 2016].
\textsuperscript{103} Prudence Glynn, ‘Today’s style is casual’, \textit{The Times}, 1 November 1966, p. 13.
The term ‘designer’ even began to be used by some companies whether they had a name attached or not – as with a 1966 Jackson the Tailor advertisement in which the mythical owner L. Jackson said he ‘told my designers – sports jackets have got to be more exciting this Spring’ (see above), while John Collier included the label ‘styled by design circle’ in many of their suits and coats.\textsuperscript{104} The layout and styling of the Jackson advertisement also echoed the Hardy Amies for Hepworths newspaper ads with its narrow column width and model tightly framed looking away from the viewer. Just as with Hepworths the association of a designer with a multiple meant that Cardin’s designs were available across the country in over 400 stores of the Neville Reed and John Temple group. However, they were at a higher price point as can be seen from a blazer illustrated in a 1966 fashion feature in the \textit{Daily Express}, which costing £14 10s. was only 9s. less than a whole suit from John Collier.\textsuperscript{105} As Norman Shuttleworth put it, this meant that fashion could be the concern of not just ‘one street or even two streets in London’ but a ‘matter of the ordinary man in every street, from 18 to 80 thinking more about his clothes’.

This high street association and provision for ordinary men did mean that even with the glamorous associations brought by couturier designers the fashion coverage tended to be in media whose audience matched the multiple customers rather than more aspirational high fashion. This could be seen in fashion columns dedicated to men’s fashion in newspapers that were frequently advertised in by the multiples, for example a 1963 feature in the \textit{Daily Express} with illustrations by ‘Britain’s leading fashion artist’, Robb or later in the 1960s in the ‘Manstyle’ column of the same newspaper (see images below).\textsuperscript{107} Other men’s fashion coverage tended to focus on London-based labels and companies, the youth-driven styles of Carnaby Street, and the growing number of boutiques making up the 1960s peacock revolution. The nascent men’s lifestyle magazines \textit{Town}, \textit{King} and \textit{Club} presented their readers with garments from names such as John Stephen, Take 6, Cue at Austin Reed, John Michael and Cecil Gee. Fashion editorials mentioning the Leeds multiples tended to be disparaging. In a 1966 piece Wilfred Woolmer in \textit{King} commented on Hardy Amies’ work for Hepworths: ‘Hepworths are highly regarded multiple tailors, but again hardly Savile Row image, even plus Hardy.’\textsuperscript{108} A feature on made-to-measure clothing for \textit{Club} included Burtons alongside three fashionable London bespoke tailors whose suits were more than double the price, but made the multiple sound like hard work:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{106} Shuttleworth, ‘Fashion is our Business’, p. 1.
\end{flushright}
A spokesman at the Regent Street Branch says that you can go in with a sketch of the design you would like and Burton will make it up for you ‘as long as it’s not too far away from the norm.’ The general feeling about Burton is that if you’re determined, patient and persistent enough you’ll get what you want in the end at a price lower than anywhere else.  

By the early 1970s, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, Burtons was having to address significant problems and made a number of changes to the company. One of these was to respond to the designer trend in menswear and in 1973 they held a press show at their new Regent Street store including ready-to-wear garments from their own design team (a dark brown velvet suit, cream Oxford bags paired with a navy sweater and a three-piece suit by John Collier, £14 19s. 6d. left, and Hardy Amies for Hepworths £17 5s., right. Models Alan Wright and Steve Gray, photograph by Larry Ellis).

---


4.22 Suit by John Collier, £14 19s. 6d. left, and Hardy Amies for Hepworths £17 5s., right. Models Alan Wright and Steve Gray, photograph by Larry Ellis.

Hardy Clark, ‘Manstyle’, *Daily Express*, 9 November 1966, p. 6

Donegal tweed suit) alongside clothes from Tommy Nutter and three other top designers. Styling director Angus Stewart described the legacy of ‘the peacock revolution which everybody wrote about’ as changing things at Burtons where ‘we were orientated towards the product rather than the public – even a big group (Burtons has 500 branches) needs to make a deliberate statement. Even when the line in most collections isn’t very exciting there’s something new about texture.’ The following year Stewart had moved to the role of Burton Group fashion advisor and under deputy managing director Peter Gorb the company was reportedly moving to employ design-trained people in management, including graduates from the RCA. Gorb stated that Burtons was ‘devoted as a group to design training in our management. We must have people who are sympathetic to the concept of good design because we are a design business. We do not look for the top creative talent because they are always going to do all right anyway and we can use them as consultants.’ Though this did not always go smoothly, Nik Cohn alleged that some of the RCA graduates had found the industry frustratingly ‘boorish and ugly’ as it refused to change. For Burtons, however, a made-to-measure style book from the Pentagram-designed era of the mid-1970s boasts of their use of fashion designers:

It will take only a brief flick though a few pages of this Style Book to become aware of one of the outstanding characteristics of Burton. Call it what you will – style, taste, fashion, elegance – it threads through all Burton clothes and is very real. And it crystalizes the special Burton appeal which carefully gives the average man the kind of fashion he feels happiest in. Design is the key. Needless to say, the Burton design team includes designers from one of the fashion world’s richest sources of talent – London’s Royal College of Art.

The heading of this section ‘Fashion designers – with care’ sums up the Burtons approach and their attempt to simultaneously engage with the increasingly important role of fashion in the menswear industry while also not wanting to alienate their customer – the average man. The photography of the guide does belie Burtons’ caution as each suit is presented as if it were from a spread in a fashion magazine, the suits given a narrative in a wide range of different locations, and the male models partnered with female models in many of the shots. The only substantial difference from a fashion shoot is the age range of the male models – from young to old. The male model for the ‘Town-tailored’ suit is even pictured browsing a current issue of British Vogue (see below). It appears that later in the 1970s Burtons also worked with American designer John Weitz – an image of a Burtons retail interior in 1977 from Leeds Museums and Galleries has an in-store display featuring a

---

113 The RCA had their first intake of students for men’s fashion design after a Hepworths donation in 1964. Glynn, ‘Bourrée for Burtons’, p. 9.
114 Cohn, Today There Are No Gentlemen, p. 130.
photograph of Weitz alongside suits designed by him (see below). Weitz had made his name in women’s fashion in the United States in the 1940s and 1950s before he entered British menswear design with Austin Reed’s boutique label Cue in 1968 and London store Selfridges produced his men’s garments under licence from the late 1960s.


LMG, LEEDM.P.2003.0001.2329.

---

For Hepworths in the 1970s Hardy Amies was still a significant part of their business. From the mid-to-late 1960s he had also established himself internationally as a menswear designer with support from Hepworths – they had bought into his company and his international design work boosted his reputation.\footnote{Pick, \textit{Hardy Amies}, p. 285.} Brian Hill, who worked for Hepworths in a senior role first as cloth buyer and then head of formal wear purchasing in the 1970s, remembered Amies’ role being primarily about presenting trends rather than the more specific designs of the 1960s:

We would have two meetings with Hardy a year, one for spring, one for autumn… and then we would get input from Hardy about what he— What trends he felt were going to be applicable to the UK because of course they were different. So that’s that’s how that would work. So he would give a presentation, sometimes it was in Claypit Lane, mostly it was in Savile Row. So we’d go down there, Hardy would have all these kind of design trends, models, all this kind of stuff and basically it was a sort of fashion show, um and you know we would talk through it all and then we would come back and then it was up to us if you like to take what Hardy had shown uh and uh and then interpret it or not, as the case might be, you know for the Hepworth market.\footnote{Interview with Brian Hill, 8 July 2013, LEEAG.2013.0165.}

An example of one of these meetings was a sales executives’ conference at the Dragonara Hotel in Leeds where Amies gave a 45 minute presentation on his autumn 1975 and spring 1976 collections – predicting the importance of green and the continuing popularity of pastels and mentioning the separate Hepworths autumn ready-to-wear range.\footnote{‘Shades of Green, Says Hardy Amies’, \textit{Hepworth Mercury}, October 1975, p. 1.} Amies’ designs had dominated the Hepworths sales through the 1960s. However, the 1970s saw Hepworths emphasise their own in-house designed ranges. For example, in 1975 they launched a poster campaign at 5,700 sites nationally promoting Hepworths collections developed without Amies. The \textit{Hepworth Mercury} announced the advertising campaign as featuring ‘specially selected garments from the Spring range of merchandise that say “Fashion” most strong and clear.’\footnote{‘Potent Posters in Pastel’, \textit{Hepworth Mercury}, February 1975, p. 4.} A photograph from the same photoshoot used in another Hepworths publication shows the green colour scheme (pastel green suit against an apple green background) used for the posters.\footnote{LMG, LEEAG.2011.0107, ‘A sales career in menswear Hepworth Tailoring’. LMG also holds images of posters from the same campaign which was extended into the autumn, see for example LEEDMS.1988.42.4 and LEEDMS.1988.42.7.} Brian Hill remembers being heavily involved in the marketing process for campaigns such as this:

Well it was a kind of a collaborative effort, it would be ok um, ‘so this is what we think is kind of on, gonna be on trend’. Um… [pause] We would work that through with the marketing people and then they’d decide which, you know, what what media was going to be used or you know then the
models models would be brought up, we’d make suits for them or you know and then the campaign would be shot.123

However, Amies remained a significant part of the identity that had been created by the company. In 1976, both returning to their outfitting past and taking advantage of Amies’ wider menswear product designs, they launched what they called the ‘Hardy Amies Coordinated Look’, selling shirts and ties for the first time since the late 1940s in a belated move to diversify their menswear.124 The company had conducted in-depth research and test marketing to develop the range and managing director Jeffrey Rowlay hoped that the new promotion and merchandising would help them overcome the problems of the previous financial year, ‘perhaps the worst in living memory’.125 A photograph of a male model wearing a suit along with one of the new shirts and ties was featured (see below) along with in-store displays which were to be introduced to all of their retail stores. Four years later in 1980, Hepworths commissioned design consultants McCann Design Associates to completely re-design their visual identity (also discussed in Chapter 2).126 Hardy Amies’ name and designs continued to feature strongly in the new company appearance — for example, on carrier bags (see below) while the ‘Hardy Amies Coordinated Look’ merchandising was retained.127 LMG have a Hardy Amies for Hepworths

123 Brian Hill.
125 ‘Stand by for blast off’, Hepworth Mercury, August 1976, p. 4.
127 ‘New Look for the 80s’, p. 3.
one-button black jacket from 1982 which has this design on its label (it had been returned to Hepworths by the purchaser due to a complaint about the jacket deteriorating after being dry cleaned).  

4.27 Hardy Amies for Hepworths suit, tie and shirt, the ‘Hardy Amies Co-ordinated Look’ launched in 1976.

Hepworth Mercury, August 1976, p. 1

Top: 4.28 Hepworths re-design by McCann Design Associates.


Bottom: 4.29 Label for Hardy Amies for Hepworths black jacket, 1982.

LMG, LEEDM.S.1986.0022.23.

It appears that Hepworths ended their long-standing relationship with Amies around this time – he himself didn’t mention in any of his publications when the deal finished only stating that he had worked with them for twenty years.  

Michael Pick implies that it was in 1982 when Terence Conran (of Habitat fame) became chairman and Hepworths’ new women’s wear venture Next, was launched under George Davies. The 1980s saw the transformation of Hepworths as the company re-defined itself again. Just as it had done in

---


129 Amies, Still Here, p. 155

130 Pick, Hardy Amies, p. 288. Davies had a background as a buyer – he started at mail order company Littlewoods in 1962 – and then ran his own clothing companies in the 1970s before being approached by Hepworths to manage the setting up of their new fashion label. George Davies, What Next? (London: Century, 1989).
the 1960s, Hepworths responded to the changing demands of the consumer by re-discovering the importance of design and fashion that worked for the contemporary high street buyer. Brian Hill reflected that:

The business, the Hepworth business was – The writing was kind of on the wall, we all knew what was happening to it. The problem was that the younger people in the business, and at that particular time I was one of them, um we all knew that we had to – That the business had to change. The trouble was the board of the business were all fairly old conservative you know men who who had sort of grown up with the business and couldn’t really see that that you know what had um been a very successful business for them was actually in terminal decline… So we tried lots of experiments, we got involved with Terence Conran, he became chairman of Hepworths and Conran was, I mean, a very uh astute businessman, a very able designer, but he didn’t really know that much about clothing. Uh a fantastic guy for what he did and I wouldn’t I wouldn’t sit here and say that he didn’t bring something to the party, certainly he did, but I, I think not enough if you know what I mean. So we tried various um different shop fits, you know more ready-to-wear, blah blah blah, none of it really worked.¹³¹

The solution for Hepworths was to diversify and they considered three options: a new menswear chain, expansion overseas, or moving into womenswear.¹³² The company chose the last opportunity and acquired Leicester-based chain store Kendalls in 1981, using it to create the women’s wear brand Next to fill the gap they had identified in the market for a ‘chain selling fashionable garments of a high quality but at competitive prices’ to women aged 25 to 45.¹³³ George Davies worked with John Stephenson from Conran Design Associates on the whole design and retail concept – the idea for the name ‘Next’ was Stephenson’s (who later admitted he had originally come up with it for Burtons in the early 1970s for a leisurewear range which never eventuated).¹³⁴ The new brand was deliberately not gendered so that if they wanted to introduce menswear later they could.¹³⁵ This new retail project was an immediate success – as in the 1960s Hepworths had found the right combination of design, fashion and price to deliver what customers wanted.

¹³¹ Brian Hill.
¹³⁴ Davies, What Next?, p. 51, p. 54.
¹³⁵ Davies, What Next?, p. 53.
Within three years Hepworths was gone – the final Hepworths stores closing in 1985.\textsuperscript{136} Between 1982 and 1985 Hepworths had been given the ‘Next effect’ with final efforts at re-designs, then Next for Men was launched in August 1984.\textsuperscript{137} An unsourced advertisement from this period with the new Hepworths logo explicitly references Next (see above), while LMG holds three sample jackets from 1983 showing some of the more informal design styles they were experimenting with. Two double breasted jackets with patch pockets are made of blue/grey hopsack wool (see one above) while the third is a brown flecked wool tweed, blouson style and fastening with press studs.\textsuperscript{138} Brian Hill was one of the only senior members of Hepworths staff who continued after the company

\textsuperscript{136} Davies, \textit{What Next?}, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{137} Davies, \textit{What Next?}, p. 76.
moved to Leicester (Next’s head office) and vividly remembers the impact of the new fashion retail chain.\textsuperscript{139}

I mean that whole, you know Next kind of menswear, it just like hammered the nails in the coffin basically um because it was um… I mean it was the hot ticket, Next. [pause] It was a huge uh sort of fashion influence um, it was— Anywhere you looked it was Next this or Next that or Next, you know I mean and it was just, it kind of swept everything before it.\textsuperscript{140}

For Hill, who started as head of menswear, and became becoming buying director for the whole of Next (menswear, women’s wear and children’s) before leaving in 1989, the entire approach of the company was different with a large design team, the influence of international trends and world-wide travel:

DS: Right ok, so there was a shift.

BH: A definite shift, because as I say at Next, was perceived as a as a leader then so we had to lead and we we were a merchandise-led business so it was ok where, you know, Mexico we’re doing this, right so that’s that’s the look, how’re we going to promote it? You know.\textsuperscript{141}

Hill’s reflections on the differences between his previous work in the multiple tailoring industry and Next were mainly about the speed of change, though he felt that even at Next there were still elements of evolution:

BH: Yeah. You’ve gotta remember that that the whole thing, the whole bespoke business is an— I mean is an evolution. The Next thing was an evolution too, but just quicker, you know what I mean. We wouldn’t carry something on from, at Next from one season to another. There would always be a, an evolution of whatever it was that, you know in the retailing business you don’t take something that’s a best seller and just throw it out. What you do is reinvent it so that bedrock is always there. Whereas in the bespoke business everything moved much more slowly. You know it might take two years for a silhouette to evolve. At Next it would evolve, it would change in the season.

Hill also felt the change in consumption was equally important as suits became less essential and fashion retailing had a quicker turnover:

Um Next was a much more seasonal, you know gotta-have-it kind of business. The suit business you know, it’s not like that. You know very few people actually need a new suit. They might want one, but you know you need one because your daughter’s getting married. Or you know I don’t know it’s your son’s bar mitzvah or whatever it’s going to be. Um but the

\textsuperscript{139} In his autobiography Davies commented that ‘Hepworths simply didn’t have the talent I needed for a visionary new approach to men’s wear’. He decided to bring in female buyers from women’s wear rather than work with the traditional male dominated menswear industry. Davies, \textit{What Next?}, p. 74.

\textsuperscript{140} Brian Hill.

\textsuperscript{141} Brian Hill.
whole Next thing that was you know it was driven by, ‘Oh well I’ve got to have one of those’.\textsuperscript{142}

From the 1960s to the 1980s Hepworths had to negotiate these shifts on the British high street as the clothes that men wanted to buy changed. Out of all of the Leeds multiple tailors during this period (though most successfully in the 1960s), Hepworths was the company that most explicitly engaged with fashion – fashion that meant a quicker evolution of styles and collaboration with a fashion designer. The twenty-year relationship with Hardy Amies combined some of the sensibility of women’s fashion with men’s multiple tailoring in ways that appealed to the broad base of male consumers who were buying suits. Amies brought his decisive aesthetic sense and publicly recognisable name to bear on Hepworths menswear while Hepworths retained the commercial awareness to ensure that these designs could be produced at a reasonable price and would sell on the high street, bringing this style of fashion design to the average man. Even more significantly Hepworths financially backed the collaboration with extensive advertising, promotion and marketing – their investment and size enabling the success to be fruitfully exploited over a period of time and to the mass market. In the next section I will discuss the way that Hepworths adopted one of the most particularly gendered methods of fashion promotion – the fashion show or fashion parade – for these collections.

4.3 Fashion Shows and Male Models


In 1955 Hardy Amies gave the second Hollander lecture to the annual meeting of the Clothing Institute. His comments on menswear were reported by *The Outfitter* in which he expressed the opinion that men’s clothes ‘always march in parallel with women’s clothes’,\textsuperscript{142} Brian Hill.
but pointed out that for menswear ‘the difficulties of promotion and display are enormous’ and gave the example that male fashion parades ‘verged on the embarrassing, even on the ludicrous’.\(^{143}\) Amies’ judgement on male fashion parades (which appears to have changed by 1958 when he used such a show to promote his men’s accessories) highlights the fragility of men’s relationship with the rituals of fashion; rituals which still had overt connotations of femininity.\(^{144}\) While some aspects of men’s public appearance being subject to scrutiny had long precedence, including the tradition of the Regency dandy, working-class monkey parades, and the striking presence of the contemporary Teddy Boy, the fashion parade had overwhelmingly feminine associations. Originating in the mid-nineteenth century as part of the development of French couture and becoming more widespread through the twentieth century, fashion parades performed femininity as well as fashion.\(^{145}\) This was very different from the male parallel to couture – bespoke tailoring. Amies made the point in 1964 that while in terms of status Savile Row could be thought of as the equivalent of women’s haute couture it was ‘always at the disadvantage of not being able to hold seasonal fashion shows. It has thus never been asked to be an authority, but has been merely a vehicle for executing the fashionable ideas of its private customers.’\(^{146}\) The concept of using live female bodies which adhered to the current standards of beauty and which showed the clothes in motion became a key part of the women’s fashion industry; fashion parades moved beyond the couture houses of Paris to appear as elements of mass consumer culture in department stores and the cinema.

Caroline Evans’ recent work has found evidence of male fashion shows being used by the American men’s wholesale industry in around 1915 and an illustration of a show at a Chicago store in 1914 that featured both male and female models.\(^{147}\) This was considerably earlier than 1942 which was the date William R. Scott argued that the first men’s fashion show in history occurred in the United States as part of the promotional activities of the influential trade organisation, the Men’s Wear Manufacturers of Los Angeles.\(^{148}\) However Scott himself cites (in a footnote) a report of a men’s fashion show in Los Angeles, a 1926 manufacturers’ ‘peacock parade’.\(^{149}\) In her study of Australian fashion shows, Margaret Maynard also discovered intriguing references to men’s parades such as a ‘natty’ show of ‘chaps’ and ‘beaux’ which was held in Brisbane in 1933 and reported by the *Australian Women’s Weekly*.\(^{150}\) In Britain the Men’s Dress Reform Party of the 1920s and 1930s used
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\(^{144}\) Amies, ‘It’s a High Fashion Show’.

\(^{145}\) For a history of the fashion show see Evans, *Mechanical Smile* and ‘Enchanted Spectacle’. Evans found a small number of references to male fashion shows in the 1910s and 1920s, *Mechanical Smile*, pp. 8, 73, 89, 217 and references to Cardin’s 1959 and 1960s shows in ‘Enchanted Spectacle’, p. 298.

\(^{146}\) Hardy Amies, ‘Designing for the man could be my most important contribution’, *Men’s Wear*, 8 February 1964, p. 24.

\(^{147}\) Evans, *Mechanical Smile*, pp. 89, 73.

\(^{148}\) This was part of a week-long annual promotional trade event, the ‘Sportswear Round Up’ held in Palm Springs. Scott, ‘California Casual’, p. 170.

\(^{149}\) ‘Styles for the City of Los Angeles’, *Southern California Business*, 5 February 1926, p. 28 cited in Scott, ‘California Casual’, endnote 69, p. 329.

mannequin shows at trade and health-oriented exhibitions to promote their idealised styles of men’s clothing.¹¹¹ Winners of one of their competitions for the design of healthier male garments were shown on BBC television in 1937 and reviews of the broadcast mocked it as providing viewers with ‘an entertaining ten minutes and plenty of laughter’, though it is unclear whether this was because of the radical designs of the clothes or the way they were modelled.¹¹² In 1950 a correspondent to Men’s Wear asserted a claim to staging ‘what was then considered to be the first men’s dress parade ever held’, on 3 November 1927; he admitted that he had ‘introduced the female element also, but it was staged solely for demonstrating men’s wear’.¹¹³ British Pathé has footage from the 1920s of a performance of men’s fashions consisting of a series of filmed scenes on a set showing different types of men’s wear being modelled, from town suits, hats, evening wear and finally sportswear.¹¹⁴ There is no identifying information with the film and while it would be easy to view it as a parody (for example, the hats are modelled by three men alternately bobbing up and down from behind a sofa), it appears to be promoting men’s clothes utilising the medium of the cinema in a similar way to women’s fashions. Evans also discovered a photograph of a male fashion show put on by the Great Nottingham Co-operative in London in 1929.¹¹⁵ These scattered examples suggest that male fashion shows did exist well before those put on by Cardin, Hepworths and Amies. While clearly not systematic or formalised, the spectacle of men in fashionable attire parading in front of an audience was clearly not an unknown occurrence. And just as with women’s fashion, the point was primarily to sell clothes.

By the 1940s and 1950s press reports of male fashion parades reveal that they were happening fairly regularly and the main problems appeared to be with finding appropriate male models. In the late 1940s Austin Reed presented a ‘style show’ of a range of men’s clothes (including an evening suit with a battledress blouse-style jacket) at the British Industries Fair and many of the garments were then filmed by British Pathé and shown at their Regent Street store.¹¹⁶ A number of other retailers were reported to have organised male fashion shows to promote their menswear, including the Brighton branch of the tailoring chain Meakers which joined up with a local women’s store for a “mixed”

¹¹¹ The Party was formed to promote better and healthier clothes for men and had strong links to the New Health Society and the Sunlight League. The Party attracted considerable publicity but marginal impact as its aims were overtaken by the concurrent influence of sports and leisurewear on men’s clothing; it did not last beyond the end of the 1930s. Barbara Burman, ‘Better and Brighter Clothes: The Men’s Dress Reform Party, 1929–1940’, Journal of Design History, 8: 4 (1995), 275-290 (p. 280).
¹¹³ His show was apparently ‘prominently’ covered by the 12 November 1927 edition of Men’s Wear – though I have not been able to check to see if that is the case. A. Rose, ‘Letters: He Staged Men’s Dress Parade in 1927, Men’s Wear, 4 March 1950, p. 26.
¹¹⁵ Evans, Mechanical Smile, p. 8.
mannequin parade’ to an audience of 250 people, and Dawson Boys, an outfitters which staged an all-male mannequin parade at the National Trades Exhibition, Bingley Hall, Birmingham, four times weekly for a month in 1950. In 1952 the general manager of Dawson Boys wrote to *Men’s Wear* to enthusiastically endorse this method of promotion, saying all the shows were ‘received with great interest and enthusiasm by men and women’ and that the results could be seen in ‘inquiries and sales at the exhibition, and at our shops during and after the exhibition. Months afterwards, people continued to inquire for styles and ensembles modelled.’

The references in the menswear trade press and the national press to male fashion shows increased markedly throughout the 1950s as it appears they became more readily accepted as a means of promoting men’s clothing within the industry. In 1951 *Men’s Wear* mused on the use of male mannequin parades, pointing out that since 1947 they had become a regular part of the French menswear trade promotions in Paris and complaining primarily about the ‘gross exaggerations’ of the garments shown. Later that year Bill Taylor (‘artist, publicist and stylist’ who had organised a series of ‘all-male style shows’) replied that: ‘I have no doubt at all that style parades on live models are one of the cheapest and surest ways of promoting consumer awareness’, arguing that most men ‘are always about to buy a new coat, a new jacket, another shirt. The style parade emphasises the need and crystallises the desire.’ He described the success of a recent show in Manchester which was delivered to audiences of hundreds at a time:

> From the very beginning – it ran for a week, doing two shows a day – it was accepted with absolute seriousness, and the amount of interest shown far exceeded expectations. I think it is best summed up in the words of a local retailer: ‘Well, I’m so surprised. Not a titter – not one titter.’

The reference to laughter by the retailer echoes the comments of Amies, expressing the anxiety that fashion shows featuring men would be considered ridiculous, un-masculine and subject to mockery due to their longstanding associations with the female body, femininity and women’s fashion.

---

160 ‘Male Mannequin Parades Make Men Think about Clothes But…’, *Men’s Wear*, 31 March 1951, p. 11.
As the number of shows increased, concerns were expressed about the lack of experienced male models and men’s discomfort in the role rather than explicitly voiced anxieties of effeminacy. A report on a French fashion show in 1949 by a Parisian tailor noted that the male models were students of the Paris Conservatoire who had been paired with female mannequins, but that being self-conscious ‘the boys clung to the arms of their partners and avoided the gaze of the predominantly feminine audience’.¹⁶³ In 1951 Men’s Wear made the point that: ‘Very few, if any, men have yet acquired the knack of appearing “natural” in a new outfit under the spotlight’.¹⁶⁴ However, rather than arguing that this meant men were intrinsically unsuited to modelling or that it was un-masculine, they put it down to experience:

Because there are relatively few parades of men’s styles, the models must perforce be those who normally earn their living in other spheres. Therefore they cannot hope to reach the proficiency of the female models, who are specially trained for their work and who usually have full-time employment.¹⁶⁵

To prevent any self-consciousness, when Birmingham menswear company Dawson Boys staged their men’s fashion parade in 1950 they selected six employees to be ‘trained in clothes modelling at a city school’ where they were coached by a ‘professional mannequin’ (and from the photograph below the training appears to have been successful, given their relaxed poses).¹⁶⁶ The coverage of this particular show prompted a number of men to contact Men’s Wear declaring their wish to become a male model. This did not seem to surprise Miss Pat Larthe, ‘head of one of London’s leading photographic model agencies’, who said that ‘photographic modelling is rapidly becoming a new career for men’.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ ‘Male Mannequin Parades, p. 11.
¹⁶⁵ ‘Male Mannequin Parades’, p. 11.
Tony Armstrong-Barnes started after being asked to do a photo shoot for a knitting pattern when the photographer suggested he could model:

‘Why don’t you do more?’ he said. ‘We’re desperate for teenage male models, there’s just nobody’… That was late ’57, because within a few weeks, I went and saw Michael Whittaker who took me on…He had one of the best agencies especially for fashion shows, which he wanted me to concentrate on because of my dancing. And he was, he did, he was really the first person to choreograph fashion shows, with dancing and rehearsals instead of just straight catwalk up and down, he did choreographed shows.168

In 1963 one agency even advertised for models in men’s magazine *Town*, ‘….and why not? Become a Male Model’ ran the top line. ‘More and more male models are today being used in magazine and television advertising. Why don’t you join the trend and enrol for an evening course of training at the world famous London Charm School the original model training school for men?’169 In 1964 Armstrong-Barnes moved to Scotties, which was one of the most well-known model agencies for men and had been started by Jean Scott-Atkinson in 1953.170 She specialised in male models and after her first year she estimated that she had about 30 men on her books who were mostly actors and students who worked part-time and were employed in advertising, for trade shows, studio and magazine work.171 This had increased to 75 full-time male models by 1967: ‘They are now so much in demand that it is an accepted profession and very much full-time. It is no longer regarded as odd being a male model. Eight years ago a model would have said he was in advertising if you

---

168 He modelled for nearly all of the multiple tailors including appearing in the first colour newspaper advertisements for Burtons in 1962 and other products such as on Kellogg’s corn flake packets with model Pattie Boyd. Tony Armstrong-Barnes. Burtons first full colour advertisements were inserted in the *Daily Express, Daily Mail* and *Daily Herald* in autumn 1962. Jobling, *Advertising Menswear*, p. 94.


asked him what he did.\textsuperscript{172} However, after prompting, Armstrong-Barnes did comment that male modelling could be perceived as not being masculine: ‘yeah it wasn’t a done thing. In those days it was still very much in those days you were still very much defined – You know, you just, certain jobs a man didn’t do like dancing or modelling or hair dressing or tailoring’.\textsuperscript{173} He mentioned that press photographers sometimes tried to get a reaction from the models, ‘they’d come to a fashion show and then make adverse comments hoping that we would retaliate…But we just ignored them.’\textsuperscript{174} Armstrong-Barnes unmistakably saw his modelling role as his career which he went on to pursue successfully.


Tony Armstrong-Barnes collection.

By 1959 men’s fashion shows were popular enough for \textit{Style for Men} to positively declare that the year to date had seen ‘some of the most successful style parades ever staged in the men’s trade’ and to outline the economics of staging such parades for their industry readers with costs including model fees, hire of the appropriate hall, building the stage setting,

\textsuperscript{172} Bennett-England, \textit{Dress Optional}, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{173} Tony Armstrong-Barnes.
\textsuperscript{174} ‘These were the only negative comments Tony made about how he was viewed as a model and George Rutland made no comments about this. Tony Armstrong-Barnes.'
printing and sending invitations. And in 1960 at least one of the Leeds multiples was also venturing into this form of display in motion. Burtons staged what *Men’s Wear* called ‘one of the biggest one-firm fashion parades ever to be staged in Britain’ in which 120 garments were modelled to an audience of 400 sales managers at their annual conference in Harrogate who greeted the appearance of a range of ‘exceptionally short Continental-styled raincoats’ with prolonged applause. In February 1960 there was a brief mention by Hepworths that ‘local fashion shows will be stepped up this year’, indicating that they were already using them before their approach to Hardy Amies. A year later Hepworths declared that they planned a ‘vast programme of public fashion parades…Eight shows will be held in major towns in England and Scotland’, a total of nearly 500 shows between March and October. The adoption by the multiples of this new form of promotion was notable enough for *Men’s Wear* to declare that while previously ‘scoffing and derision would have greeted anyone who suggested a fashion parade for men. Today it is considered no less masculine than a visit to the hairdressers’ as the fashion show had become ‘very much part of the pattern of selling menswear. And the large audiences it draws mirrors how much the public is absorbed in men’s clothes.’ For the American industry, Scott argues that the ‘all-male fashion show, was a markedly new development in the history of men’s clothing…it symbolized men’s entanglement in the fashion system.’ It is clear that these gradual moves by the menswear industry to adopt a decidedly feminine way of promoting clothing signalled an awareness of what these fashion rituals could offer the industry as well as requiring the development of new formations of masculinity. This is particularly the case considering the way these shows explicitly positioned men as fashionable subjects.

However, from their first show with Hardy Amies in 1961 Hepworths distinguished themselves from any other menswear company in their use of fashion parades due to the scale of the performances and publicity they attracted. In his autobiography Amies declared that the Hepworths directors were initially wary of his ideas and ‘they were even more worried when I told them that I planned to give a show, just as we did with our women’s collection, only using male models. They thought the sight of a group of male models parading up and down would make them a laughing stock’. Amies recounted that after he had designed the collection, a parade was organised at a private London house to show the Hepworths executives the garments, at the end of which he said ‘there was a stunned silence. Then one of Hepworths’ managers said in an amazed voice, “By gum, we could sell these!”’. In complete contrast, a Hepworths source described this event as being the

175 The estimate for one show staged was £350–£400, the relative value in 2010 would be £6,351–£7,243. Officer and Williamson, MeasuringWorth, 2016. ‘The £. s. d. of the Style Parade’, *Style for Men*, June 1959, pp. 26–27.
180 Scott, ‘California Casual’, p. 185.
181 Amies, *Still Here*, p. 68.
182 Amies, *Still Here*, p. 68.
culmination of a long period of discussion on the designs between Hepworths’ technical designers and sales staff and Amies, while the suits were tailored for Hepworths’ house model William Buck.183

This private showing was followed by a public fashion show held at the Savoy Hotel in London for fashion writers and representatives of the British and foreign press. A brief mention in the Guardian described the atmosphere as being like a first night, the first scene of the show opening with ‘three town suits’ modelled with ‘a spirited snatch of mime by three strapping male models.’184 A very short clip of unused footage of the event from the BBC reveals the modest nature of the show, with one model on a short runway modelling a short coat to a majority male audience (see above).185 The initial responses to the show were overwhelmingly positive.186 Men’s Wear concluded that:

The Hepworths parade had more meaning than a show of clothes. It contained a convincing piece of evidence that a mass-multiple clothing firm can be versatile in spite of size. The special items which Hepworths threw in – sweater jackets, motoring coats and evening coats – shattered what remains of the theory that the vast production machines are capable of turning out only run-of-the-mill lines.187

The company immediately followed up the London event by taking the show to the rest of the country in a promotional push that became significant to the marketing of the Hepworths and Amies collections throughout most of the 1960s. The first of these was at

183 ‘Production Team Score New Styles’, p. 6.
the East Midlands and Leicester Home Life Exhibition where three Hepworths models were already engaged in a programme of shows prior to the Amies launch and after 12 September switched ‘from their existing wardrobes to…show the whole of the Hardy Amies collection’. This was to be followed up by a similar programme at the *Birmingham Mail* Homes and Gardens Exhibition for nearly a month through September and into October.

Hepworths concentrated considerable resources into the annual event and subsequent national tours. Nik Cohn claimed that Hepworths were spending up to £25,000 (£360,700) on the fashion shows by the mid-1960s, which although it seems extravagant may well have been the case. Internal Hepworths documents show publicity manager Brian Bromwich stating that the cost of putting on the shows outside of London in the 1966-1967 financial year had been an estimated at £10,000 (£145,300) and an unsourced report in the *Daily Express* claimed that the 1967 Savoy show had cost £10,000. The *Hepworth Mercury* proclaimed that in 1963 150,000 people had seen their fashion shows in a twelve-month ‘Round-Britain’ tour of 22 different towns and cities. In December 1964 this included shows at the ‘Teens and Twenties Exhibition’ held at the City Hall in Manchester where Hepworths was the only men’s clothing company to take part. The *Hepworth Mercury* argued that by summer 1965 ‘male fashions have become the accepted thing’ across the country reporting that thousands packed venues at ‘Southport Floral Gardens, the Pontin’s ballrooms at Blackpool and Morecombe camps, and the Butlin’s Hotels at Brighton, Margate and Blackpool to see fashion presentations featuring Hepworths.’ Depending on the venue and event, the shows varied in how much menswear was paraded. Model George Rutland remembered that for quite a few of the smaller shows ‘they chose about three of us, uh, to travel around the country and stick us in with Hepworths clothes to model in women’s fashion shows around. They would just stick one guy in modelling Hepworths clothes. And, uh, I did a lot of that as well.’ At their height in 1966-1967 Hepworths put on 59 shows nationally. During this period the

---

189 ‘New styles on show’, p. 6.
190 Bromwich, ‘Hardy Amies Collection’; HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, Meeting Minutes ‘Minutes of the 82nd Meeting of Hepworths Publicity Committee’, 14 December 1967, p. 1.
193 ‘150,000 see nation-wide fashion tour’, *Hepworth Mercury*, Autumn 1963, p. 5.
196 He also turned down a part in the musical *The Boyfriend* to do a month-long Hepworths show in Glasgow because the modelling paid better. George Rutland.
197 The next year the number of shows was dramatically cut and the proposed budget was down to £3,525 (£47,630). Relative value in 2010, Officer and Williamson, *MeasuringWorth*, 2016. HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, Meeting Minutes: Brian Bromwich, ‘To Publicity Committee from Publicity Manager’, 8 February 1968, p. 2.
fashion shows were being utilised strategically by the company as part of their wider publicity campaign to position Hepworths as the Leeds multiple tailor most concerned with providing the man in the street with their desired level of fashionability.

4.36 Hepworths fashion show at Southport Floral Gardens, on the coast of north west England in 1965 where it was watched by an estimated 5,000 people. The biggest audience was at Blackpool where around 8,000 people packed the South beach.


Between 1961 and 1967 the London Savoy show functioned as the glamorous beginning to the year’s publicity for Hepworths. Each show was structured theatrically into ‘scenes’ or ‘acts’ which were detailed in the accompanying programme that listed each outfit along with the style points.\textsuperscript{198} The two most spectacular shows appear to have been those of 1964 and 1965 (see pages from the 1965 programme below which also featured a number of female models for the first time). The shows lasted between 40 and 45 minutes and the models paraded around 100 outfits from suits to overcoats and evening dress – 132 in 1965.\textsuperscript{199} The Hepworth Mercury described the team behind the 1965 event as comprising 30 models – ‘18 men and 12 girls’ – ten dressers, eight people organising the staging (including director, producer, stage manager, sound and lighting) as well as 14 front of house.\textsuperscript{200} In all of the surviving programmes Amies is credited with devising the shows with direction by Eddy Franklyn in 1962 and then by Michael Bentley (who modelled in the 1962 show) in 1964 and 1965. The set designs, or ‘décor’ as they were described in the programmes, were by Kenneth Partridge who had undertaken designs for Amies since the late 1950s and became known in the 1960s for his work for various Beatles; in 1964 he was commissioned by John Lennon to re-work his newly purchased country home.\textsuperscript{201} An uncredited Partridge

\textsuperscript{198} The Hardy Amies Archive only has surviving programmes for the shows held in 1962, 1964, 1965 and 1969 (which was scaled back and held in Leeds at the Queens Hotel). They were designed by graphic artist Edward Burrett who had also been responsible for Hepworths new visual identity in 1960.

\textsuperscript{199} HAA, File Box Hepworths 1: ‘Hardy Amies Designs for Men 1966’, 8 September 1965, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{200} ‘Splendid! My most invigorating fashion date says “Express” Women’s Editor’, Hepworth Mercury, Autumn 1965, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{201} Partridge had trained under Natasha Kroll at Simpson Piccadilly in window display. Pick, Hardy Amies, p. 205; ‘Kenneth Partridge; Inspired interior designer who lavishly decorated John Lennon’s mock-Tudor manor house’ Telegraph, 22 December 2015, p. 31.
and Amies women’s wear designer Ken Fleetwood could be fleetingly glimpsed in film watching a rehearsal of the 1964 show; another indication of the huge amount of resources (both financial and of design talent) required to ensure the shows were a success and made possible by Hepworths.\footnote{UK: Men’s Fashions New and Old Modelled in London, 8 September 1964, (Reuters, 1964) [16mm black and white film], ITN Source, <http://www.itnsource.com/en/shotlist//RTV/1964/09/08/BGY505170141/?s=hardy+amies&kst=1&pn=1> [accessed 27 May 2012].}

4.37 Hepworths and Hardy Amies Savoy fashion show programme, 8 September 1965, designed by Edward Burrett.


The models were a significant element of the shows and had to be approved by Hepworths as well as Amies. Tony Armstrong-Barnes remembered being invited to audition in around 1961:
Uh and then, in 19 I don’t know if it was ’60 or ’61, um, I got a call to go in for an audition to—Hepworths had their um offices on the corner of a road in Regents Street to see a man called Brian Bromwich, who I think was probably their PR man, and uh and he said me, he said, ‘Yes, I like you, I like you’, would you like to go around the corner and see Hardy, Hardy Amies at 14 Savile Row.’ He rang, checked and he said, ‘Yes, you can go now.’ So I went round. It was fine, Hardy was happy, so we did the first Savoy show, which we did every year for I think about six or seven years.

After much persuasion to model by his actress wife’s agent, George Rutland auditioned several times for Michael Bentley with a number of other candidates before being allowed to meet Amies who approved of his slim build:

…went into Savile Row, walk into this room, there he was sitting at the end of the desk, and he, he just looked at me and he said, ‘Good God,’ he said, ‘What waist have you got?’ And I said, ‘Oh, 27 and a half inches, just under 28’. He said, ‘Sign him up! Sign him up!’ I didn’t have to do very much. And, um, and so was my introduction to Hardy and the whole Hepworths set up, which I found fascinating, you know, because that was yet another avenue opening for me, something that I didn’t want to do, but, um, it was great and, and, uh, I just loved the fittings, the clothes…And, um, he used to call me ‘the bottomless wonder’. [laughs] ‘Give it to the bottomless wonder. He can wear that. Give it to him!’

4.39 George Rutland modelling a coat in 1967 from the Hardy Amies for Hepworths 1968 collection, ‘a new version of the British Warm in beige wool and Cashmere…made-to-measure for £16 19s. 6d.’

George Rutland collection.

203 Tony Armstrong-Barnes.
204 George Rutland.
Armstrong-Barnes particularly remembers the age range of the models used for the Amies for Hepworths shows:

TB: There was, I think there were 14, 16 models in the Hepworths show but they remained the same every year.

DS: Right, so he worked with the same…

TB: He might have moved a couple, but of them all they were mainly… For myself the youngest, then there was George, and we go right up through Pete Christian, Michael Bentley who’d actually worked for Hardy Amies after a while. These names mean anything to you?

DS: Michael Bentley I’ve heard of, yes.

TB: He was, he actually didn’t do the Hepworths shows because he was working for Hardy then but he was probably, when I started the top show model. And there was Dick Horn and there was George McGraw. Now when I was, did my first Hepworths show I was probably about 20 where George McGraw was probably about 60.205

For both Rutland and Armstrong-Barnes the Savoy shows were the highlight, particularly due to the attention to detail and the resources put into them. ‘The Savoy show, they were the high spot, I mean, lovely celebrity audience and uh that was all we re-rehearsed and, uh, we did it in the blue room at the Savoy.’206 Rutland also remembered the shows with obvious pleasure:

You know, um, but, you know, it was such a prestigious show. At the Savoy, Hardy Amies, Hepworths, everything beautifully put together, meticulously watched over by Hardy, so you were proud to walk down in that. You felt good, you felt really, really, really good, you know.207

A selection of photographs from the 1964 and 1965 shows published in the *Hepworth Mercury* give an indication of the atmosphere of the shows with the hundreds of guests, the lighting and the runway – all of the elements which had been established in the women’s fashion industry. The 1964 show featured a backdrop of scaled up houndstooth patterned cloth for dramatic effect and a selection of the models were filmed practising the show, including Tony Armstrong-Barnes and George Rutland.208 Unfortunately the show was not filmed live and I have not found any footage that includes sound or music. At the end of the 1965 parade, ‘men and girls crowded the stage dancing to the beat of pop music, in a party scene which presented the new Hardy Amies concept for semi-formal party wear – the Ad Lib suit’ which had the 700-strong audience clapping from the start.209 This seems to have been unusual, however, as models Rutland and Armstrong-Barnes did not remember other examples of choreography: ‘They just had background music for you to
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205 Tony Armstrong-Barnes.
206 Tony Armstrong-Barnes.
207 George Rutland.
208 UK: Men’s Fashions New and Old Modelled in London.
209 Splendid! My most invigorating fashion date, p. 2.
walk to, as I said, nothing… Nothing was choreographed. I mean, it was done in scenes of overcoats, scenes of suits, scenes of sports jackets and things like that. Getting the models to dance was not an especially original move as women’s wear designers such as Mary Quant had introduced this into their shows earlier in the 1960s, but it did reinforce the Hepworths’ stance as being fully engaged in the fashion business by bringing ideas from elsewhere and trying them with men’s tailoring.

---

210 George Rutland.
211 Evans describes Quant’s innovative use of music, dance and movement by the models in her shows. Evans, ‘Enchanted Spectacle’, p. 297.
The 1964 fashion show was particularly significant for Hepworths as it marked the centenary of the company and the show was explicitly designed to demonstrate the company’s respect for past tailoring styles while also projecting future trends. The programme described the show as being ‘much more than a men’s fashion parade. It is a study in three Acts of the evolution of men’s fashion over the past 100 years – since the foundation of Hepworths – and forward a little to the likely future.’

This was played out by three collections. The first involved garments replicating ‘important points of fashion progress since 1864’, the second was the usual collection for the coming year, while for the third ‘Future Indicative’ collection Amies said he had been inspired by the past. Along with the show programme, the company published a booklet, stylishly designed by Edward Burrett, celebrating the event with photographs of many of the garments. Remarkably, a large proportion of the garments that were made and modelled for the 1964 parade have survived and are now part of the LMG collection. Out of 112 outfits in the show, 37 suits, capes, coats and trousers were kept along with 18 hats (three types of top hats and bowlers). Two suits will be discussed, one from the ‘future’ collection and one from the ‘present’ collection. Model George Rutland has a suit from the 1966 show (see 4.13 earlier in the chapter), but apart from these pieces, there do not appear to be any other survivals from the Amies for Hepworths fashion shows from the 1960s and 1970s. Focusing on two

---

of these garments allows a greater insight into Amies for Hepworths designs as well as the process of the show production.

4.43 Split photograph of pieces from the Amies for Hepworths centenary collection, 1964. Second from left, model Bill Buck is wearing a fur coat in untrimmed nutria over a basket-weave tweed suit; next to him is Tony Armstrong-Barnes in a blue and black worsted ‘casual suit’ (both discussed below).

*Men’s Wear*, 19 September 1964, p. 27.
4.44 Two garments from the ‘future’ collection of the 1964 centenary show. Left ‘Country suit in black and white tweed, with knee breeches’; right ‘Collarless suit in basket-weave tweed’. Both suits are in the LMG collection.


4.45 Collarless suit made of Bernat Klein-designed space-dyed Scottish tweed in a basket-weave pattern.


One suit from the ‘future’ collection of the show is made of a very distinctive tweed – it features a collarless jacket with a high round neck and narrow trousers with elastic loops to go under the foot and ensure the correct taut line to the leg when worn. The basket-weave space-dyed tweed was designed by Bernat Klein (one of two of his Scottish tweeds included in the collection by Amies) and is part of an experimental collection of menswear suiting fabrics designed by Klein in the 1960s but never put into production. The suit was modelled by Bill Buck (he can be seen wearing it in the catalogue above where it has been styled with a dark polo neck sweater and dark high suede boots) and his name appears in the collar of the jacket after the model number – as with most of the other garments from the collections. The design of the suit, its narrow trousers and collarless round neck


217 Textile designer Klein was renowned for his colourful Scottish tweeds in the 1960s and developed the space-dyeing technique, a method of dyeing yarns different colours along their length. Edinburgh, National Museum of Scotland, Bernat Klein Archive. Thank you to Lisa Mason for alerting me to this, personal correspondence, 13 June 2016; Fiona Anderson, ‘Bernat Klein: Colouring the Interior’ in British Design: Tradition and Modernity after 1948, ed. by Christopher Breward, Fiona Fisher and Ghislaine Wood (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), pp. 89-100 (p. 90).
clearly a nod to Cardin and the Beatles, was also inspired by Amies’ apparent discovery of some of the detailing of historic menswear, as described in the fashion show programme:

In presenting these trend-setters, Hardy Amies points out that they contain many of the features that reflect elements of Edwardianism seen in the period costumes of Act I. He emphasises that this is logical, since men’s fashion development is merely taking up again where it left off 50 years ago…In the process of designing, the thoughts for the future came first. They have been confirmed by the study of styles of the past.218

4.46 ‘Past Historic’ 1860s styles shown at the Hepworths centenary fashion show which influenced Amies’ contemporary and future designs with high-buttoning jackets and narrow trousers.


4.47 Detail of trousers with elastic loops and '95 Buck' label in the back of the jacket. The multicoloured space-dyed yarns making up the weave of the cloth are also visible.

LMG, LEEDMS.1979.0021.6.

This interpretation of the past could also be seen in a suit with a high-buttoning jacket and narrow trouser. This suit was modelled in the 1964 show as one of the ‘Present Infinite’ collection for 1965 and, significantly, it was also chosen to feature on the cover of Amies’ first book on menswear The ABC of Men’s Fashion, the book which consolidated Amies’ status as a notable menswear designer and authority on men’s fashion. On both occasions it was modelled by Tony Armstrong-Barnes (the suit has been labelled '95 Barnes', see below) and although he has the book in his private collection, which I photographed (see below), he had no particular memories of that suit. The suit’s cut fits with the other pieces from the collection and reflects the ‘long lean look with high-fastening jackets, with four buttons and short, extra-slim lapels…low, hip-fitting trousers’ which characterised the designs. Made of a subtle black and blue diamond-patterned worsted, the suit was designed with interesting details, such as reefer-style vertical pockets which give it a more relaxed casual wear look, small 1½ inch (3.8cm) sleeve vents (with no buttons), while the back jacket panels have been tapered to narrow to the hem with an 8 inch (20cm) central vent. The trousers have a 32 inch (81cm) waist with flat fronts and horizontal slit pockets, a narrow waistband and trouser bottoms narrow (14 inch, 35.5cm) and slanted – so they would sit neatly over shoes.

---


In their review of the trends for 1965, *Men’s Wear* was sceptical of the Amies for Hepworth’s autumn show describing ‘some very modern, and some very advanced styles. Some of his offerings looked like a kite-flying exercise’, particularly the ‘extreme high-buttoning jackets’ and ‘leg tight trousers tucked into calf-fitting knee boots – was there a
rush on the shops for them?’. They did quote Bill Green of influential Soho men’s fashion boutique Vince – credited as Vince Green (Wholesale) – who felt that trousers would continue to be narrow as well as noticing that buyers from provincial shops and stores were more interested in fashion: ‘they have not been at all shocked by equally advanced merchandise we showed them last year. We have not changed the type of merchandise – it is the buyers who have changed’. It does not appear that the blue and black worsted casual suit modelled by Armstrong-Barnes actually went into production, and the basket-weave tweed collarless suit was always intended as one of the ‘gimmicky’ garments to attract press attention. However, both these suits showcased the enterprise and aspiration of Hepworths as they actively sought to engage with fashion and design during the 1960s and to make men’s mass produced clothing both fashionable and desirable. This can be seen in the advertisements and style guides (see below) which pared back the suit details into styles that would be saleable and appealing, ‘making fashion available to the average man’.

222 ‘Fashion’, p. 16.

This image has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons.


Left: 4.52 High-buttoning suit 1964, Hepworths advertisement, Daily Mirror, 2 October.

The annual Savoy fashion show – and subsequent public shows around the country – had served a very useful purpose for Hepworths in establishing their fashion and design credentials and the name of Hardy Amies as a menswear designer but in 1967 the company decided to take a different way forward. Norman Shuttleworth indicated that the company was planning ‘to achieve more positive seasonal stimulation from the Hardy Amies designs aimed at greater sales rather than impressing the Press’ by emphasising window displays and advertising ‘and full merchandising to the Hardy Amies designs’ while putting Hepworths merchandising requirements first. From Shuttleworth’s statement it appears that the company could not see enough of a sales benefit from the publicity generated from the shows compared to more traditional promotional techniques. In financial terms this meant they decided to spend a budget of £160,000 (£2,246,000) on their autumn 1967 advertising campaign in national and provincial papers. As Shuttleworth later described it, the company did not want to create ‘the impression that we were seeking an almost theatrical standard of publicity in which most of the focus was directed towards the way-out styling and the lavishness of the presentation’. Instead, Shuttleworth reiterated the ethos of compromise which the Leeds multiple tailors continually advocated, describing Amies as ‘a down-to-earth hard working designer who keeps a constructive balance between design innovation and customer acceptability – between trend-setting and trend analysis.’

The company did not discard the idea of the fashion show completely, rather they re-purposed them into ‘hard-selling, commercial’ shows aimed at an in-house audience (see 1971 show below). The end of the Savoy fashion shows could be seen as a retreat from the business of fashion which the company had argued was key to their relationship with Amies. Nevertheless, for Hepworths it appears that the fashion shows were not reaching the audience they were primarily concerned with – the men who wanted to purchase a reasonably priced, well cut and styled suit – and for the company that was the consumer they needed to capture. The Amies for Hepworths fashion shows did succeed in positioning the company at the forefront of menswear promotional trends and were crucial in mainstreaming a focus on fashion for the Leeds multiple tailors.

HAA, File Box Hepworths 1, Meeting Minutes ‘Minutes of the 81st Meeting of Hepworths Publicity Committee’, 1967, p. 1.
The high street and middle market nature of the Hardy Amies for Hepworths tailoring meant that Hepworths menswear never had an appeal to those seeking cutting-edge fashion and it was clear this was a line Hepworths never intended to cross. The collaboration between fashion designer and Leeds multiple tailor successfully brought the concept of the branded designer label to British men. Hepworths’ innovative use of fashion shows as promotional tools through the 1960s was also a major initiative for the multiple tailoring and menswear industry as it highlighted and consolidated a design ethos which strongly emphasised men’s fashion. By exploring the relationship between Amies and Hepworths this study shows how Hepworths actively responded to developments that were occurring within the menswear industry in the 1950s and were then able to take a lead on some of these trends into the 1960s. The partnership with Amies enabled a women’s couturier to design men’s tailoring on a mass production scale for the British high street for the first time; their fashion shows were on a scale that was more ambitious than the other Leeds multiple tailors; and each year they launched a new collection of men’s tailored style. All of these aspects, along with the financial success of the collaboration until the downturn in men’s tailoring sales of the 1970s, demonstrated the significance of the contribution Hepworths made to everyday men’s fashion in the post-war period.
Conclusion

1 Menswear fashion column with illustrations by Martin Welch featuring an outfit by Hepworths consisting of a grey padded cotton blouson jacket worn with a soft cotton shirt, wool and acrylic sweater, and blue corduroy trousers.


2 Designs for blouson jackets and casual styles at Top Man and Burtons in 1984.


In 1983, Sally Brampton, fashion editor of the Observer newspaper dedicated a column to the trend in menswear for increasingly casual clothes which she argued was typified by the blouson jacket, which ‘first popularised by the Italians, is now the thing…In fact it is nearly the only thing, having almost completely ousted its traditional older brother, the sports jacket’.¹ Surveying the current styles available on the British high street, the feature pronounced a Hepworths outfit of a glazed cotton blouson and needlecord trousers as the

overall winner, ‘and the perfect example of the currently popular look’, with noted Savile Row tailor Tommy Nutter declaring: ‘You can’t fault it. I really couldn’t say where it came from; it could be by a chain store or a designer.’ (See illustration above). The style was so prevalent that the Burton Group’s 1984 annual report showcased a design sketch and fashion photograph of a Burtons version on the front cover along with a Top Man slim lapelled pink jacket (above). While these two examples demonstrate the ways the two biggest of the Leeds multiple tailors were keeping up with the changes in men’s fashion into the 1980s, they are also indicative of how far men’s clothing had shifted from the tailoring heart of the Leeds multiples business model. The oversized blouson jacket with its pouched silhouette, zip and snap fastenings and sporting heritage was a totally different garment from the architectural fit of a well-tailored English-style suit jacket. During the previous thirty years the core product of the Leeds tailors had been good quality made-to-measure and ready-to-wear tailored suits made in their factories in Leeds and the north of England, however from the early 1970s the demand for these suits went into decline as men’s clothing diversified and competition increased. For example, companies such as Marks and Spencer (M&S) and C&A entered the market for ready-to-wear suits using imported garments; by the mid-1980s M&S was jointly with Burtons the largest retailer of this form of tailoring. Sales of bespoke suits fell by 75 per cent between 1970 and 1980 while ready-made suit sales increased by 51 per cent over the same period. Market research in the 1980s by Mintel pinpointed the changes as while the menswear market was estimated to have grown by 80 per cent between 1980 and 1985, a 1988 survey of 1,000 young men aged between 15 and 24 found that 67 per cent of them put clothing as their top spending priority with jeans making up 73 per cent of all of their clothing expenditure. This visible male consumerism was brought together under the label ‘new man’ as advertisers and academics sought to understand this particular manifestation of masculine clothing consumption and representation.

The 1980s presence on British high streets of the Leeds multiple tailors looked very different from that of the 1940s or the 1960s. For the two big Leeds multiple tailors, Hepworths and Burtons, there was an acceleration of the moves that they had been making from the 1970s as they emphasised retail and ready-to-wear, drawing on expertise from womenswear and market research for their menswear labels, and divested their northern

---

English manufacturing base. Hepworths’ venture Next, which launched as a women’s fashion retail chain in February 1982, epitomised these changes and was so successful it led to the disappearance of the Hepworths name from British high streets in 1985, 121 years after Joseph Hepworth had started the company in Leeds. The Burton Group concentrated on a diverse retail portfolio of both womenswear and menswear including labels Dorothy Perkins, Evans, Top Shop, Top Man and Burtons. Burtons did cling on to a vestige of their made-to-measure heritage by retaining one factory in Goole which manufactured this specialist tailoring, emphasising the transformation the company had undergone since the late 1960s. Other companies were unable to survive. United Drapery Stores merged its Alexandre and John Collier chains in 1980 and closed all of its British manufacturing except for one factory in Hartlepool; in 1985 the remainder of John Collier was bought by Burtons and the name of the chain did not last much longer.

However, the Hepworths and Burtons fashionable blouson jackets of 1983 and 1984 also demonstrate the flexibility and endurance of elements of the Leeds multiple tailors as they continued to supply men shopping on British high streets with affordable and well-designed clothing. The significance of this thesis is that it has shown how important the Leeds multiple tailors were in bringing good design and accessibly fashionable suits to men across the whole of Britain between 1945 and 1980. It has also demonstrated how, by exploring the role of men’s clothing (and particularly the tailored suit) in men’s lives, a more complex and varied picture of masculinity can be uncovered. The deliberate emphasis on the larger of the Leeds multiples in these decades after the Second World War has meant focusing on a period when these companies were notably successful and influential in the menswear and tailoring industries. It was not until the mid-1970s that their businesses faced serious economic difficulties and this periodisation has enabled a more complex picture of these companies to emerge at a time when they dominated British high streets. By analysing the role of the Leeds multiple tailors in designing, mass producing and selling men’s tailoring, in conjunction with men’s consumption of these garments, this thesis has shed new light on our understanding of the history of the Leeds tailoring industry and men’s dress in this period in several important ways.

The methodological approach of the thesis is a particular strength and the innovative and original combination of a diverse range of sources supports the key themes and findings. Most notable is the use of object study, oral history, and personal accounts alongside other sources including business archives, graphic and photographic material, and trade literature.

By working with these sources the depth and diversity of men’s experiences and relationships with mass produced and everyday clothing has been revealed. The suit could be a focus of meaning and emotion for many men; this was exemplified by men’s memories of their first suit and the survival of suits men wore for special occasions such as for their weddings. The object-based research highlighted otherwise hidden stories embedded in the garments: from one man’s out-of-fashion choice for a button-fly for his trousers; another young man’s careful consideration of collar-widths; to the fraying and soiling of the collars and cuffs of a jacket telling of its extensive wear. Studying a number of suits demonstrated the variety possible in men’s tailored garments and uncovered the importance of affordable made-to-measure tailoring to large numbers of men as it gave them design choice and the possibility of expressing individuality through what was a mass-produced garment. This helps to explain why the Leeds multiples persisted with the made-to-measure production and retailing model despite it being an inefficient method of manufacturing compared to ready-to-wear.

Augmenting the object-based research was the use of oral history interviews. These were especially valuable as they illuminated previously unexplored aspects of the Leeds multiple tailors. This was most striking with regard to interviews with two male models who worked with Hepworths and Hardy Amies in the 1960s. They were able to provide personal insights into the experience of working on the company’s fashion shows for the first time and their interviews contributed to a far more comprehensive picture of the contribution of Hepworths to the exciting developments in men’s fashion in the 1960s. The interviews also allowed for a fuller analysis of this crucial partnership to be made, and one which demonstrated the significance of the role of Hepworths in terms of design in this collaboration. Interviews with men who trained with and worked for the Leeds multiples from the 1960s shed light onto the production processes and design influences on the Leeds multiples in the 1960s and 1970s, as well as their own personal clothing narratives.

The original focus of this study reveals the numerous ways the Leeds multiple tailors utilised design and participated in men’s fashion trends throughout their business and how they constructed masculine interpretations of design, areas that have largely been neglected in studies of the industry. This has enabled a more complex picture of the Leeds tailoring industry to be understood by showcasing the important interconnections between production and consumption. The thesis demonstrates that design played a role in all aspects of the activities of the Leeds multiples. They persisted with making and selling made-to-measure tailoring (despite its more complicated retailing and manufacturing) as it fulfilled both their own, and many British men’s expectations of appropriately masculine clothing consumption and making. This was a gendered process. Men were involved in personalising their suit designs through their choices of styles, details and cloths, which contributed to an emphasis on technical rather than creative design (with its connotations of women’s fashion) within the production and training process. The factory manufacture of made-to-measure relied on craftsmen such as cutters and tailors who had the skills
required for bespoke tailoring, a method of production which had a long historical association with masculinity. The Leeds multiple tailors stressed the process of manufacture in the design of the suits they made. For example the success of the collaboration between Hepworths and Hardy Amies relied on the skill and expertise of Hepworths design and production teams to ‘productionise’ Amies’ designs so they were able to be efficiently made in their factories.

The study also demonstrates how the consumption of suits from the Leeds multiple tailors in the post-war period was also gendered. The Leeds multiples ensured that their retail outlets reflected current definitions of masculinity and consumption practices. They invested heavily in their branch architecture, window displays, store interiors and visual identities to keep their hundreds of retail branches up-to-date with changing tastes and men’s consumption habits. This was a period of considerable change in the acceptability of a certain kind of male display in men’s clothed appearance and it became easier for men to articulate themselves through fashion. This reflected longer term trends in men’s fashion as the influence of sportswear and more casual clothing which could be seen before the Second World War accelerated in the three decades after it. This thesis has shown how Burtons and Hepworths, in particular, kept pace with these design developments shifting from pre-war styles to post-war versions of modernity and masculinity. For example, the shift from the 1940s emphasis on respectability represented by the demob suit to the flamboyance which could be viewed in Burtons window displays in 1970 with full-figure mannequins featuring wigs and made-up faces, styled in a way that referenced fashion shows.

Similarly, the ways that these suits were consumed were influenced by their production, as the made-to-measure process in particular demanded considerable investment of time, money and even emotion, by male consumers. Buying a suit was a marker of manliness and attainment of manhood and these gendered associations contributed to the acceptability of male consumption of tailoring. The bespoke consumption process could be a scene of conflict and negotiation as men sometimes had to compromise with sales staff, parents or partners on the desired style details of their suits, or it could allow expressions of independence. However, from the 1940s onwards mass production and the rise of ready-to-wear gave men access to a wider range of fashionable clothes. In tailoring the shift to ready-to-wear helped to change men’s experiences of shopping as buying a suit became a less involved act; there was no waiting and no choosing of details when it was off-the-peg. Hepworths and Burtons were forced to rapidly respond to these changes in the 1970s: they developed different styles of retailing approaches; diversified their product ranges; and moved away from manufacturing and tailoring. They also introduced new brands with explicit age-related targeting of their customers and accommodated developments in consumption practices such as young men and women shopping together through ventures such as Burtons’ Mr Burt, Top Shop and Top Man.
Significantly, the project argues that it is important to study consumption practices beyond the point of acquisition. By lengthening the analysis of consumption to look at how men owned and wore their suits beyond the moment of purchase this study shows how rich the extended narratives of men’s clothing could be as these garments became part of men’s everyday lives. This was particularly the case with men’s tailored suits as they were expensive items bought less frequently while poorer men could often only afford one or two suits. This led to the expectation by some men that they would wear their suits for several years, if not a lifetime in some cases. The higher priced Leeds multiples such as Burtons, Hepworths and Alexandre were renowned for their standards in cloths and making – until the 1970s – which meant men had confidence in the lasting quality of these garments. The object study of the thesis often revealed these longer biographies evident on individual suits as they showed evidence of wear, mending or alteration. This also allows for a more nuanced understanding of the theme of conformity which runs throughout the thesis. Conformity was expressed by both the Leeds multiples themselves as well as many male consumers. Until the 1970s the business model of the Leeds multiples relied on selling factory made suits to a high proportion of the male market and appealing to the broadest range of men across Great Britain in terms of age and class. This approach meant that they emphasised a consistency and uniformity in their visual identity so their stores were prominent and identifiable, and did not produce overtly fashionable styles which may only appeal to a minority of men. Again, made-to-measure production was an important element in this process as it enabled flexibility – it gave those men who did want to purchase a different style of suit the opportunity to design their own as an individual order but did not impinge on the majority choice. Men’s personal accounts and stories of buying and wearing their suits told of the necessity for many men of fitting in and not owning a suit which would make them stand out. This was especially evident in the narratives concerned with the 1940s demob suits which men leaving the armed services were given as ready-to-wear tailoring, leading to some men expressing considerable discomfort in their appearance. However, the concern with conformity also appeared in men’s accounts of their suits in the 1970s, indicating that even as men’s fashions changed some men’s anxieties about their clothing choices remained.

Acquiring and wearing suits was a common experience for many men in the post-war period and contributed to men’s sense of masculinity. This thesis highlights the numerous ways that men’s identities have been shaped by their consumption of tailored suits made by the Leeds multiples and how changes in masculinity can be revealed by the study of clothing. By looking at men’s suits through the scope of dress history and material culture, this research argues for a multifaceted picture of the history of men’s clothing and fashion. In this respect, this study also makes an important addition to the widening of the literature and research into the history of fashion that takes account of everyday and mass produced clothing. The factory made suits of the Leeds multiple tailors were bought and worn by millions of men in the post-war period and represented variety in observance of fashion
change. The findings of this thesis argue for a much broader and more complex understanding of the history of men’s fashion and dress, one which is inclusive of high street clothing. The Leeds multiple tailors made a significant contribution to British menswear in the post-war period and were effective in their utilisation of design throughout their business. By drawing on a wide range of sources, particularly object-study and oral history, this study provides new perspectives and interpretations of men’s experiences in the three decades after the Second World War as they shopped at the Leeds multiple tailors on the high streets of Britain.
Appendix


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bankfield Museum, Calderdale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sumrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bradford Industrial Museum, Bradford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier 1950s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elmbridge Museum, Weybridge, Surrey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Collier Early 1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier 1950s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fashion Museum, Bath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons and Orange Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Cultural Trust, Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Gallery &amp; Museum, Coventry Heritage and Arts Trust, Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial War Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demob</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leicestershire Museum Service, Leicestershire</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong></td>
<td><strong>1960</strong></td>
<td>Wedding suit worn by the groom on the 26th March 1960 in Leicester. Cloth a very fine houndstooth check in black and white giving the impression of a light grey.</td>
<td>X.c129.2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hepworths</strong></td>
<td><strong>1970s</strong></td>
<td>Cream/beige ‘safari’ style suit purchased from a vintage clothes shop.</td>
<td>X.C77.2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong></td>
<td><strong>1960s</strong></td>
<td>1960s Burton suit purchased in Durham for £65. Label ‘Burton Tailored By Appointment to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II Tailors Montague Burton Ltd Leeds 9’.</td>
<td>C.46.1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hepworths</strong></td>
<td><strong>1982</strong></td>
<td>Late Hepworths black wool dinner jacket from early 1980s. With the Next collection.</td>
<td>X.C80.1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong></td>
<td><strong>1953</strong></td>
<td>Three piece suit with fabric to celebrate the coronation, 1953.</td>
<td>C.56.1988.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths; Amies, Hardy</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Two piece suit by Hardy Amies for Hepworths. Worn by the best man. 29 May 1972.</td>
<td>X.C127.2009.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Museums and Galleries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Brown/black/grey striped tie.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2015.003.3.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Suit made of blue/grey wool with narrow white pinstripe. Label: Alexandre shape fast tailoring Lined with Milium Zip trouser fly, includes buttons for braces in trousers.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2012.028.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Men's black trousers, flareline cavalier belonging to Mr. J. Newton.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1991.001.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Black wool and silk barathea two piece dinner suit. The jacket is double breasted.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.001.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Navy chalk stripe three piece suit. The jacket is double breasted. Label on the inside jacket pocket which shows that this is a demob suit.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.001.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Navy wool serge made-to-measure suit with double breasted jacket and order ticket, 11 December 1956.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.001.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Black wool barathea dinner suit, 28 October 1954.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.001.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Blue pin stripe three piece Utility suit. Ordered from Derby branch, 28 October 1949. The jacket is single breasted and fastens with three buttons. Waistcoat has CC41 Utility label inside. Donated by Burtons.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Plain heavy brown wool serge three piece suit. The jacket is double breasted and the trousers have turn ups. Donated by Burtons.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Plain heavy wool serge three piece suit. The jacket is single breasted and fastens with two buttons tied together (like a dinner jacket). Trousers have turn-ups.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Navy worsted triple chalk stripe three-piece demob suit.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Navy worsted stripe two-piece demob suit. The suit belonged to F. Jordan and he was given the suit when he was demobilised on Sept 19th, 1946 at Woking, after serving in the forces for five years. Label: Size 38 SH Code No. 89 [very unclear] S.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Plain navy yarn dyed worsted two piece suit.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Navy worsted piece dyed pinstripe three piece suit. The jacket is single breasted and fastens with two buttons. The vest or waistcoat has the CC41 Utility label inside.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1936-1972</td>
<td>Navy blue pinstripe serge two piece suit. It was worn by Mr D. Upham who bought it in Norwich in 1936 as a Sunday best suit. He wore it for interviews and formal occasions and got married it in 1949. It was also worn by his eldest son for interviews. Loan to Jewish Museum London for exhibition ‘Moses, Mods and Mr Fish’ 2016.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Brown piece dyed Glen check two piece suit. Label inside jacket suit made from wool and Terylene Label: HR [Hudson Road] CN 3688 BN 132 Pattern 38/413E.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1987.0 011.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Object Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Dark grey two piece suit. The jacket is single breasted fastening with 3 buttons. Label inside the jacket – Burton – Wool blended with Acrilan.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1987.0011.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1946-1947</td>
<td>Blue herringbone tweed demob overcoat, given out to its owner in July 1946.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1987.0011.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Three piece black wool evening suit. Inside pocket of the jacket has Burtons order ticket label.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2012.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Two piece, dark grey wool single breasted suit.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2012.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Two piece black dinner suit with double breasted jacket and CC41 Utility label.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2012.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Light brown trousers, with fall front button fastening.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1986.0022.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Replica 1866 three piece light brown or beige suit. Label inside jacket neck: B Redman Esq.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0021.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit replicating a style from 1864. Name label: 98 Redman.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0042.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit replicating a style from 1864 in grey Donegal tweed.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0042.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit replicating a style from 1864. Suit in olive green West of England tweed</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0042.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit replicating a style from 1870-1879. Name label: G Wootten Esq.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0042.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit with a black velveteen single breasted jacket and waistcoat, replicating a style from 1867.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0 042.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three-piece royal blue suit. Jacket has rever collar with satin facing. Same blue fabric trousers, worn with a white linen waistcoat which has a backing made of white synthetic material woven with the name Hardy Amies.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three-piece navy blue with chalk stripe suit designed for 1974.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two-piece lovat green suit for 1974. Label (handwritten) inside jacket: George McGrath.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece light grey flannel suit for 1974.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit. The jacket is a light brown wool with a silk satin collar. The waistcoat is a lighter brown or beige colour. The trousers are LEEDMS.1988.22.3.3.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0 042.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Light brown two piece suit, 1920s replica with Oxford bags.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three-piece wool suit of light brown with a Prussian blue stripe, replica of 1867. Label (handwritten) inside jacket: D Platt Esq.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit replicating a style from 1870.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0 042.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece cycling the suit replicating a style from 1883. Name on collar of jacket: Rutland. Modelled by George Rutland.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0 042.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three piece suit replicating a style from 1865. Modelled by Tony Armstrong-Barnes.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0 042.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece suit replicating a suit in the style of 1864 consisting of a long brown jacket with beige waistcoat and tweed trousers of rust and blue check.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece blue worsted suit designed for 1965. It is the suit on the original cover of Hardy</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1986.0 022.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece black velvet smoking suit replicating a style from 1864. Name label: J. Hardy Esq</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1978.0 042.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece black suit with velvet collar designed for 1974. Label (handwritten) inside jacket: 110 Horne.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two-piece black mohair suit for 1974. Label (handwritten) inside jacket: 105 Rutland.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Three-piece black evening suit replicating a style from 1888.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two piece 'Beatle’ style suit with white leather waistcoat, for 1974 collection.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Two-piece suit made of Bernat Klein designed tweed in a basket weave pattern, designed for 1974 collection.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3 grey morning top hats. Made by Tress &amp; Co.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.25.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6 black stove pipe silk plush top hats. Made by Battersby and Co., London</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.23.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5 light brown Derby bowler hats, made by Battersby &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.22.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6 brown wool felt stove pipe top hats. Made by Battersby and Co. in association with Hardy Amies.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1979.0 021.24.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths Centenary</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Brown cotton corduroy breeches (knickerbockers).</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1979.021.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Chocolate brown three piece suit, high buttoning jacket fastening with four large self-covered buttons, and with pale brown vest (7 buttons) and checked trousers.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1986.022.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Blue barathea double breasted sample jacket, has no buttons or button holes Label: Hepworths Made in Great Britain 1982-1986.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1986.022.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>A black jacket and correspondence about a complaint from the owner of the jacket after it had been drycleaned, which seems to have caused bubbling with the outer shell and the interfacing. Donated by Hepworths in 1986.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1986.022.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Brown tweed sample jacket with high collar, blouson sleeves and six buttons.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1986.022.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Light blue wool sample jacket manufactured by Hepworths 4 February 1983 with no collar.</td>
<td>LEEDM.S.1986.022.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accession Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Orange and brown wool tweed jacket that fastens with four concealed buttons. Neck does not fasten and the jacket has a stand up collar.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1986.022.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Blue wool jacket fastening with two buttons and a polyester lining. Designed by Hardy Amies for Hepworths.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1986.022.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Blue Teddy Boy style jacket with black velvet cuffs and pocket flaps.</td>
<td>LEEDMS.1986.022.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Grey wool three piece wedding suit, 22 February 1971, and grey, pink paisley tie: Yarr Made in England Tricel. Worn by Raymond Fox.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2015.47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Three piece suit – jacket, trousers and waistcoat, pure wool.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2011.058.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Dark brown Terylene and wool twill suit jacket. Garment label on inside breast pocket: dc designed by dress circle for John Collier Terylene &amp; Pure New Wool.</td>
<td>LEEAG.2012.027.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson the Tailor</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Navy blue pinstripe wool double breasted wedding suit, worn in 1947. The suit is labelled with a Utility mark. Worn by an ex-serviceman and it took 12 months for him to get the cloth needed for the suit.</td>
<td>LEEDME.1976.0057.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility / Demob</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Grey (with white and blue) wool pin striped suit, 1946 demob suit with Utility marks. Wool is very rough. Label: CC41 209A</td>
<td>LEEAG.2011.053.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Three piece lounge wedding suit in navy with wide silver pinstripe, worn by David Gillett on his marriage to Lorna Woodhouse in Reddish (see wedding dress 2006.43). Cost £39.</td>
<td>2006.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Tie, brown/beige polyester, checked in a diagonal design; lined brown rayon, figured with ‘Hardy Amies’.</td>
<td>1984.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier</td>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>Two-piece single breasted lounge suit in widely checked black on electric blue worsted mix; Woven inner label: ‘Styled by the Design Circle for John Collier’.</td>
<td>2012.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barran</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Two piece suit. Worn by Mr Christopher J Ratcliffe as school uniform (in upper sixth at Sir Roger Hanwood’s School, Sandwich; hence colour; cut very avant guarde but broke no rules; suit worn for ‘going out’ and later for formal occasions at Aberdeen University).</td>
<td>1980.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson the Tailor</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Wedding lounge suit. Worn by Kenneth John Chorley at his marriage to Alice Veronica Craven on 21 July 1950.</td>
<td>2008.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Two-piece single breasted lounge suit in mottled khaki green wool; dated on paper label in inside pocket (9.9.70) but typical mid-late 1960s cut including self-covered buttons.</td>
<td>2012.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>04/12/1963</td>
<td>Two piece suit made-to-measure for donor’s son, aged 12/13, for a family wedding in 1963. Was his first suit and cost £11.</td>
<td>1980.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of London, London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong> 1962</td>
<td>Black and tan shaded wool, 2-piece lounge suit label at inside right marked BURTON TAILORED.</td>
<td>1973.233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong> 1945-1946</td>
<td>Two piece lounge suit in dark blue wool, with narrow blue and beige pinstripes; woven labels ‘Montague Burton, tailor of taste’ and ‘Utility’ CC41; matching trousers with turn-ups.</td>
<td>2003.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong> 1949</td>
<td>Full length black wool overcoat with very wide stepped lapels; woven label for Montague Burton, tailor of taste, London and Edinburgh.</td>
<td>2004.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</strong> 1980-1983</td>
<td>Jacket or blazer Plum coloured polyester Lined with maroon rayon; label ‘A Hardy Amies design-Golden Talisman-tailored by Hepworths’</td>
<td>1984.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C &amp; M Sumrie</strong> 1961-1975</td>
<td>Derry &amp; Toms Liftman’s uniform</td>
<td>77.148/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montague Burton</strong> 1975</td>
<td>Pinstripe suit, trousers and jacket, made-to-measure at Burtons for Stephen Collins, aged 15.</td>
<td>2012.84/1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montague Burton</strong> 1970-1976</td>
<td>Overcoat, given by Cliff Thomas. Part of skinhead outfit, see also 81.186/1 and /3.</td>
<td>81.186/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Catalogue No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Teddy Boy revival suit</td>
<td>80.391/1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC41 Utility Suit</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Suit displayed in the Imperial War Museum exhibition 'Fashion on the Ration' in 2015 as an example of a suit conforming to the austerity regulations. <a href="http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk/online/object/84676.html">http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk/online/object/84676.html</a></td>
<td>45.29/2a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Three piece suit of dark brown woollen cloth, with fine stripes in red and rust.</td>
<td>A.1977.129 A-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Two piece suit made of wool and Terylene mixture in a glen check pattern in grey, black, green and terracotta, part of a suit.</td>
<td>A.1976.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Air Force - RAF – officer's jacket, with Nav brevet, M.B.E, two service ribbons, VR collar badges and anodised ER buttons, part of a Squadron Leader’s No. 1 Home Dress uniform.</td>
<td>EF.1997.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry and Mourne Museum, Northern Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1946-1947</td>
<td>Three-piece lounge suit, purchased in Liverpool in 1946-7. It is dark navy wool with a narrow pin stripe. The suit belonged to a gentleman from Kilkeel, County Down. He wore the suit at his wedding in 1947. He returned to Kilkeel in 1958.</td>
<td>NMM: 2007.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demob</td>
<td>1944-1949</td>
<td>Two piece suit made of herringbone tweed.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1985.134.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Collier</strong></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Three piece suit in a grey, blue and black polyester mix check, label inside John Collier, bought by donor (Mr M. Harber) in 1975.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1985.280.1.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demob</strong></td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Three-piece demob suit in grey worsted wool, 1946 – jacket, waistcoat and trousers with button on blue striped cotton collar in jacket pocket.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1970.568.CH2 : C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Three piece suit in navy blue serge.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1971.686.2.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demob</strong></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Three piece demob suit in navy blue wool.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1970.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Man’s tie in maroon velvet, label Burton, cotton and viscose, made in Great Britain, worn by donor with a suit for his wedding in December 1974.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1984.386.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burtons</strong></td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Overcoat in dark brown line checks on lighter brown ground woollen tweed. Bought by donor’s father for donor (Mr A. Hodgson) in Middlesborough in 1939 for £4 15s., hardly worn because donor joined the Colonial Service and lived in Africa for 40 years, worn at intervals whilst on leave until about 1969.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1985.292 : C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demob</strong></td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Jacket from a demob suit.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1970.569.CH2 : C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demob</strong></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Jacket from a demob suit in brown herringbone.</td>
<td>NWHCM : 1970.570.CH2 : C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Royal Pavilion and Museums, Brighton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</strong></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>Two piece dark pink suit made of wool and Trevira</th>
<th>C003986.1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</strong></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Three piece grey stripe suit in Golden Talisman Pure Wool. Heavily damaged by moth.</td>
<td>C002406.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</strong></td>
<td>1968-1975</td>
<td>Teddy Boy suit with brocade waistcoat, string tie with scull head and ‘M’ metal belt buckle.</td>
<td>CCE 0253.a-d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tyne and Wear Archives and Museums, Newcastle**

<p>| <strong>Burtons</strong> | 1941 | Three piece Utility suit from about 1941-1948 (CC41 on waistband of trousers). | TW CMS : K14898 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Collier</td>
<td>1950s - 1960s</td>
<td>Three piece suit.</td>
<td>TWCMS : G13628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>Teddy Boy suit from the 1950s. Black gabardine drape coat and waistcoat trimmed with a velvet collar and pocket flaps, and lined with a brilliant red paisley fabric.</td>
<td>TWCMS : G3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria and Albert Museum, London</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepworths and Hardy Amies</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Man’s suit (jacket and trousers), cream wool with blue stripe, mid 1960s. Given by John Hardy.</td>
<td>T.671:1, 2-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wardown Park Museum, Luton Culture, Luton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Collier</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Hopsack, blue suit with John Collier label.</td>
<td>T673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worthing Museum and Art Gallery, Worthing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Navy blue three piece single breasted wool suit. Label reads ‘Burtons menswear bespoke’, 10 September 1975. Bought by donor when he was aged 30 from Burtons store Bognor, cost £37.50.</td>
<td>1987/261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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