

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/156903>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Chapter 7

The Wrong Kind of Working-Class Woman? Domestic Servants in the Suffrage

Movement

Laura Schwartz

ORCID 0000-0003-3550-7912

This chapter looks at the participation and representation of domestic servants in the suffrage movement, exploring a previously ignored aspect of its internal class dynamics. It is argued that the exclusion of this largest group of women workers from the limited franchise of 1918 (resident servants over the age of 30 continued to be unable to vote) points to longer standing tensions with regards to the position of servants in the pre-war suffrage movement. Although domestic servants were active at the grassroots, they rarely featured in formal suffrage propaganda and public spectacle which tended instead to focus on the industrial and/or sweated woman worker. In this chapter I explore some of the reasons why the figure of the domestic servant proved so difficult to incorporate into suffrage visions of modern and emancipated womanhood. Class conflict often erupted within the movement between suffrage-supporting mistresses and suffrage-supporting maids, reflecting the difficulties of reconciling the emancipatory aspirations of one type of woman worker with those of the women who directly employed them. Militant servants often struggled to assert an independent political voice (even when their suffrage views chimed with those of their employers) due to powerful cultural perceptions of the servant as an extension of the mistress' personhood. Moreover, the degree to which the public achievements of the suffrage movement depended upon the domestic labour of servants (who kept the homes of suffrage activists while they undertook political activism; provided hospitality to itinerant lecturers; and nursed hunger-strikers back to health) was rarely acknowledged.

On Saturday 18 June 1910, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) staged one of its largest and most spectacular demonstrations. The Great Procession through the streets of central London was carefully choreographed and divided into numerous different 'contingents', each representing a particular class or type of suffrage supporter. There was a special contingent for Irish suffragettes, one for 'foreign supporters', and one for women who had attended university. Many of the contingents were organised according to profession, demonstrating the vast array of work done by disenfranchised women. There were teachers,

musicians, civil servants and stenographers, gymnastics teachers, ‘women pharmacists’, sanitary inspectors and health visitors. Even that most overworked of professions, nurses, reportedly ‘snatched a few brief hours from labours to take part in the demonstration, and had a hearty welcome all along the line of the route’. Although the achievements of professional women were emphasised and celebrated, the Great Procession also featured women working in more lowly forms of employment. *Votes for Women* recorded that ‘There were also sweated workers in poor clothes and hats that knew no fashion. There were boot-machiners, box-makers, and shirt-makers, who fight daily with starvation.’ Efforts to mobilise for the Great Procession included holding meetings for laundry workers in North London, and the canvassing of ‘factory and laundry districts’ in South London.¹ Yet domestic servants, the most common and most numerous type of woman worker², were starkly absent from descriptions of the Great Procession, a fact strangely at odds with its *raison d’etre* to showcase every aspect of female labour and experience.

This chapter examines the participation of domestic servants in the struggle for the vote, exploring a previously ignored aspect of the class politics of the suffrage movement. I argue that the exclusion of this largest group of women workers from the limited franchise of 1918 (resident servants over the age of 30 continued to be unable to vote) points to longer-standing tensions over the position of servants in the pre-war suffrage movement. Although domestic servants were active at the grassroots, they were rarely represented in suffrage pageantry and organised public spectacle, which tended instead to focus on the industrial and/or sweated woman worker. Why did the figure of the domestic servant prove so difficult to incorporate into suffrage visions of modern and emancipated womanhood? In part this was due to the location of servants’ work in the private sphere of the home, since, despite some desire to re-value the domestic sphere, the suffrage movement prioritised the fight for women’s access to professional work and political participation in the public realm. Even

more significant was the class conflict that often erupted within the movement between suffrage-supporting mistresses and suffrage-supporting maids, demonstrating the difficulties of reconciling the emancipatory aspirations of one type of woman worker with those of the women who directly employed them.

The Class Politics of the Suffrage Movement

Feminist historians have, since the 1970s, begun to challenge and nuance the notion that the struggle for the suffrage was exclusively fought by and for middle-class women.³ Jill Liddington and Jill Norris showed that working-class Lancashire women were crucial in the formation of a radical suffragist current from the 1890s onwards.⁴ Liddington's later work argued that similarly strong working-class support for the suffrage, especially for the WSPU, also emerged in Yorkshire, among women working as machinists, weavers, needle-women, milliners and in other manufacturing jobs related to the textile trade.⁵ Leah Leneman refuted earlier characterisations of the Scottish suffrage movement as more middle-class than its English counterpart, revealing a number of working-class women active in the militant societies.⁶ Gillian Scott showed how the Women's Co-operative Guild, a large national organisation of working-class housewives, also made an important contribution to the struggle for the suffrage.⁷ Sandra Stanley Holton located such initiatives within a longer-standing tradition of 'democratic suffragism', which sought votes for women in the broadest terms. In the years leading up to the First World War, this political current brought the women's suffrage movement into closer and more organised alliance with the labour movement, via organisations such as the United Suffragists, the East London Federation of the Suffragettes and the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies' Election Fighting Fund. The Fund was established in 1912 to support Labour Party candidates against the Liberals who were still delaying the introduction of an effective women's suffrage Bill.⁸ The

Women's Freedom League (WFL), despite remaining independent from all political parties, also maintained close links to the labour movement and the Independent Labour Party (ILP) and actively sought to recruit working-class women.⁹

The WSPU followed a somewhat different trajectory from the other main suffrage organisations, moving away from its originally close relationship with the labour movement. The Pankhursts and other founding members of the WSPU were all ILP women seeking a forum in which they could focus on issues specific to women within their wider socialist political activity. The militant tactics that the WSPU began to deploy in 1905 were already widely used in the labour movement, and some in the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) initially sought to distance themselves from the WSPU, not so much because of the disruptive nature of these tactics, but because of their strong association with working-class political activism.¹⁰ Up until 1906 the WSPU de facto campaigned for the ILP due to their policy of supporting whichever election candidate was most sympathetic to women's suffrage. In August of that year, however, Christabel Pankhurst changed tack, deciding that the WSPU would oppose the government candidate, regardless of party. In practice this meant mainly trying to unseat Liberal MPs, usually to the benefit of the Conservatives and the disadvantage of Labour. Following this, Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst resigned from the Labour Party in April 1907. The two organisations parted ways even more decisively when the WSPU began to actively oppose Labour as well as Liberal candidates after the Labour Party refused the WSPU's demand that they vote against the Liberals in every division in Parliament. The split between the Pankhursts and the ILP did not, however, end all ties between the wider WSPU membership and the labour movement. June Purvis, Michelle Myall and Krista Cowman have all shown that, at least at a local level, cooperation between the WSPU and the ILP often continued. Many individuals remained members of both organisations, and socialism and support for women's suffrage intertwined.

A number of working-class women continued to be active in the WSPU well into the final stages of militancy.¹¹

All the main suffrage organisations took an interest in the needs of working-class women, even if it is hard to establish precisely how large a proportion of their membership might count as working class, with almost certainly a majority from middle to upper middle-class backgrounds.¹² The role of servants in the suffrage movement, however, has never before been examined. This, I suggest, is in part due to the invisibility of servants in suffrage pageantry and public spectacle. This chapter offers an overview of the many different ways in which servants were involved in the grassroots of the movement, before going on to examine in detail their erasure from its more public face. It argues that this silence in the archival material should not be understood as indicating the wholesale exclusion of servants, but rather tells us something more about the class politics of suffrage: about which kind of working-class women the movement did and didn't deem acceptable, and how this related to tensions between servants and mistresses as they joined forces in the struggle for the vote.

Servants in the Suffrage Movement

The WSPU is having a big demonstration here today. I am a member but I cannot get to any meetings. While I sit here my spirit is with the women, wishing them success. My wings are beating hard against the bars of my cage to be free and to be able to help them.¹³

In 1908 an anonymous 'Domestic' wrote the above letter to the socialist feminist newspaper the *Woman Worker*. It lamented her inability to join what was probably the WSPU 'Woman's Sunday', when about 30,000 women processed through London, most of them wearing

white.¹⁴ Like her, many other servants found it difficult to participate in the suffrage movement's regular round of meetings and demonstrations, not to mention highly public and/or illegal actions. The feminist press thus became an especially important forum. Instead of marching through the streets with her comrades, 'Domestic' described herself as 'sat reading the *Woman Worker*', which offered an alternative way of demonstrating her solidarity. Such newspapers would have been relatively accessible to servants since, by the first decade of the twentieth century, they were often sold on the streets or left lying about in cafes and railway station waiting rooms with the hope of picking up a new audience.¹⁵ Short or serialised articles offered an ideal format for servants who might only have five or ten minutes to spare between the incessant tasks that constituted their sixteen hour working day. The feminist press was characterised by a culture of controversy and debate. The official organ of the NUWSS the *Common Cause*, for example, had an explicitly open policy with regards to its correspondence columns, and this may have helped servants acquire the confidence to make their voices heard.¹⁶ Letters could be published anonymously and frequently provoked responses from other servants, providing a rare opportunity to collectivise the grievances of an otherwise fragmented and isolated workforce.

Between 1906 and 1907 Clementina Black, a prominent member of the NUWSS, collected 26,261 signatures on a 'Declaration' from women stating their wish to receive the franchise on the same terms as men. The professions of 25,000 signatories were analysed, and 2,769 of them described their job as 'Domestic'. This was the second largest occupational group after 'Educational', and more than ten times the number of factory workers' signatures.¹⁷ Some of these servants even participated in the most visible and dangerous forms of suffrage activism. The anonymous 'Domestic' quoted above, for example, may have been trapped inside on the day of a large demonstration, but her letter also describes how she had, in the past, participated in militant activity and even gone to

prison for it.¹⁸ Likewise, twenty-six year old domestic servant Eliza Simmons was sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment on 23 November 1910 for ‘wilfully breaking three windows’ at Winston Churchill’s residence in Eccleston Square.¹⁹ It is possible to catch only a brief glimpse of such women, since just their names and occupations were recorded in newspaper reports of suffragette arrests and the registers of magistrates’ courts where they were sentenced. And these sources do not capture servants who supported the ‘law-abiding’ wing of the movement.²⁰ Moreover, the prominence and wealth of their employer tends to determine whether suffrage-supporting servants turn up in the historical record.

Charlotte Griffiths of Rochdale was fifty years old when, on the evening of 11 February 1908, she joined hundreds of other suffragettes in a raid on the Houses of Parliament. Earlier in the day she had been participating in the Women’s Parliament, which had been organised by the WSPU to discuss the injustice of women’s continued disenfranchisement and the government’s repressive action towards militant suffrage campaigners. Initially, St Stephen’s Hall (part of the Houses of Parliament) was the target of a surprise attack by twenty-one suffragettes who arrived disguised inside a furniture removal van. Charlotte Griffiths joined the second wave of demonstrators attempting to enter the House in the evening, braving not only a ‘solid phalanx of police’, but also a ‘mob of boys’ who assaulted some of her party with ‘stones and sticks’.²¹ Griffiths was one of the fifty arrested and tried at Bow Street Magistrates Court where, refusing to find two sureties of £20, she was served a six week prison sentence.²² She spent only a week in Holloway Prison, however, accepting an offer of sureties to enable her to return home to nurse her ailing mother. These were paid for by John Albert Bright (Liberal MP for Oldham), and Gordon Harvey (Liberal MP for Rochdale). It was in her capacity as a domestic servant rather than as suffragette that Charlotte Griffiths drew the attention of Members of Parliament, for since at least 1901 she had been employed as a ‘nurse domestic’ in the house of John Albert Bright.²³

Bright, son of the famous radical MP John Bright and cousin to Helen Clark, was, in his own words, 'rather weak-kneed' about the question of women's parliamentary franchise. Although he supported women's election to town councils and other public bodies, John Albert Bright claimed that he remained unconvinced that the majority of the female population wanted the parliamentary vote. Moreover, he felt that the Liberal government had more pressing legislation to pass, such as old age pensions. He nevertheless travelled to London to aid Charlotte Griffiths' release, and, shocked to find her clothed in 'hideous prison dress' normally reserved for criminals rather than prisoners of conscience, he moved a protest in the House of Commons about the treatment of suffragette prisoners.²⁴

Charlotte Griffiths was fortunate to be employed by a family with a long tradition of supporting radical causes, and militant action did not cost her her job. The anonymous 'Domestic' writing to the *Woman Worker* in 1908 was not so lucky: 'I had a hard fight to get a situation after my imprisonment. I am afraid that if my present mistress were to know that I was an ex-convict she would not want me anymore.'²⁵ Mistresses frequently advertised for servants in the WSPU newspaper *Votes for Women* and the *Common Cause*, occasionally promising that they would be free to attend suffrage meetings.²⁶ Servants also sometimes placed advertisements seeking politically amenable employers, such as one anonymous lady's maid 'out of place through her sympathies for votes for women'.²⁷ In 1910 the north-west London branch of the WSPU helped a house-maid 'who lost her berth through going on the last Deputation', and a 'cook general 'who wishes to be free to volunteer for the next'.²⁸ There is some evidence to suggest that a few mistresses saw the political conversion of their maids as merely an extension of their responsibilities and authority as employers, rather than viewing such women as their equals in a common struggle for emancipation. A friend of the mother of aristocratic suffragette Constance Lytton once suggested that it would have been better if Lytton, instead of risking her life by imprisonment and force-feeding, had instead

focused her energies on setting up a branch of the WSPU among the servants at her family estate in Knebworth.²⁹

‘Antis’ certainly accused suffrage-supporting servants of mindlessly aping the politics of their betters or, worse, of being manipulated and exploited by their radical employers. Soon after the suffragettes’ raid on St Stephen’s Hall, the General Committee of the National Liberal Federation debated the question of votes for women, during which Maurice Levy MP denounced a ‘band of women paid organisers ... bringing young girls from their employment, placing them on the streets of London amid horrible temptation’. He referred directly to Charlotte Griffiths’ arrest, claiming that John Albert Bright’s wife, Edith, ‘afraid to go out into the streets herself, allowed and induced’ her servant to ‘go and take part in the rowdyism’.³⁰ Charlotte Griffiths, however, refused to be portrayed as her mistress’ political puppet. The following week she wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* (the newspaper that had printed Levy’s slander) insisting that ‘I went entirely of my own free will, without any pressure or persuasion, but because I believed the cause was just and right, and that every woman who was able to do so should give her help.’³¹ Rather than simply enacting the political enthusiasms of her employers, it is possible that, to the contrary, Griffiths might have helped spur the Brights towards more active support for women’s suffrage. Certainly, it was her arrest that prompted John Albert Bright to make his protest in the House of Commons, and also to address female enfranchisement in a speech the following week on the occasion of the election of a woman to Rochdale Town Council. His wife, Edith Bright, became president of the Rochdale branch of the North of England Society for Women’s Suffrage, and their daughter, Hester Bright, later became its secretary – but this branch was not founded until September 1908, a number of months after Charlotte Griffiths had served a week in Holloway prison.³²

More broadly, although working for a suffrage-supporting mistress made it easier for servants to engage in the struggle for the vote, there is evidence to indicate that such servants' suffrage activism involved at least a degree of agency.³³ The Blathwayt family are well known within suffrage historiography as prominent members of the WSPU who hosted many leading suffrage activists in their comfortable home Eagle House in the Somerset village of Batheaston.³⁴ Yet little has ever been written about how their servants were also active supporters of votes for women. House- and parlour-maid Ellen Morgan, who worked for the Blathwayt's from 1904 to 1910, accompanied the adult daughter Mary Blathwayt to her first WSPU meeting in 1907. There is no suggestion that Morgan attended only in the capacity of chaperone (two other female friends also joined them), and since they did not return home until 2am, leaving Morgan only four hours before her working day began, it is reasonable to speculate that she attended out of her own interest rather than solely to please her mistress.³⁵ In the coming months Ellen Morgan attended further suffrage meetings in Bath and Bristol, along with the cook, Elsie Harris, and the char, Ellen Martha Rawlings.³⁶ Did the Blathwayts put pressure on their domestics to support a cause which was not theirs? Emily Blathwayt, Mary's mother, occasionally bought her maids tickets for suffrage events, which no doubt provided extra motivation to attend.³⁷ Yet she also recorded in her diary how, during the WSPU 'week of self denial' in February 1908, Ellen Morgan, Elsie Harris and Mr Rawlings the chauffeur had all approached Mary 'spontaneously' to add their sixpence donations to her collection card.³⁸ Ellen Morgan and Elsie Harris not only attended suffrage meetings, but also helped to distribute WSPU propaganda. At one event Ellen Morgan had to dodge an attack by a group of 'hooligans' and 'very low men' who came to disrupt the meeting, possibly under orders from the local Liberal Party, but she still managed to sell 'a large number' of copies of a book entitled *Trial of the Prisoner*.³⁹

After Ellen Morgan and Elsie Harris left the Blathwayt household, new servants May Woodham and Ellen (Nelly) Durnford also showed an interest in the suffrage movement, purchasing postcards featuring a prominent local suffragette, Mrs Morgan, posed in a rickshaw outside the Bath suffrage shop.⁴⁰ Possibly employment at Eagle House served as an introduction to the suffrage movement and encouraged some servants to become involved in a campaign which otherwise might have passed them by. And yet the political exchange was not always entirely one way. Emily and Mary Blathwayt's diaries record conversations with their servants that suggest a sense of shared struggle. They describe, for example, Ellen Morgan looking in on her way to a suffrage meeting to let the Blathwayts know how that day's 'At Home' had gone. On other occasions Ellen Morgan and Elsie Harris found that their knowledge of local and national suffrage events was superior to that of their mistresses' because they subscribed to newspapers such as the *Mirror*, which provided more in depth and sympathetic coverage than the Blathwayts' copies of *The Times*.⁴¹

The diaries of Emily and Mary Blathwayt also reveal the less visible ways in which the campaign for the vote was quietly yet consistently supported by women whose activity was confined to the home. Unlike Mary Blathwayt, Ellen Morgan, Elsie Harris and the Durnford sisters could not leave their work to accompany Annie Kenney on a speaker tour, nor even find much time in their sixteen hour working day to attend suffrage demonstrations. Yet in their own way the Eagle House servants also made a crucial, if far less spectacular, contribution to the movement. They served tea and cakes at one of Annie Kenney's suffragette 'At Homes', and cooked, cleaned and cared for the leaders of the WSPU when they came to Eagle House to recuperate from their gruelling regimes of political activism.⁴² In 1909, WSPU leader Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence published an appeal to daughters of wealthy families to give a year of their lives to the Cause, naming Mary Blathwayt as a prime example.⁴³ Likewise, another leading light in the WSPU Annie Kenney, recalls in her

autobiography how crucial the hospitality afforded by middle-class families such as the Blathways had been to the WSPU's network of itinerant organisers and speakers, saving a great deal of money that would otherwise have been spent on hotel bills.⁴⁴ What neither Pethick-Lawrence nor Kenney mentioned, however, is a fact so obvious that it did not need saying: that when affluent women such as Mary Blathwayt donated their free time and hospitality to the Cause they also automatically offered up their domestic servants. Such suffrage work took place behind the scenes, as a contribution to a more public display of support for which their mistresses took the credit. It is likely, then, that many other servants in suffrage-supporting households played a similar role, which has gone entirely unrecorded. Mary Blathwayt's diary, for example, mentions other local suffragettes' servants attending meetings and joining the local WSPU. Domestic workers would have also cared for WSPU speakers when they stayed at other houses in the area including that of Mary's friends the Tollemaches.⁴⁵

Suffrage Pageantry and Public Spectacle

If 'real-life' servants were present at almost every level of the suffrage movement, they were very rarely represented in its pageantry and public spectacle.⁴⁶ There were exceptions to this, but rather than simply recovering the odd glimpse of the servant as suffrage subject I want to ask why such depictions were so few and far between. Between about 1907 and 1914 the suffrage movement mass-produced postcards and posters, and organised seven national processions and pageants, which were carefully choreographed for maximum theatrical effect and involved beautifully crafted banners and costumes. The Artists' Suffrage League was founded by professional artists in 1907 to help with preparations for the NUWSS 'Mud March' (the first open-air public demonstration organised by the constitutionalists) and

remained allied to them after that. The Suffrage Atelier (est.1909), open to members who were not professionally trained, was non-affiliated but tended to work most frequently with the WFL. The WSPU did not have a dedicated artists' organisation but instead relied on a small group of individuals, including Sylvia Pankhurst, Marion Wallace Dunlop and Edith Downing.⁴⁷ The absence of domestic servants from their work is all the more striking given that the suffrage movement was particularly keen to represent women in their capacity as both professional and manual workers.

The 'Great Procession' of June 1910, organised by the WSPU and the WFL, was intended to symbolise suffragettes' aspirant journey 'from prison to citizenship'. It was typical of many of the large-scale suffrage demonstrations in organising marchers into blocks according to the type of work they did.⁴⁸ Such demonstrations were intended to prove to both the public and the government that women from all walks of life wanted the vote, and it was therefore important to ensure that working-class women were represented alongside more educated, wealthy and professional women. Although occupational banners of professional careers tended to be most numerous, many working-class women also attended these demonstrations.⁴⁹ In 1909, the NUWSS paid for silk workers, pottery workers, felt-hat makers, boot and shoe workers, hosiery workers and housewives (recruited by the Co-operative Women's Guild) to travel to London from the North of England for the Pageant of Women's Trades and Professions.⁵⁰ Cross-class solidarity was a key feature of many of these demonstrations, and a theme that was often remarked upon in the mainstream press. The *Daily News*, for example, reported that at the NUWSS demonstration of 13 June 1908 'one could see fair dames of Mayfair in costly lace and silk fraternising with working girls in shawls and feathers, while famous novelists and actresses walked side-by-side with workers from the factory or the farm...'⁵¹ Yet among the numerous and various working-class jobs on display, domestic service was rarely seen. Instead, suffrage postcards and posters, pageants

and processions, depicted working-class women in one of two ways: either as an industrial worker – factory workers and Lancashire mill girls like Annie Kenney – or as a sweated worker – seamstresses, piece workers and, occasionally, prostitutes.⁵²

The difficulty of fitting the domestic servant into either one of these two ‘types’ of working-class womanhood is evident in the programme written to accompany the Pageant of Women’s Trades and Professions organised by the NUWSS to mark the fifth congress of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, which they hosted in London in April 1909. As the title of the pageant indicates, its primary aim was to showcase the great variety of women’s work and to explain why each particular type of worker needed the vote. The pageant was divided into five blocks: one for doctors, nurses and teachers; another for writers, journalists, clerical workers and actresses; another for industrial workers; another for artists and craftswomen and also a block consisting of farmers, beekeepers, market and flower gardeners, jam and sweet makers, waitresses, cigar and cigarette makers, housewives and ‘homemakers’. This last group incorporated all waged domestic workers.⁵³ The Artists’ Suffrage League designed the banners, providing one for charwomen that featured a dustpan, a broom, an apron and a shield embroidered with a picture of a scrubbing brush and the slogan ‘cleanliness is next to godliness’.⁵⁴

[insert Figure 1 with caption: Postcard featuring charwomen's banners from the Pageant of Women's Trades and Professions (1909)]

Housemaids were also reported to have held a shield featuring caps and aprons and feather dusters, and the cooks carried golden gridirons with copper pans and bundles of herbs.⁵⁵ None of these groups of domestic workers, however, was given their own named section in the programme, which listed each of the 10 other trades included in their Block and

57 occupations in total. Each of these, including rather niche jobs such as ‘artificial flower makers’ and ‘indexers’, received a paragraph in the programme outlining their conditions of work and explaining why they, in particular, required the franchise. Not so for domestic servants, who were never named as an occupation but instead discussed rather obliquely under the heading of ‘Homemakers’:

[I]t is not too much to say that the well-being of the whole social body rests on the efficiency of those who serve our households. Wholesome foods and domestic cleanliness, the two prime necessities of healthy human existence, committed to their charge, and the various and fatiguing duties involved in the efficient performance of their work, call for an amount of intelligence and training too often overlooked by those who profit by them.⁵⁶

Here was an acknowledgement of the importance of the work undertaken by domestic servants, but the servants themselves were never referred to. Moreover, the programme made no mention of their working conditions, in contrast to the section on waitresses who are described as suffering ‘long hours and poor pay’, often having to pay for their own uniforms and for accidental breakages. The working conditions of housewives, were also related: ‘[t]he hours are unlimited, the work often carried on under over-crowded and insanitary conditions...’⁵⁷ In both cases exactly the same criticisms could have been applied to the conditions of domestic workers, but they were not.

Perhaps, then, the silences produced by one of the few occasions when domestic servants *were* represented in suffrage propaganda can begin to explain why such sightings were so rare. The Pageant of Women’s Trades and Professions positioned domestic servants in Block 1 alongside a seemingly miscellaneous array of workers who, if any coherency were

intended, might have been perceived as pre-industrial workers (with the exception of the cigar and cigarette makers), or perhaps as workers who worked in the private sphere of the home (gardeners, housewives and sweated piecework). The pageant did not group domestic workers with the chain makers, pit brow women, cotton operatives, silk workers, tailoresses, machinists, boot and shoe workers, felt- and straw-hat makers, hosiery workers, artificial flower makers, furriers, machine and hand-lace workers, laundresses and shop assistants – who all appeared together in Block 3. The public/private divide appears to have been important in categorising types of women’s work, meaning that industrial labourers could appear alongside shopworkers but not domestic servants.⁵⁸

One of the main aims of the suffrage processions and pageants was to counter the claims of their opponents that women’s place was in the home, and instead to demonstrate ‘that women could, and did, and had to, operate successfully in the public sphere’. Industrial workers, portrayed as coarse but also independent, could be made to fit this narrative.⁵⁹ Domestic servants, labouring in the private sphere of the home, could not. The alternative model of working-class womanhood, that of the victimised sweated worker, was equally problematic in that to depict domestic servants in such a role might imply that their employers were to blame. The ‘servant problem’ was gestured towards in the Pageant’s programme, when it noted that household work required ‘intelligence and training too often overlooked by those who profit by them’. The organisers appear to have shied away from any more direct reference towards the potential for conflict between mistress and maid at an event that was intended to showcase women united in their demand for the vote.

A similar aversion to talking about domestic servants as exploited workers was apparent in the WSPU’s working women’s deputation to Lloyd George on 23 January 1913. This is in spite of the fact that one domestic servant, a Miss R. Perkins about whom no other information was provided, was chosen to participate.⁶⁰ The deputation was organised to

coincide with the passage of the Franchise Bill, to which women's suffrage amendments were attached.⁶¹ Its leader, Flora Drummond, emphasised that the time had come for working-class women like herself to take action on their own behalf. Beyond the immediate aim of putting pressure on the government to commit to women's suffrage, the purpose of the deputation was twofold: to refute those critics who claimed that suffrage 'was a movement of rich women'; and to shame the Labour Party for failing to fight for the interests of the women of the class they claimed to represent. From late November 1912 onwards, the WSPU dedicated considerable resources to organising the deputation, offering travel expenses and hospitality to as many working women as possible to come to London to participate in a week-long Women's Parliament. WSPU organisers were appointed to mobilise women in the industrial districts of London, especially the East End, as well as those engaged in the 'great industries' in the north. The WSPU's new newspaper, the *Suffragette*, claimed that the action would incorporate all women who had to work for a living, 'whether as wages earners outside the home or as working-men's wives inside the home' – a formulation that, technically, excluded domestic servants entirely.⁶² The twenty women selected to meet Lloyd George, however, were all wage earners: four sweated workers from the East End of London, two nurses, one teacher, one shop assistant, one domestic servant, three Lancashire factory women, one woman from the Leicester boot and shoe trade, one laundress, one pit brow woman, two 'fisherwives', and one tailoress. That a domestic worker was included in this select group possibly indicates that Miss R. Perkins' fellow servants were present in significant numbers on the larger demonstration.⁶³ But although the fisherwives, nurses and Lancashire mill girls were all encouraged to wear their work-uniforms, none of the publicity photographs appearing in either the *Suffragette* and *Votes for Women* feature anyone wearing a servant's cap and gown.⁶⁴ Nor was Perkins selected for one of the short life stories of five deputation members printed in *Suffragette*. Either Perkins did not give a speech, or her speech was not

reported in the suffrage periodicals which gave extensive coverage of speeches from representatives of every single one of the other trades on the deputation.⁶⁵

One of the few times that servants became the subject of figurative representation in suffrage propaganda was in a series of three postcards and one cartoon produced by the Suffrage Atelier in protest against the ‘servant tax’ of 1911. This so-called tax was in fact a proposal to include servants in the new National Health Insurance scheme. It provoked much opposition from mistresses and maids who resented having to make financial contributions, and from many women’s suffrage and trade union organisations who felt that it was a poorly designed piece of legislation that discriminated against women.⁶⁶ The series of images focusing on the ‘servant tax’ is revealingly anomalous when compared to much other suffrage propaganda. The cartoon, published in the WFL’s newspaper the *Vote*, depicts domestic workers on a protest march, wielding their brooms and dustpan brushes in a threatening manner at the suited men cowering in front of them.⁶⁷ A postcard with the headline ‘What May Happen’ shows a cook asking the delivery boy to tell Lloyd George to take away his unwanted present.⁶⁸ In both, servants are shown speaking for themselves and asserting their rights as workers – images that appear particularly arresting when considered in light of a general resistance within both suffrage and trade union propaganda to show any kind of woman worker engaged in the act of industrial militancy.⁶⁹ The reason it was possible on this occasion, however, to depict domestic workers as political agents was because servants’ opposition to the ‘servant tax’ was directed not towards their employers, but towards the government. The cartoon depicts servants protesting alongside ‘housewives’ rather than ‘mistresses’, implying that both groups of women laboured in the home on an equal footing. It emphasises their common cause without referring directly to the employment relationship’s inherent conflicts and imbalance of power. Perhaps most

importantly, it is the housewives in this image who have undertaken a ‘national strike’, rather than the domestic servants themselves.

[Insert Figure 2 with caption: Cartoon of servants and housewives protesting against the ‘servant tax’, Vote (1910)]

Although visual propaganda tended to erase domestic servants, they were discussed in the suffrage press. This was not usually the result of direct editorial policy but tended to be prompted by letters from readers, often from servants themselves. Yet as soon as the suffrage movement’s relationship to domestic servants was addressed, conflict broke out. In August 1911 an article in the *Common Cause* opposing a legislative attempt to ban women from working at the pit brows mentioned domestic service only incidentally, comparing the healthy working environment of the pit brow women to the far more insanitary conditions of domestic service.⁷⁰ The following issue published a letter from a Mrs C.H.M. Davidson, who protested that, to the contrary, most servants were treated with ‘overindulgence and misplaced consideration’ yet were ‘incapable of appreciating it’. She complained that the board school educated girl, had now come to think of service as ‘derogatory’, ‘as she is only too pleased to have an excuse to be “independent”’ – a quality that was apparently desirable only in middle-class suffragists such as herself.⁷¹

Davidson might have also noted that this new generation of independent-minded and literate servants could read suffrage newspapers and were capable of answering back, for this is what soon occurred. ‘I see in your issue of August 24 that Mrs Davidson considers domestic service is well paid,’ wrote one (signing herself simply ‘A Domestic Servant’); ‘I wonder if she would feel she had been well paid when she had paid for two uniforms out of her wages?’ This anonymous domestic worker understood her interests as directly counter to

those of her employer. 'It is to the mistresses' advantage that things should remain as they are', she insisted, and she felt that the only way to improve the matter was for servants themselves to 'make a stir' and demand better wages and shorter hours.⁷² Over the next six months, the letters pages of the *Common Cause* were taken up with numerous and often extremely hostile exchanges between mistresses and maids. Rosamond Smith wrote towards the end of November, requesting that the discussion of domestic servants be dropped. It was a waste of precious column inches, she claimed, 'and I believe many of your readers would prefer to hear more about the conditions of employment in factories and in the sweated trades'.⁷³ Smith did not mention her own servants, but she did give her address as 12 Eaton Place, a large house in Belgravia, London. The 1911 census records Smith (age 33) and her mother living there with a butler, a cook, a lady's maid, an upper housemaid, an under housemaid and a kitchen maid.⁷⁴ This mistress also seems to have found it easier to talk about the exploitation of women workers outside of suffragists' own homes. The hostility expressed by both sides in the correspondence pages gives some indication of why, in its more official propaganda, the movement avoided representations of domestic servants.

Conclusion

The suffrage movement rarely included servants in their invocations of working-class womanhood. While the poor conditions of service and the difficulties of finding a competent and reliable maid were both popular topics in the suffrage press, servants did not feature as the political subject in its propaganda and public spectacle. This was in spite of the ubiquitous presence of servants within the everyday life of the movement – sitting in the audience at suffrage meetings, purchasing postcards from suffrage shops, writing letters to suffrage newspapers and, occasionally, smashing windows and breaking through police lines. Moreover, servants' labour made a crucial contribution to the struggle for the vote, running

the homes and providing for the material needs of middle-class women who wished to devote as much time as possible to the Cause; though the political importance of this labour was rarely acknowledged.⁷⁵ Domestic labour was certainly not invisible to the suffrage movement. Many of its activists sought to highlight the important role played by women in the home and the back breaking labour that this entailed. But when they made the case for this their attention was directed towards the working-class wife and mother rather than the waged domestic worker. Eliding the ‘servant problem’ with a more general problem of housework, one that affected women of all classes to at least some degree, was a way of avoiding the question of how a suffrage-supporting mistress ought to relate to the servants in her own movement and her own household. It also neatly sidestepped the potential for class conflict that emerged not only in spite of but, often, as a result of a shared desire for emancipation. The class politics of the suffrage movement thus need to be understood not just in terms of who was or wasn’t included, but also the kinds of classed identities that it was possible to contain within its political frameworks and those which proved too difficult, too painful and potentially too destructive of sex solidarity to fully acknowledge.

¹ *Votes for Women*, May 20, 1910, 552, June 3, 1910, 582-584, June 24, 1910, 628-629.

² Pamela Horn, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant* (Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1990), 171-72; Laura Schwartz, *Feminism and the Servant Problem: Class and Domestic Labour in the Women's Suffrage Movement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 5.

³ Those who argued that women's suffrage was a middle-class movement include R.S. Neale, 'Working-Class Women and Women's Suffrage', *Labour History* 12 (1967), 16-34; Jihang Park, 'The British Suffrage Activists of 1913: An Analysis', *Past and Present* 120 (1988), 147-62. For a critique of the masculinist politics that lay behind such assumptions, see June Purvis, 'Emmeline Pankhurst: A Biographical Interpretation', *Women's History Review* 12, no.1 (2003), 73-6.

⁴ Jill Liddington and Jill Norris, *One Hand Tied Behind Us: The Rise of the Women's Suffrage Movement* (London: Virago, 1984); Jill Liddington, *The Life and Times of a Respectable Rebel: Selina Cooper 1864-1946* (London: Virago, 1984).

⁵ Jill Liddington, *Rebel Girls: Their Fight for the Vote* (London: Virago, 2006).

⁶ Leah Leneman, *A Guid Cause: The Women's Suffrage Movement in Scotland* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1991), 93-4, 42-3, 138, 166.

⁷ Gillian Scott, *Feminism and the Politics of Working Women: The Women's Co-operative Guild, 1880s to the Second World War* (London: UCL Press, 1998). See also Kay Cook and Neil Evans, "'The Petty Antics of the Bell-Ringing Boisterous Band'?: The Women's Suffrage Movement in Wales, 1890-1918', in *Our Mothers' Land: Chapters in Welsh Women's History, 1830-1939*, ed. Angela V. John (Cardiff: University of Wales Press,

1991), 177; Ryland Wallace, *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Wales, 1866-1928* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2009), 181-3.

⁸ Sandra Stanley Holton, *Feminism and Democracy: Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain 1900-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Harold L. Smith, *The British Women's Suffrage Campaign 1866-1928* (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2010), 59, 65-7.

⁹ Claire Eustance, "'Daring to Be Free" The Evolution of Women's Political Identities in the Women's Freedom League 1907-1930' (Ph.D. diss., University of York, 1993), chapter 1, 122-7, 133.

¹⁰ Holton, *Feminism and Democracy*, 35; Krista Cowman, "'Incipient Toryism" The Women's Social and Political Union and the Independent Labour Party, 1903-1914', *History Workshop Journal* no.53 (2002), 136-7.

¹¹ June Purvis, 'The Prison Experiences of the Suffragettes in Edwardian Britain', *Women's History Review* 4, no.1 (1995): 103-133; Michelle Myall, "'No Surrender!": The Militancy of Mary Leigh, a Working-Class Suffragette', in *The Women's Suffrage Movement: New Feminist Perspectives*, ed. Maroula Joannou and June Purvis (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 173-187; Cowman, "'Incipient Toryism"?'; Krista Cowman, *Mrs Brown is a Man and a Brother: Women in Merseyside's Political Organisations, 1890-1920* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004); Krista Cowman, *Women of the Right Spirit: Paid Organisers of the Women's Social and Political Union, 1904-1918* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); Liddington, *Rebel Girls*, 95, 107, 216, part 4.

¹² Angela V. John, 'Radical Reflections? Elizabeth Robins: The Making of Suffragette History and the Representation of Working-Class Women', in *The Duty of Discontent: Essays for Dorothy Thompson*, eds. Owen Ashton, Robert Fyson and Stephen Roberts (London: Mansell Publishing Ltd., 1995), 191-211. One of the few attempts to quantitatively analyse the class backgrounds of suffrage activists was based on the data provided in the *Suffrage Annual and Women's Who's Who* (1913), which did not include many of those active in both the women's and the labour movement nor the People's Suffrage Federation, Park, 'The British Suffrage Activists of 1913', 147-62.

¹³ *Woman Worker*, July 31, 1908, 238.

¹⁴ The 'Woman's Sunday' took place on 21 June 1908 and was the only large-scale public demonstration organised by the WSPU that summer, Lisa Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women: Imagery of the Suffrage Campaign, 1907-1914* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1987), 94. It is also possible that this 'Domestic' was referring to a smaller local demonstration, but she did not identify her location.

¹⁵ Maria Diconzo, Lucy Delap and Leila Ryan, eds., *Feminist Media History: Suffrage, Periodicals and the Public Sphere* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). It was also common for servants to have access to their employers' newspapers, Margaret Beetham, 'Domestic Servants as Poachers of Print: Reading Authority and Resistance in Late Victorian Britain', in *The Politics of Domestic Authority in Britain since 1800*, eds. Lucy Delap, Ben Griffin and Abigail Wills (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009), 185-203.

A couple of mistresses even complained to the *Common Cause* that the paper's content was either too sexually explicit or too informative about workers' rights to leave it lying within reach of their domestics, *Common Cause*, June 26, 1911, 682, December 7, 1911, 621-2.

¹⁶ Maria Diconzo, Lucy Delap and Leila Ryan, 'Introduction', in *Feminist Media History*, eds. Diconzo, Delap, and Ryan, 1-20, 2; Maria Diconzo, 'Unity and Dissent: Official Organs of the Suffrage Campaign', in *Feminist Media History*, eds. Diconzo, Delap, and Ryan, 76-119, 111; Barbara Green, *Feminist Periodicals and Daily Life: Women and Modernity in British Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 149-50.

¹⁷ *Women's Franchise*, July 2, 1908, 3. There is a separate category of 'Married', so it is reasonable to assume that these are waged domestic workers.

¹⁸ *Woman Worker*, July 31, 1908, 238.

¹⁹ 'Register of the Court of Summary Jurisdiction Sitting at Bow Street', part 1, 1910, 23 November 1910, PS/BOW/A/01/040, London Metropolitan Archive [hereafter LMA]; *Votes for Women*, December 2, 1910, 143. Note that the report in *Votes for Women* spells Eliza's surname 'Simmins', and incorrectly states that she was sentenced on 24 November. Numerous variations on the spelling of this name make it impossible to determine for sure whether the Elizabeth Symmons arrested for militant activity the following year is the same person, *Daily Express*, November 22, 1911, 3.

²⁰ For brief references to other suffrage-supporting servants, see Purvis, 'The Prison Experiences of Suffragettes', 120; Liddington, *Rebel Girls*, 113, 193-4, 276-80.

²¹ *Manchester Guardian*, February 12, 1908, 7.

²² *Rochdale Observer*, February 19, 1908, 5; 'Register of the Court of Summary Jurisdiction at Westminster', part 1, 12 Feb 1908, PS/WES/A/01/052, LMA.

²³ England and Wales Census (1901), Manora, Hollington Park, Hollington St. John, Sussex; England and Wales Census (1911), One Ash, Rochdale, Lancashire. John Albert Bright claimed that he had known her for twenty years, although he did not state in exactly what capacity, 'The Imprisoned Woman Suffragists', House of Commons debate, *Hansard*, February 13, 1908, 184, cc. 284-288, www.hansard.millbanksystems.com.

- ²⁴ *Rochdale Observer*, February 19, 1908, 5; 'The Imprisoned Woman Suffragists', House of Commons debate, *Hansard* 13 Feb 1908, 184, cc. 284-288, www.hansard.millbanksystems.com. John Bright was rather mealy mouthed in his comments, describing Charlotte Griffiths as 'a very worthy woman, however mistaken', and the suffragettes in general as 'high-minded' 'whatever they [the House] might think of their actions'.
- ²⁵ *Woman Worker*, July 31, 1908, 239.
- ²⁶ The Blathwayt family, active in the WSPU, also signed up for a servants' registry they saw advertised in *Votes for Women*, E.M. Blathwayt, 'Diary', 3 November 1908, 122, D2659/24/11, 17 July 1911, 141-142, D2659/24/12, Gloucestershire Archives (GA); *Votes for Women*, October 29, 1908, 85; *Common Cause*, August 24, 1911, 349.
- ²⁷ *Votes for Women*, September 23, 1910, 836. See also, December 16, 1910, 191.
- ²⁸ *Votes for Women* 23 Dec 1910, 204.
- ²⁹ Cowman, *Women of the Right Spirit*, 22.
- ³⁰ *Manchester Guardian*, February 22, 1908, 10.
- ³¹ *Manchester Guardian*, March 3, 1908, 5.
- ³² Hester Bright became secretary in 1909-1910, Elizabeth Crawford, *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain and Ireland: A Regional Survey* (London: Routledge, 2008), 11.
- ³³ Schwartz, *Feminism and the Servant Problem*, 74-7.
- ³⁴ June Hannam, "'Suffragettes Are Splendid for Any Work': The Blathwayt Diaries as a Source for Suffrage History", in *A Suffrage Reader: Charting Directions in British Suffrage History*, eds. Claire Eustance, John Ryan and Laura Ugolini (London: Leicester University Press), 53-69.
- ³⁵ Mary Blathwayt, 'Diary', 8 November 1907, D2659/27/12, GA. [Page numbers are included when available].
- ³⁶ Mary Blathwayt, 'Diary', 11 March 1908, 1 April 1908, D2659/27/13; E.M. Blathwayt, 'Diary', 2 March 1908, 9 March 1908, 11 March 1908, D2659/24/11, GA.
- ³⁷ E.M. Blathwayt. 'Diary', 2 March 1908, 9 March 1908, 1 April 1908, 39, D2659/24/11, GA.
- ³⁸ E.M. Blathwayt, 'Diary', 20 February 1908, D2659/24/11, GA.
- ³⁹ Mary Blathwayt, 'Diary', 11 March 1908, D2659/24/11; E.M. Blathwayt, 'Diary', 18 November 1908, p.129, D2659/24/11, GA.
- ⁴⁰ Mary Blathwayt, 'Diary', 9 November 1910, .313, 21 December 1910, .355, D2659/27/15, GA.
- ⁴¹ E.M. Blathwayt, 'Diary', 13 October 1908, 109, 14 October 1908, 109, 30 October 1908, 119, 3 March 1908, D2659/24/11, GA.
- ⁴² E.M. Blathwayt, 'Diary', 26 May 1908, .63, 21 September 1908, 100-101, 9 December 1908, .137, D2659/24/11, GA. Almost all the WSPU leaders stayed at Eagle House at some point, June Hannam, 'Suffragettes Are Splendid for Any Work', 57.
- ⁴³ *Votes for Women*, February 11, 1909, . 332.
- ⁴⁴ Kenney, *Memories of a Militant*, 120.
- ⁴⁵ Mary Blathwayt, 'Diary', 29 March 1910, 96, 9 December 1910, 343, D2659/27/15, GA; Hannam, "'Suffragettes Are Splendid for Any Work'".
- ⁴⁶ Servants were more likely to be represented in suffrage fiction and theatre, most notably Gertrude Colmore's novel *Suffragette Sally* (1911) and Evelyn Glover's plays *A Chat with Mrs Chicky* (1912) and *Miss Appleyard's Awakening* (c.1911), Laura Schwartz, 'Representations of Domestic Servants in Suffrage Literature' (paper, Women's Suffrage and Political Activism Conference, University of Cambridge, 2018).
- ⁴⁷ Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women*, chapter 2; Crawford, *The Women's Suffrage Movement*, 16-8, 662-3; Tara Morton, 'Working Women, Activism and the Visual Propaganda of the Suffrage Atelier' (paper, West of England and South Wales Women's History Network 15th Annual Conference: Women's Activism: History and Historical Perspectives, University of Wales, 2009); Tara Morton, 'Changing Spaces: Art, Politics, and Identity in the Home Studios of the Suffrage Atelier', *Women's History Review*, 21, no. 4 (2012), 623-37. Tara Morton, "'An Arts and Crafts Society, Working for the Enfranchisement of Women'": Unpicking the Political Threads of the Suffrage Atelier, 1909-1914', in *Suffrage and the Arts: Visual Culture, Politics and Enterprise*, eds. Zoe Thomas and Miranda Garrett (London: Bloomsbury, 2018).
- ⁴⁸ For pageants and processions, Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women*, chapter 3; Barbara Green, *Spectacular Confessions: Autobiography, Performative Activism, and the Sites of Suffrage, 1905-1938* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1997), chapters 1-2.
- ⁴⁹ Tickner, *Spectacle of Suffrage*, 55-59.
- ⁵⁰ *Votes for Women*, May 20, 1910, 552, June 3, 1910, 582-4, 24 June 1910, 628-9; Margaret Llewelyn Davies to Miss Strachey, n.d.[1909], ALC/2737, The Women's Library at the London School of Economics [hereafter TWL].
- ⁵¹ Quoted in Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women*, 89.
- ⁵² Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women*, 50-1, 167-82; Morton, 'Working Women, Activism and the Visual Propaganda of the Suffrage Atelier'; Morag Shiach, *Modernism, Labour and Selfhood in British Literature and Culture, 1890-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), chapter 3.

- ⁵³ International Woman Suffrage Alliance Quinquennial Congress, 'Programme, Women's Trades and Professions (April 27, 1909)', 9/08/47, TWL. This is similar to the organisation of servants on the NUWSS demonstration on 13 June 1908, which dedicated one of its 8 blocks to the professions and another to working-class jobs, but invited 'the children's nurse, the cook and the parlourmaid' to march under the banner of 'Homemakers' alongside their 'lady' employers. Here also domestic servants marched in a separate block from industrial workers, *The Times*, June 13, 1908, 9; *Women's Franchise*, May 14, 1908, 539, June 4, 1908, 581.
- ⁵⁴ Postcard depicting charwomen's banners on the 'Pageant of Women's Trades and Professions' (1909), 2000.36, Postcard Box 4, TWL.
- ⁵⁵ *Common Cause*, May 6, 1909, 60.
- ⁵⁶ International Woman Suffrage Alliance Quinquennial Congress, 'Programme, Women's Trades and Professions (April 27, 1909)', 9/08/47, 6, TWL.
- ⁵⁷ International Woman Suffrage Alliance Quinquennial Congress, 'Programme, Women's Trades and Professions (April 27, 1909)', 9/08/47, 6, TWL. The Women's Coronation Procession (17 June 1911) also included a contingent of 'Homemakers', although it is not clear whether this included domestic servants or only housewives, 'Postcard featuring "Homemakers" on the Women's Coronation Procession', 2000.40, Postcard Box 4, TWL.
- ⁵⁸ The distinction was not exact; many chain makers worked in their own homes rather than in factories despite performing heavy industrial labour, Cathy Hunt, *The National Federation of Women Workers* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 55.
- ⁵⁹ Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women*, 67, 50-1.
- ⁶⁰ *Suffragette*, January 24, 1913, 221.
- ⁶¹ Sylvia Pankhurst claimed that the working women's deputation had originally been her idea, evolving out of her organising in the East End, Sylvia Pankhurst, 'The East London Federation of the Suffragettes', *Women's Dreadnought*, March 8, 1914, in *Suffrage and the Pankhursts*, ed. Jane Marcus (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 242-3; Sylvia Pankhurst, *The Suffragette Movement* (London: Virago, 1977 [first published 1932]), 427-9.
- ⁶² *Suffragette*, November 29, 1912, 95, December 6, 1912, 109-10, 115, December 13, 1913, 129, 135, December 27, 1913, 164, January 3, 1913, 174-5, January 10, 1913, 188-9, January 17, 1913, 197, 204-5.
- ⁶³ 2 reports by Beatrice Harraden refer to the presence of 'charwomen', *Suffragette*, January 31, 1913, 234, *Votes for Women*, January 31, 1913, 258.
- ⁶⁴ *Votes for Women*, January 31, 1913, 258; *Suffragette*, January 31, 1913, 235; Photograph of 'fisherwives and nurses admiring a portrait of Christabel Pankhurst', 2009.203, TWL.
- ⁶⁵ *Suffragette*, January 24, 1913, 221, January 31, 1913, 232-3; *Votes for Women*, January 31, 1913, 258.
- ⁶⁶ Schwartz, *Feminism and the Servant Problem*, 174-9.
- ⁶⁷ *Vote*, July 6, 1912, 185.
- ⁶⁸ 'What May Happen' Postcard produced by the Suffrage Atelier (c. 1911), 2002.267, Postcard Box 2, TWL. Other postcards in the series include 'Insurance Monday' Postcard produced by the Suffrage Atelier (c. 1911), 2002.254, Postcard Box 2, TWL; 'The Closed Doors' Postcard produced by the Suffrage Atelier (c.1911), 2002.239, Postcard Box 2, TWL.
- ⁶⁹ Tickner, *The Spectacle of Women*, 68, 180-1; Morton, 'Working Women, Activism and the Visual Propaganda of the Suffrage Atelier'.
- ⁷⁰ *Common Cause*, August 10, 1911, 313.
- ⁷¹ *Common Cause*, August 24, 1911, 349.
- ⁷² *Common Cause*, October 12, 1911, 466. See also August 31, 1911, 367-8, September 28, 1911, 432.
- ⁷³ *Common Cause*, November 30, 1911, 600-2.
- ⁷⁴ England and Wales Census (1911), 12 Eaton Place, Belgravia, London. Rosamond Smith was a delegate to the International Woman Suffrage Alliance conference in Geneva in 1920, International Woman Suffrage Alliance, 'Report of Eighth Congress' (Manchester: Percy Brothers Ltd., 1920).
- ⁷⁵ Schwartz, *Feminism and the Servant Problem*, 78-80.