

2018

The Shame of the Violent Woman

Sharon Crozier-De Rosa

University of Wollongong, sharoncd@uow.edu.au

Publication Details

Crozier-De Rosa, S., The Shame of the Violent Woman in S. Crozier-De Rosa and Vera Mackie, *Shame and the anti-feminist backlash: Britain, Ireland and Australia, 1890-1920*, Routledge, New York, 2018, 193-230.

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library:
research-pubs@uow.edu.au

The Shame of the Violent Woman

Abstract

British and Irish suffragettes invited passionate opposition. British anti-suffragists were adamant that violence degraded womanhood. Physically, women were not suited to the exercise of physical force. Women's bodies were built to facilitate the more nurturing and less destructive function of childbirth. Emotionally, they were not trained to engage in legitimate forms of violence as men were. Honour codes directed men's use of violence. Men were directed to adhere to standards of courage, chivalry, and fairness when engaging in physical combat with each other. Women were not brought up to embody these virtues. Violent women were, therefore, aberrations. This chapter examines anti-feminist opposition to female acts of militancy on the grounds that women's violence jeopardised the operation of codes of chivalry that were established to protect them—the weaker sex—from the violent actions of men—the stronger sex. The chapter also analyses patriotic Irish women's rejection of the shame of the violent woman and their construction of a feminist and nationalist ethics of violence. Patriotic Irish women claimed that their militancy could help restore national honour by returning the ancient nation to its pre-colonised state—one in which male and female warriors co-existed.

Disciplines

Arts and Humanities | Law

Publication Details

Crozier-De Rosa, S., The Shame of the Violent Woman in S. Crozier-De Rosa and Vera Mackie, *Shame and the anti-feminist backlash: Britain, Ireland and Australia, 1890-1920*, Routledge, New York, 2018, 193-230.

Chapter 7 The Shame of the Violent Woman

Shame and the Anti-Feminist Backlash: Britain, Ireland and Australia, 1890-1920 (Routledge, 2018)

Sharon Crozier-De Rosa

This chapter, 'The Shame of the Violent Woman', from the book, *Shame and the Anti-Feminist Backlash: Britain, Ireland and Australia, 1890-1920* by Sharon Crozier-De Rosa (New York: Routledge, 2018) has been reproduced here with the permission of the publisher.

Chapter 7 | pp. 193-230, 38 pages
The Shame of the Violent Woman
By Sharon Crozier-De Rosa

Abstract

British and Irish suffragettes invited passionate opposition. British anti-suffragists were adamant that violence degraded womanhood. Physically, women were not suited to the exercise of physical force. Women's bodies were built to facilitate the more nurturing and less destructive function of childbirth. Emotionally, they were not trained to engage in legitimate forms of violence as men were. Honour codes directed men's use of violence. Men were directed to adhere to standards of courage, chivalry, and fairness when engaging in physical combat with each other. Women were not brought up to embody these virtues. Violent women were, therefore, aberrations. This chapter examines anti-feminist opposition to female acts of militancy on the grounds that women's violence jeopardised the operation of codes of chivalry that were established to protect them—the weaker sex—from the violent actions of men—the stronger sex. The chapter also analyses patriotic Irish women's rejection of the shame of the violent woman and their construction of a feminist and nationalist ethics of violence. Patriotic Irish women claimed that their militancy could help restore national honour by returning the ancient nation to its pre-colonised state—one in which male and female warriors co-existed.

Keywords: *shame * violent women * Suffragettes * revolutionary Irish women * militant women * anti-feminism * national honour

7 The Shame of the Violent Woman

In Britain in 1909, militant suffragist Theresa Garnett publicly whipped politician Winston Churchill with a riding switch saying, ‘Take that, in the name of the insulted women of England’. In an inversion of gendered norms, the male Churchill was reported in the feminist paper, *Votes for Women*, as pale and afraid, and the female Garnett as forceful and courageous. She had undertaken ‘a piece of cool daring’.¹ Churchill and his ‘cowardly’ government would not accept deputations of suffragists. They endorsed state violence against campaigning feminists. This man, *Votes for Women* declared, was a ‘statesman who has dishonoured British statesmanship by his dishonest conduct to the women of Great Britain’.² ‘Moved’, another article declared, ‘by the spirit of pure chivalry, Miss Garnett took what she thought to be the best available means of avenging the insult done to womanhood by the Government to which Mr. Churchill belongs’. The writer added, ‘A woman has at last humiliated the man who has humiliated women for so long’.³ Yet another article represented Garnett’s actions as ‘a knightly and chivalrous thing’.⁴

In feminist reports about this incident, the male politician embodied the weaker feminine emotional values of fear, dishonesty, and humiliation. The female protester embodied the more masculine ones of courage, chivalry, and retribution. It seemed that through exercising physical force publicly, women were able to challenge the gendered nature of the emotional regimes underpinning the traditional honour codes of men.

In this chapter, I analyse a range of issues related to female displays of violence and the exclusivity of the masculine honour codes that directed men’s participation in violent conflict, but not women’s. I examine how British anti-suffragists constructed their arguments against female militancy—whether in the suffrage campaign or in World War One—on the basis that women’s violence eroded honour codes and that led to social and emotional instability. I also look at fears about the prevalence of male-on-female violence. Women’s violence did not exist in a vacuum. It invited reciprocal violence from men whether in the form of male hecklers or representatives of the police force or enemy army. British anti-suffragists were highly sensitised to the issue of male-on-female violence. Therefore, they often

predicated their hostility to female uses of physical force on the basis that women exercising violence would interfere with the normal operation of codes of chivalry. Theoretically, chivalry protected women from male acts of aggression. If women proved they were as capable of violence as men, what would compel men to exercise restraint against women? Irish women, however, took a different route into this issue. In this chapter, I also explore how Irish nationalist women challenged the gendered nature of reigning emotional regimes by claiming a special relationship with violence. I analyse their endeavours to revise modern or British understandings of chivalry to accommodate their claims of male-female parity on the issue of exercising physical force.

Physical Force and Gendered Implications of Honour and Chivalry

Anti-suffragists had long premised their opposition to the woman vote on the basis of physical force. Women could not join the military. They could not defend the nation; therefore, they should not be able to vote on matters of national security. By performing militancy publicly, militant suffragists challenged this assertion. Suffragists, such as members of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), advocated constitutional means to assert women's right to citizenship. Militant suffragists, on the other hand, used a variety of more contentious techniques. Members of the Women's Freedom League (WFL), formed in 1907 after breaking away from the dominant Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), exercised militancy by resisting the government and its laws until they were acknowledged as full citizens.⁵ The more recognised and sensationalised members of the WSPU—those typically referred to by the title 'suffragette'—employed a more violent form of militancy. They used physical force with the intention of damaging property and, later, injuring human beings.⁶

The WSPU's use of violence was strategic.⁷ Their public and strategic uses of physical force departed from the more womanly employment of moral force tactics by mainstream suffragists. Such a disruptive departure from moral force tactics shocked conservative commentators—female and male—who considered violence in men an essential if often inconvenient characteristic. They viewed violence in women to be a degradation of womanhood.

Scholars affirm the prodigiously gendered nature of violence throughout history. Pieter Spierenburg argues that in 'practically every historical setting, violent crime has been overwhelmingly a male enterprise'. Today is no different, he asserts.⁸ Robert Shoemaker agrees. In his study of masculinity and the decline of violence in eighteenth-century Britain, Shoemaker declares that, historically, violence was not seen as a feminine activity. He states that this was 'not because women were assumed to be weaker than men'. Rather, it was 'due to the expectation that women were more passive and submissive, as well as more sensitive to the needs of others'.⁹ Violence in a woman

was deemed to be out of synch with her feminine character. For instance, a woman who committed a particularly violent crime in the era Shoemaker analysed tended to be labelled a 'masculine woman'.¹⁰ Violent women were also accused of being emotionally disturbed, of being 'passionate and temperamental'.¹¹ This emotional imbalance accounted for their incursion into a traditionally masculine domain.

Historically, the masculine domain of violence was policed by honour codes. The profound association that honour maintained with masculinity means that 'males, overwhelmingly, have been the chief antagonists in violence inflicted in its name'.¹² Indeed, in many instances, masculine resort to violence was considered not only honourable but also essential.¹³ In some societies—those with pronounced ideas about honour and shame—men remaining passive in violent situations was viewed as 'a cardinal feminine virtue'.¹⁴ For example, in many European cultures it was deemed unmanly not to react aggressively to personal insults.¹⁵ Although masculine honour codes changed over time, they continued to denote the capacity for violence to be a manly trait—an integral aspect of masculine identity. Violence offered men the opportunity of proving their gender identity.¹⁶ Rules were intended to govern men's violent engagements with each other. Honour codes directed men to fight fairly and courageously. Honour, then, inspired many men's public acts of violence, and it also guided their participation in those acts.

Women's exclusion from male cultures of violence is partially explained by their exclusion from honour codes. Women were not permitted to assume an active relationship with honour and its codes. However, they were not entirely absent from those codes. A passive function was conferred on women through the notion of chivalry, an integral aspect of honour codes. Honour codes directed men to be chivalrous in their behaviour towards women or to correct the attitudes of those men who rejected such chivalry. Historically, chivalry incorporated a broad set of cultural norms. The elevation of honour above all virtues, the promotion of strict sex roles subordinating women, and class limits were chief among these.¹⁷ Chivalry regulated honour violence. Women could not earn honour through physical violence or martial prowess. Consequently, woman's place was in the home. The public world, guided as it was by men's violence and martial codes of honour, was too dangerous for the female sex.¹⁸

Chivalry, then, was an exemplary example of benevolent sexism. It revealed what René Moelker and Gerhard Kümmel explain as the

construction of a gender order in which the male is the strong one, the protector, the active one and also the courting one, while the role of the weak and passive one, those in need of protection, and the courteously treated and courted one is attributed to the female. Women here are the applauding and caring spectators only.¹⁹

Honour codes excluded women from male cultures of violence and in the process allowed men to assert 'their difference from and superior position over women'.²⁰

Women were much more likely to be victims of violence than perpetrators of it, especially at the hands of men.²¹ Some of this violence was legally endorsed. Males were already permitted to use acceptable forms of violence against their womenfolk, children, and servants, for example.²² Other forms of male-on-female violence, such as domestic violence, were much less acceptable but still prevalent. Honour played various roles in these varied forms of aggression. Historically, male heads of households were permitted to defend their honour by upholding their positions and reputations as masters of their households. Therefore, they were permitted to exercise their judgment in meting out punishment to those who threatened their position, including, as I stated before, their womenfolk, children, and servants. However, too much violence against those below them could also be considered dishonourable. For instance, 'irrational and unjustified violence against women was viewed as dishonourable'.²³

Shoemaker argues that as public forms of male violence declined throughout the eighteenth century, women might have become even more vulnerable to men's violence. He cites the 'privatization of violence' in support of this assertion. Public displays of violence became less socially acceptable in response to the growing popularity of middle-class values, such as politeness. Men had to find new ways of conducting their disputes with each other in the face of growing intolerance for public violence. This caused the link between honour and violence to weaken, although not disappear. Men's violence declined but did not vanish. Rather, Shoemaker argues, it retreated behind closed doors.²⁴ Behind closed doors, honour codes, which traditionally governed participation in fights between male equals, did little to prevent male-on-female violence. These were not equal fights but one-sided attacks.²⁵

The shift towards public violence becoming less socially acceptable forced men to readdress the nature of their actions towards other men, but they were not compelled to reappraise relations between men and women. Therefore, relationships with women remained or even grew more problematic. The emergence of the effeminate middle-class clerk and the masculinised feminist or New Woman brought about a blurring of boundaries between the sexes.²⁶ This blurring of gender distinctions publicly meant that some men might have felt the need to assert themselves over women privately.²⁷ Whatever the exact nature of the relationship between modernity, sex distinction, and domestic violence, many women at the time certainly articulated their concern about their vulnerability to male violence. As I will outline next, anti-suffragist women expressed deep concern that whatever protection they had from male aggression would be eroded by militant suffragists' displays of physical force. If women were to prove themselves as capable of violent acts as men, what need would there be for men to protect women

from men's violence? Honour codes did not guarantee women protection from male violence, but they were supposed to act as a deterrent. Given their vulnerability to male aggression, it is hardly surprising that women clung to whatever form of protection they could find, effective or not.

A Feminist Ethics of Violence?

British anti-feminists were committed to the idea that the female sex was the pacifist sex. They were not alone in their support of this viewpoint. Many feminists at the time—and since—argued likewise. Therefore, before examining the nature and extent of the British *Anti-Suffrage Review's* (the *Review*) opposition to female acts of violence, I want to briefly explore feminist interest in and debates about the nature of woman's relationship with violence.

Recent studies of women's violence—emanating mainly from feminist scholars within disciplines such as political science and international relations²⁸—tend to begin their projects by acknowledging the reigning supposition that women are the peaceful sex and that most forms of violence perpetrated by a woman are aberrations.²⁹ For example, Caron E. Gentry and Lara Sjoberg argue that many women globally participate in political acts of violence, including 'organizing attacks, leading insurgent groups, perpetrating martyrdom, engaging in sexual violence, committing war crimes, hijacking airplanes, or abusing prisoners'.³⁰ Yet, despite the extent and range of women's violent activities, they point out that the public continues to be shocked by what is deemed the aberrant violent woman. Paige Whaley Eager attests that societies, regardless of their religious or ethnic make-up, 'seem especially uncomfortable with women who are violent'. Women who commit violence outside the acceptable scope of female physical force—an acceptable scope which includes fending off an attacker (such as a rapist or a physically abusive husband), defending their children, and, to a degree, engaging in sporting or endorsed military activities—are viewed overwhelmingly as aberrant or 'less than a woman', she asserts.³¹ Drawing on the groundbreaking work of political scientist, Jean Bethke Elshtain,³² Gentry and Sjoberg argue that this is because the image of the female combatant runs counter to traditional images of womanhood 'as pure, maternal, emotional, innocent and peace-loving'.³³ They add that this figure of the violent woman also disrupts many feminists' conceptions of the liberated woman as 'capable and equal, but not prone to men's mistakes, excesses or violence'.³⁴ Violent women, therefore, are often viewed as 'bad women'. Not only are they bad because they are violent, but they are also bad at being women because they fail expectations of womanhood—they fail some feminist as well as non-feminist understandings of womanhood.³⁵

A body of feminist scholarship dealing with the history of women's participation in violent conflicts—including the two world wars—emerged in the 1980s and 1990s.³⁶ A great deal of this literature deconstructed the myth

that war was a man's business only. The total wars of the twentieth century defied the accuracy of that statement. As detailed in Chapter 5, women were pulled in to serve in those conflicts whether they desired it or not. Moreover, these histories showed that many women supported war. In the introduction to their edited collection on gender and the two world wars, for example, Higonnet et al. questioned the long-standing assumption that men were 'naturally fierce and warlike' and women, as mothers, had 'an affinity for peace'. Such a differentiation, they asserted, existed because it served the function of maintaining a distinction between battlefield and home front that helped to guarantee social stability.³⁷ In her 1990 chapter 'Why the Pursuit of Peace Is No Part of Feminism', Janet Radcliffe Richards argued that feminists who maintained the distinction between warlike men and peace-loving women were guilty of buying into exactly the separate spheres notions that anti-feminists had traditionally peddled.³⁸ If peace is good for all, then it is not a women's issue, she argued, because it is not for women. Feminists who argued that pacifism was a woman's issue did so, she said, on the grounds of a 'women's values kind of feminism' rather than an equal rights model of feminism.³⁹

Other feminist historians took a different path. For instance, in 1999, Nicole Ann Dombrowski pointed out that many feminists who championed women's entry into male institutions such as the military were often contradictory or inconsistent in their approaches. Some liberal feminists asserted that women were not necessarily less aggressive than men. They did not necessarily assume a different physical relationship with violence than men did. On the other hand, some argued that if women were to gain entry to such bastions of masculinity, they could affect a radical transformation. Being ethically superior, they could civilise the military. Such arguments about women's physical or ethical difference or sameness could not be paired unproblematically.⁴⁰ Were feminists who promoted women's entry into the military, for example, claiming that women were equal to or different from men?

Despite feminist discussions about the nature of the relationship between women and violence, assumptions that women are naturally the more peaceful sex continues to appear in histories of violence. In her 2014 book on violence, militarisation, and weapons, Joanna Bourke noted that on hearing about her research, friends asked her if she was being 'gender-blind'. 'Aren't women either innately or culturally more peaceable?'⁴¹ While she supported the assertion that males were more likely to be drawn to 'all things martial', Bourke pointed out that women were hardly lacking in complicity in sustaining the militarisation of society. Wars were routinely fought in the name of protecting woman or women, women's taxes funded military campaigns, and women, she said, are as likely as men to be co-opted by militarist values and practices through, for example, watching movies and playing on games consoles.⁴² To what degree, then, were women historically as drawn to and supportive of violence compared with men?

Writing in 2012, Setsu Shigematsu acknowledged that there were studies of women involved in acts of political violence—in protest movements as well as wars—but she argued that these had not led to a theorisation of women's relationship with violence.⁴³ Shigematsu declared that she was 'disturbed by the relative hesitation, if not reluctance, of feminists to theorize capacities, complicities, and desires for power, domination, and violence *in women*' (italics in original).⁴⁴ This was despite, she said, the very obvious support shown for state-orchestrated violence by high profile American women at the time.⁴⁵ She posited a number of reasons for feminist hesitancy in this regard. Generations of feminist activists worked to affect changes that have since enabled women to enter into formerly male-only institutions such as the military, prisons, and police force. Feminist critiques of women's relationship with violence might undermine those achievements, inviting further discrimination against women. Globally, the women's movements of the 1960s and 1970s made visible particular forms of violence that have been used against women, including domestic violence and wartime violence against women. Casting light on women's complicity in violent activism—State-endorsed or otherwise—might overshadow the very real status of many women as victims of male aggression.

Still, Shigematsu's concern was to interrogate how women have both resisted and been complicit in acts of violence. She argued that only by moving aside from the general focus on women's victimhood could feminist scholars take more seriously 'the problem of women's complicity and agency in the perpetuation of violence against other women, children, and men and how these circuits are maintained and reproduced geopolitically through gendered and racialized economies'.⁴⁶ The 'relative feminist mutedness about violence among women', she asserted—due perhaps to the tendency to universalise discourses of women's victimhood in the face of patriarchy and sexism—threatened to prevent adequate theorisations of women's investments in systems of power and violence. Shigematsu posited the need for a new understanding of feminist ethics of violence.

In this chapter, I focus on anti-suffragist opposition to women's militancy and violence. I trace anti-feminist reactions to radical feminists' adoption of militant tactics and, therefore, in the minds of their conservative opponents, their simultaneous appropriation of masculine emotional traits, values, and codes. However, by examining intersecting suffragist/anti-suffragist debates in Britain and Ireland, I also go a little way towards exploring what Shigematsu labels a feminist ethics of violence. Irish women responded to women's actual or suggested involvement in suffrage militancy, nationalist militancy, and the onset of the Great War in ways that departed radically from British conservatives. Many of them invoked gender and nationalist politics to champion the woman warrior. How did attitudes to gender, violence, and emotional regimes connect or divide patriotic women—suffragists or anti-suffragists—across Britain and Ireland?

A Word About Australia and Suffrage Militancy

Australian women are largely absent from this chapter. Before examining British anti-feminist responses to female militancy, I want to make some brief comments about this relative absence. As outlined earlier in the book, the Australian suffrage campaigns, although contentious and divisive, lacked the violence and civil disobedience of the British campaigns.⁴⁷ The British *Review* made much of this when attempting to render irrelevant suffragists' references to Australian suffrage 'experiments' as fitting precedence for the British case. The woman vote in Australia was nothing more than 'an idle compliment Australian men have paid their women', one contributor wrote.⁴⁸ The attitude of Australian women to the political franchise was one of 'supreme indifference'.

There were never any militant suffragettes 'down under.' No Minister was attacked with a dog whip, or even heckled by women. No deputations waited on him to demand votes for women. No constable had his face slapped for merely doing his duty, neither was his helmet knocked from his head. There was not even a quiet, self-respecting, ladylike league for the promotion of the franchise to women.⁴⁹

Oblivious to the often heated and discordant nature of the various suffrage campaigns that had taken place in the Australian colonies in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth centuries (as outlined earlier in the book), the *Review* declared that Australia was an irrelevant case study of the female franchise.

Yet Australia was not entirely free of association with suffrage militancy. Women from around the Empire participated in the suffrage movement in Britain more generally—tied as their interests were to British political outcomes. This was exemplified by the 1911 Women's Coronation Procession organised by the WSPU, which included marching women from places such as India, Australia,⁵⁰ and Ireland in its attempt to create what Rebecca Cameron terms 'an impressive spectacle of international, trans-historical female solidarity'.⁵¹ However, the militant side of the campaign more specifically also attracted outsiders. As Barbara Caine explains, the British militant movement acted as a magnet for feminists from places like North America,⁵² Europe, and Australia.⁵³ I will reiterate here what I have already explained in the 'Introduction'. A number of prominent Australian activists travelled to the United Kingdom and joined in the militant movement. Among these were Dora Montefi Nellie Martel, Jessie Street, and the more spectacular Muriel Matters (who is renowned for an infamous escapade during which she threw out suffrage pamphlets from an airship over London not long after she had been released from prison for chaining herself to the Ladies' Gallery grille in the House of

Commons). Perth-based Bessie Rischbieth, who became very conservative in later life, was also swept up by the energy of the militant movement when she visited London in 1913. Still others journeyed to Britain to offer their general support, most famously, Victoria's Vida Goldstein who championed the movement on her tour there in 1911.⁵⁴

Despite this record of Australian involvement with suffrage militancy, the Australian journal, *Woman*, rarely commented on the activities of pro-militant Australians. Perhaps the paper considered that being seen to pass judgement on British suffrage militancy would have rendered their already ambivalent position as reluctant suffragists even more so. As it were, they wanted to encourage British authorities to validate the Australian example by offering other Empire women the power to cast their vote too. Therefore, Australian women's views on militancy and violence do not form a significant part of this chapter. For an analysis of Australian women's attitudes towards gender and violence, see the section of Chapter 6 that discusses women's support for male threats of violence against other men—mostly virile, courageous soldiers' threats of violence against cowardly, wartime shirkers.

British Opposition to Female Acts of Violence: Shame and Degradation

The British *Review* had no qualms about declaring the militant suffragist to be a creature of no sex—a gender abomination. Even before militant tactics were to escalate to include inflicting property or personal damage, anti-suffragists expressed outrage at the militant strategy of disrupting public events. Indeed, interrupting public meetings to demand politicians pledge themselves to the suffragist cause or explain why they would not do so was to become one of the movement's most common tactics. In January 1909, the paper used the example of suffragists interrupting an Albert Hall meeting at which Cabinet Minister Lloyd George was speaking to articulate their indignation at length.

Women, the *Review* stated, had come to the event to commit 'ugly violence'. What resulted were 'disgraceful scenes' in which men were prevented from exercising their right to free speech. This was 'an aggressive attack' on British values and freedoms perpetrated by 'riotous women' who had given in to 'lunacy and hysteria'.⁵⁵ The paper recreated the scene:

Grown women and young girls, timid shrinking creatures as their friends describe them, fought, screamed, bit, and scratched like the termagants of the slums. We are told of one lady being carried from the platform on the shoulders of four stewards, her clothing disarranged, her hair streaming, her face purple with rage. Another is seen wildly struggling to remove the hands that gag her, and utilizing her sounds of freedom to shriek insults at Mr. Lloyd-George. In one of

the boxes a woman of the new model is slashing right and left with a dog-whip.⁵⁶

This assortment of disturbing images led the *Review* to conclude,

The most degrading spectacle on this planet is generally supposed to be the ejection of a drunken female from a public house, but the Maenads at the Albert Hall had not even the excuse of inebriety; and these are the special champions of the Suffrage movement, bent on showing that women can approach great national questions, calmly, with dignity and common sense.⁵⁷

The paper warned that if women were granted the right to vote, such scenes would ensue. Chaos would pervade the political life of the great nation.

Giving full scope to female capacities for excitement and hysteria in the realm of national politics would irretrievably injure and degrade English public life, the *Review* stated. It also added that such a move would result in 'the loss of English womanhood first and foremost'. The Albert Hall meeting had brought this latter message home to England. The article continued, 'As women we record it with shame and regret'.⁵⁸ Women bore the brunt of fellow women's violent behaviour.

No one could look at these faces full of wild excitement; no one could hear the storm of offensive clamour from women's mouths without shame and sorrow.⁵⁹

As explained in the first chapter of this book, the integrity of British womanhood was at risk.

Also at risk was the nature of relations between the sexes. The Albert Hall scenes were, the paper asserted, 'only the climax in a long process which has been undermining that old chivalrous respect for woman as woman which used to be our national pride'. Women were guilty of poisoning the well from which springs trust and pity for the unenfranchised sex, the article went on to say. Not only that, but these transgressive acts also jeopardised woman's rightful place in politics. The *Review* said that there was a time when 'the presence of a woman on a platform could restrain the roughest crowd'. Now, 'Ladies with bells and dog-whips have changed all that'. Through the militant suffragist, violence had entered more forcefully into the already precarious world of politics. The pity of all of this, the paper asserted, was that 'the innocent must suffer with the guilty'.⁶⁰ Bringing the reader back to the impact that violent women were having on the community of British womanhood, the article affirmed that women had shamed other women by bringing the community to which they all belonged into disrepute. This was an accusation that the paper was to repeat until the WSPU ceased its militant tactics with the onset of war in 1914.

Further into 1909, the *Review* reported that these feminists were still to be found 'slapping policemen's faces and knocking off their helmets in the middle of a crowd of all the hooligans in London'.⁶¹ It then juxtaposed the political ineffectiveness of such disreputable tactics in the face of the potential efficacy of more womanly methods employed by the non-militant side of the campaign. A section of the suffrage movement were to be found sitting outside parliament 'meekly' asking to be heard, the paper reported. Anti-suffragists 'trembled' in the face of such tactics. The *Review* considered this 'display of sweet patience and feminine gentleness' to be 'far more likely to melt the hearts of susceptible legislators than a hundred crusades led by Boadiceas on horseback'.⁶² Besides, unlike the original Boadicea who was a patriot who died fighting against foreign occupation, modern-day versions of the warrior woman were motivated only by their selfish desire for political power.

Militant feminists brought shame to British womanhood. Good British women resented this. 'Women', especially', the paper asserted, 'are burning with a deep latent shame at the behaviour of the unwomanly women who disgrace the sex while purporting to "emancipate" it.' Women did not need the suffragette's form of emancipation. They needed to be emancipated 'from the Suffragettes'.⁶³ The following year, in the face of continuing feminist disruption, the *Review* pleaded for such emancipation. It called for a halt to the demeaning of British womanhood perpetrated by a radical section of that community. It asked,

Cannot some restraining influence be brought to bear on those who would renew the sickening policy which has degraded British womanhood, and has gone far towards stirring up the animosity between the sexes which is fraught with the certainty of social disaster?⁶⁴

Womanly women attempting to shame unwomanly women was not yielding the desired results. Transgressive women were not undertaking the shameful self-assessment demanded by anti-suffragist women. Other methods were needed, then, to halt the erosion of British womanhood's reputation.

In 1912, the paper published a cartoon that made explicit the connection between shame and female militants—those they referred to as 'latter-day specimens of the old-fashioned nagging woman'.⁶⁵ Entitled 'Desperate Cases and Despar(d)ate Remedies'—referencing Anglo-Irish leader of the militant Women's Freedom League Charlotte Despard—the cartoon consisted of a series of images that juxtaposed the 'Relative Importance of the Suffragist and the True Woman'.⁶⁶ The final image, of relevance only to the suffragist, contained those historic instruments of public humiliation, the Stocks, and, specifically for women, the Scold's Bridle. If women refused to internalise shame, then the only recourse it seemed was to inflict public shame on them as in days of old.

As militant tactics escalated, the *Review* felt compelled to call on the support of other anti-suffragists in the wider community. In 1913, the paper reasserted the link between female militancy and shame. It reprinted an account of an anti-suffragist lecture given by Father Day, S. J. at Manchester that made explicit the links between women's violence and the degradation of womanhood. The cleric was reported as saying,

On the subject of militant methods there is no need to enlarge. Violence in woman is an ethical degradation of her being. The man who strikes a woman is a coward. The woman who strikes a man is lost to shame.⁶⁷

The emotional regimes governing engagements with violence were gendered. By transgressing these regulations, men and women destabilised their identities. By striking a female, men positioned themselves beyond the pale of masculine honour codes, particularly where those codes related to courage and chivalry. They proved themselves unmanly. By using violence against men, women ostracised themselves from the community of true womanhood. They brought shame to themselves. Anti-suffragist women, however, feared that that stigma would mark them too.

Revisiting and Revising Codes of Chivalry: Britain and Ireland

Suffragette violence forced those writing for the *Review* to revisit and clarify their understanding of the relationship between gender and violence. Relatively early in the militant campaign, the paper confirmed that there were times when women could justifiably resort to the use of physical force. To slap the face of a 'too-aspiring admirer' has 'the charm and piquancy of comedy'. The woman 'who resorts to the use of weapons of war to defend her home or her children, possesses the state and dignity of tragedy'. However, the suffragette 'who slaps a policeman's face because he is doing his duty, displays only the extravagant absurdities of burlesque'.⁶⁸ Her public violence was a ridiculous and vulgar imitation of man's legitimate recourse to physical force.

The act of inflicting a feminine slap did not translate well when enacted publicly. Such an action was not in tune with gendered emotional regimes. The slap that protected her honour in private, led only to dishonour and shame in public. That is because, the private slap was intended to protect a feminine conception of honour—namely, chastity—whereas the public slap was a gross misappropriation of a masculine notion of honour—namely, honour in battle and in politics.

Such a confusion of gendered emotions and actions did not bode well for women. As the *Review* affirmed, the 'very qualities which are respectively attractive and imposing in woman's own sphere, become distorted and ridiculous when translated into the sphere of public and political life'. Moreover,

if woman insists on ‘laying down her most irresistible weapon’—no doubt referring to her charm and influence—and instead arms herself with ‘man’s clumsier panoply of war’, ‘then, instead of increasing her influence in the State, she will greatly diminish it’.⁶⁹ By proving herself both unwomanly and unmanly, the violent suffragist wrote herself out of any role in relation to the political life of the country.

The *Review* cited historical cases to show that women’s violence demeaned not only womanhood but also the political cause at stake. Through their participation in revolutions globally—in places such as Russia, Poland, Italy, and France—women ‘cheapened’ not simply the relevant cause but also the very term ‘revolution’, the paper averred.⁷⁰ A few years later, in response to escalating militant tactics, the *Review* returned to the argument that through their participation in violent campaigns, women demeaned those campaigns. ‘Women took part in the French Revolution’, a 1912 article stated, ‘but it has never been claimed that they raised the tone of that great movement’. Instead, it went on, ‘women in the aggregate were guilty of the worst excesses and took the lead in most of the riots and outrages of those times’.⁷¹ The paper’s claim was that, historically, the mixture of women perpetrating violence and their inability to be emotionally disciplined had only ever produced a negative outcome for the political cause at stake.

Violent women demeaned otherwise just political causes. They also affected a negative transformation of relations between the sexes. The *Review* argued that militant women brought entire codes of chivalry under threat. In 1909, feminists disrupted politicians playing golf in order to draw attention to their demands. In doing so, they brought the concept and practice of chivalry under scrutiny. The personal attacks orchestrated by these ‘brazen’ women were ‘revolting’, but they were also ‘cowardly’, the *Review* declared. Everyone knew that men could not hit back at a lady—even if provoked. The militant movement was sustained by what the paper identified as a ‘rising tide of hooliganism’. Members of organisations like the WSPU were not men and women any longer. They simply constituted ‘a whirlwind’.⁷² Their tactics were dishonourable because they were unfair. This was not an equal playing field, guided as it was by rules that protected women from men’s physical retaliations, no matter how justified these might be. Notions of chivalry designed to protect women from men’s excesses were instead being used to safeguard the excesses of women. This was a gross corruption of gendered emotional standards.

Initially, the *Review* expressed a sense of hope that society would yet correct itself and normal relations between the sexes would resume. In 1910, it stated,

The days of chivalry are not over; never will be as long as men are men and women are women; but the moment that women cease to be women, and range themselves alongside of men in the arena of political life, then the days of chivalry and of the reign of womanhood alike will

be numbered, and the actual and intolerable subjection of woman will begin.⁷³

However, by 1912, its optimism waned in the face of an intensification and expansion of suffrage militancy. British men's reactions to feminist violence also deflated anti-suffragists' hopes of a resumption of normalcy. 'Suffragism and its by-products are exercising a demoralising effect upon the nation', the *Review* declared. It was referring to a suffrage meeting in Wales that had turned violent—an event that suffragists had labelled 'Black Friday'. Today, the article continued, 'we have the repeated spectacle of women being roughly handled by a crowd—only, of course, when they have deliberately courted their punishment'.⁷⁴ As it conjured up images of women's bodies being manhandled, the paper asserted that today the 'dignity and the modesty of womanhood is being trampled in the dust'.⁷⁵

Men manhandled women, yet the fault for doing so was not entirely or even largely theirs, the *Review* stated. Violent women brought out the worst in man. They forced him to reconsider or abandon his traditional adherence to codes of chivalry. 'The blame and the shame for the disgraceful scenes at Wrexham', the paper stated, 'lie with those presumably educated and enlightened women, not only with the rough uncontrolled mob whose passions they provoked.'⁷⁶ Violent women debased men: 'For the brute in man cannot be uncovered without exposing the serpent in woman who tempts him to his own undoing'.⁷⁷ Such viragos could not 'thus dare and rouse the brute in man without taking shame and humiliation to their hearts'.⁷⁸ Despite the confidence of this assertion, there was little evidence that such would be the case. There was little evidence that violent women would internalise the shame the *Review* directed at them and amend their disruptive ways. The tide of hooliganism looked set to continue rising.

Forcing men to review or deny chivalry also put women at risk of real physical harm. Consequently, the *Review* issued warnings of almost apocalyptic proportions directed at suffragettes.

Let them seek 'martyrdom' for themselves, if they will, in their own way; but let them beware how they open the floodgate of man's violence upon their sex. Once these are opened nothing can stem the tide by which all women must be overtaken.⁷⁹

The hope was, then, that the unrestrained violence of this Welsh incident might have 'brought it forcibly home to these women what their fate may be at the hands of men from whom provocation has released the restraints of civilised life'.⁸⁰ Instead of safeguarding against regression, as was woman's vocation, violent women brought it on. They initiated a decivilising force that morally degraded the nation's manhood and corroded long-standing codes of chivalry. The utterly frustrating thing for anti-suffragist women was their recognition of the fact that 'women *need* the chivalry of men (a

quality which Suffragettes are doing their level best to destroy), and are not ashamed to own it'.⁸¹ Violent women were blindly dismantling emotional regimes that were supposed to ensure their protection from male acts of violence. They were guilty of placing women in harm's way. Despite the rather grandiose language employed to bring the point home to its readers, the *Review's* approach to male-on-female violence demonstrated that it felt keenly the very real physical threat represented to women by the erosion of codes of chivalry.

For all their insistence on chivalry as a means of protecting women from male violence, anti-suffragists proved themselves complicit with the wider body of British men in endorsing the use of certain acts of physical force against women. By 1909, the issue of the imprisonment of women's bodies, and soon after the force-feeding of hunger-striking suffragette prisoners, received considerable media attention. These issues certainly coloured the discussions taking place in feminist periodicals like the WSPU's *Votes for Women* and the *Irish Citizen* (the *Citizen*). The *Review* discussed the controversy surrounding the cyclic imprisonment, release, then re-arrest, and later force-feeding of hunger-striking women. It asserted that 'a great deal of nonsense has been talked about the unfairness meted out by a government of men to these latter-day specimens of the old-fashioned nagging woman'.⁸² Not surprisingly, the paper argued, all this attention given to women 'indulging in a few days' fasting' in prison was frustrating and angering men. The paper targeted working-class men in particular. 'The good-humoured tolerance which originally greeted the suffragettes in working-class constituencies', it claimed, 'is rapidly giving way to a feeling of passionate anger.'⁸³ The main reason for this was the working man's intolerance for nagging. 'The peculiar form of "nagging" which the suffragettes have introduced into public life', the *Review* stated, 'is little calculated to prepossess him, and the next young lady who tries to silence a Cabinet Minister with a hand bell will have a rough time of it.'⁸⁴ The militant woman affected a transformation of gender relations, but through her actions, she also brought class relations into doubt.

In another article, the *Review* supported similar claims that nagging women invited violence from men. The 'Suffragette, who tries to goad a policeman into losing his temper, is like nothing so much as the wife who nags at her husband till he hits her, and then calls him a brute'.⁸⁵ Some women—nagging wives and now nagging militant suffragists—were undeserving of men's protection. By not adhering to the emotional standards deemed appropriate for their sex—by not allowing feminine emotional regimes to direct their interactions with members of the opposite sex—these women were not guaranteed protection by the emotional standards guiding men's behaviour. They were not assured protection from male acts of aggression. Indeed, they were accused of provoking legitimate physical retaliation from the men they wronged. The physical and emotional consequences of such a provocation did not favour either sex.

The *Review* claimed that through their militancy, suffragettes had alienated the once sympathetic English working class. By 1912, it added the Irish population to the group of people the militant feminists had estranged. In July of that year, three English militant suffragists and members of the WSPU travelled to Ireland where, in what is now a renowned display of suffragette activism, they threw a small hatchet at Herbert Asquith, visiting British prime minister, and John Redmond, leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, who had gathered to discuss the issue of Irish Home Rule.⁸⁶ Later, they also set fire to Dublin's Theatre Royal where Asquith was due to speak. The English suffragettes had not consulted Dublin-based militant suffragists, members of the Irish Women's Franchise League (IWFL), before undertaking either action. Members of the IWFL, far from simply condoning the actions of their British counterparts as expected, were angered and frustrated that members of the British organisation had conducted a brief violent campaign in Ireland without recourse to either the volatility of nationalist and Unionist relations there or the leanings and strategic outlook of Irish suffragists. The events put even more strain on the already fragile relationship between suffragists on either side of the Irish Sea.⁸⁷

In reporting these incidents and other acts of militancy in Ireland, the British *Review* chose to focus on the negative impact on gender relations wrought by the introduction of feminist violence there. The July incident was not the beginning of suffrage militancy in Ireland, however it was the most spectacular. Two months before that event, the paper had detailed the intensification of the Irish suffrage campaign. Redmond's nationalist Irish Party's decision to block the passing of the Conciliation Bill through the British parliament had excited passion and hysteria among suffragists in his home country. When those suffragists attempted to gain entry to a nationalist convention, there was an outbreak of violence. The *Review* pointed out that, as in England and Wales, women had been manhandled by a jostling crowd. The fear of more crowd violence against these women meant that they had to be protected and escorted away by the police. The paper declared that the whole episode would have been 'ludicrous if it had not worn an ugly aspect'.⁸⁸ These women, it asserted, 'had completely lost control of themselves and fought, literally, tooth and nail, suffered some very rough handling, for some of which the pressure of the exasperated crowd was responsible'.⁸⁹ The appearance of the violent suffragist in Ireland offered the British paper the chance to utter afresh the indignation spurred by the spectacle of the militant woman, this time in a different national setting.

Violent suffragism in Ireland also allowed anti-suffragists across the United Kingdom to once again draw attention to the attempted erosion of codes of chivalry on the part of violent women. This "'militant" nonsense', whether enacted in Britain or Ireland, was 'unwomanly and degrading'. However, the new Irish example provided for the exercise of a slightly different anti-suffragist tactic. This time, the more archaic Irish temperament—in contrast to the robust and progressive English one—was used to further

expose the insidious capabilities of transgressive womanhood. Female political violence, the British paper affirmed, had a profound impact on the Irish way of life. The Irish character, the *Review* stated, was essentially chivalric and conservative. Given their supposed innate conservativeness, it was hardly surprising that ‘the spectacle of these women unsexing themselves in this manner’ aroused ‘feelings of utter repugnance’ among the Irish population.⁹⁰

Later in 1912, the *Review* noted that episodes of suffragette violence were continuing in Ireland. In response to a spate of window-breaking escapades by Dublin-based suffragists, the paper declared, ‘Dublin residents of all classes were highly indignant at this outrage which brought discredit upon a country where Suffragists had up to this time, remained uninfected by the hysteria of their kind in England’.⁹¹ It seemed that Dublin was now shackled to the militancy that had for years terrorised and shamed England. Returning to the Asquith hatchet incident, the *Review* pointed out that the Irish city was ‘to have the unenviable distinction of being the scene of the worst outrages which have yet been associated with the more discreditable side of the Female Suffrage movement’.⁹² Not only that, but it also noted that feminist militancy there was escalating dangerously. The paper decried ‘the wanton nature of this outrage’—an outrage that had moved beyond mere heckling and interrupting political gatherings to acts of window-breaking, life-threatening arson, and the ‘even more dastardly’ hatchet-throwing incident.⁹³ It is only fair to say, the *Review* stated, that the hatchet and theatre incidents were perpetrated by English women. However, the very fact that Irish suffragists—through their paper, the *Citizen*—did not repudiate these acts of aggression demonstrated that they were complicit in the ‘conspiracy’. ‘Indeed’, the British paper added, the IWFL could hardly have done so considering that ‘their whole propaganda rests upon violence, and is a direct incitement to violence’.⁹⁴

Whatever the nationality of the perpetrators of these dangerous outrages in Ireland, the *Review* was adamant that the Irish way of life, and Irish women in general, suffered as a consequence. Since the extension of suffrage violence to the island, Irish women had found that they could not walk the streets at night without being molested by men. Men who have since been charged with violence against these women in courts of law have claimed that they were provoked to do so because they assumed their victims were suffragettes, the paper explained. However, it continued, in ‘every case she turned out to be nothing of the kind’.⁹⁵ Drawing attention again to the supposedly chivalric and conservative character of the Irish people, the paper declared,

Dublin used to be the only capital, perhaps in the world, where a woman was safe at any hour from insult or molestation in the streets. Women were supposed to be more respected in Ireland than in any other country in Europe. In less than three months, the Suffragists have succeeded

in destroying that traditional respect. If no other achievement stood to their credit, that fact alone would be enough to ransack their cause with shame.⁹⁶

As unsubstantiated as their claim that Dublin was the safest city in the world as far as protection from male acts of violence was, the point that the *Review* drove home was that the intrusion of feminists' modern-day political tactics into a sphere that the British paper had constructed as archaic and conservative had served to corrupt and corrode those archaic values. Those archaic values, the paper directed, had protected women from male violence. Now Irish women were on equal footing with women in England. That is, whether guilty of feminist transgressions or not, the female population had been put at risk of men's violence. That fellow women, while professing to be the champions of women's affairs, were in fact responsible for lifting existing veils of protection was to their shame. The *Review* used a romanticised notion of Ireland to further reveal just how responsible women were for the disintegration of chivalry, womanliness, and the bonds that connected not only the community of womanhood but also the community of male and female patriots.

The advent of the Great War, although it saw an end to the violent campaign of the WSPU, provoked more heated discussions about gender and violence, not least because of Irish nationalist women's continued advocacy of feminist militancy and the well-meaning though thoroughly misguided offers on the part of patriotic British women to establish women's military organisations to assist with the war effort. Honour, shame, and related emotional concepts continued to be located at the heart of these discussions.

World War One, Women's Militancy and Gendered Emotional Regimes

The onset of the war in 1914 prompted further discussion about the relationship between gender, violence, and honour codes. During the war, emotional values such as honour, courage, chivalry, and their antithesis, shame and cowardice, became a common feature of civilian and military discourse.⁹⁷ For example, across all the belligerent states, wartime propaganda was at pains to urge men to fight to protect their personal honour as well as the honour of their nation. At the same time, it depicted the enemy soldier as barbaric and entirely lacking in honour.⁹⁸ Woman's honour was invoked as a reason to go to war. Men's courage and chivalry were appealed to in terms of correcting atrocious wrongs such as the real rape of women in war and the metaphorical rape of a country by invading armies. The much-cited 'Rape of Belgium' is a case in point here.⁹⁹ Drawing on the topic of sexual violence against women in nationalist propaganda served a highly symbolic function, because rape did not just humiliate women and

injure men's self-perception, it also targeted and damaged the honour of the masculine nation.¹⁰⁰

To invoke honour, Ute Frevert reminds us, was to call to action. Historically, honour was considered to have held such emotional power that it imperatively called for action. Violence underpinned this call to action. Personal and national shame threatened if a man or the nation's manhood proved that it was not up to the task. If it proved itself weak and cowardly, then all honour was lost.¹⁰¹ Cowardly behaviour on the part of a man could only, Frevert asserts, be perceived 'as utterly dishonourable, shameful, and unchivalrous'.¹⁰² During times of war, then, the nation's honour became inextricably tied to the active and violent performance of its manhood. Women were accorded a passive position in line with understandings of chivalry. Therefore, women agitating to enter into active spheres directed by masculine honour codes jeopardised an already precarious balance between honour, masculinity, and violence. The *Review's* passionate response to such attempted incursions of male wartime spaces—particularly the theatres of violence—demonstrates just how aware anti-suffragists were of the increased pressure that the violent conflict exerted on the ongoing operation of gendered emotional regimes.

As outlined in the previous chapter, women reacted to the commencement of the international conflict in a myriad of ways.¹⁰³ In Britain, some women became outwardly jingoistic. The WSPU's Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst are renowned examples of this. Others used the occasion to morally police the general population. For instance, young women in particular deemed it appropriate to shame men out of uniform for not being manly enough to enlist to fight. Pacifists—such as Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence in Britain, Vida Goldstein in Australia, and Hanna Sheehy Skeffington in Ireland—came out in opposition to the war. Feminist pacifists evoked the image of the mother and the nurturer in their attempts to influence more women to oppose what they saw as the relentlessness of male militarism and the senseless slaughter of human life. Anti-imperialist feminists pointed out that the war served only the imperial elite not the thousands of men dying on the battlefields daily. Still other women—both on the conservative and the radical sides of politics—used the example of the war to argue that the female sex could do its bit on the battlefield. Women, this minority asserted, were as useful as men in the realm of modern warfare, where technological innovation eliminated the need for brute strength. Military strategy trumped brute strength. Discussions taking place between women about the war and women's perceived roles in war unsettled pre-war political affiliations and divisions. Whereas many on both sides of the general political divide—left-wing and right-wing—united under the banner of patriotism, others who had formerly aligned with each other—for example, members of the feminist community—split over their allegiances to the war effort and to international pacifism.

World War One and Female Combatants

Since the outbreak of war, the British *Review* looked on the behaviour of patriotic women with some trepidation. As we saw in Chapter 5, the paper accused feminists of carrying on their campaigning under the guise of carrying out their patriotic war work. These duplicitous women were guilty of the unpatriotic act of corrupting the emotional regimes guiding men's and women's experiences at a time when performances of masculinity and femininity were under intense scrutiny. Anti-suffragists were irritated and angered but not entirely shocked by the fact that feminists' pre-war deviancy continued into wartime. But they were exasperated that patriotic women generally were threatening to transgress the boundaries dividing men's and women's traditional wartime roles, thereby eroding wartime gendered emotional standards.

One year into the war, for example, anti-suffragists professed their profound embarrassment at seeing women performing war work in military uniform. Susan Grayzel notes that British contemporaries were struck by women workers taking on roles previously closed to them—like bus and tram conductors, guards and ticket collectors on trains, and postal workers—and wearing uniforms, often masculine uniforms, while doing so.¹⁰⁴ This influx of uniform-wearing women workers was jarring enough, but the sight of women in military garb was positively disconcerting. By 1915 in Britain, for instance, organisations such as the Women's Emergency Corps and Women's Voluntary Reserve had begun to wear khaki uniforms and practice drilling and parading.¹⁰⁵ These were patriotic women whose enthusiasm for working for the State, ordinarily, would have been applauded. However, instead of performing their patriotism in an appropriately feminine manner, they were guilty of weakly imitating the male soldier by donning his uniform. Their actions forced more knowing British patriots to experience vicarious embarrassment. As explained in Chapter 3, vicarious embarrassment is described as the feelings of humiliation people experience on behalf of those close to them who have had cause to embarrass themselves.¹⁰⁶ Patriotic women had committed a minor *faux pas* by dressing as men. They were not soldiers. They embarrassed themselves by not knowing this when all others did.

In a 1915 article entitled 'A Question of Taste', the *Review* pointed out that these female military uniforms were not bloodstained khakis from the war front. The wearing of military uniform and adoption of military titles by women was striking what the paper said was a 'wrong and jarring note'. Ultimately, it was a 'question of taste'.¹⁰⁷ Later, the paper again felt compelled to object to this questionable habit. While it was true that women were doing their war work, 'neither that nor the wearing of khaki livery makes them soldiers'.¹⁰⁸ The duty and the right to exercise physical force divided the two patriotic communities—masculine and feminine. Appropriating masculine uniform only drew attention to women's inadequacy as

soldiers. It highlighted the fact that they were denied entry into the sphere of direct action where those wearing the uniform legitimately were serving.

Initially, uniform-wearing women patriots embarrassed the patriotic community to which they belonged. After all, these were just over-zealous patriotic women who valued belonging to their collective. However, as it became more apparent that these women were actually proposing to assume an active role in the theatres of combat—at home in case of invasion or even on the overseas battlefields—anti-suffragists' expressions of emotional discomfort alternated between embarrassment and shame. In proposing that they mobilise—and perhaps even take up arms—in defence of Britain, patriotic women did not simply blunder. Rather, they attacked the emotional standards guiding men's and women's experiences in war. They attempted an incursion of masculine physical and emotional spaces, and they did this, again, at a time when the masculinity of the nation was under extreme duress. They proposed that they were as capable as men of defending the nation. In doing so, they undermined men's ability to safeguard the nation as was their duty. These ultra-patriotic women were now proving themselves dangerously and shamefully unpatriotic.

In January 1915, the *Review* reported that a body of British women were proposing 'a Women's Volunteer reserve'. The proposed Women's Volunteer Corps was 'not to be so Amazonian as its name implies and its founders hoped'. Rather than arming, women members were to be organised and disciplined so that they could perform duties such as carrying dispatches and taking control of transport in the unlikely event that the country is invaded. Still, there were some more ominous references to 'rifle practice'.¹⁰⁹ 'It is fortunate that the Briton is a good fighter, for we are a hopelessly unmilitary nation', the *Review* stated ironically. Then, with more earnestness, the paper went on to explain,

The lack of military instinct is displayed in the supposition that organised defence will be deficient in what the Women Volunteers have to offer, will take the field without transport and without dispatch riders. The patriotism of these women is magnificent, but it is to be hoped that the country is in a better state of organisation than their scheme implies. There remains the more serious aspect that women who might be employed in the capacities indicated would become ipso facto combatants. Great Britain would not be making a contribution to the cause of civilisation when she pressed her women into any other form of military service than that of Red Cross work.¹¹⁰

At stake was Britain's position at the head of the 'civilised' world. At stake were international codes of chivalry.

British anti-suffragists were already concerned that women enacting suffragette violence would dismantle codes of chivalry that had until now, they said, protected women from men's aggression. These were domestic codes,

intended to regulate relations between the sexes, they explained. However, if women were to now propose enacting physical force on the international stage, then entire international codes of chivalry would be brought under scrutiny. The event that prompted this renewed interest in chivalry was the paper's report in March 1915 that the Women's Volunteer Corps had dropped attempts to include taking up rifles as part of their remit and were instead turning towards the idea of establishing a Women Signallers' Territorial Corps. Equality for the Sexes before this has been treated as a folly, but is now entering on the criminal, the *Review* asserted.¹¹¹ These women claimed that they were ready to face the enemy and to put up with the penalties potentially inflicted on them as wartime belligerents. But who, the *Review* asked, is going to inflict penalties on these potential female belligerents? Not the Germans, was its response:

Certainly not the Germans, for they would refuse to recognise women as anything else than non-combatants, and if they were found assisting in military operations the infuriated invaders would consider themselves justified in regarding their enemies as outside the pale of civilized warfare. Is the British Government going to the next Hague Conference to announce that in future it proposes to employ women as soldiers?¹¹²

The Germans might have what another article declared was a 'Teutonic lust of world power' that rivalled the suffragette's violent lust for domestic power. Certainly, infamous suffragist women were the ones proposing 'drilling' women and readying them for violent conflict, the *Review* reported.¹¹³ The paper continued, however desirous of power the Germans were, at least they knew the limits of civilised and uncivilised behaviour, particularly as it directed relations between men and women.¹¹⁴ It seemed that over-zealous patriotic women and feminists harbouring an unseemly and irrational lust for power through calls for equality—including physical equality—did not.

To make its point about international codes of chivalry, the *Review* chose to ignore accusations of rape and other atrocities that were circulated by the British propaganda machine and which would have affirmed for readers that the Germans were barbarians. This was also months before the execution of British nurse Edith Cavell, which, for many British citizens, did indeed confirm that German soldiers existed beyond the pale of civilisation.¹¹⁵ Therefore, the paper persisted with the task of elucidating just what damage violent patriotic women could do to international war conventions.

Women combatants were unnatural and their proposed actions could only provoke undesirable consequences. As the *Review* explained,

Such a kicking against the limits imposed by nature and by civilization can only result in one of two alternatives: either these military women will be shot and bayoneted by the enemy, or they will take advantage of their sex so as to put the enemy's soldiers into an unfair and impossible

position, at any rate until the unnatural behaviour of such amazons has driven international usage to reconsider and revise its code of chivalry.¹¹⁶

However, there was yet another alternative, the paper stated. 'If the enemy regards such armed women as non-combatants, they may bring massacre on the whole civil population of the locality', it concluded.¹¹⁷ Violent women would only serve to dismantle entire codes of chivalry that many believed protected against decivilising forces. Despite stories and images of the blatant horrors of the battlefield that flooded into the home front, many continued to subscribe to the view that chivalry stemmed some of the savagery of war.

As it seemed more and more likely that the government was going to give into feminist demands to extend the franchise to women, the *Review* published a flurry of articles that reaffirmed its belief in the physical force argument. At least three long years of violent bloodshed and the seemingly endless loss of male lives fuelled the paper's panicked reaction to a political move that now seemed imminent. The war had demonstrated that men's and women's physical and emotional worlds remained separate. Why then would their political duties merge to become inextricable from the other? Men's bodies were sacrificed for the war effort. Men were compelled to exhibit courage and chivalry and honour, not women. Why then would women be granted the right to exercise the vote—a vote that would inevitably mean power over whether or not a country went to war? Nothing about men's and women's experiences during the war had convinced those writing for the *Review* that women were capable of adhering to the masculine emotional regimes that necessarily guided men's participation in war. Anti-suffragists were not convinced that it was even appropriate for women to contemplate their fitness for emotional regimes that had never regulated their behaviour.

In December 1917, the *Review* reasserted some well-known facts:

Now, when war occurs, it is the men of this country who make a wall with their bodies against the foe; who suffer every torture of bodily discomfort that can be imagined, and who pay the supreme sacrifice. Those who pay the piper have the right to call the tune. Women do not pay the piper.¹¹⁸

Women suffered during war. That was undisputed. One article pointed out that '*some* women have been killed and wounded at the front, or through air raids at home'. But women were not asked to sacrifice their lives during war.

The nation can and does ask its manhood to give life up in the defence of a just cause; men, therefore, knowing their responsibilities, should have the vote. That many have faced danger gladly and have given up

all to the cause of right, does not alter the fact that the nation cannot compel women to undergo anything in the nature of military service. It would take too long to explain why this cannot be done, but one word will suffice. Health. The health of potential mothers and of actual mothers must be protected or the nation would cease to exist.¹¹⁹

As this passage outlines, a woman's willingness to display courage did not seem to be under doubt. However, the appropriateness of her doing so in the field of conflict certainly was. On the battlefield, her courage was misplaced. This was a place for the exhibition of man's valour exclusively.

One month later in January 1918, the paper affirmed that 'when fighting is in the air, the occasion belongs to man, and that the Amazon is not the highest ideal of womanhood'.¹²⁰ That month, the *Review* also devoted a number of pages to renowned anti-suffragist, Sir Almroth E. Wright's plea to the House of Lords to deny the woman vote on the basis of reigning views of physical force. Wright opposed suffrage on the grounds that men's and women's bodies would become indistinguishable from each other, particularly in relation to the exercise of physical force. The woman vote would result in, he said,

A State in which the governing power—that is, the power of physical compulsion by the communal force—was committed to man and woman equally; in which such State compulsion was brought to bear equitably upon the two sexes; and in which man applied physical compulsion to a woman, and she to a man, without distinction. Of sex. In a State organised upon this pattern woman, if physically fit, would, like man, be subject to military conscription and active fighting. She would also be enrolled in the police force, and would be employed as an arm of the law to apply physical compulsion without distinction to man and woman.¹²¹

He invoked shocking images of male-female violence—of 'men and women shooting each other down and falling upon each other with bayonets' and 'of the female body shot and run-through'. He went further to include the pregnant body in his repertoire of bloody and violent imagery. There surge into the mind 'visions also of the possibility of women soldiers fighting and killed in a condition of pregnancy; and worst nightmares'.¹²² The woman's body as a sight of reproduction, life, and nurture was glaringly incongruous with the deadly intent of the battlefield.

Significantly, however, it was not the wrong done to female bodies that Wright was most worried about but rather the impact that these visions would have on the masculine mind. Such images of male-on-female violence may be dismissed as romanticised, he said, as fantastical. However, he added, 'it would, without doubt, be arguable that their appeal is to the sentimental masculine, rather than to the matter-of-fact feminine intellect'.¹²³ It

was men's emotional regimes that violent women threatened to invade at the same time that they altered their own. To allow women to exercise physical force—surely an appendage of the vote—was to make both sexes subject to the same moral law. To do so, then, would be to instil in women the idea that 'it is moral and reputable of her to resort to the weapon of force'. It is to invite her to use violence against men. Yet, civilisation, he added, relied on it 'being maintained as a settled moral principle between the sexes that neither shall turn against the other the weapon of physical compulsion'.¹²⁴ Again, however, Wright returned to the matter of masculine emotional regimes. To allow or ask woman to use violence against the male body would be to ask him to transform his entire way of thinking and being. Wright posited that asking women to alter their emotional make-up was significant but that it was 'an even greater matter' to instruct men to do so because that involved going 'to work to uproot out of man's mind the instinctive feeling that it is culpable to use physical force against woman. And it is to make bad blood in man's heart against woman and in woman's heart against man'.¹²⁵

This call to enter into the realm of politics and political violence was an attempted incursion into male worlds—physical and emotional—such as the country had never before seen. It was also a clumsily miscalculated one that revealed just how far outside the pale of the male emotional and physical world, women were. Women proposing such shocking measures did not simply affect a transformation of gendered emotional standards. Corrupting these emotional standards naturally promised dire physical consequences. To Wright—and to the women contributing to the *Review*—the dismantlement of emotional regimes that had traditionally protected women from men's violence promised only a future of unrestrained male-on-female violence. The international war had just revealed how utterly destructive and devastating male violence could be. Why would Britain sanction such a prospect?

Irish Feminists and Physical Force

The commencement of the war and the normalisation of male violence on a mass scale prompted many suffragists too to revisit discussions that had taken place earlier in the suffrage campaign about women's resort to physical force. Therefore, before concluding, I want to necessarily briefly return to the notion that I raised near the beginning of this chapter about a feminist ethics of violence.

Irish militant suffragists had often used the example of the increasing militarisation of early twentieth-century Irish society to distinguish between reactions to male and female displays of militancy. In October 1914, the *Irish Citizen* reported the arrest of feminist activists, Mrs Sheehy Skeffington and Mrs Connery, for trying to address a crowd in the vicinity of visiting British Prime Minister Asquith. At the same time, nearby male socialist activists, Mr Larkin, Mr Connelly, and Mr Daly, addressed a crowd and

were protected by a large body of men from the socialist Irish Citizen Army with rifles which they apparently discharged into the air from time to time. No attempt was made by the police to interfere with these meetings. The article concluded that the effectiveness of shows of male political violence exposed the ineffectiveness of peaceful, though militant, female protest.¹²⁶

Not all suffrage militants in the country agreed with exercising typically masculine forms of force, however. As with the British suffragists, the militant movement in Ireland was split between those who advocated the destruction of property and those who promoted more active forms of violence, such as violence against the person.¹²⁷ The appropriate nature of woman's weapons of war was a highly contentious subject. This was even so in two countries which were variously embroiled in domestic and international conflict; where displays of mass, organised violence were increasingly accepted as normal.

The onset of the Great War advertised the versatility and effectiveness of violence for those women who had previously advocated political violence, whether for feminist, nationalist, and/or general military campaigns. For example, in the first year of the war, advocate of Irish and Indian feminism and nationalism, Margaret Cousins, issued the call, 'One man, one gun; one woman, one gun.'¹²⁸ If fighting was wrong, she argued, it was for men and women equally. If it was justifiable then it was equally so for both sexes too. 'Modern warfare', she declared,

depends more on skill and endurance than on brute strength. Physiology proves conclusively that woman's power of endurance is greater than man's. Her success in sports proves woman's equality of skill and aim. Powers of magnetic leadership have constantly been acknowledged in women.¹²⁹

Cousins was quite rational in her approach to the issue. It made more sense to her to send single women to war where they risked death than to send married men who had wives and children dependent on them. Sex did not delineate capability for exercising physical force. Morally, emotionally, and physically now—in the era of technological warfare—men and women were equally suited to and equipped for war.

Besides, as Cousins pointed out, women were already arming in anticipation of civil strife between nationalists and Unionists in Ireland. This was in evidence through women's involvement with the Unionist Ulster Volunteer Force and the nationalist Cumman na mBan, the Women's Council of the Irish Volunteers (later the Irish Republican Army). As outlined in Chapter 2, prominent nationalist feminists, including Constance Markievicz, claimed that Irish women had a special ancestral relationship with violence. Markievicz was a nationalist, socialist, and feminist politician and soldier. She trained boys and young men for armed combat through the militant Fianna na hÉireann, a nationalist version of the Boy Scouts, which she co-founded

in 1909.¹³⁰ She fought in the failed nationalist uprising in 1916 and was sentenced to be executed only to have that sentence commuted to life imprisonment because of her sex. While incarcerated in 1918, she was elected to the British parliament but refused to take her seat. In 1919, she was elected to the first Dáil Éireann (Irish parliament). She was appointed the minister for labour, thereby taking her place as the first woman minister of any European parliament. Markievicz endured more imprisonments during the Anglo-Irish War or Irish War of Independence (1919–1921). During this time, she was appointed president of the Cumann na mBan, the militant women's organisation supporting the armed separatist group, the Irish Volunteers.¹³¹

Markievicz was a vocal advocate of women arming in defence of their country. Prior to the war, her views had been aired through public speeches and in the pages of women's periodicals like the *Bean na hEireann* (the *Bean*) and the *Citizen*. At the outset of the international war, the *Citizen* republished one of Markievicz's earlier, well-circulated call to arms. Markievicz instructed Irish women to arm themselves with 'noble and free ideas'. 'And if in your day the call should come for your body to arm', she added, 'do not shirk that either.'¹³² It was preferable that women arm themselves than that they rely on the 'problematic chivalry' of men.¹³³ Too many women existed in 'domestic ruts', armed only with 'feminine pens'. Hers was a call to direct action. As a radical Irish nationalist and a separatist, Markievicz was not a friend of the British war effort. But she considered that the war was useful because it had helped to shake 'women out of old grooves' by forcing different responsibilities on them.¹³⁴ She lauded the feminist consciousness-raising that war could bring about for women.

Like many of her fellow nationalist feminists, Markievicz asserted that Irish women in particular had a proud tradition of militancy to live up to. 'I have never heard in the early history of any country so many stories of great fighting women as I read in the history of Ireland', she declared. Here she was referring to the stories of Maeve, of Macha, of Granuaile, of Fleas, and many others.¹³⁵ Fighting was in the Irish woman's blood. 'Ancient Ireland bred warrior women, and women played a heroic part in those days', she asserted.¹³⁶ Here she was supported by prominent feminist nationalist Hanna Sheehy Skeffington. Sheehy Skeffington declared that in ancient times, Irish men and women were equal in arms, as in other professions.¹³⁷

Irish women had lost their way since these ancient times but it was not impossible for them to reacquaint themselves with their proud warrior tradition. They only had to invoke the spirit of more modern specimens of Irish warrior women, for example, those who fought in the United Irishmen's Rebellion of 1798.¹³⁸ Markievicz explained that, in that 1798 conflict, many women 'actually fought in the ranks, like Ireland's Amazon women of the past'. Even those who did not—those who 'were not of the old martial nature, and who shrunk from the clash of arms'—were not idle. They played their part by sending 'their mankind to battle with a brave word, and

many earnest heart-deep prayers'. The 'timidest' of Irish women 'were ever ready to nurse the wounded, hide the fugitive, and to strain every nerve to serve the National cause and the Nation's heroes', she said.¹³⁹

Since then, too many Irish women had been seduced by the comforts and familiarities of daily life. Too many were

so utterly indifferent to the struggle that is going on around them; caring very little for the National cause, provided they can be amused, well fed, and prosperous enough to live in the same style as their friends and contemporaries.¹⁴⁰

Women were to blame, but they were aided by men and colonialism. By accepting the imposition of the soulless, middle-class gender ideals of the modern world that were introduced and imposed on the Irish by the British—those that banned women from spheres of action that they had enjoyed in the past, such as combat—modern Irish women had been 'civilised'. Indeed, the successful implementation of sex segregation had severely endangered women's very existence, Markievicz accused, adding, 'To-day we are in danger of being civilised by men out of existence'.¹⁴¹ The difference, she instructed readers, between the warrior women of old and women today is that the women of old owed 'no allegiance to any man'.¹⁴² Only the suffragette and the woman trade unionist seemed to still embody the spirit of the warrior women of old.¹⁴³ But, again, Markievicz saw it as one of her duties to reawaken that spirit in the Irish women of her day. Her strategy was to hold a mirror up to the Irish woman who had been seduced by the luxuries and ease of British-imposed modernity in order to reflect her shameful state. She wanted to shame fellow Irish women into honouring their warrior women ancestry.

Along with the other women who had participated in the 1916 Rising, for example, Markievicz had shown that women could fight. More than that, a *Citizen* contributor declared, she was also responsible for overturning the myth that women could not assume a leading military role because men would be too ashamed to be found following a woman into battle. 'It has been my lot during the last few weeks', the author continued, 'to meet several men who were "on the Green with the Countess,"'¹⁴⁴ and I have entirely failed to observe on their part any feeling of disgrace at being led by a woman; their wives, too, seem to regard that fact with pride.'¹⁴⁵ The warrior woman was not shameful and neither was the warrior woman leader—leader of men as well as women.

Markievicz understood the power of training. She drilled the boys of the Fianna in the use of arms. Women too could be trained in such skills. But her testament to women's combat capabilities went beyond mere technical skill. The desire and the right to bear arms was, she claimed, the Irish woman's privilege. Courage underpinned that privilege. Courage was an emotional virtue shared by Irish men and Irish women. It was their shared

heritage. Markievicz's legacy has always been highly contested and controversial. Immediately after her death—and indeed since, for the controversy continues—commentators have variously criticised her for her flamboyant style and passionate manner, and for the fact that she trained young men and instilled in them a desire to kill and die for Ireland.¹⁴⁶ Yet one thing that has not been disputed is her capacity for courage. Even writer and socialist compatriot, Sean O'Casey, who condemned Markievicz for what he said was a superficial personality and lack of commitment, declared that she had physical courage, with which 'she was clothed as with a garment'.¹⁴⁷ This female combatant's physical courage may not have been in doubt. But its exercise in the field of battle was out of character with the times.

Patriotic Irish women, such as Markievicz, constructed an ethics of violence that pertained to Irish women specifically. Irish women, nationalist feminists declared, had a proud past of shared warrior status with their manhood. Men and women had adhered to the same emotional standards, engaging as they did in the same physical activities, combat included. Back then, there was nothing shameful about the violent woman. British colonisation, through the imposition of modern or civilised notions of separate spheres, had corroded the historic nature of relations between Irish men and women. It had sentenced men and women to different physical spheres guarded over by different emotional regimes. It was up to nationalist women to instigate a decivilising process that would allow them to return to a pre-British and pre-civilised world. Then they could take their place alongside men in the public worlds of politics and war. Recollections of that proud past of gender equality had been deployed to awaken Irish women's nationalism. However, it had also been used by nationalist feminists and feminist nationalists to justify their recourse to militancy.¹⁴⁸ Margaret Cousins may have argued along more universal lines that women could fight if men were fighting. If fighting was good for men, it was good for women. However, the overwhelming sense emanating from the community of nationalist Irish women was that their specific ethnic heritage rendered them fit for militancy. The ethics of violence that they constructed, then, was less exclusively feminist than it was nationalist feminist. The fighting Irish woman was not shameful, but the woman who denied her heritage and instead embraced British models of passive femininity was.

Conclusion

British anti-suffragists were adamant that violence degraded womanhood. Women were not fit for active engagement with violence. Physically, they were not suited to the exercise of physical force. Women's bodies were built to facilitate the more nurturing and less destructive function of childbirth. Emotionally, they were not trained to engage in legitimate forms of violence as men were. Honour codes directed men's use of physical force. Men were directed to adhere to standards of courage, chivalry, and fairness when

engaging in physical combat with each other. Women were not brought up to embody these virtues. Therefore, when women demanded access to the battlefield—or when they performed violence publicly in the name of feminism—they attacked the make-up of the different gendered emotional regimes. They brought shame on womanhood when they abandoned their life-giving instincts for the destructive capacities of masculine violence. They threatened to corrupt the nature of manly emotional virtues like courage and chivalry when they attempted to embody those virtues. For example, by demanding to stand alongside their brothers in the country's defence during the Great War, patriotic women cast aspersions on British men's ability to perform their manly duty of protecting the nation. They cast doubt on his ability to embody the emotional qualities required of him to perform this function at this crucial time.

More than that, by enacting violence publicly, women jeopardised the existence of codes of chivalry that were established to protect them—the weaker sex—from the violent actions of men—the stronger sex. They provoked a reappraisal of codes of chivalry to the detriment of both women and men. Women were already vulnerable to male violence but militant women brought the very real threat of male-on-female violence much closer to home than it had been previously. If women were capable of combat then why would men need to adhere to emotional regulations that were intended to protect the supposedly weaker sex? By forcing men to react violently towards women—by provoking men's anger and violence as they disturbed public meetings and threw hatchets at prime ministers—violent women also forced men to confront that part of themselves that they worked to control. They awoke man's inner brute. No one benefitted from such an awakening.

By threatening to fight alongside men for the nation's defence, violent women also provoked the wrath of the international soldier. She jeopardised entire international codes of chivalry that were designed to protect women from some of war's barbarity and depravity. The violent woman in the theatre of war put all women at further risk of wartime male violence. Moreover, men could not abide by notions of chivalry that required them not to strike a woman when women were pointing guns at them. To ask them to do this would be unfair. It would put them at a disadvantage. Women entering conflict zones destabilised the gendered character of international emotional regimes.

Indeed, suffragist violence compelled British anti-suffragists to re-examine their views on legitimate forms of male-on-female violence. Anti-feminists expanded the category of womanhood which was undeserving of the physical protection promised to women by codes of chivalry to accommodate feminists. Nagging suffragettes were added to nagging wives as women who deservedly provoked men's wrath and their violence. The inability of suffragettes—or 'latter-day specimens of the old-fashioned nagging woman'¹⁴⁹—to internalise shame revitalised the need for pre-modern forms of public shaming. For example, British anti-suffragists recalled the effectiveness of the

torturous Scold's Bridle as a means of imposing shame on those women who refused to amend their ways. In the modern age, violent women served no other function than to return society to its pre-civilised state.

Irish women, however, justified their recourse to violence on the grounds that what they desired was indeed a return to this pre-civilised state. They wanted to reinstate gender relations that had existed in Ireland before the onset of British colonisation and the so-called civilising process. This meant reinstating an emotional regime that directed men's and women's actions equally. Drawing on stories of ancient Irish equality, Irish nationalist women championed the recreation of a permanent national context in which men and women could engage equally in the public worlds of politics and war. They proposed an ethics of violence that was feminist in nature but that was largely directed by nationalist concerns.

Notes

- 1 *Votes for Women*, 19 November 1909, p. 116.
- 2 *Votes for Women*, 19 November 1909, p. 116.
- 3 *Votes for Women*, 19 November 1909, p. 120.
- 4 *Votes for Women*, 26 November 1909, p. 138.
- 5 Laura E. Nym Mayhall presents a nuanced analysis of militancy in her article where she places the less-recognised militancy of the WFL and the more infamous militancy of the WSPU into the longer tradition of radical protest in the country. Both the WFL and the WSPU understood themselves to be 'Suffragettes' at the time. However, the WFL rejected violence unlike the WSPU. See Laura E. Nym Mayhall, 'Defining Militancy: Radical Protest, the Constitutional Idiom, and Women's Suffrage in Britain, 1908–1909', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 39, no. 3 (2000) pp. 340–371, pp. 343–349.
- 6 As outlined in the Introduction to this book, from 1905 to 1912, the militant campaign—largely through the WSPU—took the form of heckling politicians, noisily disrupting political meetings, and a willingness to go to prison rather than paying fines for 'unruly' behaviour. From 1912 until their cessation with the beginning of the Great War in 1914, suffragettes, as members of the WSPU were labelled, moved on to more violent and often illegal forms of activity such as mass window-breaking raids, vandalising post boxes, attacking public property, including setting fire to buildings and going on hunger strike. See June Purvis, 'Fighting the Double Moral Standard in Edwardian Britain: Suffragette Militancy, Sexuality and the Nation in the Writings of the Early Twentieth-Century British Feminist Christabel Pankhurst', in Francisca de Haan, Margaret Allen, June Purvis and Krassimira Dasklova, eds., *Women's Activism: Global Perspectives from the 1890s to the Present* (New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 121–135, p. 121. For a recent, revisionist history of the nature and origins of suffragette militancy see Laura E. Nym Mayhall, *The Militant Suffrage Movement. Citizenship and Resistance in Britain, 1860–1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- 7 Violence is defined as behaviour that involves physical force and is intended to 'hurt, damage, or kill' according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Gemma Clark, therefore, argues that all violence is mindful because violence is, by definition, the intended infliction of injury on people or property. See Gemma Clark, *Everyday Violence in the Irish Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 1.

- 8 Pieter Spierenburg, 'Masculinity, Violence, and Honor: An Introduction', in Pieter Spierenburg, ed., *Men and Violence. Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998) pp. 1–29, p. 1.
- 9 Robert Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', *Social History*, vol. 26, no. 2 (2001) pp. 190–208, p. 202.
- 10 For example, he quotes the *London Evening Post*, 29 March 1735 in relation to a woman committing robbery with violent assault in Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 202.
- 11 Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 202.
- 12 Carolyn Strange and Robert Cribb affirm that the profound association that honour maintained with masculinity means that 'males, overwhelmingly, have been the chief antagonists in violence inflicted in its name'. See Carolyn Strange and Robert Cribb, 'Historical Perspectives on Honour, Violence and Emotion' in Carolyn Strange, Robert Cribb, Christopher E. Forth, eds., *Honour, Violence and Emotions in History* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014) pp. 9–38, p. 8.
- 13 Spierenburg, 'Masculinity, Violence, and Honor', p. 1.
- 14 Spierenburg, 'Masculinity, Violence, and Honor', p. 1.
- 15 Spierenburg argues that this is not a characteristic of some non-European cultures. See Spierenburg, 'Masculinity, Violence, and Honor', p. 3. Duelling was one way for more elite members of a society to react to personal insult. For an example of a study of duelling in European society, see Ute Frevert, 'The Taming of the Noble Ruffian: Male Violence and Duelling in Early Modern and Modern Germany', in Pieter Spierenburg, ed., *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998) pp. 37–63.
- 16 Certain forms of violence, such as duelling before its demise through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, also offered gentlemen the means by which to prove their superiority standing. See Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 200.
- 17 Steven F. Shatz and Naomi R. Shatz, 'Chivalry is Not Dead: Murder, Gender, and the Death Penalty', *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice*, vol. 27, no. 1 (2012) pp. 64–112, p. 67.
- 18 Shatz and Shatz, 'Chivalry is Not Dead', p. 68.
- 19 René Moelker and Gerhard Kümmel, 'Chivalry and Codes of Conduct: Can the Virtue of Chivalry Epitomize Guidelines for Interpersonal Conduct?', *Journal of Military Ethics*, vol. 6, no. 4 (2007) pp. 292–302, p. 298.
- 20 Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 196.
- 21 As Angela Woollacott argues, violence against women has been used historically to maintain men's privileges. Globally, women continue to be highly vulnerable to male violence, whether domestic violence, sexual assault, wartime violence (including sexual violence), and workplace violence (for example, trade union violence when women enter male dominated industries). Violence against women continues to be a transnational as well as national issue. See Angela Woollacott, 'A Feminist History of Violence: History as a Weapon of Liberation?', *Lilith*, vol. 16 (2007) pp. 1–11, pp. 1–4.
- 22 Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 203.
- 23 Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 206.
- 24 For example, Shoemaker points out that by the end of the eighteenth century, more homicides by men were reported as taking place in place 'in private houses,

- taverns, coffee-houses, and shops'. See Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 206.
- 25 Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 203.
- 26 It is widely accepted that the term 'New Woman' was first coined in 1894 by the novelist Sarah Grand, pseudonym of Frances Elizabeth Belleuden Clarke, author of *The Heavenly Twins*, 1893. Grand's article entitled 'The New Aspect of the Woman Question,' in which she uses the term 'New Woman,' was published in 1894, in the *North American Review*. (David Rubinstein, *Before the Suffragettes: Women's Emancipation in the 1890s* (Brighton: Harvester, 1986) pp. 15–16.) See also Barbara Caine, *Victorian Feminists* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) p. 252. For an extensive discussion of Grand and the New Woman novel see Teresa Mangum, 'New Strategies for New (Academic) Women', *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, (2007) pp. 1–19.
- 27 Shoemaker, 'Male Honour and the Decline of Public Violence in Eighteenth-Century London', p. 208.
- 28 While some of these analyses of female combatants make use of historical case studies to demonstrate their arguments about the relationship between gender and violence, they are guided by the research agendas and theories of the political sciences rather than those of historical studies. See, for example, Caron E. Gentry and Lara Sjoberg, *Beyond Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Thinking about Women's Violence in Global Politics* (London: Zed Books, 2015); Siphokazi Magadla, 'Women Combatants and the Liberation Movement in South Africa: Guerrilla Girls, Combative Mothers and the In-Betweeners', *African Security Review*, vol. 24, no. 4 (2015) pp. 390–402; Swati Parashar, *Women and Militant Wars: The Politics of Injury* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014); Paige Whaley Eager, *From Freedom Fighters to Terrorists: Women and Political Violence* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); and Miranda Alison, 'Women as Agents of Political Violence: Gendering Security', *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35, no. 4 (2004) pp. 447–463.
- 29 Miranda Alison acknowledges just how widespread this assumption is and devotes her article to debunking this myth through case studies of female militants in Sri Lanka and Northern Ireland. See Alison, 'Women as Agents of Political Violence: Gendering Security', p. 448.
- 30 Gentry and Sjoberg, *Beyond Mothers, Monsters, Whores*, p. 2. Angela Woolacott draws on research that demonstrates that girls (under 18), voluntarily and involuntarily, have been part of fighting forces in 55 different countries between 1990 and 2003. These countries include developed (including the United States, Israel, Denmark, France, Ireland, Sweden, Britain, Australia, and Japan) as well as less developed (for instance, Mozambique, northern Uganda, and Sierra Leone). See Angela Woolacott, 'A Feminist History of Violence: History as a Weapon of Liberation?', p. 7.
- 31 Eager, *From Freedom Fighters to Terrorists*, p. 3.
- 32 In her groundbreaking work on women, feminism and war, Jean Bethke Elshtain argued that, despite accumulating evidence of women's participation in modern conflicts, the notion of woman as a static symbol of peace continues to exert a hold over the popular imagination. Women have been used time and again to exemplify qualities that work to keep the barbarism of war at bay. (See Jean Bethke Elshtain, 'Women as Mirror and Other: Toward a Theory of Women, War, and Feminism', *Humanities in Society*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1982) pp. 22–44, p. 32.) They represent the possibility of a return to normality once the conflict has ended. (Margaret Randolph Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel and Margaret Collins Weitz, 'Introduction', in Margaret Randolph Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel and Margaret Collins Weitz, eds., *Behind the Lines*:

- Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987) pp. 1–17, p. 2.)
- 33 Gentry and Sjoberg cite Elshtain's 1987 book, *Women and War*. See Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Women and War*, (New York: New York University Press, 1987).
- 34 Gentry and Sjoberg, *Beyond Mothers, Monsters, Whores*, p. 2.
- 35 See Gentry and Sjoberg, *Beyond Mothers, Monsters, Whores*, p. 3.
- 36 Important contributions to the study of women and the military, pacifism and women, and, gender and war were made in the 1980s and 1990s and include, for example: Margaret Randolph Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel and Margaret Collins Weitz, eds., *Behind the Lines. Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987); Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives* (London: Harper Collins, 1988); Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias, eds., *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory* (Savage: Rowman and Littlefield, 1990); and Ruth H. Howes and Michael R. Stevenson, eds., *Women and the Use of Military Force*, (Boulder: Lynne Reiner Publishers, 1993). Nira Yuval-Davis also deals with the gendered nature of the military and war in her book, *Gender and Nation*. See Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (London: SAGE Publications, 1997).
- 37 Randolph Higonnet, Jenson, Michel and Collins Weitz, 'Introduction', p. 1.
- 38 In this chapter, Richards was questioning why the Greenham Common camp had to be entirely female. See Janet Radcliffe Richards, 'Why the Pursuit of Peace is No Part of Feminism', in Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias, *Women, Militarism, and War* (Savage: Rowman and Littlefield, 1990) pp. 211–225.
- 39 Richards, 'Why the Pursuit of Peace is No Part of Feminism', p. 223.
- 40 Nicole Ann Dombrowski, 'Soldiers, Saints, or Sacrificial Lambs? Women's Relationship to Combat and the Fortification of the Home Front in the Twentieth Century', in Nicole Ann Dombrowski, ed., *Women and War in the Twentieth Century. Enlisted with or without Consent* (New York and London: Routledge, 1999) pp. 2–37, p. 4.
- 41 Joanna Bourke, *Deep Violence: Military Violence, War Play and the Social Life of Weapons* (Berkeley: Counterpoint, 2015) p. 4.
- 42 Bourke, *Deep Violence*, p. 5.
- 43 Specific examples of histories of women's engagements with war exist. However, they do not tend to theorise about women's or feminists' ethics of violence. Rather, they plot women's participation in violent campaigns. See, for example, Lisa Lines, 'Female Combatants in the Spanish Civil War: *Milicianas* on the Front Lines and in the Rearguard', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, vol. 10, no. 4 (2004) pp. 168–187, and Jeffrey J. Roberts, 'On John Keegan, Soviet "Amazons", and the Issue of Women in Combat', *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military*, vol. 14, nos. 3-4 (1996) pp. 11–28.
- 44 Setsu Shigematsu is a scholar of Asian and gender studies. Her book, *Scream from the Shadows*, is a history of the Japanese Women's Liberation Movement. See Setsu Shigematsu, *Scream from the Shadows: The Women's Liberation Movement in Japan* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012) p. x. In 2007, Lee-Ann Monk, who has written on women asylum warders' use of violence against their patients, noted that histories of women as violent tended to depict these women in ways that denied their agency and status as responsible moral citizens. She directed that a feminist history of violence should seek to explain unsettling complexities of women's agency in violent situations, such as colonising processes. See Lee-Ann Monk, 'A Feminist History of Violence: History as a Weapon of Liberation?', *Lilith*, vol. 16 (2007) pp. 12–14, p. 13.

- 45 She cites American politicians, Madeleine Albright, Condoleezza Rice, and Hillary Rodham Clinton for their support of state-sanctioned imperialist violence, especially in the name of saving women. See Shigematsu, *Scream from the Shadows*, p. x.
- 46 See 'Preface' in Shigematsu, *Scream from the Shadows*, pp. ix-xiv.
- 47 Joy Damousi, 'Socialist Women and Gendered Space: Anti-Conscription and Anti-War Campaigns 1914–1918', in Joy Damousi and Marilyn Lake, eds., *Gender and War: Australians at War in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) pp. 254–273, p. 257.
- 48 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 27, February 1911, pp. 25–26.
- 49 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 27, February 1911, pp. 25–26.
- 50 In an inversion of accepted hierarchies within the family of nations that made up the Empire—namely, an understanding which placed the imperial centre at the top—already enfranchised Australian women marching carried a banner which instructed their imperial mother to 'Trust the women Mother as I have done'. The issue of how the British responded to such suggestions emanating from its former colonies are examined in detail in Chapter 3.
- 51 The 'transhistorical' element refers to the inclusion of women dressed as iconic female figures from the past. See Rebecca Cameron, 'From Great Women to Top Girls: Pageants of Sisterhood in British Feminist Theatre', *Comparative Drama*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (2009) pp. 143–166, p. 153.
- 52 For example, by 1915, the National Woman's Party (NWP) as an amalgam of the more militant American suffrage bodies led by activists such as Alice Paul, Lucy Burns and Harriot Stanton Blatch—all of whom either had connections with or experience in the British militant movement—adopted more visually arresting and disruptive techniques including the infamous 1913 march held in Washington, D.C., the day before the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson as president. From 1917, they deployed the 'Silent Sentinels' tactic of conducting a campaign of silently picketing outside the White House. For more on the militant tactics of the Silent Sentinels, see Belinda A. Stillion Southard, 'Militancy, Power, and Identity: The Silent Sentinels as Women Fighting for a Political Voice', *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, vol. 10, no. 3 (2007) pp. 399–417.
- 53 Barbara Caine, 'Australian Feminism and the British Militant Suffragettes', Paper presented to the Department of the Senate Occasional Lecture Series at Parliament House, Canberra, Australia, 31 October 2003: www.aph.gov.au/binaries/senate/pubs/pops/pop41/caine.pdf, accessed 21 January 2016.
- 54 Barbara Caine, 'Australian Feminism and the British Militant Suffragettes'. For an account of an exchange Goldstein had with a British commentator over the comparative value of the Australian women's and British man's vote when she visited England, see Sharon Crozier-De Rosa, 'The National and the Transnational in British Anti-Suffragists' Views of Australian Women Voters', *History Australia*, vol. 10, no. 3 (2013) pp. 51–64. This exchange is also discussed in Chapter 3.
- 55 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 2, January 1909, p. 1.
- 56 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 2, January 1909, p. 1.
- 57 In Greek mythology, Maenads are the 'demented', 'mad' or 'raving' female followers of Dionysus. *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 2, January 1909, p. 1.
- 58 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 2, January 1909, p. 1.
- 59 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 2, January 1909, p. 1.
- 60 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 2, January 1909, p. 1.
- 61 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 8, July 1909, pp. 1–2.
- 62 Boadicea was queen of the Iceni people of Eastern England and led a major uprising against occupying Roman forces. *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 8, July 1909, pp. 1–2.

- 63 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 11, October 1909, pp. 5–6.
- 64 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 15, February 1910, p. 3.
- 65 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 9, August 1909, pp. 1–2.
- 66 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 43, May 1912, p. 105.
- 67 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 51, January 1913, pp. 321–322.
- 68 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 22, September 1910, pp. 5–6.
- 69 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 22, September 1910, pp. 5–6.
- 70 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 11, October 1909, pp. 1–2.
- 71 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 46, August 1912, pp. 179–180.
- 72 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 41, April 1912, p. 63.
- 73 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 22, September 1910, pp. 5–6.
- 74 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 230.
- 75 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 236.
- 76 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 236.
- 77 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 236.
- 78 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 236.
- 79 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 236.
- 80 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 48, October 1912, p. 236.
- 81 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 47, September 1912, p. 219.
- 82 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 9, August 1909, pp. 1–2.
- 83 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 11, October 1909, pp. 3–4.
- 84 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 11, October 1909, pp. 3–4.
- 85 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 9, August 1909, pp. 1–2.
- 86 The English suffragettes were Mary Leigh, Gladys Evans, and Lizzie Baker (Jennie Baines).
- 87 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 1, no. 17, 17 September 1912, p. 130.
- 88 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 43, May 1912, pp. 102–103.
- 89 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 43, May 1912, pp. 102–103.
- 90 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 43, May 1912, pp. 102–103.
- 91 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 46, August 1912, p. 188.
- 92 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 46, August 1912, p. 188.
- 93 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 46, August 1912, p. 188.
- 94 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 46, August 1912, p. 188.
- 95 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 47, September 1912, p. 217.
- 96 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 47, September 1912, p. 217.
- 97 Edward Madigan, ‘“Sticking to a Hateful Task”: Resilience, Humour, and British Understandings of Combatant Courage, 1914–1918’, *War in History*, vol. 20, no. 1 (2013) pp. 76–98, p. 78.
- 98 Madigan, ‘“Sticking to a Hateful Task”’, p. 88.
- 99 The use of the ‘Rape of Belgium’ as a means of ensuring support for the Allied war effort went beyond the borders of Britain and Europe. For example, see Judith Smart, ‘“Poor Little Belgium” and Australian Popular Support for War, 1914’, *War and Society*, vol. 12 (1994) pp. 23–42.
- 100 Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History—Lost and Found* (Budapest and London: Central European University Press, 2011) p. 74. See Chapter 2 for a discussion about the nationalisation of honour.
- 101 The relationship between masculinity and violence is discussed in much greater detail in Chapter 6.
- 102 Ute Frevert, ‘Wartime Emotions: Honour, Shame, and the Ecstasy of Sacrifi 1914–1918 Online. *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, Last Updated 8 October 2014: http://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/wartime_emotions_honour_shame_and_the_ecstasy_of_sacrifi accessed 21 May 2017. For an extended discussion of honour, also see Frevert, *Emotions in History*.

- 103 For a general and comprehensive guide to women's involvement in and reactions to World War One, see Susan Grayzel, *Women and the First World War* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013).
- 104 Grayzel, *Women and the First World War*, p. 36.
- 105 Grayzel also notes that even in far-off, Australia, women who wanted to serve in the military established the Australian Women's Service Corps. By January 1917, this group had 700 members who practised marching and drilling. Grayzel, *Women and the First World War*, p. 54.
- 106 Laura Müller-Pinzler, Lena Rademacher, Frieder M. Paulus and Sören Krach, 'When Your Friends Make You Cringe: Social Closeness Modulates Vicarious Embarrassment-Related Neural Activity', *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, vol. 11, no. 3 (2016) pp. 466–475, p. 467.
- 107 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 82, August 1915, p. 59.
- 108 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 99, January 1917, p. 4.
- 109 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 75, January 1915, p. 4.
- 110 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 75, January 1915, p. 4.
- 111 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 77, March 1915, pp. 20–21.
- 112 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 77, March 1915, pp. 20–21.
- 113 In 1915, the Review reported that 'the more blatant extravaganza in the service of the "cause" comes out in the offer of a notorious Suffragist lady to raise a battalion of fighting women, and in the organisation for the "drilling" of women by a woman'. See *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 77, March 1915, p. 21.
- 114 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 77, March 1915, p. 22.
- 115 Edith Cavell's execution is discussed in Chapter 6.
- 116 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 77, March 1915, p. 21.
- 117 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 77, March 1915, p. 21.
- 118 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 110, December 1917, p. 98.
- 119 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 110, December 1917, p. 98.
- 120 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 111, January 1918, pp. 7–8.
- 121 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 111, January 1918, pp. 4–5.
- 122 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 111, January 1918, pp. 4–5.
- 123 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 111, January 1918, pp. 4–5.
- 124 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 111, January 1918, pp. 4–5.
- 125 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 111, January 1918, pp. 4–5.
- 126 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 3, no. 20, 3 October 1914, p. 153.
- 127 This debate was exemplified by an exchange taking place in the paper in 1915 between two well-known correspondents: Lilian Suffern and M. E. Duggan. Suffern argued that when 'reason and persuasion' did not work. Physical force via the destruction of property would get male politicians to sit up and listen. Duggan, on the other hand, asserted that militancy was a betrayal of the female emotional community—'a betrayal of that very instinct of motherhood' that militants claimed they cared about. Property destruction was an apt political tool for women. See *Irish Citizen*, vol. 3, no. 31, 19 December 1914, p. 243, and *Irish Citizen*, vol. 3, no. 35, 9 January 1915, p. 267.
- 128 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 3, no. 17, 12 September 1914, p. 132.
- 129 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 3, no. 17, 12 September 1914, p. 132.
- 130 For more on Na Fianna Éireann, see Marnie Hay, 'An Irish Nationalist Adolescence: Na Fianna Éireann, 1909–23', in Catherine Cox and Susannah Riordan, eds., *Adolescence in Modern Irish History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015) pp. 103–128.
- 131 For more on Markievicz, see, among others, Sinéad McCool, *No Ordinary Woman: Irish Female Activists in the Revolutionary Years* (Dublin: The O'Brien Press, 2003), pp. 185–6; Ann Matthews, *Renegades: Irish Republican Women*

- 1900–1922 (Cork: Mercier Press, 2010); Karen Steele, ‘Constance Markievicz and the Politics of Memory’, in Louise Ryan and Margaret Ward, eds., *Irish Women and Nationalism: Soldiers, New Women and Wicked Hags* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2004), pp. 62–79.
- 132 *Bean na hEireann*, vol. 1, no. 9, July 1909, p. 8.
- 133 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 23, 23 October 1915, p. 137.
- 134 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 23, 23 October 1915, p. 137.
- 135 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 25, 6 November 1915, p. 150.
- 136 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 23, 23 October 1915, p. 137.
- 137 *Bean na hEireann*, vol. 1, no. 13, November 1909, pp. 5–6.
- 138 The Irish Rebellion of 1798 was staged by the Society of United Irishmen (established 1791) which was inspired by the Enlightenment ideals of the American and French revolutions. The Society advocated parliamentary reform and the elimination of British rule in Ireland.
- 139 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 25, 6 November 1915, p. 150.
- 140 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 25, 6 November 1915, p. 150.
- 141 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 23, 23 October 1915, p. 137.
- 142 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 23, 23 October 1915, p. 137.
- 143 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 23, 23 October 1915, p. 137.
- 144 During the Rising, she was positioned in St Stephen’s Green, Dublin.
- 145 *Irish Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 40, October 1916, p. 230.
- 146 For example, journalists have more recently labelled her a woman of beauty but no substance, ‘a snob, fraud, show-off, and murderer’ who dangerously ‘brainwashed’ children into believing that they should kill and die for their country. See Nicola Tallant, ‘She was a Snob, Fraud, Show-Off, and Murderer’, *Irish Independent*, 29 October 2006, and Kevin Myers, ‘FF Celebratory Plans for the Easter Rising a Load of Claptrap’, *Irish Independent*, 20 April 2011.
- 147 Sean O’Casey, ‘Drums Under the Window’ in *Autobiographies 1* (London: Papermac, 1963), pp. 596–597, quoted in Matthews, *Renegades*, pp. 73–76. There were other examples of male commentators noting Markievicz’s courage. For example, in his 1919 book, *The Irish Republic*, Charles Newton Wheeler declared that she was a revolutionary who was courageous, impulsive and reckless; a soldier who, if ‘all tales be true’, kissed her gun before surrendering to the British. Likewise, Richard Michael Fox, who claimed Markievicz as a personal acquaintance, extolled the Countess’s courage and passion. Her inspiration was actual as well as spiritual, he wrote. See Charles Newton Wheeler, *The Irish Republic: An Analytical History of Ireland, 1914–1918, with Particular Reference to the Easter Insurrection (1916) and the German “plots.” Also a Sketch of De Valera’s Life by Harry J. Boland, his Private Secretary: A Close-Up View of Countess Markievicz, and a Defense of Ulster by Ulstermen* (Chicago: Cahill-Igoe Company, 1919) pp. 243–246: <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=loc.ark:/13960/t3514hr60;view=1up;seq=9>, accessed 21 October 2015, and Richard Michael Fox, *Rebel Irishwomen* (Dublin: Progress House, 1967 [1935]), p. 18.
- 148 For a more nuanced discussion of the differences between nationalist feminist and feminist nationalist in the Irish context, see Chapter 2.
- 149 *Anti-Suffrage Review*, no. 9, August 1909, pp. 1–2.