

**“No Time for Receptions till the Vote is Won”? Suffrage Activists and Leisure in  
Edwardian Britain  
Joyce Kay  
University of Stirling**

When Marion Wallace-Dunlop, the first suffragette hunger striker, penned her biography for inclusion in *The Suffrage Annual and Women's Who's Who* (SAWWW) [1], she described herself as an “exhibitor” of art, listed two books she had illustrated and referred to her membership of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), the Fabian Society and two London clubs. Personal details included her place of birth and current address together with seven lines describing her suffrage activities. But under the heading of recreations she wrote the words that prompted the title of this article: “No time for them – till the vote is won.” She was not alone in pointedly referring to a lack of other interests: Sylvia Pankhurst also noted in her biographical entry that she “has no time for any.” These statements would seem to reinforce the commonly held view of active female suffragists as “a dedicated body of ... earnest workers” [2] and of many educated Edwardian women as “serious (sometimes too serious).” [3] Using information largely obtained from those sections of the SAWWW biographies covering recreations and club membership, this paper will suggest that the conventional portrait of the single-minded, worthy suffrage supporter has been exaggerated and that many who considered themselves to be suffrage enthusiasts nevertheless retained a life outside the movement.

The most prominent activists are not necessarily representative of any campaign and one of the inevitable distortions of research into women's suffrage has been the emphasis on the leaders and personalities of the major societies. This is understandable as they were the speechmakers, the headline grabbers and, perhaps most significantly, the women who left memoirs or some record of their lives. Their words and deeds have been painstakingly examined and, like the women mentioned already, their devotion to the cause has suggested

little time for or interest in recreational activities. The unique and extraordinary Emmeline Pankhurst and her equally exceptional daughter, Christabel, make no reference to them in their SAWWW entries although the latter was said to have “an easy grace cultivated by her enthusiastic practice of the dance” [4] and she and her sisters had at one time been members of the Clarion Cycling Club. Emmeline, however, may never have enjoyed active pastimes. According to Christabel, “her young days were not those of games and much exercise.” [5]

The same, however, cannot be assumed of her followers or those who joined other suffrage societies. June Purvis has noted that WSPU organisers relied on a large network of less politically active women while Sandra Stanley Holton, considering the notion of the “average woman”, suggested that very few individuals actually relinquished a major part of their lives to the campaign. [6] Their political activity was not divorced from their ordinary existence but was simply fitted in alongside domestic responsibilities; their involvement in the fight for the franchise did not necessarily lead to their withdrawal from neighbourhood and community or from recreational pursuits. Although such a statement may be inaccurate when applied to the indomitable Pankhursts, their generals and front-line troops, it may have resonated with countless rank-and-file suffrage workers throughout Britain. These are the very women about whom so little is known, even after the ground-breaking reference work of Elizabeth Crawford. Piecing together the jigsaw of the past is never easy since many lives, “whether quiet or busy, were not such as to gain a place for them in the Dictionary of National Biography or any other hall of fame.” [7] Yet, according to one suffrage historian, it is hard to appreciate the composition and strength of the movement without knowing more about the individuals who were its mainstay. [8] The ways in which they occupied their spare hours may help in building a picture of those who dedicated some part of their lives, great or small, to the suffrage cause.

*The Suffrage Annual and Women's Who's Who*, published in 1913, is one of the few sources of information on the leisure interests of individual suffragists. The early sections provide

details of over 40 national and local societies, key dates in the suffrage campaign and a list of votes cast by members of parliament for and against the various Edwardian franchise bills. The *Who's Who* contains biographical entries on nearly 700 women and 70 men with suffrage connections, and all the major suffrage societies are represented: 37% of women belonged to the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), 25% to the WSPU, 12% to the Women's Freedom League (WFL) and the remainder to a variety of other associations, the most popular of which were the Church League for Women's Suffrage and the Conservative and Unionist Women's Franchise Association. Many, but not all, of the biographies follow a format that includes age, address, family background, education, marital status and occupation, together with highlights of individual suffrage careers such as prison terms served, participation in marches and election campaigns, speeches delivered, meetings organised and publications written. It has been labelled "useful and informative", and has been employed extensively to flesh out the lives of suffrage activists and the organisations to which they belonged. [9] It is often cited in key texts on the suffrage movement and has been the subject of an entire article purporting to offer an analysis of the biographies. [10]

This, however, should not blind researchers to its undoubted flaws. To begin with, its respondents are not necessarily the most active and prominent members of the suffrage campaign as Park - and the volume's editor - would have us believe. [11] Many are relatively unknown - of 692 women listed in the SAWWW, only 136 warranted an entry in Crawford - and although numerous important figures are included, there are notable absentees, amongst them Janie Allan, Maud Arncliffe-Sennett, Ada Chew, Selina Cooper, Eva Gore-Booth, Jessie Kenney, Mary Richardson and Grace Roe. In their place are biographies of women such as Mrs Mary Boden of Derby who admitted to "general work and sympathy" for the suffrage movement but whose contribution to public life was largely focused on the National British Women's Temperance Federation; Miss Lettice MacMunn of the Hastings and St Leonard's Women's Suffrage Propaganda League who worked for suffrage "on purely educational lines"; and Miss Christina Campbell, a member of the WSPU who felt it

necessary to state that her suffrage work “has been almost entirely of a secretarial nature.” One reason for the unexpected omissions may be that many entries arrived too late for inclusion, apparently, according to the editor, because of difficulties in contacting potential biographers. This may account for the fact that only 765, not the intended 1,000 entries, were published. It is also possible that some supporters of the cause chose to remain anonymous; even those who did contribute could be guarded about supplying personal information such as home address or date of birth. [12] Nevertheless, although the absence of well-known campaigners could be considered a drawback in an anthology of suffragism’s leading lights, it might be seen as a positive advantage in any analysis of the ‘ordinary’ suffragist.

A survey of the SAWWW should also bear in mind that it was a commercial venture supported by advertisements, notably from Selfridge and Co., the Oxford Street department store which supplied the front cover and a series of advertising slogans on each page of the volume. [13] It was launched probably in mid-1913 following the appearance of a suffrage novel by the same publisher: *The Poodle Woman* was meant to be the first of a series but it was not well received, causing the project to be shelved.[14] A second edition of the SAWWW and an enlarged 1914 production were also promised but failed to appear, not because war intervened, as Park suggests, but as a result of the publisher’s misjudgement of sales potential for books on suffrage.[15] A review of *The Poodle Woman*, though finding it “insufficiently stimulating”, had commended its appearance: “time was when commercial success was incompatible with suffrage propaganda”. [16] In all likelihood it remained so, not helped by the unfortunate publication date during the first six months of the WSPU arson campaign. Any market that may have existed probably went up in smoke along with the pillar boxes, public buildings and private homes set alight in 1913 and renewed sponsorship for the SAWWW may have proved impossible in this climate. For whatever reason, the ‘annual’ remained a one-off.

The entries themselves also present certain difficulties for historians. No attempt was made by the editor to restrict space: the length of biographies therefore varies from two lines to an

entire page, and the content from modesty to self-aggrandisement. The foreword also states that “no biography, worthy of admission, has been omitted” but this policy has certain disadvantages. Firstly, personal composition reflects views, emphasis and experience through the eyes of the writer. The result is a subjective portrait, coloured by use of language and the author’s sense of self. [16] While this provides fascinating insights into the way individuals perceived themselves and their attachment to the suffrage movement, it has resulted in an uneven presentation of material. Some contributions include personal details such as date of marriage, number of children, educational achievements and recreations; many concentrate almost exclusively on suffrage involvement with imprisonment, demonstrations and speeches to the fore – a tendency particularly noticeable with the more militant WSPU members. Others say little about suffrage and instead seem keen to make an impression on the reader, appearing to seize the Edwardian equivalent of Warhol’s ‘fifteen minutes of fame’. Lady Dorothea Gibb, for example, wrote that she was stoned “for being the fourth woman in York to ride a safety bicycle” and declared that “all the world was shocked” when she allowed her daughter to ride astride a saddle but she disclosed nothing of her suffrage life except her membership of the NUWSS. Mrs Jacobina Cursiter was proud to reveal that she was among the first to attend lectures given to women at Glasgow University but, although she was Honorary Secretary of the Orcadian Women’s Suffrage Society, she made no other mention of suffrage work. The entry for ‘Lady Stout’ (no first name supplied), President of the Australian and New Zealand Women Voters’ Committee in London announced that she “is one of the most popular women in the Empire”, and must surely have been written by the editor. Similar examples of this type suggest that ‘A.J.R.’, short of genuine self-penned biographies, composed some him/herself from readily available sources.

A self-selected sample of individuals is also unlikely to be representative of suffrage societies, their regional strength or the age, class and marital status of activists, a defect which somewhat undermines the volume as a basis for studying the social composition of the movement. On close examination it becomes clear that whole families living at the same

address have been included, regardless of their suffrage pedigree. Over 100 near relations, roughly 15% of the entrants, have submitted information: there are 18 sets of sisters, 17 mother/daughter examples and 15 husband/wife partnerships, a fact that tends to distort the significance of certain local suffrage branches. Several small towns such as Falmouth, Cornwall and Keswick, Cumberland seem to have a disproportionate number of suffrage supporters: it is as if the entire committee has signed up for the *Who's Who*. The Falmouth branch of the NUWSS boasts eight representatives including three members of the Fox family and a further three from the Stephens household. Between them they account for the Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer, a committee member and three Vice-Presidents!

This study, however, is not overly concerned with the balance between suffrage societies, their regional distribution or the manner in which women portrayed their suffrage careers. The wholesale and uncritical acceptance of biographies by the editor and the flaws noted above are unlikely to invalidate the SAWWW as a source of information about female leisure. There seems to be little reason why suffragists should exaggerate or falsify their personal interests or membership of a club and the volume therefore remains a unique snapshot of the leisure activities of several hundred Edwardian women, from battle-hardened activists to mere supporters all of whom, in some way, espoused the suffrage cause.

\* \* \* \* \*

Women's recreations have seldom featured in social histories of the Victorian and Edwardian eras. Perhaps it was right and proper in the early development of women's history that leisure should have been overlooked in favour of topics crucial to female advancement in the public sphere: politics, law, education, paid employment and philanthropy. The importance of domestic life, encompassing family relationships, marriage, motherhood and household management, has also been the subject of extensive and necessary research but this large and

ever-growing body of historical evidence on women's lives has largely ignored recreation. [18] Social historians seem to have regarded female leisure as an oxymoron. The topic has been addressed more commonly by sports historians who have often viewed female participation in sport as part of the general movement towards emancipation. [19] However, until recently there has been more emphasis on aspects such as the development of physical recreation in schools and colleges and the problems of feminine attire in sport than on the significance of sporting activities for adult women [20] enabling one sports historian to assert that, even in 1914, sport was still "essentially a male phenomenon." [21]

It is therefore surprising to note its importance and that of physical exercise in the pages of the *Suffrage Annual*. Table 1 shows that 314 profiles list recreations and, of these, 178 (56%) include a sporting activity. According to these biographies, cycling is more popular than needlework, golf more favoured than painting and swimming preferred to photography. Nearly 100 women mention *only* outdoor exercise. Of these one-third took part in field sports (hunting, shooting, fishing), horse-riding and golf, activities that were largely restricted to the comfortably-off middle classes.[22] Golf, in particular, had become a popular game for Edwardian women and figures compiled for 1911 suggest that around 50,000 had joined golf clubs. [23] WSPU members Charlotte Marsh, Vera Wentworth and Emily Marshall were all golfers and staunch activists who had served prison terms. It is unfortunate that there is no record of their views or those of other suffragist golfers on golf course attacks during the militant campaign of 1913-14 as it seems unlikely that they could have condoned such tactics. The editor of *Woman's Golf* in the weekly magazine *Golf Illustrated* certainly had no hesitation in stating that "if golf and conscientious convictions were at war in the breast of the most ardent Suffragette, we feel that golfing instinct would somehow come before political hysteria." [24]

Hunting, once the prerogative of the aristocracy, now boasted "as many women as men in the field" [25] and *The Gentlewoman*, a 'quality' weekly, ran a regular column on hunting

throughout the season. [26] John Lowerson noted that one of the most important contributions to the sport's popularity came from the pens of two Irish women who wrote novels under the joint names of "Somerville and Ross." [27] They were in reality Violet Martin, a member of the Conservative and Unionist Women's Suffrage Association (CUWFA) and her cousin Edith Somerville, Master of the West Carbery Foxhounds. Both were contributors to the SAWWW and also mentioned music amongst their interests. Shooting was another sport increasingly open to women. Miss Mary Bridson, Honorary Secretary of the NUWSS in Bolton, stated that she had written magazine articles on big game shooting and the enquiries page of *The Gentlewoman* in March 1913 contains the response, "Oh yes, many ladies are experts with the rifle. Consult the Secretary of the Byfleet Ladies Rifle Club." In the face of these more challenging pastimes, the gentle amusements of croquet and archery, once favoured by Victorian ladies, faded away, scarcely featuring amongst this cohort of Edwardians who seemed to prefer the thrill of the chase and the skills of gun and rod. [28]

Nearly 40% of the entire sample took their exercise in the form of walking or cycling, a pastime that became extremely popular for both men and women in the late nineteenth century and whose social impact is difficult to exaggerate. "The New Woman, pedalling her way to freedom" came to epitomise changing times.[29] Miss Mary Trott of the WFL, an assistant schoolmistress from Cheshire, listed swimming, music and all outdoor pursuits as her recreations but laid particular emphasis on cycling, her record for 1912 being 130 miles. Bicycles were particularly useful to suffrage campaigners – the town of Newbury was said to have a "bicycling corps" of women who would ride to outlying villages and canvass support. [30] According to one historian, the bicycle not only became an instrument of radical propaganda, especially in the hands of the Clarion Cycling Clubs, but a weapon in the campaign against the male golfing establishment 'with bicycle-borne suffragettes causing unpleasant things to happen between tee and green.' [31]



According to the SAWWW, favourite indoor pursuits were still the traditional female interests of reading, music, needlework and painting while the most frequent non-sporting outdoor occupations included travelling, photography, driving and gardening. Motoring had become an increasingly accepted pastime for women in the period up to 1914 and *The Gentlewoman* ran a regular feature on 'Woman and her Car': "One constantly sees women driving, even through West-end traffic and doing it as skilfully as men, and sometimes more so." [32] Mary Bridson stated her recreations as driving and managing her motor car, while Miss Edith Stoney who had published papers on mathematical physics and subscribed to the funds of the CUWFA, included cleaning her car as well as driving it! Miss Helga Gill, a young Norwegian member of the NUWSS, not only skied and drove but held a certificate of the Motor Drivers' Union while Mrs Mary Cope whose suffrage credentials included committee work, speaking and marching in processions, listed half-a-dozen interests including riding, tennis, golf, and driving. She was also the only woman in this sample to reveal an interest in cricket. (It is unclear if she played or merely watched.)

Owning and running a car implies surplus income – Park thought that it “definitely indicated substantial wealth” [33] - but gardening was a hobby that could be enjoyed by suffragists from many walks of life. Lady Meyer, Vice-President of the National Political Reform League, had “taken prizes for carnation-growing” and a new variety had been named after her. Teresa Billington-Greig, formerly of the WSPU and a founder of the WFL, referred to herself by 1913 as a “freelance feminist” and listed gardening as an interest. Evelyn Burkitt, an organiser in the WSPU, had been one of the first suffragettes to be forcibly fed, and was charged with attempting to set fire to a grandstand at a Leeds football ground in November 1913; she also mentions gardening as a favourite recreation.

Overall, nearly 100 separate pastimes are featured at least once. Although many are predictable (singing, dancing, the theatre) others are adventurous (rock climbing, snow-shoeing and sea angling), practical (poultry farming, cabinet making and dog or cat breeding),

or intellectual (geology, architecture and languages). Not all respondents, however, are examples of 'new woman.' At the most mundane level, housekeeping and letter writing are mentioned while four women cite conversation, three specify jigsaws, crosswords and playing patience, two count lace making and one, surely in jest, considers attending committees as a recreation. There are also some unexpectedly docile comments for a volume that claims to include the most active members of the suffrage movement. A quiet home life, resting, trying to entertain others and looking after family hardly suggest political activism of the type usually associated with the suffragettes. Yet, bewilderingly, the women who make these statements juxtapose them with comments such as "is a forceful speaker of the women's cause" and list "all women's movements" amongst their recreations.

Even well-known suffrage figures mention leisure pursuits in their pen portraits. Millicent Fawcett, president of the NUWSS, includes walking, riding and skating, although she concedes that the latter two were in her younger days. Emily Wilding Davison of the WSPU, martyred only a few months later at the Epsom Derby, details eight instances of imprisonment but still finds space to add swimming, cycling and studying. Her biography confirms that she had been "an ardent cyclist and swimmer" as a teenager, winning a gold medal at a swimming championship at Chelsea Baths. [34] Una Duval, who had famously refused to allow the word 'obey' in her wedding vows and wrote a pamphlet entitled "Love and Honour, but not Obey" mentions singing as her hobby. Annie Kenney, one of the most significant figures in the WSPU, cites reading and studying social conditions. Rose (Elsie) Howey, who had dressed as Joan of Arc in suffrage processions, nominated riding, driving and hockey as her favourite pastimes. Charlotte Marsh, the WSPU organiser for Nottingham, mentions hockey in a different context as well as golf and swimming. In a reference to her window-smashing exploits, she admitted to walking "down the Strand as if I was playing hockey." [35] Alice Low, organising secretary of the Edinburgh branch of the NUWSS was even more proficient with a hockey stick, having represented Scotland in an international match against England in 1903. Ten years later, her SAWWW entry includes cycling, acting, theatre-going and music.

Two biographies are particularly interesting, not only for what they reveal in 1913 but because of the subsequent histories of their authors. Teresa Billington-Greig cites walking and gardening as her recreations but she had other sporting interests. Her husband was the manager of a firm that made billiard tables and in the 1920s she founded the Women's Billiards Association, becoming its honorary director in 1934. She was also the honorary secretary of the Sports Fellowship whose aim was to interest under privileged girls in athletics. [36] Rose Lamartine Yates, secretary and treasurer of the Wimbledon WSPU, began her *Who's Who* entry with the statement that she is the only woman councillor out of 68 elected to the Council of the Cyclists Touring Club (CTC), an organisation with which she had been associated for many years. She had met her future husband in the CTC and since her marriage, they had cycled extensively in Europe. After her election to London County Council in 1918, she was instrumental in the establishment of Britain's first cycle lane, in Merton. [37]

Although the SAWWW contains information about the recreations of a large number of suffrage women, occasional references to leisure activities can be found in other feminist sources. Mary Blathwayt, an ardent follower whose family set up a rest home for suffragettes near Bath, led the sheltered life of an upper-middle class daughter in her parents' house until she joined the WSPU in 1906, eventually resigning to join the non-militant NUWSS in 1913. She enjoyed music, gardening and cycling, and was said to be very fond of swimming and "enthusiastic for the village rifle club." [38] Liliias Mitchell, one of two suffragettes who replaced the flags on the private royal golf course at Balmoral in 1912 with a set in the purple, white and green suffrage colours, and later attacked prime minister Asquith on the links at Dornoch, listed numerous pastimes in her unpublished memoir. These included reading, the violin and music clubs, dancing and hockey. [39] Her entry in SAWWW, however, omits any recreations, recording only the prison terms she served for the cause. Even in prison, however, suffrage women found ways to while away the time more pleasantly. WFL member

Sarah Bennett, a woman in her sixties, “caused considerable amusement in the Home Office by having the temerity, at her age, to request that gymnastic appliances, such as skipping ropes and balls, should be made available in Holloway in order that the suffragette prisoners might keep fit.” [40] Charlotte Marsh, serving a six-month term of imprisonment at Aylesbury in 1912, was instrumental in organising a sports day, including a potato race, for female prisoners. [41]

So little attention has been paid to the recreational activities of Edwardian women that it is difficult to estimate whether the pursuits of the suffragists are typical or not. Publications such as *The Gentlewoman*, *Womanhood*, *Golf Illustrated*, *Badminton Magazine* and *The Sportswoman’s Library* certainly suggest that some of the more physical recreations were increasingly popular. [42] The occasional features in *The Gentlewoman* on poultry keeping, dog showing and horse breeding seem to indicate that these were also acceptable hobbies. Only eight contributors to the SAWWW mention these activities but a description of the women’s march from Edinburgh to London in 1912 shows that others could have been involved in similar undertakings. Mrs Florence de Fonblanque, sister of Maud Arncliffe-Sennett and the organiser of the march, employed one of her favourite mares, Butterfly, to pull the light van that accompanied the marchers. Bred and broken in by her, the horse completed the journey as far as Finchley but was then sent home in order to avoid the crowded London streets.[43] Her owner only mentioned hunting as a recreation but it seems entirely possible that other women who engaged in ‘horsey’ pursuits might also have bred animals.

The recreations of the 314 women in the survey are both eclectic and surprising and it would seem that suffrage women were fairly typical of the period in undertaking a wide range of hobbies, particularly physical exercise. Although the most strenuous pastimes such as rowing and mountaineering were largely restricted to women aged under 35, many other activities – tennis, golf, swimming, cycling - were continued into middle age, as they would often be in

present day society. Unfortunately a lack of evidence may prevent historians from ever knowing the extent to which such ordinary recreations were jettisoned by suffrage activists at the height of their involvement in the movement. It cannot be assumed, however, that every spare moment was devoted to suffrage work or that mere supporters denied themselves everyday pleasures. These, in turn, were not confined to the amusements mentioned above.

\* \* \* \* \*

The late Victorian and Edwardian era provided other recreational outlets for increasingly independent women in the shape of department stores and ladies' clubs. By 1900 there were over 200 stores throughout the country [44] from Frasers in Glasgow and Jenners in Edinburgh to Harrods, Debenhams and Selfridges in London. They not only offered shopping facilities where customers could browse and select goods in a safe, pleasant and socially acceptable environment: their restaurants, cloakrooms and retiring rooms positively encouraged a whole day's shopping. Lengthy opening hours – sometimes 8.15am to 7.30pm in London – facilitated a day trip to the city for out-of-towners; friends could meet for lunch and linger for afternoon tea, advertised at Selfridges as “a home away from home.” [45] Gordon Selfridge claimed to have helped emancipate women by building a “private place in public”, “a rest cure” from the hurly burly of the city. [46] Within the store were a silence room, library, and reading and writing rooms where visitors could deal with correspondence or leaf through papers and magazines as though relaxing at a private club. This was the image that a store such as Selfridges chose to convey in its advertisements: “the Modern Woman's Club-store” and “a Club and Rendezvous as well as a Store” were only two that emphasised the friendly, sociable atmosphere of the establishment.[47] The final society seal of approval was obtained in March 1914 when titled ladies agreed to serve behind the counters for a day, the proceeds destined for training schools for mothers in Poplar and Stepney.[48]

Although Selfridge marketed his store as a source of entertainment, and shopping as “a delightful and respectable middle-class female pastime” [49], the Edwardian woman, unlike her twenty-first century counterpart, would not have listed shopping as a recreational activity. Membership of a club, however, was worth acknowledging and many contributors to the SAWWW did so. Ladies’ clubs of various types had made their appearance in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, not only in London but in many British towns and cities. Edinburgh boasted a Queen’s Club and a Ladies’ Caledonian; Glasgow offered the Kelvin Club and the Literary Club as well as the Society of Lady Artists’ Club which prided itself, perhaps incorrectly, on being the oldest (1882) women’s residential club in Britain. [50] Liverpool Ladies’ club was matched by similar institutions in the large urban centres of Manchester, Bristol, and Leeds, and also in smaller towns such as Bath, Brighton, Cork and Inverness. These, in addition to at least 35 London establishments, have been heralded as an offshoot of “the enormous growth of associational culture” in late Victorian Britain [51], as a means of allowing women “to enter the masculine world of the city” [52] and as a focus for “independent working women who lacked social contacts.” [53] Whatever their rationale, they assembled under one roof those with shared interests (for example, the Suffrage Club), backgrounds (the University Club for Ladies) and views (the Imperial club for Conservative and Unionist women). Many modelled themselves on London male clubs with dining, smoking and drawing rooms, as well as libraries and silence areas. Some offered an address in the capital for those from ‘the provinces’ together with bedrooms whose comfort equalled that of a first-class hotel. They also provided somewhere to entertain and socialise respectably in the public domain, somewhere to change before an evening out and somewhere to conduct business – whether interviewing domestic servants or meeting literary editors.

As department stores promoted shopping as a form of entertainment to while away daytime hours, so many clubs offered a range of leisure activities in the evening. Lectures and debates, concerts and formal dinners were organised, particularly in those that catered for the modern, ‘professional’ woman. The Pioneer was founded in London in 1892 as “a home for women of

advanced views” [54] and held a weekly club dinner followed by a debate; the Sesame (1895) organised a literary and educational programme; the Glasgow Lady Artists, formed by ex-students of the College of Art, not only hosted concerts but exhibitions of members’ work. This use of the club for marketing purposes as well as leisure or private business was exemplified by the Lyceum, established in London’s West End in 1904 as a breakaway from the Writers’ Club and subsequently replicated in several European cities. [55] It offered the usual range of dining facilities, evening concerts and a library, but also allocated space for a book gallery selling members’ publications and an art gallery to display their work. Furthermore, it aimed to provide “a substantial milieu where [women] could meet editors and other employers and discuss matters as men did in professional clubs, in surroundings that did not suggest poverty.” [56] This was undoubtedly a sideswipe at a number of smaller clubs that offered little more than genteel respectability in straitened circumstances. Like the spartan female college decried by Virginia Woolf some twenty years later, their situation was such that “not a penny could be spared for ‘amenities’; for partridges and wine, books and cigars, libraries and leisure.” [57].

This was not the case for the elite group of ladies clubs. A clubman writing in 1907 noted that “many owned fine establishments, supported by large constituencies and commanding substantial revenues.” [58] One of the most fashionable and palatial was the Empress with over 2000 members: only three SAWWW contributors – Lady Treacher, Viscountess Dillon and Mrs Boden – enjoyed its privileges. Major Griffiths went on to observe that “good living is not by any means despised or unattainable in ladies’ clubs, and their cellars are said to be as well supplied and as largely patronized as those of any clubs in London.” One was reputed to have some of the best champagne imported “and of having done full justice to it.” [59] However, he appeared to draw a distinction between the more traditional social club, serving ladies of wealth and leisure, and the newer breed catering for “ladies who labour at intellectual pursuits and are constantly engaged in earning their own livelihood in the various walks now happily open to them.” [60] To this group he attributed the recent growth of

women's clubs; the key to their success was the respectability they conferred on newly independent women.

Such respectability frequently came at a price. Although a club offered opportunities to entertain friends or business colleagues, it could not always be done cheaply: luncheon in particular was said to be more expensive than at equivalent male institutions. [61] According to Griffiths, the reason for higher charges at women's clubs was the requirement to make a profit when income was generally less than in male establishments and finance was dependent on the number of subscriptions rather than their size. [62] At fifteen guineas, however, the annual fee for a club such as the Empress was comparable with the fashionable Carlton club for men. This not only allowed it to employ one of the best orchestras in London [63] but also to offer a lower rate to country members – Irish and Scots women paid as little as five guineas. Even this amount was substantially greater than the subscription for a club such as the Pioneer (two guineas) or the popular International Women's Franchise (IWF) which charged only one guinea, or as little as half a guinea for Irish, Scots or overseas members. Another method of defraying costs was to admit men at a higher rate, a solution obviously unacceptable to the many clubs that chose a women-only existence.

Club membership was often restricted quantitatively or qualitatively as well as by ability to pay. The Writers' Club (1892) and the University Club for Ladies (1887) were each limited to 300 members. The Lyceum was only open to women who had published an original work on literature, journalism, science or music, those with university qualifications or, somewhat lamely for a forward-thinking organisation, the wives and daughters of "distinguished men." [64] Its membership was said to read like a Who's Who of women's writing and the arts [65] Some clubs refused to admit men even as visitors. Some, including the Pioneer, forbade alcohol; others, such as the Park, banned smoking or playing cards for money. The Glasgow Society of Lady Artists, perhaps mindful of the nation's Calvinist doctrines, outlawed all such vices ... and men as well. Several had a particular clientele in mind - the Athenaeum (1913)



was founded for women interested in politics, art, literature or music; the Sesame, open to both sexes, offered lower subscription rates to professional women, hoping to attract teachers. Further down the social scale the Enterprise club (1889) catered for lower middle-class female workers such as clerks and junior grade civil servants. It supplied very different fare from the elite West End clubs, providing French conversation or woodcarving classes as well as opportunities to play hockey or chess. [66] At the Mayfair Working Girls' Club, founded by 'philanthropic ladies' for the benefit of tailors, costume makers and factory hands, "gratis evening performances are given by lady amateurs, especially on Saturdays to keep them from 'the low music-halls.'" [67] It is no surprise to discover that none of the SAWWW entrants belonged to the latter establishments.

Both early and late twentieth-century male writers agreed that the burgeoning of ladies' clubs was the result of female emancipation and an increase in the employment of middle-class women. Rubinstein also suggests that they were assisted by a rise in the number of those with their own disposable wealth. [68] Alice Zimmern, whose biography appeared in SAWWW, thought the arrival of ladies' clubs was a sign of the times and "a significant feature of a changing age." [69] Philippa Levine, writing almost a century later, saw them as "a valuable escape route" and an alternative social environment to the home. [70] From the suffrage perspective, Crawford portrayed them as "fertile seed beds" for nurturing the campaign and useful meeting places for tea and talk after processions and demonstrations. [71] Other feminists, however, have been less positive about the women's club movement. It has been argued that, far from opening up the public sphere, the advent of female clubs simply herded women into private enclaves within it. [72] They have also been depicted as snobbish, clique-ridden and unfriendly, criticisms that could surely be levelled at equivalent male establishments or at a great many societies in any period. [73]

A further difficulty in analysing the women's club is the paucity of evidence. Few records exist, resulting in an over-dependence on journal articles published in the 1890s when their novelty

was worth reporting. [74] There is scant information on changes or developments that may have taken place in the Edwardian period as the second generation of clubwomen entered their portals and it seems likely that the original clubs failed to move with the times. In 1882 a founder member of the Glasgow Society of Lady Artists thought that “we were looked upon as just a little fast! The same as when girls started cycling ...” [75] In 1908 it was faced with a proposal to change its name to the more feminist ‘Women Artists’ but although there was said to be an overwhelming majority in favour, the Victorian name was retained in deference to the views of three pioneer members. [76] Speakers around this time included Lady Asquith, whose husband was instrumental in thwarting all attempts to extend the franchise, and Mrs Humphrey Ward, one of the leading anti-suffragists. Although it had extended its constituency by opening its doors to lay members in 1892, it seems safe to say that this club was no longer at the forefront of emancipation. The Pioneer, too, appears to have lost its reputation for feminism. The death of the founder in 1897 led to the formation of a breakaway club: by 1909 men, once restricted to the position of guests, were entitled to claim full membership though this may have been to improve a precarious financial position rather than to dilute an all-female ambience. Conservatism may therefore have been the driving force in the establishment of so many new clubs in the early twentieth century. The Lyceum, Emerson, IWF, Athenaeum and New Century were all founded between 1904 and 1911 and it is to these institutions that over half the SAWWW sample belonged.

It is not possible to say why some individuals joined a club while others refrained but of the 692 entrants in SAWWW, 250 (36%) were members of 42 separate institutions. Furthermore, nearly half of these were women who failed to list any recreations. By adding the two groups together, ‘recreationalists’ and ‘clubbers’ accounted for 63% of the total, implying that almost two-thirds of suffrage activists had an interest in or an opportunity to sample hobbies and organised entertainments, often beyond the home. Although the majority belonged to only one club, roughly 25% held membership of two, three or even four. In these cases the women usually cited either a London and a provincial club, or one of the two London suffrage clubs

plus another ladies' establishment in the capital. Twenty-four of these were mentioned but only five attracted a significant number of suffrage members.

Even the most cursory glance at the biographies indicates that the majority of their authors lived in London and south-east England. Although reduced subscriptions were often available for women from more distant parts of Britain, suffrage activists on the whole do not appear to have taken advantage of this right. A half-price 'country membership' failed to attract more than 10% of those with addresses in Yorkshire or the north-east while less than one fifth of 100 Scots and Irish women in the total SAWWW sample belonged to London clubs. The only areas in which metropolitan club membership was fairly popular were Wales, the south-west and what is now Cumbria with 40% of this group maintaining a London address. Many women taking part in processions or other suffrage activities in the capital would have stayed with friends or relatives: Frances Murray from Dunbartonshire certainly did so on her visits to the capital. [77] Her daughters, Eunice, President of the WFL in Scotland, and Sylvia, both said to be ardent feminists [78], possibly did the same and it was only when Catherine Marshall's work detained her for lengthy periods in London during 1912 that she gave up staying with friends and rented a room. [79] What cannot be denied is that two-thirds of those who mentioned a club came from the south-east of England, split evenly between Greater London and the Home Counties. These are the members who are most likely to have taken advantage of the regular facilities on offer – dining, evening entertainment, a room in town for the night – and to have viewed membership of a club as another source of recreation.

A distinction may have to be drawn between the two suffrage clubs, the International Women's Franchise and the Suffrage, and the rest. The IWF had only opened its doors in 1910 and was said to have 1500 members, both male and female, by the following year. [80] Although it was similar to many London clubs with its drawing and smoking rooms, its lecture series and annual club dinner, its whole *raison d'être* was as a 'single issue' organisation, thereby distinguishing it from the more traditional ladies' social club. Perhaps for this reason, and because it was inexpensive to join, its clientele was somewhat younger

than most – 20% of the SAWWW group were under 35 years of age. For many of these young women – Rose (Elsie) Howey (29) and Mary Gawthorpe (32), organisers in the WSPU, Helga Gill (28) and Alice Hess (26) of the NUWSS and Iris Yeoman (24), formerly treasurer in a WFL branch – it was their only club. There they might have rubbed shoulders with several young men prominent in the suffrage movement such as Victor Duval (28), founder of the Men’s Political Union for Women’s Enfranchisement or Hugh Franklin (24), one of the few men to be forcibly fed while imprisoned for the cause. Equally they might have met the 69-year-old Charlotte Despard, doyenne of the WFL, or titled women such as Lady Chance and Lady Willoughby de Broke. The IWF attracted an unusually broad cross-section of suffrage activists including a significantly higher percentage of militants (42%) than other London clubs although numbers of married and single women were virtually identical.

The membership of non-suffrage establishments is more likely to impart the flavour of Edwardian ladies’ clubs and define their nature and composition in the years before 1914. According to the SAWWW sample, their clientele was overwhelmingly middle-aged or elderly, with 62% aged 45 and over. Not surprisingly, suffrage society affiliations leaned heavily towards the less militant sections of the movement – only 14% belonging to the WSPU or WFL – but single women only just outnumbered married. This might appear to contradict the view that clubland was the haunt of the working spinster, the new professional and the ‘mannish’ feminist. [81] It may also be a reflection of the age and numerical advantage of constitutionalists in the biographies.

A closer inspection of three clubs paints a more vivid picture. The Albemarle, for instance, was founded in 1881 and was open to both sexes. In 1913, ten of the suffrage sample claimed membership, including Millicent Fawcett, and on closer inspection they shared many similarities. All belonged to either the CUWFA or the NUWSS, and had been or were still married. Most had homes in London, half were over 65 years old and if all ten had met on

club premises, it would have been a prestigious gathering, boasting five Presidents and two Vice-Presidents of their respective societies. It may also have been a serious occasion as only three of the ten mentioned any recreations, and these were largely restricted to walking, reading and attending lectures or concerts. Only the youngest, a woman of 54, admitted to the more adventurous pastime of motoring: little wonder that she also belonged to the reputedly livelier Pioneer club. Here a further seven members pursued some active hobbies including ski-ing, caravan and cycle camping, digging and foreign travel as well as the more sedate music and reading but once again, the majority were over 50 years old. If this group is an accurate reflection of the Pioneer in 1913, the 'woman of advanced views' was now a mature matron rather than a modern miss, though her attitudes may have been no less ardent.

The nine Sesame club members, however, were a younger and more diverse set altogether and their club was open to men as well as women. Although most belonged to the NUWSS, they included the thirty-three-year-old Una Duval, wife of Victor and member of the WSPU. Catherine Marshall, an activist in the NUWSS in London and her home town of Keswick, was the same age; both she and her mother Caroline were members. Catherine seemed to regard sport as an important leisure activity. In 1909 she had sought "a keen suffragette" to help out in Cumberland, perhaps combining useful work for the cause with a pleasant holiday in the district, whose chief delights she enumerated as good bathing and mountain climbing, and excellent golf links. Better still, she suggested that a party of friends with bicycles could cover the whole area as speakers and still have time for its sporting attractions. [82] Another Sesame club member, Lady Betty Balfour, sister of the militant Lady Constance Lytton, was involved in both the CUWFA and NUWSS in London and Scotland. Her *Who's Who* biography states that she has been active in the suffrage movement for three years, "refuses now to do any [party] political work till the vote is won", and enjoys music, reading novels and cycling. The range of activities pursued by this group of women stretches from needlework, singing and gardening to the more physical tennis, rowing and skating.

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

Research into the suffrage campaign and its supporters has resulted in hundreds of scholarly books and articles over the past 40 years, covering many aspects of the movement.[83] Little attention, however, seems to have been paid to the lives of ordinary suffrage women and the ways in which they occupied their leisure time. Sports historians, on the other hand, have been quick to condemn female sportswomen and participants in physical exercise as neither emancipated in outlook nor committed to feminist ideals. [84] The women whose biographies appear in *The Suffrage Annual and Women's Who's Who* demonstrate that it was possible to take part in both suffrage and sports activities, as well as a range of other leisure pursuits, and to be involved in an urban cultural environment through their membership of clubs. Marion Wallace-Dunlop may have been atypical in having “no time for recreations till the vote is won.

## References

- [1] A.J.R. (Ed.) (1913) *The Suffrage Annual and Women's Who's Who* (London: Stanley Paul).
- [2] Elizabeth Crawford (2000) *The Women's Suffrage Movement: a reference guide, 1866-1928*, p. xi (London: Routledge).
- [3] James Laver (1958) *Edwardian Promenade*, p. 196 (London: Hulton).
- [4] E. Sylvia Pankhurst (1931) *The Suffragette Movement*, pp. 220-21 (London: Longmans).
- [5] Christabel Pankhurst (1959) *Unshackled: the story of how we won the vote*, p. 17 (London: Hutchinson).
- [6] June Purvis (2000) 'Deeds, not words': daily life in the WSPU in Edwardian Britain in June Purvis & Sandra Stanley Holton (Eds.) *Votes for Women*, p. 138 (London: Routledge); Sandra Stanley Holton (1992) The suffragist and the average woman, *Women's History Review*, 1, pp. 9-24.

[7] Charles Loch Mowat (1961) *The Charity Organisation Society*, p. 82 (London: Methuen).

While this statement relates to members of the leisured and professional classes in late Victorian Britain, it can apply equally to Edwardian women.

[8] Leah Leneman (1995) *A Guid Cause: the women's suffrage movement in Scotland*, p. 219 (Edinburgh: Mercat).

[9] Crawford, *Women's Suffrage Movement*, and Diane Atkinson (1996) *The Suffragettes in Pictures* (Stroud: Museum of London/Sutton Publishing) have obtained much detailed information from the SAWWW.

[10] see, for example, Leneman, *Guid Cause*; Martin Pugh (2000) *The March of the Women* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Andrew Rosen (1974) *Rise Up, Women! The militant campaign of the Women's Social and Political Union, 1903-1914* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul); Sophia van Wingerden (1999) *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain, 1866-1928* (Basingstoke: Macmillan). Also Jihang Park (1988) The British suffrage activists of 1913: an analysis, *Past and Present*, 120, pp. 147-62.

[11] Park, 'The British suffrage activists', p. 147; A.J.R. (Ed.), *Suffrage Annual*, foreword.

[12] A number of women gave either the address of their club or their local suffrage branch instead of a home address. Some refused to give their age, or referred coyly to a birth date eg, Mrs Marguerite Palmer, a founder member of the Irish Women's Franchise League, had served imprisonment for her suffrage activities, yet chose to refer obliquely to the year of her birth as "in the eighties".

[13] There is no mention of the suffrage campaign in the official history of Selfridges - Gordon Honeycombe (1984) *Selfridges: 75 Years; the story of the store, 1909-84* (London: Park Lane Press) – perhaps because it escaped the window smashing that affected other West End shops. An approach to the present owners has yielded no further information.

[14] Crawford, *Women's Suffrage Movement*, pp. 580-81.

[15] Park, 'The British suffrage activists', p. 147. The *Suffrage Annual* states (p. 161) that the Reform Bill of January 1913 had just been defeated "as we go to press." The book probably appeared in the middle of the year, leaving 15 months in which to produce a second edition

and/or a 1914 version before the outbreak of World War I. A commercial explanation for its demise seems more plausible.

[16] Review in *Votes for Women*, quoted in Crawford, *Women's Suffrage Movement*, pp. 580-81. The book's author Miss Annesley Kenealy, a journalist, notes in her SAWWW entry that she suggested the 'Votes for Women Novels' series.

[17] For a discussion of women's 'experience' and 'language' in a poststructuralist context, see Purvis (2000) 'Deeds, not words', note 10, pp. 153-54. Amongst the arguments here is the notion that experience is a linguistic event. For the perception of self, see Ernesto Spirelli (1989) *The Interpreted World: an introduction to phenomenological psychology*, Chapter 5 (London: Sage). The author suggests not only that the 'self' is actually a series of 'multiple selves' but that the 'self' concept does not remain fixed over time. Thus, although memories may remain unaltered, their significance and interpretation may differ, a somewhat worrying concept for those who base their views of the suffrage campaign on memoirs, oral history and autobiographies of the major participants. I am grateful to Trish Barry for this reference.

[18] Even recent women's histories have failed to include sections on leisure and recreation; see, for example, Kathryn Gleadle (2001) *British Women in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave) and Susie Steinbach (2004) *Women in England, 1760-1914* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson).

[19] Kathleen E. McCrone (1988) *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914*, p. 286 (London: Routledge); Marilyn Constanzo (2002) 'One Can't Shake Off the Women': images of sport and gender in *Punch*, 1901-10, *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 19, p. 50.

[20] For example, Jennifer A. Hargreaves (1985) "Playing Like Gentlemen While Behaving Like Ladies": contradictory features of the formative years of women's sport, *British Journal of Sports History*, 2, pp. 40-52; Kathleen McCrone (1987) Play up! Play up! And Play the Game! Sport at the late Victorian girls' public schools in J.A. Mangan and Roberta J. Park (Eds.) *From 'Fair Sex' to Feminism* (London: Cass); Jihang Park (1989) Sport, Dress Reform



and the Emancipation of Women in Victorian England: a reappraisal, *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 6, pp. 10-30.

[21] Neil Tranter (1998) *Sport, Economy and Society in Britain, 1750-1914*, p. 91 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[22] Park, 'The British Suffrage Activists', p. 148 suggests that most of the contributors to the SAWWW were of middle-class or upper-class origin.

[23] *Ladies Golf Union Yearbook*, 1911 (London: LGU).

[24] *Golf Illustrated*, 7 February 1913, p. 173 following damage to four golf courses in the Birmingham area, the first of many over the next 18 months. Acid was poured onto the greens and turf trown up; sometimes VW or Votes for Women was carved into the ground.

[25] Major Arthur Hughes Onslow (1913) Then and Now: Hunting, in Alfred E.T. Watson (Ed.) *Badminton Magazine of Sports and Pastimes*, 36, p. 136 (London: Hulton). The author made no attempt to quantify women active in field sports

[26] *The Gentlewoman*, 1913-14.

[27] John Lowerson (2001) Foxhunting, in Karen Christensen, Allen Guttman and Gertrud Pfister (Eds.) *The International Encyclopedia of Women and Sports*, p. 432 (New York: Macmillan).

[28] Only four women mention croquet; there are no archery enthusiasts.

[29] McCrone, *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women*, p. 183; Leonora Davidoff, The Family in Britain in F.M.L. Thompson (Ed.), *Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750-1950*, Vol 2, p. 102 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Insufficient information is available to quantify numbers of female cyclists.

[30] Atkinson, *The Suffragettes in Pictures*, p. 14.

[31] Chris Harvie (1994) Sport and the Scottish State in G Jarvie and G Walker (Eds.) *Scottish Sport in the Making of the Nation*, p. 46 (Leicester University Press: Leicester).

[32] *The Gentlewoman*, 4 October 1913, p. 451.

[33] Park, 'The British suffrage activists', p. 154.

- [34] Liz Stanley with Anne Morley (1988) *The Life and Death of Emily Wilding Davison*, p. 19 (London: Women's Press).
- [35] Transcript of tape, quoted in Joyce Marlow (Ed.) (2000) *Votes for Women – the Virago book of suffragettes*, p. 163 (London: Virago).
- [36] Crawford, *Women's Suffrage Movement*, p. 56.
- [37] UK Newsquest Regional Press – This is Local London, 2 April 2003.
- [38] B.M. Willmott Dobbie (1979) *A Nest of Suffragettes in Somerset – Eagle House, Batheaston*, p. 10 (Batheaston: Batheaston Society).
- [39] Liliias Mitchell, *Suffrage Days* (unpublished memoirs). I am grateful to the late Leah Leneman for letting me see a copy of this.
- [40] Crawford, *Women's Suffrage Movement*, pp. 49-50.
- [41] Martha Vicinus (1985) *Independent Women: work and community for single women, 1850-1920*, p. 273 (London: Virago).
- [42] Frances E. Slaughter (Ed.) (1898) *The Sportswoman's Library* (London: Constable). See Catriona Parratt (1989) Athletic "Womanhood": exploring sources for female sport in Victorian and Edwardian England, *Journal of Sport History*, 16, pp. 140-57 for information on the monthly publication, *Womanhood* and McCrone, *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women*, Chapter 9, for discussion and extensive bibliography of contemporary literature on women's sport.
- [43] A.J.R. (Ed.), *Suffrage Annual*, p. 145.
- [44] John Benson (1994) *The Rise of Consumer Society in Britain 1880-1980*, p. 40 (London: Longman).
- [45] Erika D. Rappaport (1995) "A New Era of Shopping": the Promotion of Women's Pleasure in London's West End, 1909-1914 in Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz (Eds.) *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life*, p. 146 (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- [46] *Ibid.*, p. 144.
- [47] A.J.R. (Ed.), *Suffrage Annual*.
- [48] Honeycombe, *Selfridges*, p. 44.

- [49] Rappaport, “A New Era of Shopping”, p. 137.
- [50] Crawford (p. 118) notes that the Albemarle Club was founded the previous year, 1881, but does not indicate whether this club provided sleeping accommodation.
- [51] Jose Harris (1993) *Private Lives, Public Spirit: Britain 1870-1914*, p. 24 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- [52] Eleanor Gordon & Gwyneth Nair (2003) *Public Lives: women, family and society in Victorian Britain*, p. 217 (Yale: Yale University Press).
- [53] Vicinus, *Independent Women*, p. 298.
- [54] Crawford, *Women’s Suffrage Movement*, p. 126.
- [55] *Ibid.*, p. 125. Branches were formed in Berlin, Paris, Rome and Florence.
- [56] *Ibid.*, p. 124.
- [57] Virginia Woolf (1993 reprint edition) *A Room of One’s Own*, p. 35 (London: Bloomsbury Publishing; first published 1928, London). Crawford notes that the New Victorian club “does not appear to have had even an apology for a library.” Crawford, *Women’s Suffrage Movement*, p. 126.
- [58] Major Arthur Griffiths (1907) *Clubs and Clubmen*, p. 153 (London: Hutchinson).
- [59] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
- [60] *Ibid.*, p. 154.
- [61] Sir Charles Petrie (1965) *Scenes of Edwardian Life*, p. 40 (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode).
- [62] Griffiths, *Clubs and Clubmen*, p. 156.
- [63] Crawford, *Women’s Suffrage Movement*, p. 120.
- [64] *Ibid.*, p. 125.
- [65] Vicinus, *Independent Women*, p. 298.
- [66] *Ibid.*
- [67] Griffiths, *Clubs and Clubmen*, p. 158.
- [68] David Rubinstein (1986) *Before the Suffragettes: women’s emancipation in the 1890s*, p. 224 (Brighton: Harvester).

- [69] *Ibid.*, p. 226.
- [70] Philippa Levine (1990) *Feminist Lives in Victorian England: private roles and public commitment*, p. 67 (Oxford: Blackwell).
- [71] Crawford, *Women's Suffrage Movement*, p. 118.
- [72] Gordon & Nair, *Public Lives*, p. 217.
- [73] Rubinstein, *Before the Suffragettes*, p. 226; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, p. 299.
- [74] See, for example, Eve Anstruther, (1899) Ladies' Clubs, *Nineteenth Century*, 45, p. 605; B.S. Knollys (1895) Ladies' Clubs in London, *Englishwoman*, pp. 120-25.
- [75] DeCourcy L. Dewar (1950) *History of the Glasgow Society of Lady Artists' Club*, p. 10 (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press).
- [76] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- [77] Gordon & Nair, *Public Lives*, p. 117.
- [78] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- [79] Crawford, p. 383.
- [80] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- [81] Levine, *Feminist Lives in Victorian England*, p. 67, suggests that clubs were particularly popular with single women.
- [82] Marlow, *Votes for Women*, p. 86.
- [83] See Purvis & Holton (Eds.), *Votes for Women*, pp. 7-11. Over 100 items are listed for up to 1999.
- [84] Tranter, *Sport, Economy and Society in Britain*, p. 92.